

**STATION PRESS.**

Printers, Account Book Makers,  
Book Binders, Stationers,  
Embossers and Rubber Stamp Makers,

**BUDHANÁ GATE,**

**MEERUT CITY.**

**Meerut Conspiracy Case.**

**1929 — 32.**

P507  
1261

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY  
BRANCH LIBRARY  
BOMBAY

124

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S  
BRANCH LIBRARY  
BOMBAY

P. 527.

A Star of India File containing the following of documents  
amongst others.

---

P. 527. (D) .

2/1 EUROPEAN ASYLUM LANE,  
CALCUTTA.

14th March '29.

Dear Datt,

I received your letter of 11 January about two weeks ago, owing to the fact that Kishori Ghosh was away from home for some time. You need not be alarmed about my health. It is now quite good, except for occasional symptoms of debility and weakness. While the cool weather lasts I am trying to take regular walking exercise etc., and this has done me good.

You suggest that I should retire and do some writing. It is an attractive idea, though I do not quite know what I should write? But it will depend upon other events, and in any case the position here is now very bad, and I should not like to leave it.

You remind me of the question of sending press reports to the Sunday Worker and so on. I feel very guilty about this. I found soon after I came that I should have to get some sort of licence from the Director General of Posts and Telegraphs, in order to wire at Press rates. Otherwise it is impossibly expensive of course. And at that I simply dropped it. Subsequently Desai told me in Bombay that he intended to do something, but I don't know if he is. I saw him for a few days at Calcutta, but forgot to raise the question. Muzaffar is writing to the Sunday Worker this week, asking them to apply to the D. G. at Delhi on his behalf. This seems to be necessary. When he has got his licence, if he gets it, perhaps we can do something.

Have you seen Desai's "Spark" by the way? Ho has done it quite well, I think, in the circumstances, but it was a hopeless proposition from the first. We have heard nothing of it now for three weeks, so it must have collapsed. I suppose. (I am wrong. As I write, Nos. 5 and 6 (but not 4) are received).

About the Conferences etc., you again embarrass me. I was present at the T.U.C. of course, and took fairly full notes up to a point. After that the atmosphere became so heated that it was impossible. I might give some sort of account, but it would be difficult. Bradley said he would send as complete a report as possible to the W.W.L. At Bombay he has access to the official documents, so his report, if he has sent one, would be the best.

As for the others, I really know as little as you can have gathered from the Press; rather less in fact, as, though I collected mountains of cuttings, I confess that I have not read them all. I followed the W.P.P. meetings and subsequent private discussions

closely, of course, and attended the A.I.C.C. once or twice. That was all there was time for. The Independence League was, as you suggest, a piece of bluff from the beginning, at any rate on the part of the leaders. Jawaharlal may have meant what he said, but he could not stand out against the pressure of his father and Mahatma on the one hand, and the intrigue of Srinivas and Subhas on the other. I think we were right (in the W.P.P. "Political Resolution") in describing the Bengal League as a brake on the others. Anyway the whole thing has collapsed now. It is a curious compromise—Dominion Status this year, Independence next! It is not quite true to say that it has wholly collapsed of course. It seems to have some life still in Madras, where the W.P.P. has never been heard of. But while they keep Satyamurthi & Co., at the head of it, it won't do much I am afraid.

I saw your article, and was interested in your suggestion about Jawaharlal. I had not noticed the passage you quote, I confess, though I was present at the time. He spoke in Urdu of course (which I am sorry to say I don't know yet). You are right though, as to his character. He has the I. L. P. mentality.

As for the future, the Congress is making every effort to keep the leadership of the mass movement, and the police by arresting Gandhi are doing their best to help. But in spite of all talk, they cannot get beyond the middle-class and cloth-burning. If only we had the men and resource! Bombay and Punjab seem to be going on fairly well, but activity here is at a low ebb, and U. P. is too big a job to tackle with the men we have got. The All-India Party is a farce, as might have been foreseen.

The Bengal W.P.P. events are nothing short of a tragedy. I write in a mood of despondency about this; I feel that the work of a year has practically been destroyed. The bulk of the Party members remain, but of the active men, half have gone (they resigned recently, and we gather, will form a "People's Party"), and what is worse, the other half all seem to be paralysed—through sickness, other occupations, or mere slackness. I blame myself to some extent. I feel that if I had exercised the firmness (not to say brutality) of Bradley or Allison, it might not have happened. That, at any rate, I fancy. But I admit that I can see nothing concrete which I shall have done otherwise. I have been trying to write an analysis of it, which I thought might be published as a pamphlet. (It is not typed yet, so I cannot send you a copy). I show to my own satisfaction that there is an undercurrent of political and ideological difference between the two groups. The opposition tends towards an anarchism somewhat reminiscent of Bakunin (at any rate in the political methods!), and on the other hand towards reformism and sheer capitulation to the Congress. The petty bourgeois influence which you have hinted at. But I have to admit that it would

be absurd to say that this is the principle cause of the split. A knowledge of psychology is required here. I am at a complete loss to understand the ferocity of the opposition. Why for example should Dr. Bhupen Dutt go about all over Bengal, as he seems to have been doing for months, spreading the most atrocious personal libels against us? We have never injured him at all, beyond the very mildest protest when he borrows our most expensive library books and "loses" them. (He is not a Party member, though he has often been asked to join, but is nevertheless a member of the opposition group.) The same question may be asked about Dr. P.B. Das Gupta, and other non-members, as well as about all the actual oppositionists. The conclusion is irresistible that there is some very capable provocateur at work, whose function is to exacerbate personal quarrels. He may be acting on behalf of the Congress, or the other people. Who he may be of course, we cannot tell.

I must say, in justice to ourselves, that we have kept our tempers very well, and have done nothing which could be said to be provocative. We did not even reply to their statements which you must have noticed in "Forward". The split when it came was quite unexpected by us, but had obviously been carefully prepared from their side, and developed at once to an extreme of personal bitterness. Some sort of relations were kept up for some time, and we were hoping that when tempers cooled and so forth, some at any rate of the opposition would realise their error. They rallied their forces energetically however, and did their best apparently to make any peace impossible. They approached us now and then, but apparently with the object of finding out our intentions, and of creating further disagreement among us, in which they succeeded to some extent. Both the Baurja and the Union Jute Mill Strikes collapsed partly because of their efforts to fight us out by propaganda among the workers. At length, when the situation was becoming impossible we expelled two of them (after due notice etc.) for non-payment of subscriptions for two years. The rest chose to make a grievance of this and resigned enbloc. We were not sure whether to be sorry or pleased. It is fairly clear even in this case that they were simply waiting for us to move and give them an excuse. It was a first aggressive act we have undertaken throughout the whole affair.

You will reply, with truth, that after all it is only a temporary difficulty. It does not affect the workers. But even a temporary difficulty is of great importance at this time. You must have noticed how threatening the atmosphere is becoming. Heaven knows where any of us will be in six months. Unless something can be done immediately nothing can be done at all. And of course this affair has resulted in a general withdrawal of support so that we are absolutely crippled.

I note you point about working-class leadership. I do not remember hearing of this article before. Your criticism is of course correct, but I feel that the writer whoever he may have been has some excuse. Roughly speaking you can have working-class leadership in a Union in India in two conditions. On the one hand you may become in effect a shop-union, like the B. N. R. and many others. Or on the other, you have to get absolutely on top of the employers, as they have in the Bombay mills now. In any intermediate position, victimisation for leaders is a certainty. I know from experience that almost everywhere the workers are in deadly fear of it. They are all married of course (this is, I believe, an important point to remember in discussing Indian Trade Unionism) and there is no unemployment benefit, State or otherwise. I am, I am sorry to say, the President of the Garden Reach Workers' Union (of the workshops repairing river and other steamboats). I was first approached by these men in December last. I asked them to make a worker president. They absolutely refused. They would have Subhas, or K. C. Mitra, or myself. So I accepted. The Secretary is an outsider also. Even now they will do absolutely nothing except under the cover of the Secretary or myself. They are educated men, several of whom know English, and could perfectly well conduct the Union on their own.

I have been thinking about the working class—Youth movement. There is no such thing in existence yet, even in Bombay, so far as I know. Here we formed the "Young Comrades League" about eight months ago. Unfortunately, when it might have begun to make contact with the working class, it was "captured" by the opposition, who swamped it with class-conscious young "bhadralok". So, if anything is to be done, it must be started again from the beginning. I enclose a copy of its "Statement of Programme and Policy".

I intended to mention previously, but forgot, a point which may be of interest. We gather from Bhuken Dut's propaganda and chance remarks, and from what Jawaharlal has said in private to a party member, that there is in Berlin some group who are interested to decry and malign everybody who is working here. It doesn't matter much of course, but they have succeeded in doing quite opposite damage in Bengal at any rate. If you think it worth while, and if you can, you might make tactful inquiries, and find out what is at the bottom of it.

Some few weeks ago I attended a conference at Kustia, where was inaugurated the "Bengal Peasants League". Some of the leaders who were put in the Committee are rather reactionary, I think, but the programme is all right, and the active men are good. The said reactionaries will not interfere too much. I gather, also. So there seems to be no reason why it should not progress well.



There is, as you know a fairly well-developed peasants' movement in various parts of Bengal. I wrote months ago a longish account of the movement in Atia (Mymensingh Dist.) for the Sunday Worker. But I think they cannot have received it, and I have not another copy. We have just met a man with an interesting story from Khulna District. Some one of us must go there also.

I can think of no more gossip at the moment. I should say, by the way, that I have heard practically nothing yet of British Party affairs, nor even anything of value about the International.

Best wishes,  
Philip.

## P. 527. (2)

Mr. J. Ryan,  
Trades Hall,  
Goulborn St.  
Sydney,  
Aust.

### *Organisation :*

(1) Organisation is a somewhat dull and uninspiring subject to read about or discuss; but it hardly needs to be pointed out that it is a matter of the highest importance for us in the working-class movement. It is a common place that all human affairs can be conducted only by this means. Governments, armies, industries maintain themselves only by highly perfect organisation. Even civilian population have to deal with their own affairs by means of more or less elaborate organisation (a caste system or whatever it may be) depending upon the conditions of their life. How necessary then is organisation for us, at present a small minority, who have to make an attack upon the well organised powers that be, to convert to our view a large population of ignorant people and set them in well-directed action—briefly, to pursue a task of enormous difficulty with the very slenderest resources.

The task of organising is more difficult in India than in e. g. America or Europe, not because of any supposed Oriental peculiarities or Eastern mentality, but because industrialism is young and not yet wide-spread in India. Industrialism produces the physical and psychological conditions (concentration of population, regularity and discipline of habits etc.) which make organisation easy. Discussion of organisation is all the more necessary therefore, and as real effort to put into practice some at any rate of this most important principles.

What is contained in these pages makes us pretence of finality or authority. The type of organisation fitted to any given conditions has to be found by experience in those conditions. But here it is attempted to give some suggestions derived from both Indian and European experience, which may be of use in Indian practice.

(2) Organisation is subservient to policy. In determining organisation there have to be considered the end aimed at, the means to be employed and the conditions in which the policy is to be pursued. Organisations therefore differ a great deal. But generally any organisation carries into effect the principles of *specialisation*, and of *discipline*. Specialisation involves both economy of strength and the raising of the level of efficiency etc.

of the weaker members of the organisation to that of the strongest. By means of specialisation, all members, however, they may differ, may be equipped more or less effectively with the resources, of knowledge, experience, etc., of the best among them. Discipline involves the most elementary principle of common action—"Unity is strength"—but also means more than merely enforcing unity and obedience. It supplies a psychological corrective to ordinary human weaknesses, faction, laziness etc.

Barabazar Lab. U. Asst. Sec r. Chiranjil Lal.	Each month and back number 89/8 Lower Chitpur Road, "Kirti" Calcutta. (Rameshwar Docks).
--	---

3. Let us consider first Trade Unions, as the first organisation two which the workers have recourse, and the basis of our movement. There are to subjects, necessarily inter-connected, to be considered (1) how to see about getting an organisation (2) what kind of organisation to establish. It is primarily the second which will be dealt with here. It is assumed that the first object of Union organisation is to force the best possible conditions out of employers, by the only effective means i.e. vigorous attack. The way in which this can be done in practice, is discussed a little more fully in "The power of labour." The essential thing is to formulate the programme of the Union—i.e. the things which, the members are to achieve by their joint action. It is assumed that there are at any rate mainly *demands*, i.e. things which the employer is to be induced to grant. Other things benefit etc. will be discussed later.

The question is then, what kind of organisations to establish. It is generally agreed that the principle of industrial unionism is sound; that for purposes of fighting T. U.'sm the industrial union i.e. one union for the industry, is best. According to this principle there should be e.g. for cotton mill workers, one union covering mills, ginning factories, cotton godown, etc. etc. and having branches in Bombay, Ahmedabad, Sholapur, Nagpur, Madras, Calcutta, Dacca, etc. etc. And so on with other industries and services.

It is worth while to spend a moment on considering whether this is a desirable plan of organisattons for India—although except in one or two industries, this is not yet a very practical question.

Industrial unionism is not a sacred principle; it is a more or less workable compromise. Briefly, the interests of workers are found together among themselves in various different ways; and corresponding to these different ties, different types of organisations should be suitable.

Actually there have been in this history of labour a few main types of union organisation. The chief of them are these: (1) the "*craft*" union based upon the performance of the same (usually skilled) type of works (examples: the spinners, weavers, carders etc. Unions at Ahmedabad and the Indian Quartermasters' Union at Calcutta), (2) the "*shop*" union, based upon employment in the same works (example: the Jamshedpur labour Unions; and in an extended sense, all the Indian Railway Unions;—and many others.) (3) the local general union, (example: the Mazdur Sabha at Cawnpore, which tries to organise all workers living in that city; The "Syndicates" of France and other European countries were similar in principle; (4) the general or "One Big Union" (In India the Bauria Labour Union, which takes in all kinds of workers and establishes branches in various places; Rangoon, Bassein etc. is the only approach to this. The "Knights of labour" and later "Industrial Workers of the world" of America, the "Australian Workers' Union", the "One Big Union" of Canada; the "National Union of General and Municipal Workers"; and the "Workers' Union of Great Britain are well-known examples outside; (5) the Industrial Union (examples, the Bengal Jute Workers' Union the Colliery Employees' Association (Jharia); and in another sense the All-India Railwaymen's Federation, are the beginnings, skeletons as it were, of this kind of Union).

Briefly to review these type in turn:

(1) Nobody nowadays defends craft-unionism, (in theory though it is still very common in practice) and it is hardly worth discussing. It is enough to say that it can organise only skilled men dividing them from the unskilled and semi-skilled; it divides even the ranks of the skilled into many different groups, it is therefore completely destructive of class-consciousness; it cannot survive in any case in an industry whose technique is subject to considerable change. (Such change as has now been going for sometime on in America, and has already resulted in the practical destruction of large sections of the old T.U. movement. The same process is now beginning to be seen in England—the old craft unions in several industries are in a state of ferment and are visibly breaking down.

(2) Although it is so widespread, few also defend shop-unionism, except capitalists. Capitalists, when they establish workers' Union under their own control in order to fight the workers, always establish shop-unions. And they have far less difficulty in "capturing" even an originally genuine workers' union which is built on this principle, than they do in getting hold of a union which covers several different firms.

(cf. the old Jamshedpur Labour Association), the B. N. Ry. Indian Labour Union, the N.W. Ry. Unions, E. B. Ry. Indian Labour

Union, ( and the new "Federation") all of which were or are in some cases in other more less effectively captured by the management).

(3) Few now defend the local general union principle—except ambitious labour leaders. Because by its means the largest number of workers can be organised with the least trouble—without regard to the effectiveness of the organisation. The syndicalists of Europe built their movement on it, but even they insisted more and more on the strong national organisation at the expense of the local body. Weakness lies, not in its uniting all workers of a locality—that is essential; but in its inevitable if involuntary tendency to disunite workers of one industry in different localities. The practice if not the idea of the local general union is likely however to be popular in India, because of the great distances, the poverty of the movement and the prevalence of local difference of language & dialect which prevent communication on a natural scale. Miss Broughton (Lady Chatterjee) actually advocates it on these grounds. The writer's view however that for most industrial workers it is quite unsuitable. The bond which most directly unites workers the world over, is the fact that they produce for a common market. This is certainly the case nowadays in India. The local union cannot hope to cope with this situation.

The issue then in theory lies mainly between the Industrial Union and the One Big Union. (The latter has yet not many individual support in India, but there are a number of organisers whose actual work tends in this direction. It should therefore be dealt with.) The advocates of the O. B. U. can argue that, even if in the early days of capitalism an "industry" could be considered isolated, that is not to the same extent the case now.

The concentration of capital proceeds not only "horizontally" (uniting many firms which do the same work) but also vertically" (uniting many firms doing different processes with the same material), and finally heterogeneously (uniting firms doing altogether different work). In India the concentration of capital is very far advanced, and we are definitely under the third stage. The biggest capitalist group—Sassoon's, Tatas' Birla Bros., Andrew Yule, Bird & Co., Burn & Co., Sir R. N. Mukharji, not to mention the Government, extend their operations into all spheres of production. In the important industrial region of Bengal, Assam and Bihar (apart from Jamshedpur) the chief industries—coal, jute, tea, metal, engineering, shipping, electric supply, pottery etc., are almost completely controlled by a small number of firms, (including both Indians and English), which are so closely connected and interlocked as to constitute in effect a single group.

This is a powerful argument for the O. B. U. as is the further point, that if we take—as we must—the largest view, and

construct workers' organisation with the object of taking power into the hands of the workers, we must concentrate mainly on getting *class* consciousness, (not *craft*, or *locality* or *industry* consciousness). To them the industrial unionist replies (1) the fact of the concentration of capital cannot be questioned. None the less, the unity which is needed most is unity in on the basis of the common market. These who produce the same goods under different capitalists compete against each other even more directly and these need unity of orgn. more than those who produce different goods for the profit of the same capitalist. (2) We must be practical. Workers join unions primarily to get better conditions immediately. The industrial union necessarily concentrates on this more definitely than the O. B. U. which appeals too directly to the workers' idealism and class consciousness, without giving time for these things to be learnt by experience. (3) We can get something of the necessary unity by joining the unions together in the T. U. C., Provincial T. U. Fedn. and Trades Councils. (4) In any case the question of the political (class) struggle is primarily one for the workers' Party. The O. B. U. is an attempt to make one organisation score as Union and Party at the same time—with the inevitable result of inefficiency in both—the Union aspect and the Party aspect.

On the whole then, the industrial union has it, and in fact the principle is in theory now almost universally accepted. It is however, a fact to be reckoned with that up to the present in India practically all Unions are local or sectional in one way or another and there is yet no large scale successful industrial Union in existence. The reasons for this are familiar, and are important. It is however the belief of the writer that, at any rate in the most important industries, the difficulties must be fought and overcome. No good case can be brought forward for keeping Indian Unions in a more backward stage than those of other countries.

The following are the industries which certainly, or in the writers' opinion probably, should be organised on the industrial plan.—

(1) Railways: (the formation of the A. I. R. Fedn. shows that this necessity is felt. The transformation of this Fedn. into a genuine all inclusive Union is a most urgent task).

(2) Seamen: (There are completely separate Unions at present. In order to have any real strength the Union must be united, and all those Seamen who sign on at Calcutta, Bombay and Rangoon (and also Colombo and Singapore) should be in one Union. It should have offices also at Madras, Karachi, Mangalore, Chittagong, and indeed all minor ports. The inland Seamen (on the Bengal and Assam and Burma river systems) might remain as

they are, separately organised, though they should be in close touch though standing (illegible) with the general seamen's Union, (and of course with the railwaymen's Union—E. B. K. A. B. P. and B. R. Sections).

(3) Miners: (It would be desirable to include with the coal miners those small and scattered groups of workers in the salt, gold, mica, manganese and other ore-mines).

(4) Tea-garden workers: (including those employed in the tea-factories).

(5) Jute workers—including those employed in mills, presses, godowns, and in subsidiary industries, such as rope-making.

(6) Cotton workers: including those employed in mills, ginning and baling, and perhaps also clothing factories, and those in the small number of woollen and silk mills.

(7) Pottery, cement, lime, bricks, firebrick tile, and glass (etc.) workers, and those engaged in quarrying and dressing stone etc.

(8) Chemical, dyeing, bleaching, indigo, bone and manure, matches, paint, soap etc. workers.

(9) Engineering and iron and steel workers, including foundry, smelting, engineering, construction, ship-building and repairing, ordnance, motorcar manufacture and repairing, etc. etc.

(10) Dock workers—including Port Trust and private docks, waterside transport workers, jetty workers, etc. (It is perhaps necessary to point out that the work of a dock is not merely of local application. If one dock is closed by a strike, in most cases ships can be diverted to another dock and essential material carried by rail etc. to its destination. All waterside workers therefore, except those engaged in ship-building and structural repairing, should be in the Dock-workers Union, which should however have close relation with the Seamen on the one hand and the railwaymen on the other).

(11) Oil-wells, refineries, depots, stores, tinning and packing factories etc. (mineral oils and other oils if any used for industrial purposes).

(12) Timber getting, wood-productive, saw-mills, carpentry, cabinet-making etc.

(13) Food, sugar mills, rice mills flour mills' tobacco factories, breweries, ice-factories, oil mills, coffee factories, caning and bottling, mineral water factories etc. etc.

(14) Leather works, tanneries, boot and shoe factories etc.

(15) Postal, telegraph, telephone. All these work for an all-India or international market, more or less, and their interests are bound up all over the country to such an extent that (except perhaps in the smaller and more diverse industries) and groups there can be little doubt as to the propriety of industrial unionism. It should be noticed however that there is much room even in the bigger and more clearly defined industries, for disputes as to the allocation of workers to one industrial Union or another such disputes as e. g. whether carpenters etc. employed in ship-building should be in the building-workers or in the engineering and ship-building Union, or whether Railway Press workers should be in the Railway or Press workers' Unions etc. No principles for the settlement of such disputes can be laid down in advance. They must be settled by agreement among the unions and groups of workers concerned; with the object in mind of providing the most efficient fighting machine. It will also be seen that the grouping is in some cases rather arbitrary. It is not intended in any way to be final. It is merely thought by the present writer that some concrete outline will be useful, even if it is not accepted and consequently (in some cases without any intimate knowledge) the workers in the various industries have been allotted to what seem suitable unions, which it should be said, in several cases have yet no existence at all.

A somewhat different position is occupied by various other occupations, which are more definitely local in regard to their market, or their supply of labours or both. As these cases, if the necessity of country-wide unity is not so strong nevertheless some kind of uniformity of organisation should be adopted and in most cases a federal principle, country-wide, but somewhat looser than the discipline of an industrial union, is to be expected ultimately. Again, therefore, a scheme of allotment to a small number of unions is put forward, which it is thought will conduce best to unity and effectiveness. These workers are: (1) Municipal (scavengers, workshops, clerks, roadgangs etc.) and gas, electric light and power, and water supplies.

(2) Press, book-binding, paper-mills.

(3) Town or local transport, train, bus, taxi, tanga, ricksha, etc., workers.

(4) Building (perhaps excepting large-scale metal construction which may be apart of this engineering industry).



(5) Shop-assistants, domestic and hotel-servants.

(6) Clerks (Commercial and Govt.). (other clerks should be organised by their industries e. g. Ry. clerks.)

(7) Agricultural labourers.

(8) Teachers. (Etc. other groups will probably occur to the mind of any reader, but none are likely to be of importance).

There is no room in any ordered and comprehensive scheme of organisation for miscellaneous or rather, casual labour unions, such as exist in almost all countries. There are few examples yet in India, as only skilled workers have yet been organised to any appreciable extent. The organisation of casual labours (i. e. those who work at unskilled occupations such as docks—labour, road-making, railway permanent-way gangs, buildings labour, etc. etc and usually drift more or less rapidly from one to another) should be in the different industrial unions, with provision between unions for recognition of each others' membership cards, or for interchange of members. Such systems work successfully in Europe and America.

Of the structure of the industrial Union, much could be said. Such Unions will naturally differ a good deal in detail, but generally they will have as part of their machinery(1) general meetings, which will decide all important questions (at any rate in theory). (2) control committee, (3) District or Provincial Committees, covering suitable subdivisions, which may or may not coincide with the existing political Provinces; (4) Branches, consisting of all the members in an area sufficiently small to enable them to meet frequently; (5) Branch Committees.

As to G. M's the principal point is to see that they are made genuinely representative of the rank of file. All delegates should be elected in branch meetings—either one or more delegate per branch, or one delegate to represent a local group of branches. The danger to fear is the control of the G. M. by the Union bureaucracy. This is bound to occur to a certain extent, but a democratic method of election etc. may avert it.

An important difficulty which will become manifest if unions actually are formed on the scale suggested here, is that of the expense of G. M's. It can be reduced by having a minimum number of delegates, consistent with adequate representation, but otherwise will have to be tackled as best it can. In some unions it is the practice to hold G. M's every two or even three years. This would save expense etc. but is not to be recommended. Annual meetings are necessary, if the Union is genuinely active.

A similar difficulty, but if possible on a graver scale, occurs in connection with Executive Committees. The T. U. C.

and the A. I. R. F. almost the only country-wide labour orgns. at present illustrate this. Their E. C. meet so infrequently (last yr. only once each between Annual Meeting) that they are useless as *Executive*. In present crisis with E. C. S. of the size which is usual in all kind of Indian organisations this is inevitable unless the members are rich. The only method is to cut down the size; then one can insist on regular quarterly bi-monthly or monthly meetings and get value from an E. C. There must of course also be a responsible Sec. at some suitable centre and small advisory committees with him. This is done e. g. in Australia, where conditions in regard to distance etc. are similar to ours (worse in comparison with population).

The question of Trade Union bureaucracy arises most acutely in common with the Centre E. C. Almost all Union, of any size show this tendency, for there to be formed a group of professional leaders, whose interests differ from those of the mass of workers, and who consequently mislead the Union. This is at its worst when the leaders are now workers, as in India, but it is also occurs in a very grave form in England for example, where not one in a hundred Union officials is a non-worker. Some Unions avoid it by enforcing a rule that all E.C. members and officials must attempt to spend a certain proportion of their time actually working at the trade. This is healthy, of course, but by itself is not enough. The only cure actually is the consciousness and vigilance of the rank and file. The same evil is to be looked for and combatted among the subordinate bureaucracy of the Districts and Branches.

The function of District Committee are intermediate and vague. In some industries they will not be necessary at all, but usually some orgn. intermediate between branch and centre is necessary for its ability to concentrate upon local affairs more quickly and with less important reservations than Central officials. In the Jute Industry e.g. the great bulk of which is closely concentrated, D.C.s will not be necessary, except for the jute press etc. Workers, who are scattered along the rivers in North and East Bengal, and who would in any case have a sub-Committee to secure this special interest. In the railway union the D.Cs. would probably correspond with the lines. D.C.'s can be constituted by direct election annually by the member of branches in the area covered.

Branches constitute the basis of the Union in all cases, and it is in regard to, them that the greatest change in present practice is required. At present branch meetings take place very seldom, are addressed almost exclusively by national officials, and admit all workers whether member or not. While general propaganda meetings for nonmembers are necessary, there is an even more important place for branch meetings i.e. meetings of all the branch members, for the purpose of discussing and deciding their own affairs by themselves.

Officials are not necessary, non-members should not be admitted, meeting should take place at regular intervals (month, or two weeks,) or week and at a regular time and place. A regular practice of collecting subscriptions at br. meetings should be established. Decisions taken should be properly recorded, and communicated to the H. Q. of the Union etc. etc. Only in this way can there be any training of the mass of workers in self government and administrations of working class affairs and any creation of a real leadership from among the workers themselves. If it is found that branch meetings are poorly attended, efforts must be made to make them more attractive and important. This and all other activities of a branch are made facilitated if it possesses a room or hall sufficiently large to hold meetings in Small committees may meet in private houses, though of course a permanent office is better. But practically no Union or branches in India have a room large enough for full meetings, and this is in the writer's opinion, one reason for the backwardness of the movement in this vitally important matter of holding branch meetings. It is very difficult to conduct a serious business meeting in the open air. The only practical way of tackling the question is for the branches of different Unions in each centre to cooperate in the maintenance of a hall or room of sufficient size for meetings, e. g. through the *Trades Council*. But by whatever means, br. meetings must be held and encouraged. No reform in the present practice of the T.U. movement is more urgent than this. A similar important point which is badly neglected in present T. U. practice is the maintenance of effective contact between branches and centres of Unions. This can only be done by requiring delegates and representatives to report regularly and fully to their branches on the doings of District and Central Committees. Such procedure should be automatic, but in fact it is not done, and the result is extremely harmful.

*Factory Committee:* A part of the organisation of the working class which is of great importance should be discussed here, viz. the factory (or shop, station, yards, dock, mill etc.) Committee. These Committees can usually be established only when a considerable degree of solidarity and militancy is attained, so that victimisation can be resisted. From each department or suitable subdivision of the works, one delegate (or more) is elected by all the workers, and these form the Committee. It is the chief function of the committee as a whole, and of the delegate in their departments, to lead the fight of the workers against the management in all the questions which come up in working hours—allotment of work, speeding-up, fines, punishments, favouritism, etc. etc. This can obviously be done on the spot far more effectively and quickly than by the clumsy method of correspondence or deputation from the branch. The Factory committee will also assist very materially in securing 100 per cent Trade Unionism

in the factory, and can see (by periodically inspecting T. U. cards) that tall members pay their dues regularly. The Factory Committee should have direct representation in the branch committee and in the Trade Council, and should be a recognised part of the Union machinery.

A number of problems which arise in connection with the organisation of Union must be touched upon, though in some cases no very definite solution can be suggested.

Such is the question of the division of powers between the branches and the centre (and as a subsidiary, the district orgn.) And, what is in practice almost the same question, that of the division of funds between the branches and the centre.

The remarks made in para—(re. industries) apply here. Those industries which are closely inter-connected (Jute, cotton, Seamen, tea, coalmining, perhaps railways,) demand more centralisation than less highly "integrated industries." In practice Unions differ to some extent in these matters. Most industrial Unions are fairly strongly centralised in regard to constitutional powers the C. E. C. retains final control of negotiations with employers, and complete control of strike action, and may even (this is perhaps undesirable) control affiliations of branches, etc., but in regard to finance may leave substantial sums, subject to constitutional safeguards, in the hands of branches. A plan which is probably suited to the requirements of the average Union, is to divide automatically all money collected as subscription into the various funds, roughly as follows: to remain in hands of branch (Br. general fund) 15%; to Centre, General Fund, 35% and special funds (say) Reserve or Strike fund 34%, Unemployment 10%, Sickness 10%. (Other special funds may be added or substituted; the division between Branch and Centre may be altered; provision for Dist. Orgn. may be added. This is suggested as a workable proportion in normal circumstances.)

If variation which is popular in European Unions, is to have a fixed rate of subscription to each fund (roughly in the proportion suggested), but to make contributions to certain funds, such as sickness, death benefit, etc. Voluntary.

The actual collection of funds is usually a difficult matter. But it can be said generally, that until this question is solved, no permanent mass Unionism and therefore, working-class consciousness is possible. The older syndicalists for example, controverted this view. They depended upon the "militant minority to lead the unorganised mass. The Russian Revolution of 1905 illustrates how an unorganised working-class can act in a conscious

manner. None the less, while the organisation of Unions of a fairly free and militant type is still legally possible, there is no need to fall back upon this counsel of despair. It was without saying that a Union must be active in the defence and service of its members if it is to continue to receive their support, and must conduct intelligent propaganda among the workers on the principle of Trade Unionism. Historically it is the fact that only when the Unions instituted benefit funds did they become permanent mass organisation. Some will question whether this method is to be adopted on the ground that the possession of benefit funds by a Union tends to make its members, and especially its officials, cautious and conservative—to breed a capitalist mentality in fact. This undoubtedly does happen, and must be fought against by the class conscious members of the Union. It is the writer's view none the less, that more good to the Unions in the present day in India is to be expected from instituting Benefit Funds then by abstaining from them. But it is in any case desirable to make the Unions more than purely "business" organisations. Educational work, social entertainment, etc. can with advantage be taken up, and will render the Unions more stable than they would otherwise be.

Much depends upon the method of collection. The method which is now usual in Eur. Union and is the best if it can be done, is to collect the subsn automatically at the meetings as Part of the branch business. In this way no commission is given, and generally the minimum of expense and disturbance is incurred. Though often the Branch Sec. or treasurer (who is a worker) is given some small sum either monthly or annually, as a compensation for the time he expends in book-keeping and correspondence. But this requires a membership trained to some extent in Unionism. Other wise collectors have to be employed, either full-time Union employees, or worker doing the job in their spare time, and this is expensive (commissions etc. have to be paid) and unless the collectors are tactful men, the members are apt to be estrayed and driven away from the Union. These however, are the only two methods open to a Union. Unless, like most Indian Unions, one depends upon chance, that is to say, these are the only organised methods.

In either case, it is advisable to use the system of membership cards—(Model cards)...If the rate of subscription is constant, the use of adhesive stamps as receipts is very effective, and saves trouble. (They can be specially printed for the Union at quite cheap rates.) If however, separate contribution is made in various funds, so that members' payments vary, the system of stamps becomes complicated and troublesome.

The rate and period of subscription provide another problem. In Britain, where weekly payment of wages is almost universal, weekly payment of subscription is usual. In India monthly wages

are the rule, and in consequence monthly payment is usually the idea. Many Unions however, in despair at their lack of success in getting monthly payments have introduced a system of yearly subscription. This is bad, for two main reasons: (1) it weakens the tie between the member and the Union, reducing that constant contact which is necessary for loyalty and discipline; (2) it renders it in most cases impossible to get enough money to run the Union properly. (The maximum which can be exacted from a man at one time, even yearly, is about one rupee. Unless the workers happen to be numerous and closely concentrated so that organising expenses are small, income thus obtained hardly be enough at any rate for an active Union.) It may be said definitely then that (except in Seamen's Union) monthly subscription should be aimed at (or quarterly at least), and that an average of about 4 per month should be asked from all except low-paid workers, and that the Union and its branches, both in their primary work of fighting for the workers' interests and secondarily as social and educational centres, should be sufficiently active to keep the loyalty and support of the members.

A minor point which is worth mentioning in this connection is the necessity of adequate controls over funds. It is always necessary to insist on proper book-keeping, so that the same actually collected and spent can be easily ascertained; it is necessary to give receipts (in the form of stamp, receipt form or signature or card) to all men from whom money is taken; it is necessary to place two men in charge of all funds; and it is necessary to insist upon annual audit by the E. C. or D. C. of Branch books. It must be remembered that to a worker with a family, even the forms in the heads of a branch will represent quite a big temptation; many good men have been lost to the w. c. movement because in a moment of weakness they have realised the ease with which they could steal their comrade money, and have done it.

Finally should be discussed the burning question of "outside" leadership. Every body is aware of the possible and actual dangers of it; that it leads to reformism and obstruction of the workers' struggle and prevents the development of working-class leadership. As also everybody is aware of the apology for it: the absence of educated men, and the fear of victimisation. Actually these two reasons are not as compelling as is often supposed. A Union can usually hire (and thus control) one or two men who are educated enough to do all necessary technical work; and victimisation can be avoided by the same means at any rate as effectively as by the use of unpaid outsiders. In any case, in most Unions led by outsiders, much of the real organising is done by workers—and the employers know it. The real reason for the almost universal recourse to outsiders is the workers' "inferiority

complex". They think a "big man" will assist them in negotiating with the management, etc. This is so, (if at all) only when they are content to negotiate on terms of appealing to the employers generosity etc. There is no need to point out that this type of negotiation is of no real use, and that when the workers attempt a real fight, outside leaders are usually a hindrance than an assistance.

If a real fight is attempted the question of victimisation is certain to come up. It may well occur even if no serious fight is intended, being resorted to by the employer simply as a warning. There are two ways of dealing effectively with victimisation. One, which is resorted to by all too many Indian Unions, is to convince the employer, the Union really must be harmless, i. e. useless. The other is to convince the employer (and this commonly be done by action) that victimisation will be so dangerous for him, that he will not do it. This must be the aim of all unions in connection with this important matter.

Another question, similar to the foregoing, is already of great importance in the T. U. movement in this country. That is, the question of representation of different grades in the Union and its committees. It is natural, and is usually found in practice, that the upper or skilled grades (except the highest, which are frequently opposed to T. Unionism) are proportionately more strongly represented in Unions than the lower grades, and even more strongly in the Union committees. The result varies in different industries and different circumstances, but in some cases it is as bad as the control of the Union by reactionary "outsiders." (As examples may be cited: the old Jamshedpur labour Association, the Postal and R. M. S. Association, which in many places—throughout Bombay Presidency for example—has split, with the formation of a new (Postal and lower Grade Staff Association; the E. B. Ry Indian Labour Union—and other Railway Unions—and the Bengal Mariners' Union). This danger may be combatted by making provision in Brach and Dt. and even in E. C.s for representation of different grades. The dangers of such provision are, that the committees may be made unwieldy, and that a craft or sectional spirit may be evoked. Unless the thing is pushed to excess however, there is not much danger of encouraging such a degree of sectionalism as to be dangerous to unity. But especially in a Union All-India E. C., if attempt is made to represent geographical as well as occupational divisions, the result will probably be to swell the numbers excessively. It would therefore probably be wiser to avoid sectional reprn. in the E. C.s of Unions which however, should be representative of geographical areas. But fundamentally the only cause for this danger is the spirit of revolt of the workers themselves. They must be

apprehensive of, and ready to fight against any tendency for clerks or other privileged sections, to "boss" in the Union, not on grounds of mere sectional spirit, but because they are aware of the probability of its resulting in a reactionary regime of policy.

An even more pernicious thing, which is to be observed in some Unions, is the control of the Union by Sergans, jobbers, sardars (or their equivalent). These, though workers in origin, are often actually exploiters, and if so should not be admitted to the Union at all. It is in any case essential to prevent such people, or even lower grades (foremen, mistries, etc.,) from controlling the Union and divided body. There should certainly be a single Railwaymen's Union, with some kind of subdivisions according to companies. Similarly in the cotton industry. Most of the centres are now connected with the rest, by bonds of common ownership. Even where the this is not the case, the case for unification of the Union is strong, since otherwise there is always the risk of blacklegging by one upon the other. Among the big industries Jute is even more obviously, one in which a single Union is necessary, as also is coal mining. Engineering is an industry which requires one Union, though it desirable that at present the railway and marine workshops should be organised with the Ry. and Marine Unions as they are. The engineering industry is one in which national unity is particularly required. The mere fact that some shops are in Bombay and others 1200 miles away in Calcutta does not mean that blacklegging by one or the other is not impossible. They should however have a jt. Com. with the Ry. and Marine workshop repr. of the Ry. Unions etc. The metal (iron industry etc.) workers should be in the same Union. There is nothing to be gained by separating.

*Printing Town* In the case of seamen again, the existing division is indefensible. The seamen which are signed on at Bombay (Colombo also), Calcutta, Rangoon, (Singapore also) to be in one Union, and those seamen who even temporarily are ashore at Chittagong, Karachi, Madras, Aden, Mangalore and other minor ports should have the services of Union Office. Here the problem of government of the Union could be difficult (as in all Seamen's Union it is more or less difficult). Only the inland seamen of the Bengal waterways might remain in a separate union (which however, should be connected by a joint committee with the general seamen's Union and the A. I. R. Union, E. B. R. Section).

As to dock workers, there seems to be a stronger case here for decision; but in the opinion of the writer one Union is really required here. If the possibility of a dock workers' strike are considered, it is clear that those strikers of one centre must be



protected against the possibility of blacklegging through the transference of shipping to another centre. One Union is required.

On the other hand, as has been said, there are classes of workers, municipal employees, town transport workers (tonga, taxi, buss, tram etc.), water, gas and electric supply workers, club usually with main industry.

Railways

Seamen (separate inland seamen)

Mines (incl. gold, salt, metals)

Docks.

Tea Gardens and factories.

Jute (incl. presses), subsidiary and allied (rope &c.)

Cotton (incl. ginning and baling) (and wollen and silks) and clothing, hosiery.

Engineering (metal smelting etc. also, ship-building, ordnance, motor-car repairing etc.)

Printing, book-binding (papers)

Oil (wells, refineries, stores, tinning and packing factories etc.)

(Cement, lime, bricks and tiles) Stone dressing, glass.

Food (Sugar mills, rice mills, flour mills, tobacco factories, brewery, ice-factory, oil mills, coffee, canning and bottling.

Leather (tannery, shoes.)

Municipal (scavengers, road gangs, workshops, light, gas, power, water supplies.)

(Town transport (taxi, tonga, tram, bus— bullock carts) ricksha.

Saw mills, (carpentry, cabinet making etc.,)

Chemical, dyeing, bleaching, indigo, bone and manure, matches, paint, soap.

Building.

Post, Tel. Clerks (Commercial, and Govt.)

Tel. Shop Asstn. etc. Dom-Secr. and Hotel emplr.

## The Power of Labour

### (1) To the Workers and Peasants.

This pamphlet is meant to appeal to the poor. In all countries most of the people are poor. But in India nearly all the people are far poorer than in almost any other country.

Let us take a few examples, and compare them with the poor of England. (the English workers are rather better paid than most European, but worse than most American workers.)

Indian farm labourers get from Rs 5 to Rs 15 per month. English farm workers get Rs 60 to 80.

Indian scavengers get Rs 8 to 20 ; English Rs 100 or more.

Cotton mill workers Rs 20 to 60 ; in England Rs 100 to 200 or more.

The average wage of all Indian Railway employees, including Europeans, is less than Rs 40. In England the minimum is over Rs 100.

(Miners (men) get Rs 20 to 25 ; in England the worst-paid miners get Rs 60. Many get Rs 100 or more.

These are only wage workers. Everybody knows what is the poverty of the peasants. It is worse than that of industrial workers, and on the average can be little above that of the farm labourers.

After this it is hardly necessary to speak of other matters, which however, really bear equally hard upon the poor of India. The figures given, which, if not accurate, are representative, should be eloquent enough.

But consider (1) hours of work. Why is there a statutory eight-hour day in many European countries (which is observed in practice even where it is not legally enforced), and in India a statutory eleven hours (often not observed in practice)? And no legal limit to hours in most of the States? While Indian workers spend practically all their day in labour, they will be much hampered in their task of educating and organising themselves for getting improvements.

And then (2) housing. All observers agree that the housing of workers in India, in practically all places, is worse than anywhere in the world. The houses of peasants are as bad or worse, as they are too poor to build good houses, and in many places are

prevented by landlords from building proper buildings at all. Even in India good houses are necessary, for health, and for the enjoyment of a proper educated life.

With housing goes sanitation, upon which, with proper food, depends the health of the country. Indian sanitation is well known to be among the worst in the world.

(3) education. Again it notorious how bad is the system of education in India, which is indeed one of the most backward countries in the world in this respect. Only about 9 p.c. of the whole population can read and write; that is, about 5 p.c. or less of workers and peasants can do so. Moreover those who are educated in Government schools etc. are often given false ideas as to the economic and political position of the country. They are miseducated.

(4) social and political rights and status. In this respect also India is one of the most backward countries in the world. Messrs. Purcell and Hallsworth in their Report on Labour Conditions in India (1928) express the greatest protest at the fact that the wages and other conditions of work of practically all workmen are "imposed upon them" without their wishes being consulted at all. In almost all countries, including some which are industrially less advanced than India, workers habitually take part in determining conditions of employment.

Similarly in regard to the Government of the country, both central and local. In almost all countries nowadays, the poor have some sort of right, in theory, to determine the Government. They vote for candidates at elections etc. Even though this right of voting in itself gives no real control over Government, which is almost always in the hands of the rich, nevertheless the workers and peasants usually have powerful parties which fight to impress their views upon the Government, or even to overthrow the rich man's Government and to establish their own rule.

But in India, the poor have practically no voice, even in theory. Most of them are disqualified from voting, which is almost confined to the middle and rich classes. While even the representatives of these voters do not govern. We are governed by outsiders whose only interest is to exploit us. And up to the present there has existed no organisation of the poor which could fight for their interests.

In short, the situation is that we, who produce the food and other necessities of life, conduct the transport, keep the land sanitary and healthy, and in fact do all the necessary work of society, receive far less than our proper share of the wealth of society, and in fact occupy the status of slaves in the country which we ought to own and rule.

## (2) How To Alter It.

The only way to alter it is by organisation. The British in India and, rich classes generally, maintain their power only by organisation. Their wealth and education make it easy. We have no wealth, no education. Our task of organisation is immensely difficult. But we have numbers on our side. When well organised, however poor and ignorant, we shall be irresistible.

Much has been said of organisation. Many people are getting sick of the word, for while much is said, little is done. All Parties cry for organisation of the people as the only and obvious way to get freedom for the country. But they have all failed.

We must begin organisation seriously, and in a practical spirit. All other organisations have failed. Why? Because they ignored the fact of class-interest. They attempt to organise "India"— zamindar and cultivator, master and servant, landlord and tenant, capitalist and wage-earner, rich and poor. They attempt to organise for what purpose? To fight for India's freedom— freedom for India's rich to sit on the back of India's poor. Naturally they failed, and will fail.

We take into account class interest. We believe that strong organisation of the people can be brought about only if it is set up and carried to fight continuously for the real interests of the people, regardless of the interests of those who exploit them. The poor and exploited, in India as in all countries, form an immense majority. The rich exploiting minority stands in their way, with interests in almost all respects contrary to theirs. If mass organisations are to be effective, and if they are to command the support and confidence of the majority, they must rigidly keep out the expression of the opposing interests of the rich. That is to say, these organisations and their members must be "class-conscious".

It is failure to secure this which has been the principal cause of the collapse of so many industrial workers' Unions and peasants' organisations in the past. How often have Unions been formed, with members of the rich employing or managing class as their officers? Such Unions usually go well for a time, until there comes a fight with the employers over some real issue. The "leaders" of the Union, who may be really more in sympathy with the employers than with the workers, stop the fight, "conciliate", make peace somehow or other, and the workers' cause suffers. The members lose faith and drop away. Eventually it collapses.

Similarly there have been formed on many occasions Unions of peasants to fight for some cause or other. But only too often there have been made leaders or committee members (because

they are big men, educated, etc.) rich peasants, landowners, moneylenders, lawyers, or what-not, who turn out to be afraid to lead a fight against their own class. \* Some of these middle or upper class people even go to the length of telling us not to fight for improvements at all, that we must achieve satisfaction by reducing our needs, not by demanding the satisfaction of more needs. This of course is directly helping the upper classes to keep the lower classes in contented subjection to them.

Ours must be a class movement, class--conscious, and led so far as possible by members of our own class. In any case, if we must have middle class leaders, we must make sure that they are well-meaning and honest, and must control them.

Further, our movement must be militant. No "gradual reforms" or "moderate demands" must satisfy us. The sufferings of the poor are too intense. We must put forward clear and bold demands, and then work to gather support and strength as rapidly as possible to enforce them. We enforce them by any possible means, peaceful or otherwise, by threat, demonstration, or strike. Having achieved our first aim, we must push on for further aims and so on.

What should we aim at? This can be seen more clearly when we have reviewed briefly what the masses have achieved in other countries. But it is in any case clear that the workers in industries, or in railways, under municipalities, etc., must aim at improving wages. This is the most fundamental thing. We should have a standard, the "minimum wage" which would give fair comfort to an average family, which we should strive to get for all workers. Then we must get a reduction in hours of work for workers. We can not easily become educated, or build a powerful movement for our own advance, until we have leisure. These things will obviously be resisted fiercely by employers, since if they are granted, profits will decrease; but we must not mind. We must face their opposition and overcome it. We are engaged in a class-war.

In the same way peasants must not abate their demands out of fear of the opposition of landlords, moneylenders, or other exploiting interests. There is a class war in the countryside also, which must wage to a successful conclusion.

### **(3) What The Workers Have Done.**

Let us look for a moment at what the workers and peasants of some other countries have done.

(1) in England. In England industrialism, which has grown up only recently in India, began 150 or more years ago, and

has gone on extending until 4/5 of the people are engaged in industry, and only the minority in agriculture. In the early stages of industry, the workers who had previously been engaged in farming, or in cottage-industry, etc., were driven from their previous occupations by bankruptcy due to competition, or by seizure of their land by landlords etc., and went into the factory towns, where they suffered very great cruelty and hardship. Their wages were about the same as Indian workers' wages are now. Their housing was very bad; no sanitary arrangements, great overcrowding etc. Their hours of work were unlimited, even for young children.

They soon began protesting. They smashed machinery, and were imprisoned and executed for it. They formed Unions, which were declared illegal and criminal in 1799. Nevertheless they continued to organise secretly, until in 1824 Government was forced to allow the Unions to exist openly. They then formed a Grand National Union, with five lakhs of members intending to overthrow the employers' Government and establish their own. They failed, and they again set to work to build up the Trade Union movement as it exists at present. For nearly a century this movement has been struggling on and now has a membership of between 50 and 60 lakhs.

Its chief achievements are: (1) it has raised wages for practically all workers from a level of about 20—30 Rs. per month to about 100—150 per month. Some workers, agricultural labourers, some miners, etc., get less, perhaps as low as Rs. 60, but others get more, Rs. 200 etc.

(2) It has with almost complete success fought for the standard eight hour day. This is not enforced by law, except in mines, and, but is practically observed. If a worker works more than eight hours he is usually entitled to "overtime" pay at increased rates.

(3) It has forced central and local Governments to improve housing. Most workers now live in houses, which, if small and uncomfortable, are fairly clean and sanitary.

(4) It has forced Government to grant (a) much factory legislation, to secure safer working, proper ventilation, sanitation etc., in factories. (b) state sickness insurance, unemployment benefit, old-age pensions etc. (c) a secure legal status to Trade Unions (d) universal primary education (e) universal suffrage.

(5) It has built up a powerful workers' political Party, the Labour Party, which, if still backward in consciousness and timid in policy, has been and is still a great instrument for training the workers for their future task, which they are now contemplating,

of overthrowing the capitalist Government, and taking political power into their own hands.

The history of British Labour gives us several lessons. We learn from it first, the immense power which a solid workers' organisation can wield. The Union were the chief cause of the reforms just mentioned, which they extracted from a selfish ruling class, in spite of their fierce opposition to such heavy expenditure. Second, we learn the necessity of political action by the working class. Much against their own will the British workers were forced into politics in order to achieve the purely economic aims which they set before themselves. Their chief problems now are political. Actually the British workers are themselves now learning a third lesson, which we can well notice also. The steady pressure of the workers' advance is becoming unbearable to the rich ruling class, and they are now engaged busily in reversing the order of history. They are reducing wages, stopping unemployment benefit etc., destroying the legal status of the Unions, and so on. The British movement is being faced with the fact that it cannot get the conditions which it wants while a capitalist government remains in power, and that their first and most pressing duty is to overthrow that government and establish their own.

(2) Let us turn to Russia. Here conditions were and are more like Indian conditions. Industry occupies only 15 or 20% of the population, the rest being engaged in agriculture. As in India, too in Russia, industry developed fairly late. When about forty years ago the workers began to be recruited in large numbers for the factories, forced from the fields by hunger, they were treated, as everywhere else, with great cruelty and negligence. They revolted, and began to organise. Their organisations were suppressed and the leaders cruelly punished. They continued to organise secretly, and established a strong workers' Party the Communist or Bolshevik party, which helped the organisation and fought the Government. By this means they were able to get some improvements, though their conditions remained very bad.

Ultimately, with the increasing strength of the organisation of the people, the cruel and reactionary government of the Czar and the landlords was overthrown in March 1917, and a capitalist-middle class government took its place. The Unions and the workers' Party were then made legal, and their membership and influence quickly grew. They immediately came into conflict with the capitalist Government, and very soon, in November 1917, they overthrew it. In this they sought and secured the help of the peasants, who were very much oppressed by the landlords. Under the leadership of the workers' Party and its allies, the peasants organised themselves and threw out the landlords, refused to pay rent, and seized and divided among themselves the big estates which the landlords had been keeping for their private use.

Now, since 1917, there is a Workers' and Peasants' Government in Russia, although many of the other Governments of the world, which speak for the capitalists and landlords, have made war against Russia with the object of overthrowing that Government. They have not succeeded, and the Workers' and Peasants' Government continues to work on for the benefit of the poor. It is impossible to give a list of the improvements that they have made, in the course of a rule of ten years. But here are a few items.

(1) The Government, instead of being by Parliament or Assembly, is controlled and carried out by workers', peasants' and soldier's council ("soviets"), which are elected by the workers from their factories, the peasants from their villages, the soldiers from their regiments. Thus real democracy and control by the people is obtained.

(2) The Trade Union movement has been built up to include almost all workers (outside agriculture) and is now the biggest and best organised in the world. It has just one crore of members. It takes a prominent and active part in the control and running of industry, as well as pressing for the interests of its members.

(3) All means of communication, and all larger factories with all sources of raw material are owned and controlled by the workers' Government. Only some distribution and smaller factories are owned by private capitalists.

(4) Wages, after a disastrous fall in the war time, have been brought up again to the pre-war level, and are steadily advancing.

(5) Hours of work are brought down to a rigid standard of 8 per day (6 for some kinds of work.)

(6) All kinds of amenities, clubs, sports, hospitals, children's homes, rest houses, etc. are provided by the State of the Unions, using largely the houses and palaces of the old ruling class.

(7) The peasants are in practical possession of the land, the only tribute being a single tax paid to the State. The Peasants' requirements are provided to a large extent by Cooperative Societies, State aided, which seek to provide goods at the cheapest prices. Village Government is controlled by councils of poor peasants.

(8) Education is compulsory, and is usually continued up to 16 or 18 years. The poorest can easily take university courses. All, even the old are being taught to read and write. Before the Revolution about 10% was literate. Now about 80% are literate.

We can learn many lessons from the work of the Russian working class. We learn for the first time by practical example



that it is possible for ordinary poor ignorant workers and peasants to conquer power from the rich and to construct a Government and economic system suitable to themselves, that is, for the benefit of the great majority. And we learn in detail how it can be done—how it is necessary to build up the workers' revolutionary Party to lead the struggle for power, and to lead the effort of the masses to consolidate the power and to construct a new socialist economic life. We can learn the strategy, organisation and tactics necessary for the struggle, but that cannot be dealt with here. Perhaps the most important point should be mentioned however, and that is the relations between the workers and the poor peasants. In India also the interests of these two sections are closely allied, and the poor peasants can have no leader ultimately other than the working class. The chief thing is however, that we have now before us a practical example, showing us that the masses can triumph over almost any difficulties, and giving us hope for our own future work.

(3) In China. From China also we have much to learn in regard to the workers' movement. China is like India in that there is relatively little industry, most of the people being peasants. Most of the industry, moreover is owned by foreigners, who had in consequence established some sort of Government over a large part of China. After the last great war, a movement developed in China, as in India, for attaining the freedom of the country for foreign rule. In this movement, as time went on, the workers and peasants took a more and more active part. Especially the workers in the Trade Unions developed very great activity in the years 1925-7. Beginning in about 1921, the Trade Union movement grew very quickly, and with a very militant policy. By 1927 it had a membership of 25 lakhs, and the Communist Party had about 50,000 members.

Owing largely to the help of the masses, the national movement was very successful, the foreigners were fairly quickly driven out of a considerable part of China, and National Governments were set up. At this point the masses began to demand that their position, which was extremely bad, perhaps if anything worse than that of the Indian masses, should be improved. They began to try to get their representatives into the Government etc. And this is where they found a mistake they had made. They had relied too much upon the upper classes for the organisation and leadership of their movement. The Trade Unions were led by workers, but the Kuomintang, the big nationalist Party, was still largely under the leadership of capitalists and landlords, while the peasants armies had landlords mainly as their officers.

Almost in the moment of victory the split appeared. The foreigners used the opportunity to bribe some of the upper class leaders, and a war broke out between the two sections, in which the

landlord and capitalist classes were helped by the foreign money and armed forces. The upper class side won, for a time, and were permitted by the foreigners to establish their rule, on condition that the foreigners property was allowed to remain in their possession.

The Chinese workers' experience can teach us much. As they found there so we shall find here, that while we remain under the rule of a foreign Government we shall not achieve much improvement in our position. It was this fact which led the Chinese workers Unions to take up their fight against the foreigners' rule, and we shall have to do the same. We shall find that we are obliged to take a leading part in securing national freedom, and until we have done that, however hard we fight, we shall not get satisfactory conditions.

Secondly, we learn the need for the independence of the Workers' and Peasants' movement. We must take part in the political movement, but as an independence force. We must not rely for leadership or assistance upon the upper classes, or at any rate must free ourselves from that leadership as soon as we can. We must develop strongly our own ideas, our class consciousness, and our independent organisation.

#### (4) What has been done.

What have we in India done up to the present? In our country industrialism began relatively recently, and has grown quickly only in the last twenty years or so. Now India is considerably more industrialised than China. The organised workers movement practically dated from 1918—ten years ago. In 1918-22, for about three years, many big strikes took place and many gains were achieved. But few permanent Unions were established, and after that time many of the gains were lost again. While in 1920-21 the movement was powerful, if still very badly organised, by 1923-4 it had almost collapsed. Since then in the last three years it has again been recovering, and has made a big stride forward this year. But it has many weaknesses still. Its total membership is probably not more than 2 lakhs (less than one-tenth of that of the Chinese movement!) It is not united—many unions are not affiliated to the Trade Union Congress the central organisation to which all unions should belong. Some unions fight against others in the same trade. Many unions exist only in name. In very few do the members take a really active part in determining policy. Many confine themselves to too narrow a sphere—one town, or even one factory. Most unions lack a fighting policy. They try perhaps to remedy little grievances, but not to get advances in wages and improvements generally. Consequently workers do not look upon them with enthusiasm. Finally, and summing up

most of the faults of the movement, the leadership is mainly in the hands of the wrong type of people, middle class men who do not understand the real purpose of the workers' movement.

As for the peasants' movement, it is, as is to be expected, more backward even than the Trade Unions. In a number of places there are Unions of Peasants, but compared to the total number they are indeed a drop in the ocean. They again are often misled by outsiders who have contrived to get the leadership into their hands.

Finally, there is coming into existence the Workers' and Peasants' Party, which is trying to unite together the Unions of workers and peasants and to organise the others who have not yet joined Unions. It tries to invigorate the Unions, to free them from bad leaders, and to give them a militant policy.

#### (5) Organisation and Programme.

Thus the workers' and peasants' movement is still weak and backward in India, though it is making hopeful advance in some places. Up to the present it has few gains to record, in spite of all its struggles, some of which have been very fierce and prolonged. But that is no reason for despair. Success cannot come without effort. Rather it is a reason why everybody should enter the movement, to strengthen and invigorate it. Organisations must be started where they do not exist, all must be imbued with the right class outlook and policy, so that in as short a time as possible we may rival other workers' organisations, and their successes.

What then is the right policy? The examples of other countries show that the first and most important thing is the industrial workers' movement. The peasants had been exploited and oppressed for ages, but had been unable to make much effective resistance, until another class came to their assistance. Only when the class of industrial workers is organised and conscious, even though it be small, can the Indian peasants form a strong and permanent movement. The workers' movement will be the leader of the peasants.

Thus we begin with the industrial workers. The fundamental workers' organisation is the Trade Union. All workers must form and join suitable Trade Unions. The workers in any occupation, in any factory, on any railway etc., must meet together, and decide to fight against their employers for better conditions. They must frame their demands, propagate these demands, among all their fellow workers, to get their support for them, and enrol them in the Union. Some time may profitably be spent in preliminary work must set the example. Nor serious work is possible without it.

(4) Discipline. Necessity of discipline. Discussion on general question before decision, which when taken must be obeyed by all including opposition. Only way to get unity and effectiveness. Proper persons must be elected to committees etc. and when elected, must be obeyed. Fraction leaders and fraction decisions also. (Lenin's insistences on "iron discipline".) Party is the highest organ of working class. Mas very difficult task. Absolute devotion to Party essential. No personal aims and ambition. No petty quarreling etc.

Effort must also be made to draw into really active work those members who are employed. Party cannot depend upon full-time workers. Only a disciplined well-functioning organisation can do this.

(5) Fraction work. importance of fraction meetings before W. P. P. T. U. etc. meetings. Obedience to lead given by Branch committees etc.

(6) Reporting. In order that Party may know what it is doing, and what are the conditions in which it is working etc., it must receive regular reports from all members. Reports go to group leaders, branch committees etc. Essential if centralised character of party is to be maintained.

(7) Training.-

(8) Organs. Party organs are extremely important part of party machinery. Must be helped in circulation and contents by all members (selling to workers; "worker correspondents" etc.)

Lesson 7. Recapitulation. (Should be in the nature of an examination in part. Take care, by judicious questioning, to get from the class if the most important points are grasped by all.) until most, if not all of the workers concerned are members, and some fund has been collected. All workers should be frequently called to meetings in which they discuss conditions, demands, etc., and learn the policy of the Union, and the necessity of doing faithfully what the Union decides. The greatest thing which has to be learnt by all workers is necessity of solidarity, of sticking together. It is the beginning of class consciousness. And it is essential for this purpose to draw all workers into the active life of the organisation. No Union can be said to exist properly, unless the members meet frequently and discuss the Union business and decide all important questions. These things cannot be left to committees. This is one of the biggest mistakes our unions make.

Then as to programme. We must not hesitate to make big demands. Unless we do this we shall never get anything. Employers will laugh at our "insolence" if we are weak. If we are strong they dare not.

First wages. We must try to establish a minimum wage. The standard adopted by many Unions is Rs. 30 per month. This is a very moderate figure, but is much higher than what most workers actually get. The average wage of Indian workers is probably below Rs. 20. So if we can get a minimum of Rs. 30 enforced, we shall have done much. But of course that does not mean that we must not fight for increases for those who get above Rs. 30. A gain for any section of the working class is a gain for the whole class. A big general advance in wages must be the first item of our programme, and it must include the enforcement of the Rs. 30. minimum.

Only less important is the question of hours. Here there is no difference of opinion. We must aim at the standard eight-hour day (and 44 hour week-5½ days.)

In regard to housing, it is best to press for a housing allowance from the employer, and to force the municipal authorities to build decent houses. Some employers will build houses for their workers, but this is dangerous, as it gives the employer a strong weapon to wield in case of dispute, he can evict strikers, etc. and cause them much trouble.

Within the place of work it is necessary to press for proper facilities for taking meals, for sanitation, ventilation, etc., and for safe methods of working.

It is also important to wage campaign against the system of recruiting labour which is common in many industries, viz. through sardars, jobbers, mukadmas, foremen, etc. The system is productive of very great evils; the sardars exploit and oppress the workers in many ways; it must be abolished.

A fight must be waged also against the employers' practice of fining and dismissing without notice or proper cause. Particularly victimisation of workers for Union activity must be fought.

There are many other matters which a Union can deal with, but these are the most common and most pressing. The most important questions are wages and hours, and a Union stands or falls by its success or failure to deal with these two things.

There are other kinds of activity which a Union will undertake. It will try to give on its own some service to its members. It may establish a club in which its members meet and discuss; it may start benefit societies (to give unemployment, death, and similar benefits); it may start a journal, etc. etc. All these things are good, and may be made to help the Union substantially. But it must never be forgotten that they are not the primary work of the Union, which is to fight for better conditions.

There are still more things a Union must do. It must join with the rest of the Labour movement. It must affiliate to the Trade Union Congress and its proper Provincial Federation. It must seek to establish effective unity with all unions in the same or kindred trades—“one Union for one Industry” is the object. (This is an important question in India at present. There are already probably too many Unions. The maximum strength is not brought to bear upon opponents unless unity is attained among the workers.) It should help where possible to organise unorganised workers in other industries. It must assist to establish Trades Councils in all towns where there are several Unions or branches. (Trades Councils are joint committees of the workers of all trades and occupations living in one town or conveniently small district. For the struggles of the Labour movement as a whole, they are extremely important bodies.)

Second, we have to consider the peasants. The workers' movement comes first, and leads the peasants in a general sense, but it must learn that the peasants constitute an essential ally to the workers. Peasants organisations must be brought into close relations with the Trade Union movement by affiliation with the Trade Union Congress and its local bodies.

It is necessary for peasants' Unions, equally with those of the workers' to be careful in regard to leadership, and not to let the organisation be dominated by any class other than the actual cultivators, and generally the poor of the countryside. There are several different classes in the rural population, and if the Union is to represent the exploited majority, it must depend primarily upon the agricultural labourers, i. e. those who are employed, part or whole time, in agricultural work; the peasants who cultivate their own land without employing outside labour; and the village employees, craftsmen, etc. If in our organisation we depend upon these, we shall be doing good; if we are led by rich peasants who employ others, or landlords who do no work but collect rent from others, or upon shopkeepers, moneylenders, etc., we shall be strengthening the grip of the exploiters over those whom they exploit.

The agricultural poor must organise, village by village, and district by district, to wage the class struggle against those who exploit them. They must resist attempts by Government to increase their assessment, or by landlords to increase rent. They must attempt to reduce rents, to stop arbitrary exactions from them by landlords, and to stop forced labour etc. They must strive to establish their right to tenancy, against the landlord's right of eviction. In all these things, the power of solidarity can be employed, by demonstration etc., and ultimately by direct action, i. e. the withholding, by common decision, of rent or

payment due. In a similar way, the fight can be carried on against other oppressors, such as moneylenders. There are a number of instances in Indian history where the peasants have achieved considerable gains, against Government, or landlords, by the power of solidarity and concerted action.

#### (6) The Future.

Such is in outline the programme and type of organisation which we propose for the immediate future. We believe that experience in India and other countries shows that it is practical, and the most desirable road for Indian workers and peasants to follow. It provides indeed the only hope for them of attaining within any reasonable time, to a tolerable condition of life. Present conditions are unbearable; they must be altered, and this is the way.

But, as our short examination of other countries and movements shows, the workers and peasants have other tasks before them. It was the experience of the English, Russian, and Chinese workers (and all others) that they could not get the elementary things which they wanted, better wages etc., without entering politics. They had to fight against individual employers and landlords for their particular demands, and against the Government, i.e. the general committee of all the employers and landlords, for their general demands. We shall have to do the same.

We want education; we want proper sanitation and public health services. Only the State can give them to us. We want legislation in connection with conditions of work, insurance against unemployment, sickness, old age, etc. We want the State to assist agriculture to increase production etc. We shall strive to force the state to do these things; we want universal suffrage, so that we can get greater freedom to develop our political movement. Further, we shall find that the only solution to our difficulties is the taking over by the state of the public services and big industries, which are at present run by private capitalists. While big capitalists exist, we shall be exploited and crushed by them. The big industries must be taken from them. Similarly the peasants will find that while the landlords remain in possession of the land, they can do little to improve their lot. They will have to aim, not merely at reducing rent and alleviating oppression, but at ousting the landlords altogether, and taking over the land entirely, as the Russian peasants did.

These things a capitalists-landlord Government will never do; we must establish therefore a popular democratic Government.

But first, we must acquire the freedom to do that. The Chinese workers and peasants found themselves in the same position as we are. They were not free to do anything they wanted, because

they were under foreign rule. They found actually that they were not free to take even the most elementary steps to better their position. If they merely tried to get better wages, the foreign police interfered and stopped them. We have found also, in many recent strikes, how difficult it is to make any headway against employers who are backed up by a Government which is unaffected by popular feeling. Our first task is therefore to free the country from foreign rule.

The Chinese workers found themselves helpless under foreign rule, they revolted against it. So must we. We must organise as they did, a mass movement of all workers' and peasants' Unions for the attainment of national freedom by direct mass action. This is the only weapon mighty enough to perform the enormous task of getting national freedom, which has foiled our upper class politicians for generations. But we can succeed in it, as the Chinese masses succeeded.

That is our greatest task for the present, and for it we must consciously prepare, by organising the Workers' and Peasants' Party, whose principal aim is the attainment of complete independence by the direct mass action of the workers and peasants. Individuals should join the Party, and get all Unions to affiliate to it, by conducting propaganda among their members in this direction.

Thus, to sum up, our immediate practical task is to organise on a class basis, and fight for better conditions; and this can only be done with a militant programme and policy, as here outlined. For this purpose we have to build up a strong Trade Union and Peasants' Union movement. But at the same time we have to prepare and organise for bigger political tasks—in the first place the attainment of complete independence. For this purpose we have to see that the workers' and the peasants' movements are closely allied together, and to build up a strong Workers' and Peasants' Party, to lead the struggle. The two lines of action go together. Each will help the other—each is essential for the success of the other.



## P. 527. (4)

### **Elementary Course—for workers etc.**

(For methods of conducting class, see "Elementary Course of C. P. Training" C. P. G. B. Generally: (1) supplement class work with all relevant literature in members' languages. (2) be as concrete as possible. Get, from the members or elsewhere, facts regarding their experience of the class struggle, their own Union organisations, reformist leaders whom they know, economic position of their own firms etc. Also use freely instances drawn from Chinese and Russian Revolutions. (3) be careful to proceed by means of discussion (see "Elem. Course" pp 5 6 7), drawing in *all* members of class. *Avoid lecturing.*)

For instruction to non-Party workers the same syllabus may be used with slight modifications. The necessity of the C. P. must always be stressed in such instruction, and its object must be to make the members into suitable recruits for the Party. *e. g.* the first lesson "Need for the Party" etc. may become "What is the Working Class Movement?" (see p 2a)—leading up to the function and necessity of the Party as the highest organ of the working class, but dealing also with the duties of other workers in Trade Unions etc. on the same lines.

For W. & P. P. members (workers) it may also be adapted similarly. But care must be taken again to emphasise the leading position of the C. P. and the provisional and temporary nature of the W. & P. P. The aim of all W. & P. P. workers should be to qualify for membership of the C. P.)

### **Elementary Course.**

- Lesson 1. What is the Party?—need for Party etc.
2. Capitalism—Socialism etc.
3. Method and Policy (general).
4. Trade Union Work.
5. Other work—in the workshop etc.
6. Party organisation and discipline.
7. Recapitulation.

Lesson 1. Need for Party.

(1) What is the Party? First, what is the politics—class struggle. (brief account of class situation and struggles in India Working class must play a part in the class struggle (1) in order to get living conditions (2) also to get rid of capitalist system and establish workers' rule. This struggle is very difficult. Party is

therefore necessary as *leader* of the class. C. P. is leading organisation of the working class.

(2) Brief account of working class movement throughout the world—achievements and organisation. C. I. and C. P. s. Objects; the attainment of working class rule internationally by overthrow of capitalist governments etc. Begun in U. S. S. R. Necessity of same process in India, hence need for C. P.

(3) Relation of C. P. to working class. Most intelligent active class-conscious members—not divided from working class, only the most forward section—always in touch with working class feeling, leading struggle, expressing grievances etc. Work of C. P. among workers through T. U. fractions, factory groups, open agitation, demonstrations, Councils etc.

(4) Function of C. P. as leader. In all work in connection with workers the Party or fraction formulates policy (1) in light of its special knowledge and study of politics (2) after study of the needs of the situation (3) with the revolutionary object in view. The best possible use is made of the situation at each moment, if the workers follow this policy.

Hence necessity of *centralisation* in Party. And necessity of *discipline*.

Lesson 1 (modified for non-Party workers).

(1) What is working class movement? Struggle of workers, as sections, and later as class, for certain aims. (Hence, nature of class: economic grouping, with approximately same interests etc.) What are the aims? (1) sectional, immediate, economic primarily.

(2) general (i.e. of class), primarily political, to be attained only ultimately after victory of class. This division is only partial). Necessity of both types of aim-workers cannot achieve immediate demands; therefore must fight for political power etc. (2) By what means and organisation can these things be done? By T. U.s? Unsuitable as aims are sectional and mainly immediate. Organisation, including backward workers etc. precludes political activity. T. U. C.? Unsuitable because merely a coalition of sections (hence not a true class organisation) aims mainly immediate, organisation cumbrous and includes various even counter-revolutionary elements. Type of organisation required—Party of most conscious active individuals (C. P.). This will be leading organ of class.

(3) Illustrated by history of labour movement in other countries—begins as a T. U. movement demanding reforms - passes

into political movement led by Party. International nature of movement. Similarity of conditions. Actual position, especially U.S.S.R., and England. (In England preliminary stage of Labour Party—analogue to W. P. Party—a preparation for, but not a real workers' Party).

(4) How does class struggle go on? In workshops etc., in T. U.s, open political movement (meetings, demonstration etc), in legislatures. etc. etc. In all Party lead required.

(5) Determination of policy requires special study, knowledge of political theory, firm maintenance of revolutionary outlook etc. Hence centralisation of Party. Also required Unity of action. Hence discipline. Relation of Party to class—not separate, simply most advanced individuals, leaders.

Lesson 2. Capitalism, Socialism.

(1) We dealt in the last lesson briefly with the necessity of the Party, arising from the class struggle of the workers. In order to lay down a sound policy it is necessary first to know more about the class struggle, and second to know more about our aims in it. What are we fighting against, and what are we fighting for?

(2) The working class in all countries (except U. S. S. R.) lives under capitalism. Capitalism in the dominant form of production, and the ruling political force all over the world. It is our principal enemy, even in India, where most of the people still live under pre-capitalist agricultural conditions. Capitalism involves (1) ownership of the means of production etc. by individuals (the capitalist class) (2) the existence of a non-owning poor class (the workers) who use the means of production, (and other conditions not necessary to deal with here). This position inevitably means ill-treatment of the workers by the capitalists—underpayment etc. exploitation, in short. And party explains the poverty of the workers. (Also to be explained by the inefficiency of capitalism, due to its individual basis.)

The workers struggle to improve their conditions—sometimes with a little success. But experience shows, and theory—confirms, that decent conditions cannot be obtained for all under capitalism (because capitalism depends upon exploiting—it exists to make profits). Workers must therefore aim at getting control of the means of production. That is, they must aim at a revolution against capitalist rule—they must take away the capitalists' property, and therefore also their political power. (The Government in all capitalist countries is capitalist.)

(3) The aim then, is control of the means of production by the workers—not by individuals but by the class (eventually by society as a whole). i. e. socialism, not capitalism. (Develop the

idea of socialism—equality, internationalism, social control etc. as opposed to the practice of capitalism. Cite what has been done in U. S. S. R.)

(4) This is to be done by revolution. i. e. workers as a class will have to rise and overthrow capitalist Government as a first step before taking capitalists' means of production. Political power is the first essential. Workers' Government must be established—“Dictatorship of Proletariat”. (i. e. suppression by force of the efforts of capitalism to reinstate itself).

Revolution is necessary because capitalism and the capitalist state fight vigorously to defend themselves, using police, army, law courts, and all means of physical pressure, as well as education system religion, press etc. All used in fight for class power. Even after the seizure of power of the workers, these things may be in the hands of the capitalists to a large extent. Hence necessity of “iron dictatorship” for some time, until all possibility of counter-revolution has disappeared.

(This is briefly the distinguishing feature of Communism—the attainment of socialism by revolution, and the maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There is also a school of so-called socialists who believe in attaining socialism by non-revolutionary means. Even the experience of Indian workers up to the present—forcible suppression of strikes etc. should convince them of the foolishness of this hope in non-revolutionary methods.)

### Lesson 3. GENERAL POLICY AND METHOD.

(1) With socialist revolution as the aim, which must always be kept in mind, how do we intend to proceed?

(a) by organising and supporting workers in their struggle for immediate demands (wages etc.) This is the most important part of our work, because the workers are the most important revolutionary class, and the only class which will fight resolutely for socialism (of Russian Revolution). We assist Unions, taking the lead if possible (C. P. should be the leader of the working class), in factories etc. also (factory groups, factory committees, in education work, etc. etc. (b) by organising poor peasants for revolution against landlords and for non-payment of taxes to Government. Peasants are essential as ally to workers in revolution, and this alliance will enable the working class to get the leadership of the peasants, who are naturally very reactionary and backward, and conduct them towards socialism (of Russia). (c) by assisting and taking the lead in revolutionary nationalist movement. For this purpose the W.P.P. is formed as a coalition Party of these three main groups—workers, peasants, and petty-bourgeoisie. Workers,

led by C.P. must maintain lead of W. P. P., and not allow it to degenerate into a petty-bourgeois nationalist Party, or a labour reformist or terrorist, or any other. It is through this Party mainly that we ally with, or fight against the nationalist bourgeoisie (Congress etc.) These are the main lines of work. But also (d) we have, either directly, or indirectly through W.P.P., T.U.C. etc., to take up particular questions as they arise, and wage campaigns on them, e.g. war. (necessity of fight against any imperialist war, with object of defeat of one's own imperialist Government. Especially necessary to defend U.S.S.R.) Finally, it must be remembered that the object of all this work, including preparation for the national revolution, is the attainment of the socialist revolution.

(2) By the progress of a movement of this type, there will come about a revolutionary upheaval—strikes, demonstrations, N.Co. non-payment of taxes, etc,—primarily against imperialism. Eventually national Government will be formed (of China). If this is bourgeois (this is possible, though so far as we can tell, improbable), we shall have to turn our attention immediately to overthrowing it, before it has time to consolidate. In any case we shall have to fight the bourgeoisie openly—workers' dictatorship or bourgeois dictatorship. Organised workers, backed by peasants, can be successful. Petty bourgeoisie will vacillate from side to side. (That is why the W.P.P. has dangers).

(3) The only organisation which can take us through such a course as this the C.P. It must be centralised, disciplined, of sufficient size ("mass party") to be in effective contact with the majority of the workers, and leading sections of peasants; and must be able to manoeuvre—keeping contact with masses, keeping revolution in view, but making alliances and compromises when necessary.

#### Lesson 4. TRADE UNION WORK.

Working class the most important class for us. Hence one (or more) whole lesson on Trade Unions.

(1) What are Trade Unions? Organisations of the mass of workers mainly for fighting individual employers or groups, for immediate demands. Not directly political organs, and not well suited for political struggle. But capable of disciplining mass of even backward workers, and at decisive moments of bringing them into political action. Hence extremely important for us to strengthen, permeate, and lead. Give us one of the best means of getting real contact with the masses.

(2) We are able to lead because we have the best policy—organisation, solidarity, fighting, *i.e.* class struggle. We must always

pursue this policy, and prove that the C.P. is the only Party which really fights for the workers.

(3) In particular we have to fight the reformists. Most dangerous enemies—all anti-revolutionary, hence pro-capitalist (Lenin's analysis: reformism as policy of capitalism within the working class). Different kinds, reformist "socialists", bourgeois nationalists, humanitarians, Government agents etc. All same in the end. And all the same now, in that they will not fight even for immediate demands. (Reformism generally—British Labour Party etc.)

(4) Organisation of T.U. movement. (see W.P.P. Conference T. U. resolution) Industrial unionism etc. Importance of Trades Councils. Regular branch meetings; workers as leaders; generally democracy in the T. U. s.

(5) Party members' work—fraction work. discipline, reporting to superior committees etc.

#### Lesson 5. Other work with working class.

(1) The struggle of the workers goes on in the most intense manner at the point of production—in the workshop etc. The organisation of the workers should begin there. Especially the Party organisation. C. P. should organise itself on the basis of factory (or mill, mine, workshop, station, etc.) groups. History of Russian C. P. shows their importance. They enable effective mass work to be done illegally. If *a. g.* open T. U. ism is prohibited or rendered useless by repressive laws, factory group work takes the leading place.

Duty of Party factory group to be the leader of workers in all troubles. Meet illegally to decide policy etc. Get workers to react solidly against victimisation, over-pressure, bad treatment etc. Get open Factory Committee elected by all workers (with C. P. fraction). Factory Committee looks officially to all grievances, and generally leads fight against management inside shop. Also sees that all workers are T. U. members etc. Part factory group also leads outside work *a. g.* arranges meetings (with outside speakers) etc. Even Factory Committee may do this also.

(2) Education. Workers should manage to establish groups among themselves for education in Trade Unionism, politics, etc. Party should take lead in this. It is most important to get all Party members through a course of instruction in Party policy. But this work should also be extended to non-Party Trade Union etc. All this work should be conducted from the Party point of view. Especially in this country, this means is valuable for

combatting communalism. All leading Trade Unionists etc. must be freed from communalism, which breaks up the working class, and puts it under the lead of (bourgeois) religious leaders. In particular, all Party members must see to this very strictly. They must themselves do no religious propanganda of any kind.

(3) The open leadership of the workers' struggle must not be left to the reformists, or even to the W. P. P. Regular public meetings demonstrations (on May-Day, anniversaries, etc.) should be organised by the C. P.

(4) Even social activities (sport etc.) should not be neglected. If possible, Party should take the lead, *e. g.* in founding workers' clubs, with hall or room, where library, entertainment, drama etc. can take place. Party influence is much increased by such means as this.

Generally, no opportunity should be missed of getting at workers and forcing them into class activity, under Party lead.

#### Lesson 6. Party organisation.

(1) For doing all this work, organisation is required. It is necessary, first, in order to make the best use of our small strength that is, centralisation must be observed. Policy is decided by central committee of best read and most experienced men, who instruct others, thus all get the benefit etc. Secondly, organisation is working in difficult conditions. Many enemies, many temptations (tendency to become reformist, personal ambition, idleness, bribery etc.) Therefore discipline is necessary.

(2) General structure. Comintern—National Party (C.E.C., Party organs, fractions in T.U.C. etc.)—Provincial Party Committee (organs in vernaculars, other fractions etc.)—Branch (Branch Committee, training groups, T. U. fractions etc.)—factory groups and area groups. Fractions are not part of the Party structure, but are controlled by Party committees.

The basis of the Party is the group of members for various purposes. The most important are the Factory Group, and (for those who cannot form factory groups) area group. Factory Group should so far as possible form the basis of the Party. Its tasks are (1) leadership of workers in the class struggle in the factory (2) recruiting (3) training of members (factory group should also be training group) (4) distribution of Party literature (5) keeping in contact with, and reporting to Party on, workers' mentality etc. It is also necessary to use for part of this work, members who are not actually working in the factory. Some of these things can also be done by area groups.

Next is the branch, which controls the fractions in the T. U. branches, arranges for training of factory or special training groups, etc. Branches cover a town, or part of large city, etc. Factory and area groups have their leaders in the branch committees. Provincial and central committees, etc.

(3) Meetings, necessary for Party groups, branch committees, etc. to meet weekly, at regular time and place. This is very important. Organisation throughout Indian political life fails because of slackness in this respect. Efforts should be made to make Union branches, etc. meet weekly. But if this is impossible, at any rate Party groups

---

### P. 527. (5)

A pamphlet entitled "Elementary Course of Communist Party Training" with a preface by T. B.—Published by the Communist Party of Great Britain, 16 King Street, London W.C. 2.



## P. 527. (6)

### Manifesto of the C. P. I.

(1) Crisis in national and labour movement—strikes, demonstration etc.—(illegible) crisis approaching. Necessary for us to do something active and decisive so that the opportunity shall not go by (N. C. O. movement opportunity lost). Workers and poor generally rally up to realise their position. Intolerable poverty is the cause of the unrest. It must be put an end to. In this position, the only remedy is Communism. Previous movements have collapsed for lack of ruthless and decisive lead. This C. P. only can give. Government and bourgeoisie attack communism as the cause of disturbance. This alone should suffice to divert our attention to it.

Rightly Communism is the philosophy-politic of the workers. The C. P. is the workers' Party.

(2) Communism is based on the class struggle. Its conception is this. In industry we see nowadays two classes—owners and workers. Owners are rich, powerful, educated; they control Government, Police, Law courts etc. etc. Workers are poor, weak, ignorant, always attacked by Police etc. The capitalist owners of industry get their riches from the work done by the workers, and so they exploit as much as possible—pay as little, get from them as much work, as they can. That is the struggle—shown in the fact of victimisation. Lack of education (causes) no politics allowed any workers, T. D. Bill, P. S. Bill etc., shooting in strikes, starvation etc. etc.

Communism believes that the only way to finish the struggle is for the workers to fight and win it—to oust the capitalist, and become themselves the owner of industry, and the possessors of Government powers controlling education, health police, etc. socialism. Then and only then will the workers be properly looked after, property paid, not exploited, etc. etc.

*Mere on socialism &* (4) But T. U. s believe this? No. C. P. *dict. of proletariat.* says that all workers must join Union and unions essential. But Union only are fight for inc. of wages etc. They cannot fight for political power.

W. & P. Party? This also is essential. It is the party of the poors, workers, peasants, clerks etc. etc. to fight for *national freedom* i. e. against British capitalists. This is right. C. P. men join W. & P. Party, and work for it. This stage of the fight is right.

But—the C. P. the *workers'* Party is needed. The workers are the most important factor in this struggle. They also are the only

section which will fight relentlessly and determinedly and can fight (industry concn. etc.). Middle-class will vacillate—peasants will go to sleep and set in their holdings—workers will fight. Moreover workers fight for *socialism*—the most advanced form of social orgn. (necessary for other classes, but the other classes do not fight for it). The C. P. will see that the alliance with the peasants and the P. W. is maintained. But the workers must not be claimed to them by the W. P. P.

(5) Therefore workers' party must be there:—C. P. Fight inside T. U. S, everywhere for the real fighting workers' policy. For *wage inc.* for *natl. indep;* etc. etc. what is its policy? (1) Based on class struggle—no peace with enemy only turce. (2) Discipline and unity in the party—the party a managing orgn. (3) penetration and control by Party of other organisations of the working-class—party as leader of class—Complete devotion of members to Party—(4) Working class as principal instrument of historic change at present period.—class which can overthrow imperialism and capitalism and establish socialism—class which can fight. Triumph of working-class is the aim of Party; (5) Must be by *revolution*—insurgent of power and all party policy is dictated by this consideration—preparing the Party and the masses for revolution. (6) Alliance with peasantry and solution of agrarian question by revolutionary means. (7) Only those who work in organised and disciplined manner in Party—professional organisation etc. etc. (8) Complete independence of labour from burghoise leader (9) complete exposure of reformists as bourgeoisie in labour movement.

(6) All workers must be encouraged to form and join unions—to fight for wage increments. So this way a solid and militant labour movement can be created, under lead of communists.

(7) This must take part in politics—in a (illegible) direction i. e. for overthrow of imperialism. In this work side by side with W. & P. P. and even with Congress (explain vacillating and bourgeoisie character). Take all opportunities to push this fight on and complete it with economic struggle—under eventually to (illegible) crisis—War danger.

(8) Then in this party must lead workers found in goal of establishment of Soviet Republic of workers and peasants—Workers Govt. and socialism—against bourgeoisie and Congress etc.

(9) 1st task—recruiting and strengthening Party from workers and training workers to know politics and lead movement. 2nd to conquer masses—win T. U. s. etc.

Appeal to all to join party.

For str. C. P. as the only guarantee of the success of the w. class, and the conquest of poverty, subjection and misery and the coming of socialism and happiness.

the productive forces is conditioned by invention, organisation etc. may appear to be a denial of the "materialistic" theory and some critics urge this argument. The conditions of production social, legal, etc., necessarily require adaptation to alteration in the forces of production. A given social structure can usually adapt itself more or less peaceably to minor changes, but repeatedly in history, the accumulated effect of changes in the productive forces has become so great that mere adaptations or reforms have been insufficient, and the whole society is overthrown and a new one erected. Such is the real occasion of all social revolutions.

But the means whereby reforms or revolutions are achieved requires study. Society is not a conscious body. It cannot adapt itself, until it is established on a class-less basis. Only communist society can undertake systematically to provide for its own future, and the Soviet Republics' early efforts to do this have already attracted the anxious attention of far-sighted bourgeois economists. For this reason Marx (Critique of Political Economic) describes capitalism as "the closing chapter of the *prehistoric* stage of human society". As changes become necessary in the social structure, the need for change finds expression in a growing antagonism between various classes in the community. Changes in production increase the Wealth or importance of some classes, and decrease those of others. The class of owners of the dominant means of production (slaves in ancient society, land under feudalism, factories, etc. under industrial capitalism, and soon) usually establish complete control of political power and the state, and also control directly, or ally themselves with the class which controls, religious ideas and the educational system.

The old classes cling to the state power and the obsolete laws and practices which they had designed in their own interest, the rising classes advance the demand for suitable changes in the social structure. The conflict of ideas (frequently, in the past, of religious ideas, more or less clearly expressing the fundamental needs of the contending parties) develops into a political, and often into a physical struggle. "The history of all existing societies," says the Communist Manifesto, "is the history of class struggles." This conception of class-struggle and the role of social classes in history, is of the greatest importance.

Social classes are considered to have arisen in primitive society with the introduction of the institution of private property in the means of production. (And all class conflicts since then have been essentially connected with property relations. With the complete abolition, under Communism, of private property in the means of production serious class conflicts will probably disappear.)

~~\*\*(Some lines crossed-out.)\*\*~~

It is unnecessary here to follow the complicated history of the struggle which have accompanied the evolution of production from primitive tribal society, with its few simple tools and domestic animals, to the present highly complicated internationally-extended economic and political system. It is only necessary to bring out the chief deductions from this history which can be applied to the present day, the stage of the domination of the bourgeois.

In the first place the development of the productive forces is going on indeed at a greater pace than even before, and is demanding alteration of the property relations. (In which direction?) It is to be expected, from the example of all history, that in consequence class struggles will spring up, and bring about these changes. This is the case. (Hear some lines are cut off.) Even these minor conflicts are not always peaceful cf. the French "Revolutions" of 1830 and 1848, which were essentially of this type (vide. R.W. Postgate "Revolution 1789-1906.") The pressing of the British Reform Bill of 1832, a decisive stage in the transfer of power from the landowning-merchant bloc to the industrial capitalists, was accompanied by serious civil disorder. But even in the time of Marx, and it has become increasingly clear ever since then, or far more fundamental class struggle, that between the capitalist class as a whole, and the industrial workers, was rending society asunder. More and more definitely society is living up into two camps; minor differences disappear, and the stage seems set for a classical case of a decisive class struggle.

*Second:* Class struggles in the past e.g., in ancient Rome between the slaves and their masters, definite and fundamental though they may have been, have passed off without a decisive engagement, owing to the growth and intervention of some new property-owning class, or similar occurrence. Is such an event possible in this case? Or alternatively, as some bourgeois theorists seem to hold, is it possible that capitalism will maintain itself indefinitely, either by sheer force or by continued concession to the working-class?

To the former question the reply must be negative. Although capitalism in its short history has undergone much international development and change, there is no indication whatever of the rise of any new form of property-relation or social organisation, other than that of the working-class. But see chapter.—The rise of an extensive class of small *rentiers* or stock and bond-holders, has led some bourgeois theorists to predict its extension to cover a large part of the working-class etc. also, and these to constitute a new type of ownership of capital. This is a temporary phase, even in Britain and America, where alone it has become important, and in any case does not alter the situation fundamentally. As regards the second question,

## P. 527. (7)

### Preface :

#### *Introduction :—*

Short historical sketch of rise of Communist ideas

The contribution of Marx—first working class revolutionary period.

The contribution of Lenin—Second (Imperialist).

#### (1) *Foundation of Marxism :—*

M. C. H. Class—struggle theory and economic—next step.

M. C. H. not a final theory but a method.

Chief ideas—developed of productive forces.

(not worked out in detail).

Application to present day :

1. development and therefore class struggle still going on,
2. can Capitalism survive and buy off or defeat working-class ?
3. Importance of working class.
4. decisive nature of struggle.
5. International nature
6. interpretation of all "politics" parties etc. in class terms.
7. theory of spontaneity, determinism etc.

### **"Communism: A Guide for Reading".**

#### **Preface :**

This booklet is produced by the C. P. I. with the objects (1) of generally enlightening the Indian public which is systematically misled and is very much in the dark, as to the real nature of Communist theory, aims, and policy. (2) of winning the intellectual and eventually the practical, sympathy of intelligent and energetic young people for what is the only consistent and correct social theory, and the only ultimate social aim which is at once practically attainable and ideally desirable.

(3) of assisting our members in their practical work among the masses, by providing a general guide as to policy and some direction in regard to theoretical instruction.

Necessarily, owing to the conditions prevailing in India, is intended mainly for an educated reader, the arrangement is therefore made with an eye rather to logical development than to

interest, or ease of assimilation. This explains for readers with some acquaintance with the subject the emphasis on some points not usually stressed, and the comparative or complete neglect of others. The subject nevertheless presents no difficulty, although, while so many denounce and condemn it very few people take the trouble to understand it.

It is intended also to provide an intelligible, though of course to sketching account of the whole subject. While primarily a guide study it can in itself suffice to give some introductory idea. But much further reading and study is necessary before the subject can be adequately grasped. The bibliography attempts to indicate the contents of the most vital works, and mentions others of importance. It cannot of course claim to be exhaustive even of the material available in English. But several of the books etc. mentioned also give special bibliographies, through which the student can be made familiar with the ramifications of the subject.

Finally it must be emphasised that in order to get a real living idea of the theory and policy of communism, the application must be studied from day to day in practical affairs. The periodical and other (illegible) literature produced by the Communist International and the larger Communist Parties and their associated bodies contain a wealth of very illuminating discussion of theory and its application to the objective facts, and of organisational and tactical problems. Unfortunately through all these periodicals, with a good deal of the more permanent matter dealt with in the bibliography, are proscribed by the Government of India. India is in fact, with the exception of the Police States of Eastern Europe, practically the only country which systematically stifles the intellectual development of the people in this way.

**Introduction :—**By Communism is meant solely modern and revolutionary Communism. For present purposes we are not concerned with so-called "primitive communism" or with the various utopian socialist or Communist theories which have been put forward by isolated thinkers from time to time throughout the historical period. Even now such views are proclaimed, in India and elsewhere by religious and other sentimentalists, but their ideas, though often highly attractive and expressed with ability and conviction, are profoundly unrealistic and therefore inevitably reactionary in practical effect.

Modern Communism arose during the nineteenth century, in Europe, that is to say, when for the first time in history there developed on the one hand large scale industry, providing the economic and technical basis for a planned and ordered society designed for the welfare of all; and on the other the industrial proletariat, the means whereby that society may be sought into existence. It arose piecemeal and spontaneously from the struggles.

of the young industrial working class, in England and elsewhere, towards the end of the eighteenth and early in the nineteenth centuries, but the ideas which go to make up the Communist theory were for the first time synthesised and put forward in a systematic manner by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels from the 1840's onwards. They were able to lay down the methodological basis of modern revolutionary theory, the principle of historical (or 'dialectical') materialism; to proclaim 'class-struggle as the essential subject matter of human history, and class struggle, with its culmination in revolution, as the principal means of social advance; to analyse capitalism, to give the broad outlines of its future development, and to predict its eventual collapse under the strain of its own inconsistencies and the growing antagonism and class-struggle of the proletariat; to pick out the industrial working-class as the revolutionary class *par excellence* whose historical function it will be to bring the society of classes and nations to an end, and to usher in through the dictatorship of the proletariat, a world-wide socialism. They were able to discuss the broader strategical and tactical problems before the working class, to assist in the establishment of the First International, and to begin the fight against the anarchists and the reformists for the triumph among the workers of the ideas of scientific socialism or Communism.

But after the period of the European bourgeois revolutions, and the first revolutionary attempts of the workers, which ended in the commune of Paris of 1871, and which profoundly influenced the thought of Marx and Engels. An interval occurred both in the revolutionary experience of the industrial workers and in the development of their revolutionary theory. After the first stormy years of the establishment of modern large-scale industry there set in a period of extremely rapid but more or less peaceful expansion and consolidation of capitalism. The First International collapsed in the 70's, and the workers of almost all countries went through a generation of submission and acquiescence in capitalist exploitation and reformist leadership. But by the end of the nineteenth century, when the period of imperialism was well advanced, and the revolutionary lessons of the breakdown of capitalism began to force themselves upon the working class, a new generation of workers' leaders came forward. Daniel De Leon in America James Cannolly and his followers in Great Britain, Rosa Luxembourg in Germany, other less known propagandists and theorists in Europe, and most important of all, the Bolsheviki Party led by Lenin in Russia, again raised the almost forgotten question of revolution for the overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of socialism.

But it was not merely a question of reviving the revolutionary lessons which the first Marxists had taught, and which had been subsequently neglected. The new imperialist period, which, Marx, with

all his insight and knowledge, could not possibly foresee in detail, had to be analysed, and its significance for the working class and the other exploited sections of humanity, had to be set forth. This theoretical development was primarily the work of Lenin. In his articles, pamphlets and books, from the 'nineties up to the revolution of November 1917, he discussed the nature of imperialism as the final stage of capitalism; the revolution in the colonial countries; the agrarian question and the relations of the peasants and the proletariat; the state as a weapon in the class-struggle, and the tasks and tactics of the revolutionary working class in opposition to the bourgeois state-machine; reformism and opportunism in the labour movement, and their role as the last time of defence of capitalism; the function of the workers' Party, instructed, organised, rigidly disciplined, in the closest contact with the masses, as an essential to the revolution; these and many other theoretical and tactical questions; left untouched or half-solved by the first generation of revolutionary Marxists, he brilliantly and finally settled.

But beyond all this, he for the first time was able to convert theory into practice. The Bolshevik Party, formed and trained largely under his leadership, was able to seize the opportunity provided by the first acute crisis of Imperialism the first great imperialist war, to overthrow the feudal-capitalist rulers of the Russian Empire and to consolidate the power of the working class over a large area of the globe.

More important perhaps even than the theoretical work—could they be separated—is the example provided by Lenin and the Bolshevik Party of the organisation, strategy and tactics of a great and successful working-class revolution.

But further, owing to this, Lenin was able before his death, to carry forward the theory and practice of the working-class struggle into a still later phase. He was able to tackle the immensely difficult, and hitherto almost untouched problems, economic, technical, social and political, of the period of the transition to socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat. And finally in accordance with the advancement and consolidation of the working-class, and the more deeply revolutionary nature of the present period, the revolutionary organisation of the international working class is correspondingly strengthened. In place of the few feeble and scattered groups of revolutionaries of Marx's time, striving first to assimilate the lessons he had taught, and distracted by the struggle with the anarchists, we, have now at any rate something approaching a consolidated international revolutionary Party of the working-class, capable of adequately working out its new theoretical problems as the situation changes and develops, and increasingly capable of taking an actual leading and decisive part in the practical struggle.



The work of this later revolutionary period thus constitutes an enormous addition to the traditional stock of Marxist theory bringing it up-to-date, redering it concrete and practical, and adds to its previous purely revolutionary content, at any rate the beginning of constructive socialism. The whole subject, associated with the two great names of Marx and Lenin, and comprehended under the term modern Communism which is here sketched in historical outline is dealt with in a more formal and theoretical manner in the following pages.

## THE FOUNDATIONS OF MARXISM.

### CHAPTER I.

The leading principles of Marx's thought are usually considered to be three: the Materialist Conception of History, the Theory of Class-struggle, and his economic Theories. The former two can properly be considered as one, and are dealt with in this chapter, while the economic analysis of capitalism, to which Marx devoted so much of his life, though necessarily closely connected with the remainder of his system, is best considered separately. The next chapter deals with this subject.

The "Materialists Conception of History," "Historical Materialism," or "dialectical Materialism", is to be looked upon as a method of investigating and understanding social phenomina, rather than as a final and comprehensive theory. It would indeed be opposed to Marx's own view to suppose that a final and completely correct theory can be laid down. The way in which any generation or any class regards history and social development is to be explained by its historical position and requirements, and this applies to the modern world and to the working-class in particular. It should not be supposed however, that this theory is to be looked upon merely as one of many, standing on an equal basis with any other views. It is rather a nearer approach to the truth than preceding views, because it comes later, and therefore comprehends them; and also because it comes later, and therefore comprehends them; and also because of the special position of the movement and class by which it is brought forward. The working class is international in its interests; it gets rid of national prejudices. It is a new class; it has no shady past to conceal or distort. It is an exploited class; it has no vested interests to preserve. It is a revolutionary class; it has no fear of the future. In all these respects the outlook of the working-class can claim superiority to that of its predecessor, the bourgeoisie. All students of history and economics will realise how even the studies or bourgeoisie scholars and far more the ordinary stock-in-trade of the bourgeois purveyors of knowledge have been distorted for these and other

reasons. It may be worth while to give a few instances. It is a common place that the bourgeois historians of Europe have often allowed the exclusively national nature of their class interests to prejudice their judgement. It is not so often realised that Indian nationalists are equally biased of the absurd claims made by many for India's "ancient glories" on the basis of obscure reference in old texts. The same root has been productive in sociology of many fantastic "race" theories—as to the "special genius" or general superiority of the "whites", the "Aryans" the "Anglo-Saxons" etc.

The devotion of the bourgeoisie to their individual economic interests, as expressed in "free competition" etc., has led in many cases to a serious over-estimate of the role of individual figures in human development, (cf. Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero-Worship").

A third instance, familiar to students of English history, is the way in which bourgeois class-pride leads historians to gloss over the very important process of "primitive accumulation" of capital which went on from the XVI century onwards, and made possible the industrial revolution in the XVIII and XIX centuries. The appalling brutalities of this process, which went on from generation to generation, not only in the colonies but in England also, usually escapes mention altogether.

**Short historical sketch—XVIII cent. materialism & dialectical idealism (illegible) para meaning of dead materialism :—**

The method then consists in considering the material basis of society first. Society is looked upon fundamentally as an organisation for the production, distribution, etc., of the material means of life. It is obvious why such a view is put forward in a fully developed form for the first time by a working-class movement. Its state of advancement will depend essentially upon the technique of production (tools, machinery etc.) at its disposal, and the organisation of production, the class-structure, the method and organisation of Government, the religious system, the educational system, the ideas current etc. etc. will be conditioned more or less directly, and more or less closely, by the fundamental basis. In particular what Marx calls the "conditions of production", the class-structure of society and the form of the state and its laws, will at any time tend to conform to the material and human productive forces" in operation.

The evolution of society is thus closely conditioned by the development of the productive forces. Production, distribution, communication, etc. improve both qualitatively, and quantitatively, irregularly, but fairly continuously, as the result of the invention of instruments, the discovery of materials and sources of energy, improved organisation of labour etc. etc. That the evolution of

the possibility must not be overlooked, though it is much reduced by the maintenance up to the present of the Soviet Republics, that capitalism will be able, by its enormous wealth and control of technical and military resources if not to preserve itself from collapse, at any rate to prevent the establishment of the control of the working-class. But as for the possibility of the perpetuation of capitalism, again the reply is negative. Marx's theoretical analysis, confirmed to the full by the later experience, leaves no room for doubt that capitalism is an essentially unstable system. (See next chapter) It is a socialising product. Thus the T. O. occurrence at some stage of a decisive conflict, in which the working-class will be victorious, is highly probable.

Third, the class struggle which we are now witnessing, is of an unprecedented character. It is a struggle against all private property in the means of production. Its successful outcome will mean the establishment of a totally new kind of society, in which property, the chief root of social conflict, will have been abolished, in which equality of men can be established; in which the scientific control of society in its own interests will become possible. In short the utopia which idealists of all times have imagined, will at last become capable of realisation. And it is the industrial working-class which will carry through this fundamental revolution in human affairs. All other classes, however, cultured and idealistic their members may be, are dragged along by capitalism, and can hardly contemplate, let alone lead, a revolt against it. That is not to say that exceptional individuals from the middle-class etc. may not give valuable assistance to the cause of communism. But they can do so only by identifying themselves with the working-class. The day-to-day struggle is fought mainly by the working class, and entirely on the basis of its interests, demands and slogans. The working-class is necessarily the leading section in the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism. And in the working-class today, deplorable as its position is, can be seen more clearly than any where, the embryo of mankind of the future. The working-class is on its way to becoming socialised; it has largely discarded that predatory individualism which distinguishes other sections of humanity, and renders unified and intelligent action almost impossible; in its actual economic position it foreshadows the state of things when each will give to society according to his ability, and receive from it according to his needs.

This accounts for the great importance which Marx and all Marxists attach to the working-class. They see in it the only possible force which can bring into existence an ordered and decent state of society. They see in the working-class struggle, not a selfish and sordid effort to improve its own position at the expense of others, but a training and preparation for its great struggle of the future which will benefit enormously the whole of mankind.

The only way in which idealists can assist in the attainment of a better system of Society is by assisting in the revolutionary education and organisation of the working-class.

FOURTH: because of this unprecedented character and the decisive change in society which it will bring about, the present class-struggle is of exceptional acuteness. It is not a question of the transfer of power from one section of the ruling and exploiting class to another; it is a question of the abolition of exploitation and class-rule. Moreover the bourgeoisie in its attack upon Communism, feels that it is defending not only its class interests, and those of all exploiting classes, but culture and civilisation itself. It is unable to conceive of a civilisations which embraces the whole of mankind. Almost all civilisations up to the present have been the product of a small ruling and exploiting class, and moreover have been merely national in scope. Internationalism is of course incomprehensible and not repulsive to imperialists. Thus the bourgeoisie is enabled to rally to its side important sections of the educated and middle-class, and to give to its resistance a vigour and an idealism-- mistaken though it may be—which it could not otherwise possess. The conflict will be, and actually is, extremely violent and uncompromising. Any concessions made by the bourgeoisie are granted to temporarily superior force, or as manoeuvres to disarm its foes. If the working class, by peaceful and "constitutional" means or otherwise really threatens its interests, capitalism will go to any lengths of brutality and dishonesty to defeat it. This has been shown on many occasions, from the French Revolution of 1848 and the British "Chartist Movement" onwards. The notion widely prevalent among workers and their "leaders" that capitalism can be conquered peacefully is a means for disarming the working-class. It also follows from the necessarily stubborn and violent character of the struggle that the regime after the workers' seizure of power cannot immediately be a fully democratic one. The workers' Government must retain for some time considerable arbitrary powers of suppression of opposition movements. The "dictatorship of the proletariat" will have to be established.

FIFTH, the struggle of the working class is an international one. Capitalism, which as Marx points out, has been an extremely revolutionary force in world history, has established all the conditions for the attainment of the ideals of world peace and the international control of the general affairs of mankind. It has established adequate means of communication; it has destroyed or absorbed all earlier types of civilisation, and with its rapidly spreading railways, machinery, electricity and chemistry, has brought, or is trying the productive forces of the whole world up to the same technical level. In spite therefore of many important differences, the fundamentals of the situation in all countries are

coming more and more to conform to the theoretical pattern here sketched.

But capitalism politically has never progressed beyond the national bounds in which it grew up, and its imperialist expansion tends rather to accentuate the division between the chief capitalist powers of the world. It even makes extensive use of national prejudices to bolste up its power among other strata of the population.

But the working class has fundamentally no national interests. It can proceed without great difficulty to an international consciousness, and in fact even before Marx's time, the working class in Europe had shown evidence of its international solidarity. By this time internationalism prove an essential part not merely of the theory, but of the practice of the working-class movement.

SIXTH, the key to the understanding of past history, historical materialism and the theory of class-struggle retain their value as a guide to modern politics. All political movements are based essentially upon class interests. A little amplification of these statements is not out of place. Opponents often attempt to discredit the Materialist conception of history, by substituting for it what is called "Economic Determinism", which is stated to mean the theory that every person always acts in accordance with his individual economic interests. This theory is manifestly untrue, and if applied to historical events is often quite unsound, even as a first approximation. Historical Materialism makes no such assertion. In the first place it deals with classes only. And in any case it is a method, not a dogma. It indicates that in any given series of events, the structure and development of economic class interests is to be examined first, as it is usually found that these exercise a dominating, though of course never an exclusive, influence on affairs. But in any instance there will be determining the course of things an infinity of influences which may be traced ultimately to material foundations but which may cut across immediate economic interests. It is usually sufficient to isolate and name only a small number, or even one, of these influences--and almost invariably that one is the immediate economic interest of the class in question.

It is clear that at periods when "events more quickly", and especially in the modern world, when economic and political development is taking place at an unprecedented speed, this necessary simplification is nearer to the truth. While in periods of relative stagnation, when the "Superstructure" which society erects upon the economic basis becomes more eloborate and rigid, the interpretation of events is a more complicated matter. Political parties or similiar forces always represent some class or grouping of classes. It is not necessary that the leading members of the party

should be all, or even predominally, members of the class which they represent, though that is usually the case. And it is common for ruling-class parties, which have continually to deceive the majority of their supporters, who are members of the exploited classes, to clothe their predatory policy in idealistic words. But the actions of a party are far more consistent than its composition or its propaganda, and can always be traced to the real class interests which dominate the party. In order to judge of a given political situation, and especially to conduct political action, it is essential to analyse the given situation from the point of view of objective economic developments, and the reaction to them of the class interests concerned. (for analysis of the presents ituation of India from their point of view, see chapter 7).

Finally, a word must be said on a subject which has proved a fruitful source of controversy among followers of Marxian ideas. Marx in his youth was a student of Hegel, and throughout his works are to be found traces of that influence. He formulated his theory of class struggle in Hegelian terms, and continuously used the Hegelian expressions "dialectical development" etc. This has led some Marxists, to read into history the same mystical pre-destination that Hegel ascribed to the development of the "idea", and therefore to regard the ultimate victory of the working-class and the establishment of socialism as a complete certainty. Thus an attitude of fatalism and quietude is engendered. Although some of Marx's enthusiasistic propaganda may lend colour to the suggestion that he regarded the victory of the workers as certain, his actual work in no way supports this view. He was in fact exteremely energetic in propaganda and organisation, and anxiously seized every opportunity to advance the workers' cause in a revolutionary direction. In any case, the idea is untenable. Marxists, with other scientific persons, may assume the truth of determinism. But to assume determinism is not to acquire omniscience. Especially in the social sciences, it is humanly impossible to take account of all the relevent data, and therefore it is impossible to predict with certainty. All we can do and all that any Marxist pretends to do is to indicate the broad possibilities of development, and to estimate the influence upon events of our actions. And, as Marxists are concerned not so much "to interpret the world" as "to change it", they will see that their actions have the maximum effect in the direction they desire.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY :

The work of Marx is naturally best studied historically. "The life and Teaching of Karl Marx" by Max Beer (Parsons, London, 1925—Price 3s. 6d.) gives a short account of his life and of the chief theoretical and historical influences which formed

his thought. It renews his chief writings, and gives a short but admirably clear analysis of his system of ideas. A summary treatment is also given in "A Guide to the Study of Marx" in by Max Beer (Labour Research Dept. London—Price 6d.).

A more systematic account of the life of Marx and the atmosphere in which he developed his system is given in "Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels" by D. Riaganov (London, Martin Lawrence 1927, p.p. 221—price 7s. 6d.).

Interesting biographical details, and discussion of various aspects of the work are given in "Karl Marx" by D. Riaganov (London, Martin Lawrence 1927 ). It is a symposium of essays etc. by friends and later followers, including Engels, Liebknecht, Luxembourg and Lenin.

There are many expositions of Marxism, most of which are now out of point and unobtainable. There may be mentioned "The Theoretical System of Karl Marx" by L. Bondin (?) (Chicago C. H. Kerr and Co.—\$.1.) "Karl Marx's "Capital by A. D. Lindsay (London Oxford U. P. 1925 p. p. 128—2s. 6d.) is a simple treatment mainly of the labour theory of value, but also of other matters, by a sympathetic non-Marxist. "Basic Principles of Scientific Socialism" by A. S. Sacks. (New York Vanguard Press 1927—Price -/50 c.).

It is necessary to read the chief of Marx's and Engels' own writings. Other than the purely economic works, the most important are "The Manifesto of the Communist Party" (1848) (Bombay, the Hindusthan Press As. 6.) the classical statement of the principles of scientific revolutionary socialism. "A Critique of Political Economy" (1859) (Chicago C. H. Kerr & Co. 1.25.) sketches the foundations of his economic theory and also, in the long "Preface" deals with historical method. "The Poverty of Philosophy" (1847) (Chicago, C.H. Kerr and Co.—1.25.) is a refutation, of the sociology and economics of Proudhon, a French Socialist, and almost the earliest statement of Marx's views. "The Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science", by F. Engels ( ) (Bombay Sunshine Pub. Co.—R. 1. ? ). A number of pamphlets collections of letters etc., have been published, (New York H. Kerr & Co. ?) "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Buona-partre" (1852) (London, Allen & Uunion—4/6.); an account of the "French Revolution of 1851". "The Class Struggle in France" ( ? ); an account of the revolution of 1848 and "The Civil War in France" (1871) (London Labour Pub. Co.—2/-); an account of "The Peasants War in Germany —F. Engels—N.Y. Lab. Pubs.—\$ 1.50.—1927).

The People's Marx,—Borchardt (London Lab. Bookshops—1921—3/-)

The Poverty of Philosophy—Chicago C. H. Kerr & Co.—  
\$ 1.25.

The Evolutions of Property—Paul Lafargue 1891 (London,  
Allen and Union—3/6).

Marxism and History—London 1927 (Illegible) 1/-. The  
Commune. "*Revolution and Counter Revolution in Germany*"  
(London, Allen and Union—Price 5s.) dealing with the German  
events of 1848. All give an idea of the working of history as Marx  
saw it. "Selected Essays of Karl Marx" (London Parsons, 1925  
Price 5/-) contains some interesting discussions on various  
questions.

Accounts of theory in general terms are: "*Historical Mate-  
rialism*" by N. Bukharin (London, Allen and Union? 1925—18/-).  
a simple, but thorough discussion of the subject as a theoretical  
weapon of the working class.

("The Materialist Conception of History") by Benedetto  
Croce—pubs. rejects it in part. *Essays in the M.C.H.* by Liabriola.  
(C.H. Kerr & Co., Chicago. \$ 1.50.)

.....	.....	Labriola.
.....	.....?	Acholes Loria—Allen and Union?

*Marx, Lenin and the Science of Revolution* by Max Eastman  
(London, Allen and Union 1927—7/6.) is an interesting but some-  
what exaggerated attack on Marxism and the Marxists, for the error  
which some of them commit, of transforming (illegible) into a  
philosophical system.

Discussions of historical subjects in the light of this method  
are given in "*A short Course of economic Science*" by A. Bagdanov.  
—(London, C.P.G.B. 1925—3/-) this gives an account of human  
history in general terms from primitive conditions to imperialist  
capitalism, as the product of the development of productive forces.  
"Social Struggles" (5 vols.) by Max Beer. (Parsons, London,—5/-  
each).

More shortly done in "Communism and Society" by W. Paul,  
London C. and G. B. 1927 216) "Marxism and History" by J. S.  
Clarke—(London 1927—1/-) discusses some interesting detailed  
questions.

"*The Peasants' War in Germany*" (?) by F. Engels.

—(New York Lab. Pub. 1927—\$ 1.50.)

"*The Organ of the Family Private Property and the State*" (?) (?)

Engels— Chicago H. Kerr).



*"The History of Social Development"*—H. Muller-Lyer—(London  
Allen and Union 1920—18/-.

*"The Evolution of Property"* by Paul Lafarque 1891 (London, Allen  
and Union—3/6.)

*"Foundations of Christianity"* by Karl Kantsky. K. York Lab.  
Pub.—\$ 3. 50.)

*Ellic and the Materialist Conception of History* Karl Kantsky  
(Chicago C.H. Kerr ?).

## Manifesto of C. P. I. to all Workers.

Comrades!

The working-class is now entering upon a period of trouble and suffering, of great dangers and great opportunities, which it will have to face solidly as a class if it is to avoid many further years of slavery and degradation. We have recently passed through big strikes, and we shall soon have to fight many more. A big crisis is coming in industry—and the Govt. is showing in the T. D. Bill and P. S. Bill what sort of reception it is preparing. The political events of the last few months, constituting a series of demonstrations by the masses of the people and of answering acts of repression by the Government, show that a crisis in the struggle for national freedom is also approaching. The news from Afghanistan, from China, from America and from Europe, all go to show that a big world-war is coming in the near future. Then we shall see probably a great attack by all the imperialist powers to crush the Workers' Republics of Russia. Or one group of Imperialist robbers will fight another group, and there will be a hideous slaughter of the masses of the people by war, by disease and by famine, and awful suffering, through high prices and low wages, hunger and slave-driving for the remainder, all for the selfish purposes of the capitalist masters of the world.

In spite of all efforts lasting for many years now, to improve them, the workers are still living in terrible conditions of poverty, sickness, ignorance and oppression. They are gradually developing a consciousness of these evils and a will to abolish them. They are now slowly realising, that in order to get better conditions, they have only one means to depend upon—their ability to fight solidly for them against the capitalist class. And in spite of all difficulties and defeats, they are fighting, and will continue to fight.

But the working class cannot remain satisfied with the struggle as it is. The Trade Union movement even as it exists, is weak and disorganised, and misled by the bourgeoisie. Strikes fail more often than not. The capitalist Government uses all means of violence and coercion to break the workers' fight. The future under Capitalism promises only blacker reaction, more terrible oppression, destruction of the Trade Unions, worse condition of life. The system of imperialism all over the world is declining and collapsing, and as it falls, it drags down with it the working class and the poor and helpless into the lowest depths of misery.

The working class must fight against this. The working class is the only force which can withstand the downward rush of civilisation. It is the only force which can reorganise society anew, and abolish the evils of the system as it exists. The working-class while fighting for the improvement of conditions must aim further and higher. It must aim at no less than the reorganisation of society on a better basis—it must fight for workers' rule, for socialism, for communism. The bourgeoisie and of the officials and police, in seeking a cause for the 'unrest' for the workers, all blame Communism. We thank them for showing that communism is the right policy for the workers.

Comrades! the crisis is approaching. Very soon we shall be crushed under the new Trade Disputes Act. Very soon war will again be upon us. Again the bourgeois nationalist of the Congress are putting themselves at the head of the mass movement, as they did seven years ago, simply in order to betray it. Why did the great mass movement of that time collapse, leaving Imperialism still victorious and the masses still in the depths of degradation of poverty? Because the leadership was in the hands of the bourgeoisie, who were drawn by their class interests towards imperialism, and betrayed and deceived the masses.

add p. 73  
475.  
We must not be deceived this time! We must not allow this second opportunity to go by by differences of a personal or trivial character. It is indeed the fact that at no stage was there any difference or discussion on a question of political principle.

It may be remarked in passing that because of this circumstance this split is almost unique in history. When Mr. Srinivas Iyengar wished to obtain the leadership of the Congress Party, he did at least pretend that he had some important difference of policy with Pt. Motilal Nehru. He deceived nobody, but he maintained the decencies of bourgeois politics. It is very deplorable that the serious politics of the proletariat should be carried on with even less regard for principle.

Nevertheless, it is the purpose of this essay to show that beneath the personalities at work, there is a divergence of a political character. It is not suggested that there is any sharp cleavage, or that the split has divided the persons concerned into two ideologically well-defined groups. In particular, it is not claimed that the Party as a whole is or has been free from all the political errors alleged against the dissidents. There is as usual in human affairs a gradation, and on the whole, and roughly, those who incline in one direction have separated from those who incline the other way.

(4). What then in this conflict and the events connected with it, are the ideological and political manifestations? The principal seem to be as follows:—

(a) The predominance of personalities. The curious absence of any political element from the disputes has been remarked. *Personal motives* are throughout of the greatest importance. (Ambition, to become secretary, or what not; blind friendship and devotion to individuals or subordinate groups rather than to the Party as a whole; spite or envy, on the part of certain non-members, who, as is well known, took a prominent hand). *Personal issues* were chosen to fight on, with hardly any colouring of principle to disguise their nakedness. (Who should be Gen. Sec; who should be on the E. C.; "Just so-and-so" was in effect the slogan of the dissident group; even the "arbitrary conduct" of the President") (Illegible) *Personal attacks* were employed to conduct the fight. The whole affair depended upon a wide-spread campaign both with the Party and without of slander against individuals. (So-and-so is not a revolutionary; is pro-British; shows favour to such-and-such, and neglects some-body-else; misappropriates the Party funds; even—"is a spy". Two or three members who in the Conference voted against the dissidents were assailed with similar hints and libels).

The value of all this for our diagnosis is clear. The proletariat even at its worst and most corrupt, never treats politics with such levity. This is characteristically the behaviour of the petty-bourgeoisie, to whom politics is not a serious question of the fate of classes and peoples, but is a career or a hobby.

(b) Closely related psychologically to the last point, and equally striking is the *conspiratorial* method of organisation and attack. There is some evidence to show that planning and propaganda had been going on for several months prior to the Conference, but practically no hint of this had reached the ears of those member, against whom the attack was made. The Rec. Com., the Young Comrades' League, and to a certain extent the Party itself, were invaded by partisans of the conspirators, while to swell themselves still further, delegates were brought in from the affiliated (and some unaffiliated) Unions, who were in some cases not members of the Unions concerned, and were not members of the Party.

There is a striking historical parallel between these tactics and those employed by Bakunin and his anarchist followers in attempting to "capture" the International in 1869—72. The most important accusation made by the Marxists against Bakunin was that he caused his followers to enter the International with their

---

(It should be said in justice to the members thus attacked that their behaviour in this matter at least has been almost blameless. It did not take two to make a quarrel. Although attacked both in private and in the press, in some cases with scandalous libels, they have refrained from retaliation and even from replying. To accuse them of "forming a clique" against the dissidents, or of "venting personal spite" against any of them, as has been done, is absurd).

organisation, which was pledged to support him, still secretly in existence. There is of course all the difference in the world between open fraction fighting on the basis of principle, and secret fraction organisation on the basis of personalities.

The parallel is too close to be accidental. This characteristic alone would be almost enough to justify us in branding the dissidents as anarchists. It should be noticed also that anarchism is essentially an individualist philosophy.

(c) This view is borne out by the close association of the dissident group with terrorism. Almost all the persons concerned have been at one time or another imprisoned or interned for their connection with the terrorist revolutionary movement. And though they have no immediate intention of reviving this tactic, there can be little doubt that they have not shed all terrorist prejudices. The Indian movement was not by any means consistently anarchist in the theory, but was strongly tinged with it, and the psychological and historical association of terrorism and anarchism is close.

(d) Another indication pointing in the same direction is the marked opposition to discipline shown by the dissident group. The most striking instance is the policy previously mentioned of introducing as accredited delegates to the Conference persons whose claims to be present were flimsy or non-existent. It is equally objectionable from this point of view that the dissident group submitted to manipulation in Party questions by these and other non-members, some of whom are well known to be hostile to the Party. Some of the dissidents appear to observe a dual allegiance for acting as members of other groups and parties whose leaders are hostile to the Party. There have been many minor indications of the same type, such as the desire to be "in confidence" in regard to matters which are properly confined to the knowledge of one or two members; neglect to pay subscriptions; neglect to sell or circulate the Party organ; even down to the constant failure to return books borrowed from the Party's none-too-well stocked library.

(e) A political error of which Party members have been guilty in the past, is often associated with an anarchist deviation. This is the tendency to an "ultra-left" isolation from the labour movement as a whole. Several members of the Party for some time refused to attend the meetings of the Bengal T. U. Fed., although they were entitled to go as delegates. Similarly the same members for some time "boycotted" the Bauria Jute Workers' Strike, on the ground that it was led by reformists.

---

(It is interesting to recall that Bakunin in his attacks upon Marx employed personal abuse of a low type. He made use of the fact that Marx was a Jew, and accused him of forgery and of being an agent of Bismarck).

(f) It is possible to trace the same anarchist ideology in minor indications, such as the marked tendency to concentrate propaganda & activity upon the middle-classes, as shown in the formation by this group of the Socialist Youth League, and the Unemployed Youth League. (It is no exaggeration to say that "Youth" in the political sense in India is synonymous with with "petty bourgeois.") Their complete dominance in the Young Comrades' League is similar sign. (Traces of this tendency may be found in the Chairman's (a party member of the group) address to the Socialist Youth Conference Calcutta.

Dec. 1928:—"The Youth movement must be the nursery to train the future free citizens of free India" and "The radical minded youth is the sard of India."

On one occasion at least prominent (non-Party) members of the group have expressed objection to allowing workers to speak in a Trade Union meeting.

It is tempting to cite the view put forward half seriously by a prominent (non-Party) member of the group, that the best revolutionary material, on which the Party should concentrate its efforts, is to be found not among the industrial workers, but among the (illegible) proletariat, the roughs and criminals of the cities. This is of course a direct link with Bakunism.

(g) Finally it is permissible perhaps to point out another characteristically anarchist idea in "Some Aspects of Ind. Socl." published in connection with the Socialist Youth League. In addition to the appeal to the petty bourgeoisie there is a clear tendency towards Utopianism (one of the many strands in the complex thread of anarchist thought. Thus (p. 5) "—it is thought desirable—to bring in the cult of socialism as an experimental measure in the course of the uphill journey towards the goal of independence....." and (p. 7) "As for socialism in the constructive aspect, it may be attempted with great advantage in carrying on certain experiments in socialism:" and (p. 8) "In small areas, by a sort of voluntary cooperation introduced among the masses, they may receive their preliminary training in holding land and capital in common...." etc. The central anarchist doctrine may also perhaps be deleted in the same. (p. 2) "Socialism means an all-round liberation of the individual man from the bandage of the Church, the State and the society...."

---

(It should be said that the author of "Some Aspects" has taken no part in the events here discussed, but his close association with the group in question suggests some community of ideas).

(5) The anarchist trend in the ideology of this group (and to some extent of the Party generally) may thus be taken as established. But there exists also, what is at first sight a contradictory tendency, towards capitulation to the Congress and to reformist Trade Unionism. There is however, no ultimate contradiction. It will be remembered that in the history of the revolutionary working-class movement, "left" deviations (towards syndicalism, anarchism, etc.) and "right" (towards reformism), have very frequently been associated, not only in the same groups, but in the same individuals. The social roots of the two tendencies are the same—Plechanoff remarks that the anarchists are merely the *enfants terribles* of the bourgeoisie. The psychological roots are not dissimilar. To take an obvious instance: the tendency to look for revolutionary material among the petty bourgeoisie on the one hand and the slum-proletariat on the other, is a result of lack of confidence in the revolutionary possibilities of the industrial workers. This, turned, as it were, the other way round, is but the view of the reformists.

The chief facts which go to show the influences of the Congress, or of bourgeois nationalist ideology among the dissidents are as follows :

(a) the inclusion in the groups and even in its leadership, of a number of active Congressmen, both ex-terrorists and others.

(b) the tendency towards cooperation with the Congress shown by the Bengal Jute Workers' Union, which is under the control of this group. At the last Annual Meeting three Congressmen were quite unnecessarily placed in prominent official positions in the Union. The very bulky Report of the Union has been published in "Abmasakti" and "Forward". It is to be noticed that for some time the work and propaganda of this Union has been notoriously and increasingly reformist. There is also a tendency to associate with other Congress reformist labour leaders, e. g. in E. I. Ry. Union.

(c) The conduct of the Party members in the Bauria Jute workers' strike. After some time the initial mistake, of obstention, was corrected. But when Party members assisted in the strike, their policy showed an opposite error. Instead of cooperating with the strike leadership and criticising its lapses or mistakes, they launched a campaign of personal recrimination and abuse against the leaders. There is no doubt that the demoralisation thus produced contributed towards the collapse of the strike. Similarly the policy pursued in the Lillooah Strike tended to degenerate into mere subservience to the reformist leadership of the Union.

(d) attempts to utilise nationalist prejudice. The dissident group's report of the events at the Calcutta Conference ("Forward"; 26/12/1928) contains a blatant attempt to arouse hostility towards an "English Communist" because of his nationality. Similarly members of the Party have been denounced by some of the dissidents as "pro-British", because of their association with another "English" Communist. (A similar tendency is seen in the openly expressed aim of the dissident group, to secure that the headquarters of the Party should be in Bengal. This was in part no doubt an attempt to rally the followers of the group by an appeal to provincial patriotism).

(e) The political tendency of the opposition group may thus fairly be characterised as at bottom petty-bourgeois, showing itself principally in very typical deviations both to the "left" (anarchism) and to the "right" (reformism and nationalism). This diagnosis is of interest and value as casting light upon the probable future of the "People's Party". But it is clear that the political difference which exists, important though it may be, is not by itself a sufficient explanation of the split. Especially is this so, since the existence of the political divergence is not clearly recognised on either side.

To state the real causes of the quarrel is indeed difficult. Any assignable cause seems inadequate to explain so startling an occurrence. The aim of an ambitious leader, or of a intriguing outsider, would be, it is to be supposed, to control, not to destroy, the Party. The dissident group probably did not at first intend to split. Even if every allowance is made for the development of sectarian passion it is still hard to see why a quarrel having such slight origins should extend to such lengths especially as on one side at least, a fairly successful effort was made to maintain a conciliatory attitude. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that there was in operation some influence more consistently malicious even than the ambitions and jealousies which obviously played their part, whose aim was definitely not to control the Party but to destroy it.

---

(It is interesting to recall signs of a definite class-consciousness such as the refusal to sell the Party organ in public. This is no doubt felt to be a menial occupation).

(There is some recognition of it, though it is possibly not clear, as is shown by a remark of a prominent member of the dissident group during the Conference. He referred to his followers as the "left wing" of the Party).



7. An interesting question which has been raised in the course of this dispute is to account for the apparently unusual predominance of personalities in Bengal politics.

Or X meets Y casually in the street, and informs him that Z has said that he (Y) is a fool (or a spy, or a bourgeoisie or what not) Y does not want to reflect upon the inherent improbability of the report, still less to consider the importance or inquire into the truth. He proceeds to revenge himself upon Z, by the curious method of getting up an intrigue to "smash" the Party of which Z happens to be a member. The reason is for to seek. Bengal is distinguished perhaps beyond any country in the world for discontent against its Government and at the same time for the possession of a very numerous class of needy intellectuals. Under the severest economic pressure many will be found ready to do anything for money, while even if that inducement is absent, many are only too eager to sell their unemployed talents in mere mischief making. Such to the bewildered outsiders, is politics in Bengal. It is well known what havoc this business has caused in past yrs. in the T. U. movement. It seems now to have entered the Party. Is it too much to ask all the sincere persons concerned to unite to keep it out? Of course Bengal is not an exception (Illegible).

(8) As has been said, it is not maintained that the W. & P. Party is opposed to the "People's Party", is completely free from the errors and deviations which have been considered here. But there can be no doubt that its theoretical equipment is sounder, and it is more conscious of its faults and is ready to correct them. The "People's Party" on the other hand, starts its life under the most unfavourable auspices, with a dangerous theoretical and ideological bias, under the shadow of a network of dirty intrigue and wirepulling, burdened with the association of a load of shady and unscrupulous opportunists. Consider for a moment the situation which we have to face. The mass revolutionary movement is rising; internal and international development are heading rapidly for crisis of the most severe and far reaching type. The T. D. Bill and who knows what other repressive measures will soon be upon us. The repression of our movement has in fact already begun. But

---

A wishes to gain the favour of B, (Govt. Dept. or an important institution or merely some wealthy individual). He finds that he cannot do so unless he can show that he is influential enough to make it worth B's while to pay him. He casts about for some opportunity, and lights upon a mass of partially organised workers. So he starts a rival Union, or (preferably: it is easier) he approaches C and D, prominent members of the existing Union, and organises a "clique" with them to oust the unsuspecting E, and instal him (A) in his place. With complete disregard for truth and the interests of the Union members E is set upon with the vilest calumnies, and is rapidly hounded out. A, now an Important Personage, a Labour Leader, pockets B's subsidy.

we are yet in a state of almost pitiful unpreparedness. The bourgeoisie are still practically unchallenged as leaders of the masses, in spite of the ridiculous inadequacy of their cloth-burning programme, *simply because of our weakness*. Is this the time for the only Marxists and revolutionists of the country, few as they are, to fight among themselves over trivialities and jealousies?

It is to be hoped that it will not be vain finally to appeal to all in the Party who have not yet made their choice—even to those sincere men who have made their choice and left the Party—to consider the matter anew, in the light of the facts here given, to neglect the Wiles of the wreckers, and provocateurs, to spurn the ambitions of the egoists and careerists, and rally round the Workers' and Peasants' Party, which with all its faults is the only Marxists revolutionary organisation in the country, and with all its weakness, is the only body capable of providing that correct and energetic leadership which the movement needs.

## P. 527. (9)

### The Split in the W. P. Party.

(1) As is now well known, a serious split occurred among the Bengal delegates to the First All-India W. and P. Party Conference, which was held in Calcutta in Dec. last. Far from healing with time, as was expected by some, this split has now widened and has resulted in a complete and open breach.

Up to the present, that matter has received insufficient attention from members of the Party, who have been too ready to assume that it is simply a "personal" quarrel. So serious an event, having as it may very important consequences for the movement demands analysis and study. What follows is an attempt to make such an analysis, and to draw the obvious conclusions.

(2) First, a brief history, though the events are well-known will not be out of place. To many the first indication of difference within the Party was provided by the events on the third day of the Calcutta Conference. There had however, been minor, though important, differences previously. About 18 months before, the question had arisen of the admission to the Party of certain individuals. Their admission was supported by the present dissidents but rejected by the remainder of the Committee on the ground that they were not genuine supporters of the Party policy of mass action, but were still in their outlook and sentiment terrorists; (and further that they were persons of almost universal ill-repute, who could only do the Party harm in the eyes of the public). The same proposal had been brought up and again rejected a year later.

Another indication of difference had been provided in 1927 by the formation by the same dissident group with no apparent or stated reason of an independent organisation with its own office and journal, which could only be intended as a rival to the Party.

This however was soon abandoned. None the less the developments at the Calcutta Conference were completely unexpected by all except those in the dis. group.

On the third day of the Conference this group brought forward an amendment to the proposed constitution that the Gen. Sec. of the Party should be directly elected by the Annual Conference. This was evidently designed to secure the election as Gen. Sec. of the proposer of the amendment, who as Sec. of the Rec. Com. had packed the Conference with his supporters, several of whom were not members of the Party or of any organisation entitled to representation. The amendment however, aroused strong opposition and was dropped.

In the election of a National Executive Committee, the number of candidates put forward from Bengal was five, to fill four places. The dissident group supported four, and other Bengal members another four. After discussion it was agreed to take the vote province by province. The Bengal members voted by a large majority for the nominees of the dissident group, but the other three provinces were declared to have voted for the other four. The latter were then declared elected. At this, the two dissident members among those elected withdrew their names, and the whole group walked out. The dissidents subsequently gave as an explanation of their behaviour, their indignation at the arbitrary conduct of the President and their objection on principle to the presence in the National E. C. of the individual against whom they had voted. This later point is discounted by the fact that on the previous day they had asked the same man to join with them for the purpose of 'ousting' the General Secretary of the Bengal Party.

The dispute was settled within a few days by the return of the two members to the National E. C. But it soon became apparent that the division which had been created had not been repaired. The dissident group established a new headquarters. They caused to be held, without the knowledge of the Party, an Annual Meeting of the affiliated Jute Workers' Association and appointed as three of the officials Congress-men of whom the Party could not approve. After a few minor brushes in connection with payment of subscription etc., the bulk of the dissident group resigned *en bloc*, and announced the formation of a new "People's Party".

(3) Such, in brief outline, were the events which led to the breach. Other events and circumstances are relevant and important and some will be referred to later. But enough has been said to show that to all appearance the breach was caused ~~by~~

Yet still to-day bourgeois 'leaders' are controlling the movement. In spite of all their talk of "the masses", they are still burning foreign cloth— as if that will get independence ! They are still giving imperialism "another chance" as if they are not certain that imperialism is their enemy ! The bourgeois labour leaders are still trying to enter into co-operation with Imperialism through the Whitley Commission. They still hold back the development of the labour movement splitting and disorganising it for their own class purposes.

How can we stop this nonsense? How can we see that the masses are properly lead to the struggle ? Only by taking the lead in *our own hands-into the hands of the working-class*. Only by pressing

the real policy of the working-class i. e. the policy of Communism. Only by building up the real workers' Political Party, the Communist Party.

Communism is based on the *class-struggle*. In society now we see more and more clearly two classes—owners and workers.

The owners are few, rich, powerful and educated, they control the Government, the police, the law courts, the prisons, the army and navy, the newspapers, the industries. The workers are many, poor, weak and ignorant, they are always oppressed by the forces at the disposal of the capitalists. The owners, in order to get their riches from the work done by the workers, exploit them to the utmost; they get as much work out of the workers as they can and pay them as little as they can. This is the class-struggle which the workers all know which shows itself in poverty, insanitation, ignorance, child-mortality, in victimisation, suppression of the workers political activity, the Trade Dispute Bill, starvation, beating and shooting upon workers on strike.

The policy of the Communist Party to end this struggle, which brings with it so much misery and degradation, is for the workers to *fight and win it*. The workers must defeat the capitalists decisively, must dust them, and become themselves the owners of industry, and possessors of state power, controlling education, health policy, the police-force and law courts, the army and navy, and all the apparatus of society. Then, and only then, when there have been established workers' rule, *Socialism*; will the working class be properly cared for, properly paid, not exploited, educated free.

The working class must conquer power, as the working-class of Russia has done, and establish its own dictatorship, when the efforts of the capitalists to get back what they have lost, will be suppressed with all the power of the state. Then the wealth and power wielded today by the capitalists will be used, not as, now for selfish purposes, but for the advancement of civilisation, the feeding of the poor, the education of the ignorant the healing of the sick. Then under the dictatorship of the workers, will be established that socialism which all progressive thinkers for centuries have imagined when all men and women will really be equal, when "from each will be taken by society according to his ability, and to each will be given accordingly to his need".

Will the workers' Trade Unions do this? No, they cannot. The Communist Party calls upon all workers to join Trade Union, and build them up as strongly as possible, and take part in their fight for improvements. It is necessary that the Union be freed from bourgeois congressmen and imbued with the militant policy and theory of Communism. But the Unions alone cannot conduct

the fight for political power, cannot establish the dictatorship of the workers, nor bring about socialism.

Will the workers' and Peasants' Party do these things? No; again, the W. and P.P. is a necessary stage. It gathers together all forces for the first fight against Imperialism for the independence of the country. The workers and the Unions must support the W. and P.P., and help and take the lead in the policy for which it stands—the fight of the poor, the peasants, the clerks, the shop-keepers, as well as the workers, against Imperialism and for national independence.

But, the Workers' own Party, the Communist Party is also needed—is needed most of all. The working class is the most important factor in the struggle of the poor masses. The workers are the only section which will fight determinedly and consciously, and the section which can fight most effectively. The peasants will be but passive followers of the working class; the petty bourgeoisie will vacillate from side to side. Only the workers, drilled and disciplined in factory life and exploitation, in command of the vital industrial forces and lines of communication of society, can and will fight to the end. And the workers are the only section which will fight for more than their immediate aims—they with a social consciousness, a knowledge of the needs of the situation, they will fight for socialism.

This is the need of the Communist party to organise and discipline and lead the fight of the workers, and this of all the oppressed, out of the deep pit of imperialism, on to the heights of socialism. All the best and most conscious and militant of the workers must band themselves together in the ranks of the Communist Party, and educate and train and discipline themselves, to form that vanguard which alone can lead the masses. (The Com. Party is still very small and very young. It has a great and difficult task to perform. It is the special object of the repressive measures of the enemy. It has little time in which to prepare itself. Big crisis are coming in the very near future, in which the working-class must act decisively if it is to be saved. The workers must organise now their vanguard the Communist Party, if they are to emerge victorious. We call upon all workers to join the Communist Party, and help forward the great cause of the exploited and oppressed throughout the world.

“Down with Imperialism!”

Up with Communism!

Join the Communist Party to Day!

P. 528

"Imperialism—The State and Revolution" by Nikolai Lenin.

---

P. 529.

*T. of this rejected*

A Bengali pamphlet entitled "Sacco and Venzetti" by Dharani Kanta Goswami.

---

P. 530.

"Workers" Life No. 106, dated 1-2-29.

---

P 697.

Warrant of arrest against M. A. Majid, alias Abdul Majid  
S/o Mir Faiz Bakhsh Kashmiri, of Dhal Moholla, inside Mochi gate,  
Lahore City. Executed on 20. 3. 29.

P. 698.

Warrant to search after information of a particular offence.  
(Section 96, Criminal Procedure Code).

To

Mr. R. A. Herton  
Officer on Special duty  
Home department  
Govt. of India.

Whereas information has been laid before me of the Commission of the offence of Section 121-A, Indian Penal Code, and it has been made to appear to me that the production of articles mentioned in the attached.....list..... is essential to the inquiry about to be made into the said offence:

This is to authorize and require you to search for the said things in the house, office or other place, belonging to, or under control of M. A. Majid alias..... Abdul Majid, son of Mir Faiz Bakhsh, Kashmiri of Dhal..... Mohalla, Inside Mochi Gate, Lahore city.....

and, if found, to produce the same forthwith before this Court, returning this warrant, with an endorsement certifying what you have done under it, immediately upon its execution.



Given under my hand and the seal of the Court, this 15 th day of March 1929.

E. H. H. Edye.  
District Magistrate  
Meerut (U. P.)

(Signature).

Forwarded to the Dy. Inspector General  
of Police, C. I. D., Lahore, for favour of  
execution.

R.A. Horton  
D. I. G. Police U. P.

15/3/29

Forwarded to S. S. Police, Lahore, for favour of execution.

Sd/—J. Slattery.

19/3/29

D. I. G., C. I. D.

Lahore.

Forwarded to, Insp. L. Jawahir Lal for execution.

Sd/—J. A. Scott.

S. S. Police,

Lahore.

20/3/29.

I accompanied by M. Uttaullaha of Punjab C. I. D. S. I. Burkhurdar, S. I. Rahmat Ali of Lahore Police and three witnesses named M. Mohd Hussain, S. Fateh Ali Shah and S. Baqar Sultan, whose addresses etc given in the search list after Darbandi searched the house of M. A. Majid and his cousin Mir Mohd Hussain. The articles recovered are mentioned in detail in the Farad Brahmugi attached herewith, duly completed by me and the witnesses.

Sd/—Jawaher Lal

Insp. Police,

20/3/29 C. I. A.

D. M. Meerut Returned after compliance.

Sd/—F. Binge

Inspector

for S. S. P.

Lahore

21/3/29.

P. 699.

Search list in Urdu, of things attached from the house of M. A. Majid Alias Abdul Majid S/o Mir Faiz Baksh, of Dhal Mohalla, inside Mochi Gate, Lahore city on 20th March 1929.

P. 700.

A manuscript article in Urdu entitled "Dushmanan-I-Hind"

P. 701

An appeal printed in Urdu, Gurumukhi, and English, requesting the public to subscribe to the fund started by Bhag Singh Canadian and Sohan Singh Josh, Managing Directors of "KIRTI", for enabling them to publish the Magazine in Urdu also.

The appeal published in English, is given below:—

## APPEAL

These are the days of communal hatred and strife. In one word, the Mohammedans are cutting the throats of the Hindus, and the latter are at daggers drawn with the former. Such is the atmosphere at this time that even the wisest amongst us cannot help remaining aloof from the present-day suicidal politics. The seeming cause of this cut-throat struggle appears to be 'religion',

...ch has always been the cloak for bigotry, hatred and narrowmindedness, but the real cause at the bottom, is the economic question, i. e. in common parlance the bread question.

Why are the Indians fighting amongst themselves? Because, on one hand, the Mohammadens, where they are in majority are insisting on getting 55% of the seats in the legislature and the same percentage of loaves and fishes of office; and special rights where they are in minority. On the other, the Hindus are pursuing a similar policy.

The Hindu-Muslim-Sikh rank and file are not affected in the least with the demands either of the Mohammadens or any other community. Because in this communal strife it is only the clever rich of all communities who are playing the winning game. The teeming millions knowing as they do nothing of the tactics of the intriguing rich, are being made the cats' paw in this civil war-fare. The result is that the rank and file are the only sufferers, while the whole gain goes to the scheming rich.

For about last two years we have been trying our level best to bring about class-consciousness amongst the rank and file through the medium of the Punjabi monthly "KIRTI" so that the masses should understand the Philosophy of Labour and cease taking part in the game of the intriguing rich. Slowly and steadily our efforts are bearing fruit. But the pity is that the circle of the readers of the Punjabi "KIRTI" is very limited, because the Punjabi knowing world consists mostly of sikhs only. In order to preach the Labour principles amongst the Hindu-Muslim-Sikh rank and file and extend our field of work and in order to bring about class consciousness amongst them, it is immediately necessary, that we should approach them through the medium of Urdu. For this purpose we propose to start an urdu labour paper as soon as possible. It is admitted on all hands now, that it is the left-wing labour policy that will emancipate India and give her complete independence.

In order, therefore, to form a left-wing labour party and bring out an urdu labour paper we want "Sinews of war." In this world nothing can be done without money. We want funds to push on our labour propaganda. We therefore appeal to the public to supply us with the "sinews of war," so that we may be able to continue our fight for freedom of mother-India.

A strong urdu "KIRTI" will not come by wishing for it. It will only come if we will work for it. Let us one and all put our shoulder to the wheel. Give what you can afford. Give regularly. Urge your fellow-workers to do the same.

In order to fight with the wealthy scions of conservatism and reactionism on the one hand and the capitalist Govt. on the other

we must come out in the open, thus showing our enemies that we will brook no opposition to our determination to carry on our labour work.

Give us a chance to serve humanity by contributing your mits to-words "The urdu KIRTI fund." Will you rise to the occasion? On your help depend the futuré of mother-India and labour movement. Come I be quick.

*Yours in liberty,*

**BHAG SINGH Canadian, SOHAN SINGH Josh,** Managing  
Directors "KIRTI." *Amritsar* PUNJAB (INDIA)

---

P. 702.

## MOHARRUM MANIFESTO

OF THE

Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bombay

TO

THE HINDU AND MUSLIM MASSES.

COMRADES,

As the festival of Moharrum is being celebrated at present, the workers, and Peasants' party of Bombay deems it its Party duty to call on the Indian Masses to maintain absolutely peaceful and fraternal relations with one another during the festival and not to react to the mischievous propoganda of communal fanatics and start cutting one another's throats. During the last three years, religious riots involving plenty of bloodshed, the sufferers being almost exclusively the downtrodden and exploited sections of the Hindu and Muslim communities, have broken out in various parts of the country. The poison-propoganda of communal organisations which are spreading all over the country with dangerous rapidity, the fanatical appeals to the religious and communal passions of the Hindu and Muslim Masses by their well-fed *bourgeois* and *bourgeois-religious* leaders, their attempts to set the Hindu Masses against the Muslim Masses and *vice versa* for their individual or class interests,

have disintegrated the National Mass Movement for SWARAJ. It has also prevented a rapid unification of the Hindu and Muslim Masses and their organisation into a united formidable force to achieve freedom. The working masses of India betrayed by their reactionary and reformist leaders, have played into the hands of the fanatical priests and reformist *bourgeois* political leaders fighting for a division of lucrative jobs or seats in the Legislators.

The working masses of both the Hindu and Muslim communities have nothing to gain by the communal movement which only splits them on religious lines to the advantage of the exploiting classes. The fundamental political and economic interests of the toiling masses demand that they should refuse to be drawn into the communal movement which is only a conspiracy to prevent the union of the Hindu Masses and the Muslim masses against the exploiters, to set one group of slaves against the other group in the interests of the exploiters, the capitalists, landlords and the religiously-inclined wealthy intellectuals. If riots break out and blood is spilt, the sufferers almost exclusively are the poor and middle classes of both the communities. Comrades! It is shameful and tragic that the Hindu Masses and the Muslim Masses who are exploited in common should fight amongst themselves.

The first condition for the success of the struggle for freedom of the Indian Masses from their existing miserable political & economic state is that the starving Millions of India should realise their fundamental common interests and *having realised that*, they should organise themselves and launch a united mass struggle for freedom. The Masses and the lower middle classes of both Hindu and Muslim communities should feel that they constitute one single homogeneous body united by a bond of economic serfdom and social and political exploitation. As such, their real interests dictate that they should unite and fraternize with one another against the common exploiter rather than respond to the sinister propaganda of well-fed Hindu and Muslim priests and politicians and batter one another's head. Slaves of all communities and of all lands should unite together irrespective of differences of race, religion and latitude till the international army of all oppressed overthrows all exploitation and slavery.

Comrades, the Workers' & Peasants' Party is the political vanguard of all exploited elements of the Indian People, Hindu, Muslim, Parsee and Christian. As such the party considers his duty to advise the Indian Masses not to participate in religious struggles and communal movements with the religious harpies and ambitious-bourgeois politicians OF India—dreamers of Pan-Hindu or Pan-Muslim Swaraj—aspire to kindle on a country-wide scale. The Communal movement will only create a disastrous divisions in the rank of the masses, splitting the masses on

unreal communal lines, thereby weakening and make impossible a really powerful and effective mass struggle for freedom. The best reply which the Hindu and Muslim masses can make to the diabolical designs of communal fanatics and scheming politicians to set them against one another, it is to unite themselves with greater zeal and speed and proclaim to the world both vocally and in concrete practical action, 'Neither differences of Religion nor of Race, Caste or creed, can divide us, we who form the one homogeneous mass of oppressed and exploited. United as one huge army of militants, we struggle forward till victory is won.'

Yours fraternally,

S. S. MIRAJKAR.

Issued by Shantaram S. Mirajkar, Secretary, The Worker's and Peasants' Party of Bombay, at 17 Dwarkadas Mansions, Bombay No. 4.

---

P 703.

**INDIA AND BRITAIN**

*British Imperialism is leading to a rapid  
Britainising of a Capitalist Master-Class  
in India and a rapid Indianising of the  
large Working Class in Britain*

(BY SHAPURJI SAKLATVALA, M.P.)

I have been to India and I have come back. Whilst I was there events were daily happening which would make me pity Great Britain more than India, and after I return I see events happening here which, without the imperialist hold over India, would not have been possible and which are dragging the British working-class on their downward path.

The British race has a reputation for being conservative on the whole and (though several of its members wear different political labels and trade marks), has betrayed its conservatism at every turn of events. At the same time the history of the world and the modern geography of the world give you instances that the British race is enterprising, is daring, and possesses many men

and women of revolutionary spirit. I often ask myself, are the British and in their innermost nature, or really conservative temperamentally do they appear conservative as an economic effect of tremendous advantage gained by them through their spirit of enterprise and revolutionary temperament? I feel more inclined towards this latter belief.

Somehow or other, large numbers of members of the working-class have been permitted to believe in the possibility of a stationary life, even in inevitable and gradual progress coming whilst you wait. With the qualities of daring and enterprise and unscrupulousness of method of some of her sons, the economic resources of this island country became so vast in a comparatively poor world that men and women began to feel that their share in the distribution of it, however unjust or unfair it is, would be ample enough for all purposes of life, and this spirit of complacency sustained the whole of the nation for over a century, till it has created a state of mind much akin to the fatalism of their Oriental brethren.

#### CHANGED CONDITIONS.

The world's conditions have changed. Capitalism has grown, capitalistic competition has become keener, class interest has become sharper, imperialism has stepped in as a powerful instrument with which to undermine the standard of life in Britain, and yet through all these changes, in spite of the thunder and quaking shocks of the revolution of Russia and mighty changes in Europe, the habit of the mind of the Briton still drags on in the same groove. He does not realise that what appeared to him to be a stationary condition was nothing but continuous replenishment from inexhaustible sources of loot from abroad. There is neither an assured continuity of economic or political rights, much less an inevitable gradual progress.

The neglect of the British working-class to study British imperialism in its proper light is leading to the accomplishment of two processes, namely, a rapid Britainising of a capitalist master-class in India and a rapid Indianising of the large working-class in Britain. In Britain within the class struggle one sees gigantic efforts on the part of the workers to level up their conditions of life and their political rights to those of the upper classes. Then one travels in India and sees a picture of sharp contrast, a trans-planted life of modern European luxury and comfort and a little away from it a stagnant life of the human being, even as it used to be a thousand years ago.

Take your worst slums, your most congested lodging-houses and yet you cannot conceive of that broken-down mud hut, to enter which even a stature of 5 feet of humanity has got to nearly double

up. There is no other ventilation or opening for light, and there is even nothing to see inside these huts, which are invariably completely unfurnished. I am not talking now of villages; I am talking of large industrial centres like Nagpur and Cawnpore where exist cotton mills more flourishing than most cotton mills in Lancashire, and where several thousand workers are still consigned to these death-traps.

#### CAPITALIST GRIP IN INDIA.

You struggle here by forming organisations, conducting agitations and fighting for various rights to improve the health of the working-class population and to reduce their death-rate. Then one goes in India, and there is to be seen openly modern Western industrialism, under European or Indian capitalist control, barefacedly worsening the health conditions of the workers, increasing the toll of death till infantile mortality which normally in India would be as high as nearly 20 per 1,000, reaches the appalling figure of 600 to 800 per 1,000 amongst children born to parents working in factories. Poverty, misery, human degradation seem to be a rightful heritage of the workers in the new industries in the East. The people out there seem to accept it with philosophical calm. The westernised Indian himself looks upon it as something that matters neither seriously nor immediately and which he seriously believes would be remedied as soon as political power is seized by him from the foreign intruder. He does not realise that any nation, in order to wrench power from a foreign conqueror or oppressor, would require national strength and consciousness of tremendous dimensions and this could not be obtained and consolidated without the workers and the peasants in his land being well organised.

On the other hand, in order to alleviate the mental agony of his suffering poor, or simply through the accustomed unfeelingness of the capitalist profiteer, the educated Indian tries to instil a philosophical contentment in the workers and the peasants and to prevent as far as possible any self-consciousness dawning upon them. Thus is accomplished with success a vast experiment of the British imperialist of producing modern goods and services of public utility through human agency at a cost incomparably lower than at home. He also succeeds in personal domination by keeping large masses of humanity as bond-slaves, rigorously tied to their jobs through the necessity of staving off starvation and through the severity of legislative enactments.

In the midst of this process some of us cried out against it in Britain, but in vain, to tell the Briton that his immediate task lay in levelling up the conditions of his fellow-workers in India. But the appeal failed to touch the British worker. His leaders and his organisations worked like machines that were invented and per-



fect before the advent of economic imperialism and peril, and proved incapable of devoting themselves to alter their conditions.

#### LEVELLING DOWN THE BRITISH WORKERS.

An almost conceited view was taken that the low level of the Indian was well deserved and that the higher level of the British workers was something that was permanently secure by his own merit. The shrewd capitalist class on the other hand awaited stabilisation of conditions till the difference between two standards of human life under its control were well marked and were capable of being brought to play their part under one and the same common imperial commercialism. Then, by exerting the ordinary pressure of a competitive system of life he compels the British worker to level down to the economic position of the Indian worker, which process will naturally continue till a common level is reached either one as low as that of the Indian, or one as high as that to which the British organisations assist the Indian workers to reach.

For the last four years the cry of the Indian workers went out unheeded by British ears to secure for them trade union rights similar to their own and to save them from proposals which were not conferring special rights for the Indian workers but which were tightening the bonds of serfdom upon them.

Here once again the British worker dreamt that his own position was secure for ever upto a certain stage, and it would be the lookout of the Indian worker to safely reach that stage of advancement. However, under economic imperialism such dreams are soon shattered and to-day the challenge goes forth to the British workers to level down to the serfdom of the Indian workers. I see therefore two rapid developments, the Britainising of a master-class in India and the Indianising of the working-class of Britain. To me it is as clear as daylight that the primary duty of the British workers is to form an international solidarity with the Indian and Oriental workers and to level them up for the sake of securing a world standard and not to look upon such an act of solidarity as a mere spasmodic expression of internationalism or as an act of secondary charity from the stronger to the weaker group.

More words are useless and unnecessary; events will prove the correctness or otherwise of this forecast.

"The Labour Monthly."

## **Manifesto of the Workers and Peasants Party**

### **TO THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.**

The appointment of the Statutory Commission, by the attention it has attracted and the passion it has aroused, is likely to dominate the attention of the Indian public for some time to come. Though in itself only a step in the development of Imperialist policy, it is probably destined to be of considerable importance in determining the future lines of political development in India.

It is therefore highly necessary that the National Congress, which claims to speak with the voice of the people of India, and to express their desire for Swaraj, should consider carefully its conduct in relation to this momentous event, and should bear in mind its own representative character.

The vocal section of the nation is practically unanimous in advocating boycott of the Commission, as at present constituted, and there is no doubt the silent masses will be found eager to support an attitude of boycott. The rally of all sections, including many representatives of the bourgeoisie, (Liberal and Moderate politicians) to the idea of boycott is to be welcomed, and their cooperation on a common platform with the National Congress, if that is possible, is desirable.

But it seems to the Workers' and Peasants' Party necessary to utter a warning as to the dangers of such cooperation. The majority of the moderate leaders enter the Boycott campaign with motives different from those which animate the mass of the people and their popular representatives. Their protest is against the personnel of the Commission, not against its function and the imperialist policy which it is designed to carry out. Their participation in the propaganda of boycott will tend to lead India into the futile demand for representation on the Commission (in one form or another, either by actual Indian membership, or in a parallel Indian Commission, or in a "Round Table Conference" (instead of along the fruitful path of mass protest against, and boycott of, any and every Commission responsible to the British Government.

It is essential that in its desire to retain the support of moderate sections, the congress should not be led to sacrifice its principles or to modify its campaign.

First, it must be made clear that the Congress boycotts the Commission, not because of its personnel, or any accidental circumstance of its appointment, but on principle. The Congress does not recognise the right of the British Government, or of any

Commission appointed by it, whether containing Indian members or not, to determine the nature of the future Government of India. The Indian richer classes, because of their own sectional interests, are unwilling to break the British connection, and are forced to admit Britain's right to political dictatorship in India. The mass of the people, represented in the Congress, whose interests are opposed to those of the richer classes, cannot agree to this position. They stand for complete national independence.

Second, it is necessary that the Boycott campaign should not be confined to the futile and unrepresentative Legislatures. The Congress should bring into the campaign the widest masses of the people, the working class and the peasantry, who alone can supply the strength to make a real boycott effective. It must therefore be made clear that the Boycott is a step towards the attainment of national freedom, and that any improvement in the miserable lot of the mass of the population is dependent upon Swaraj and the cessation of Imperialist exploitation. The masses will willingly take up a campaign designed to lead towards the relief of their pressing economic and social needs, and only in this way can they act.

But such a campaign, which should aim at the eventual non-payment of taxes, will not receive the support of the landowners and commercial and industrial capitalists, whose sectional interests are directly threatened thereby. The experience of the Non-Cooperation movement clearly shows this fact. But the peasants and the working class, who form the great majority of the nation, with the "intellectual" and middle classes, whose fundamental interests are with the masses, cannot hold their hand for fear of frightening the upper strata, who have so often in the past led them astray. The Indian bourgeois class, with its political spokesmen, has again and again proved to be a broken reed. The masses must learn to stand without their support.

### **"Round Table Conference"**

It must be said that the Swaraj Party itself cannot be exempted from this charge. Organised as it is solely for Assembly and Council work, in which it represents part of a thin upper crust of less than five per cent of the population, it inevitably tends to voice the views of the upper classes, and with few exceptions its members are to be looked upon as equally guilty with the bourgeois Liberals, Moderates and Responsivists.

The official demand, which the Swaraj Party, supported by other sections, has often made in the Assembly, is for a "Round Table Conference". This idea is superficially more attractive than the demand for Indian membership of the Commission, since

it permits India's representatives to be appointed nominally by India, instead of by the British Government. But it is fundamentally a demand of the same type. A Round Table Conference is essentially an instrument of compromise, and the issue is one which permits of no compromise. India requires strength, and the demand for a Round Table Conference, a demand which appeals merely to those classes which can gain from a possible compromise with Imperialism, in no way adds to India's strength.

Thus there is a serious danger that the Congress will allow itself to be led astray by the clamour of the bourgeois representatives, both within and without, who will attempt to keep the Boycott campaign within the confines of the Councils, and will try to turn it in the direction of pressing for concessions, in regard to membership of the Commission or the appointment of a supplementary Indian Commission, or a Round Table Conference. Neither of these things must be allowed. The platform of the campaign must be laid down definitely by the Congress, and any who are willing to accept it may then cooperate.

#### A CONSTITUTION FOR INDIA.

It has been often suggested that the Congress should officially prepare a Draft Constitution, which should be presented to the Government as the minimum demand with which it can be satisfied. It is clearly necessary that the demands of the people must be put forward in an authoritative form by the National Congress, and such sanctions as it is within the power of the people to adopt must then be used to gain those demands. And among the demands to be presented, a Constitution drafted by representatives of the Indian people will take an important place.

The detailed working out of the provisions of a Constitution is of minor importance. The broad principles on which it must be based are clear. First, it must declare complete independence for India. No compromise such as "Dominion Status", which would give the appearance of autonomy without removing the reality of exploitation, cannot be accepted by the people as a whole. Second, it must be democratic. Every adult person must be entitled to vote. Third, the paramount need at the present stage is a strong national representative body, which can voice the demands of India as a whole. Provincial or linguistic divisions are for the present comparatively unimportant. Fourth, while protection of minorities is ultimately necessary, there is no place for communal representation. The recent growth of communalism originated in the electorates provided by the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme. And in any case there is no danger of the neglect of the rights of sections by a really popular assembly, since the interests of the people are one. Communalism will be got rid of by the united action of the mass of the people, among whom there are no essential differences.

Thus India must demand an absolutely unrestricted National Constituent Assembly, elected by universal adult suffrage, which shall be the supreme organ for expressing the will of the people. Nothing short of that can be accepted. India must become a democratic country.

But, while it is necessary to put forward the demand for a constitution drafted by the representatives of the people, and establishing a Constituent Assembly, such a demand by itself does not more than touch the fringe of the real needs which the masses feel and suffer. It is a necessity, but only a preliminary. It is required to provide the means whereby the needs of the people can be expressed, and remedied. And these needs are primarily social and economic.

The National Government must guarantee to the peasants :-

The land belongs to the toiler.

Reduction of land rents.

Exemption from rent for poor peasants.

Protection against the avarice of money-lenders.

Assistance of means of credits to the cultivator.

For the industrial workers there must be guaranteed :

The eight-hour day.

A minimum living wage.

Legislation in regard to working conditions and housing.

State provision for the unemployed.

Public utilities must be the property of the nation. Railways, telegraphs, waterways etc. must be run for the public use.

Workers and peasants must be given full rights of combination and of strike.

There must be free primary education for all.

Freedom of religion and worship, freedom of the press and of speech.

These are the main points of a programme which will unite the overwhelming majority of the people and set them in irresistible action. The programme of bourgeois nationalism (defence of the interests of the landowning and capitalist classes) has failed to stir the enthusiasm of the nation. The people must assert itself and move towards freedom in spite of the timidity of the bourgeoisie. The

National Congress must be liberated from the influence of their spokesmen. Those willing to fight honestly and courageously for freedom must become the leaders of the people.

The organisation that wishes to conduct the struggle for national liberation must become the party of the people, representing not the fortunate few of the electorate, but the unfranchised majority. Council Chambers present too restricted a field of cooperation for the party of the people, which must find much wider spheres of action.

*A National Constituent Assembly* guaranteeing complete national independence and the democratisation of national life in every respect these are the main blanks of the nationalist platform. The battle to realise this programme must be fought with the slogan "*Land, Bread, and Education*".

The appointment of the Statutory Commission gives us an opportunity to start this battle in right earnest. This insulting demonstration that imperialism is still in the saddle and intends to remain on our backs, has stirred the nation as it has not been stirred for years. The reason of public opinion has been healthy and vigorous. The Congress must seize its chance, place its popular democratic programme before the people, and transform the Boycott of the Statutory Commission, in spite of doubtful friends and timid allies, from a mere parliamentary demonstration into the final nation-wide fight for Swaraj.

Do you approve this publishing in the name of the workers' and Peasants' Party of all India.

MUZAFFAR.

19/12/27

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S  
BRANCH LIBRARY  
BOMBAY

P. 705.

*Rejected*

*For favour  
of publication*

*2 St. Albans Villas,  
London, N. W. 5*

## With the Compliments

OF

Sh. Saklatvala, M. P.

### "THE INDIAN COMMISSION."

The Parliamentary Labour Party have decided, unitedly, to elect Mr Vernon Hartshorn a member of the South Wales Miners' Federation to the British Governments, Indian Commission instead of Mr. Stephen Walsh.

They were appointed by the *united* support of the Parliamentary Labour Party which exposes the few sham "lefts" who invoke "party discipline" to justify their silence when the parliamentary states the side of British Imperialism against India. They are no better than the renegades who helped to vote war credits in 1914, who used the same plea.

But have they been appointed with the approval of the British workers ?

Have the Miners of South Wales and the dockers of Limehouse appointed these two ?

Will the Welsh miners, still pinched and bitter with the memory of 1926 and the reality of their own terrible conditions of unemployment, short time, and semi-starvation in 1927 allow their elected officials to parliament sit side by side with the representative of the British Ruling Class the same class that starved them—in a commission which says to Indian Miners and textile workers ; "We shall determine exactly which way of sweating and starving you and your families will suit the British Empire best" ?

Will London workers, especially dock workers, who remember the tanks, the armoured cars, the police batons of 1926, the hunger and suffering of many strikes before them, permit their Member of Parliament to take his seat on a commission to safeguard the rule of the British Imperialists, *whom they fought last year* over Indian dockers and transport workers ?

We believe that, given a militant lead, the workers of Ogmores & Limehouse will not stand for being misrepresented in this fashion. They will not stand for their elected representatives supporting their class enemies against their class brothers.

(from "Workers Life" December 9th 1927).

## Lansbury—India's New Enemy.

Mr George Lansbury's article in last Friday's Daily Herald deserves to become a classic example of Labour Imperialism. Space forbids more than a few choice gems. Thus—

India and Britain at present are tied together with bonds which has been cemented by blood and war."

What blood, Mr Lansbury? The blood of Indian peasants, slaughtered in thousands to establish the British Rajah in India? The blood of Indian patriots blown from the mouth of British cannon after the great National rising of 1857? The blood of Amritsar? The blood of the millions upon millions who have died of hunger under British rule? Be a bit more definite, Mr. Lansbury: tell us what blood it is that "ties" the Indian people to the rule of the British Capitalists.

### THE "NEXT STEP"

"What is the demand the Indian people make as the next big step in the development of Indian self—government?

The next big step, Mr Lansbury? And what was the first big step? Was it the sham Montague—Chelmsford "reforms"—which gave the vote to three per cent of the population, ensured that the deputies elected by this means should be out—numbered by Chamber of Commerce representatives, British officials etc, etc, and then provided a "safety clause" enabling the British Government to ignore any decisions of the Indian Assembly which it did not like? Or does Mr Lansbury mean the Bengal Ordinances, that charter of freedom establishing uncontrolled police dictatorship over political agitation, which was issued by the Labour Government?

### SUFFER AND WAIT.

"Just as the people in this country must suffer and wait while education and organisation are set going to enable them to win their economic and social freedom, so also must India".

It would be interesting to hear Mr Lansbury get up and tell an audience of British workers that they must "Suffer and wait" until "education and organisation are set going"—i. e. until a sufficient number of trade union bureaucrats and ex—"Left" politicians get a majority of Parliamentary jobs. It would be interesting to hear Mr Lansbury telling the British workers that, pending that time, they must co-operate with the capitalists in a Commission for the better preservation of capitalist rule in Britain. But Mr Lansbury dare not say this openly to a British working class audience, because they would throw him out. He only dares say it to the Indian people.



BECAUSE THERE ARE BRITISH SOLDIERS,  
AEROPLANES AND MACHINE GUNS TO  
PROTECT HIM.

“The Labour Party is taking part in this commission, does so because it believes that by so doing it can best serve the interest of the masses of India”

How concerned the Labour Party leaders are for “the interests of the masses of India,” all of a sudden, Mr Lansbury ; They were a little forgetful in 1924, were they not ? They allowed Bombay strikers to be shot, and Indian Communists to be jailed, under Lord Olivier, without a protest. All these years they have remained silent about the thousands of political prisoners in British jails in India.

They raised no protest against the use of troops and police to smash Indian workers’ strikes : They said nothing about the brutal sentences inflicted on Indian workers’ for “exciting class hatred,” or for the “seditious conspiracy” of attending a Communist university in Moscow : the starvation and disease, the frightful death rate of the Indian peasant millions have “escaped their notice—so far as even their parliamentary speeches are concerned.

INDIA’S “SQUARE DEAL”

But, when they are going to take part in a commission for the better Government of India, i. e. for the better maintenance of the Indian workers’ and peasants under the rule of British capitalists, then they suddenly discover “the interests of the masses of India.”

“What is needed is confidence that India is getting a square deal.”

Yes, Mr Lansbury : but the question is, needed by whom ? One can readily agree that it is needed by the British Imperialists so that they can get on with their dirty work in India ; and by their Labour agents, so that they can go on posing as “Socialists,” “Internationalists” and the friends of the oppressed.

And no doubt Mr Lansbury is right when he says that, if the Indians boycott the Commission, the position of “their friends” the Labour leaders, will become “almost impossible”.

BECAUSE THEY WILL BE SHOWN UP AS INDIA’S  
ENEMIES, NOT HER FRIENDS ; ALLIES OF  
BRITISH IMPERIALISM, NOT ITS  
OPPONENTS.

“ From Workers Life ”

## THE UNEMPLOYED OF BRITAIN ORGANISE.

BY A. G. E.

The great march to London of the miners of south wales has done a great deal to rouse opinion in Great Britain regarding the unemployed workers and the dispicable action of the Tory ( in some case labour ) Guardians of Relief in the localities, and also the whole Tory Government's general attack upon the British workers.

The demand also of the Unemployed movement to be linked up with the organised workers has been met with a Blunt refusal by the leaders in the organised movement. This has brought into being again, after a period of quiet, a general demand to form a fighting Unemployed Movement. The National Unemployed Workers Committee Movement are now organising a nation wide campaign to organise the unemployed of Britain and the first particulars of the campaign are given by Wal Hannington (who was the organiser of the miners' march ) in an interview to the press last week.

"In the first place " he said, "the necessity for organising the unemployed against government attacks is clear. In the second place, the failure of the T. U. C. General council to do anything for the unemployed is also clear. It is therefore necessary that the National Unemployed workers' Committee Movement conduct its campaign with the utmost vigour. At present we are overhauling our local machinery, reviving inactive branches and forming new ones. During the campaign itself, of course, we shall also open up a lot of new ground. Our chief aim in the campaign will be to get 100% membership of the organisation. We shall do this not only by meetings and demonstrations, but by intensifying our work for the unemployed. We have found that a strong unemployed movement can do a great deal at the labour Exchanges and the Boards of Guardians. Any unemployed worker who has a complaint can take his case to the organisation. The committee of the Unemployed Movement interviews the labour Erchanges or Boards of Guardians, often with great success.

Barnslay has recently provided a number of cases of strikingly successful effort by our Movement. The Miners' March gave the campaign a splendid send-off, and many new branches of the organisation are being formed all over the country. The marchers control Council is now running a special campaign throughout the South Wales valleys, recruiting members for the Unemployed Movement.

### IN TOUCH WITH EMPLOYED.

" We are anxious " said Hannington "that the unemployed workers shall keep in the closest possible touch with the employed

workers. We are concentrating our plans to secure that this touch shall be maintained. It should, of course, be the duty of the T. U.C. General Council to help our campaign; but in 1924 they broke up the Joint Committee of the General Council and the National Unemployed Workers Committee Movement, and since then have approved the infamous Blanesburgh Report, and tried to sabotage the Miners March.

We can expect the majority on the General Council to try and sabotage this campaign, but fortunately the rank and file is not prepared nowadays to take lying down the sabotaging behests of the General Council."

### THE BRITISH COAL MINES IN CRISIS.

By A. G. E.

Last November the Durham miners were forced to accept a modification in their agreement in the relation of Wage payment, with the Coal-owners.

Now that the men have had a little time to study the situation they are beginning to realise that for a four month's truce in the coalfield they have sold their basic rates, part of their percentages, and down the slippery slope they will travel at a furious pace after March 1st 1928.

The leaders of the miners might well shout "there; we told you there would be no wage reductions in December, despite all that the, "Reds" said. The men now reply, "No; because you have given them wage reductions in March without a struggle. In the meantime the bosses are taking it off us pit by pit, and will then get a thundering lump in March."

The men are asking themselves "will wage reductions in March save us from worse things to come"? Will the deficit have been wiped away by them?. This deficit must be wiped away before wages can be raised to a decent standard. Wages in the coalfield are being paid according to the capacity of the industry to pay. The ascertainments are calculated on figures given by the coalowners, on a period of working, and it is according to the result wages for the future period are paid. The deficit now stands at about £2 million and has a tendency to increase, not decrease, month by month.

In March the "Independent Chairman" who decides, after weighing up the figures presented by the coalowners, will say,

" THE INDUSTRY CANNOT PAY" and further reductions in wages will follow. This has been done in connivance with the leaders of the Durham Miners who refused to fight last year.

Until March then, the Durham miners will be more or less quiet. The wages will remain the same. (except for the attack on individual pits.)

But what about the other districts in the British Coalfield?

In South Wales, the agreement stipulates that the owners can apply for a revision of the minimum rates paid to the workers. Last September a claim was put in by the owners but decided against them. Now they have again applied for a revision in the minimum percentage on basis rates and in the minimum subsistence wage. They are demanding a reduction in the first from 28 per cent. to 25 per cent; and in the second from 8/0 $\frac{1}{4}$  a day to 7/6 a day.

The present level of wages in South Wales are terribly low. The large percentage of the collieries only working from two to, at the most, four days per week. Cases have been submitted to the Agents of men after working three days, take home about 8/- after 'stoppages' have been deducted.

A joint meeting has been held between the owners and the Men's representatives where the owners demand for a reduction was opposed by a demand by the men for an increase of from 28 per cent. to 35 per cent. on minimum percentage, and for the subsistence wage to be increased from 8/0 $\frac{1}{4}$  a day, to 8/6 a day.

These demands will again go to the "Independent Chairman" for decision. Here again the same "ability of Industry" to pay basis of wage payment prevails, and the accumulated deficiency according to the ascertained amounts to £ 3, 476, 258.

Royalties paid to the owners of the land amounts to, in South Wales, 8d per ton and the owners never ask for any reduction in them.

Again Northumberland will face a demand from the owners in January for a reduction in wages.

In Fifehire, Yorkshire and Lancashire the same tale is told of short time, repression and victimisation. Collieries are closing down and threats are made to workers in individual pits that if they do not accept reductions in wages or do away with certain local customs the owners will close the mine.

The pressure of the Capitalist class is being felt. Section after section in the mining industry are being systematically attacked. Instead of being satisfied with the result of the defeat of the miners in 1926 (due to the most part to the treachery of bureaucratic leadership) they are insistently pushing forward exhorbitant demands, knowing full well that no opposition will be

given to them by the responsible leaders. But, The National Minority Movement which is a growing active force working within the Miners' organisation is consistently demanding that a halt be called to the owners demands and that it be faced with a resolute fighting leadership. They ruthlessly criticise the present leadership, maintaining that it is treachery to the workers cause, and present a programme of action to rally the workers once again together. They are demanding that the Districts form themselves into One British Mineworkers Union as a preliminary to demanding the Mines for the workers and for the benefit of the workers as a whole and not for the benefit of the few rich.

---

P. 706.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF FRIENDS OF THE  
SOVIET UNION.

BY A. LOSOVSKY.

The celebrations of the Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution have turned into a grand and mighty demonstration of International proletarian solidarity. Workers throughout the world demonstrated their solidarity with the working classes of Soviet Russia. In spite of the vilification and slander showered down upon the October Revolution by the bourgeois and social-democratic press during the past ten years, although misrepresentations about the land of the Proletarian dictatorship have been broadest - this Tenth Anniversary of the October Revolution has been celebrated by workers the world over. There is not a country in which the workers failed to mark this great anniversary with meetings and demonstrations and the publication of special numbers devoted wholly to the Tenth Anniversary of the Proletarian Revolution.

Celebrations were prohibited in many countries. Turek, a young worker in Poland, was murdered because he had written "Long live the October Revolution" on the wall of a house. It is characteristic that articles summarising the situation were not only published in the Revolutionary press; the bourgeois and social-democratic papers likewise "celebrated this Anniversary.

While the social-democrats throughout the world were deriding and hurling mud at the proletarian celebrations the wide masses of the workers were frankly, gladly and wholeheartedly celebrating the Tenth Anniversary. Representatives from all the continents and colonies and semi-colonial peoples met in Moscow on that great day of International rejoicing. All were represented. England, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, Estonia, Latvia, Austria, France, Spain, Portugal, Ireland, Finland, the Balkan countries, United States, Columbia, Ecuador, Argentina Uruguay, Chili, Mongolia, China Japan, Indonesia, Philippines, India, Tibet, Korea, Turkey, Poland, Checho-Slovakia ) such is the incomplete list of countries where the workers fraternised with the working classes of the U. S. S. R., on this Great Anniversary. It is of special importance that besides the workers of various shades of opinion, the representatives of National-revolutionary parties in the oppressed countries and even representatives of the progressive bourgeois intelligentsia came to the U. S. S. R. if only to get away for a short period from the moral and spiritual reaction rampant in capitalist countries to-day.

Even a superficial study of the Soviet Republics was sufficient to convince every unprejudiced person that the U.S.S.R. were nothing like their bourgeois and social-democrat prototypes. And as everybody having a more or less intelligent understanding of affairs, knows that an imperialist conspiracy is being hatched against the proletarian state, it was no difficult matter to come to the conclusion that organised action would be necessary to defend Russia. That was why the idea of convening a *World Congress of Friends of Soviet Russia* was hailed with widespread sympathy. The congress was duly opened in Moscow on November 10th. The mood of the congress which embraced about a thousand persons from the four corners of the earth, was extremely interesting. The overwhelming majority of the representatives that attended were social-democratic workers and non-party workers. The seriousness with which they deliberated on the ten years of activities of the Soviet State and way and means to defend the U.S.S.R. from the onslaught of the imperialists was indeed very marked. Extremely characteristic was the fact that all the representatives of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples received a hearty welcome at the congress. The representative from revolutionary China was greeted with prolonged applause. The representatives from *India*, the Negroes from South Africa, Sierra Leone and representatives from other Colonial and semi-colonial countries were likewise given a hearty welcome. This alone distinguished the Friends of U.S.S.R. Congress from all the Congresses of the second and Amsterdam Internationals, where down to the present time coloured workers are treated as representatives of "inferior" races. No less characteristic was the exceptional ovation given by the congress to the offi-

cial representatives of the State (Rykov, Voroshilov, and other members of the Government). In a word, the temperature of the Congress was so high that a certain section of the bourgeois intelligentsia simply melted away.

The Friends of U.S.S.R. Congress deliberated on two reports; *The position of the U.S.S.R. and the New Danger*. Indeed the first report raised the question of defending Soviet Russia before the members of the Congress. It was raised because all the representatives recognised the gains achieved by the October Revolution. And once the workers realised that in the U.S.S.R. much was being done for the Socialist cause, the conclusion was plain: all means and resources would have to be used to defend the only workers' State in the world. In short, the second point of the Agenda was the logical outcome of the first. Social-democrats the world over contest, first of all the socialist character of the October Revolution; secondly, they deny that war is being prepared against the U. S. S. R. Some of the Reformists (members of the General Council), do not believe that war preparations are being made against the U.S.S.R., other assert that the strained atmosphere in Europe has been caused by the "Red Imperialism" of the U. S. S. R. The possibility of the success of the role played by international reformism was destroyed by the Congress - a Congress where the majority of the representatives were social-democratic and non-party workers.

*The Resolution* adopted unanimously stressed especially that socialist construction was making big strides forward, that Soviet Russia was a Land of Proletarian Democracy where every thing is done by the workers for the Workers. The resolution, furthermore, enumerated in detail all the achievements of the U. S. S. R. and in view of their greatness and momentous importance undertook: "to defend, in the countries represented, the first workers' Republic in the world: to struggle against the capitalist threat of war on the U. S. S. R.; to divulge the intrigues of international diplomacy which is preparing war; to condemn everywhere the rupture of diplomatic relations with the U. S. S. R.; to get the respective Governments to recognise the U. S. S. R.; to give widespread support to the initiative of the U. S. S. R. to achieve disarmament (although the U. S. S. R. knows in advance that the Imperialist warmongers will not permit disarmament); to struggle jointly with the proletariat to counter all imperialist wars in general; to defend the cause of the oppressed colonial peoples against their enslavers, and first of all to shield the revolutionary movement of the Chinese working classes and to struggle for trade union unity in the various countries and throughout the whole world"

This declaration needs no comment. It makes very clear indeed that the U. S. S. R. is the *Motherland of all Exploited*

*classes* and oppressed peoples, furthermore, such language is used only about something that is dear to every toiler, about something that is worth defending.

No less definite and clear was the second resolution adopted against imperialist war, in defence of Soviet Russia and in support of the Chinese Revolution. The resolution refuted the social-democratic legend about 'Red Imperialism' and condemned and branded war against Soviet Russia as counter revolution. The peaceful character of the international policy of the U. S. S. R. was especially stressed by the Congress. The predatory plans of imperialism were revealed, whilst the League of Nations was condemned as a "bloc of capitalist brigands".

This resolution was all the more interesting as it showed that such slogans as "Defence of the Fatherland," "The last war", etc. were simply inspired by imperialism. It should not be forgotten that this is the most sensitive point for the social-democrats, and if workers affiliated to the second and Amsterdam Internationals could have raised this question it shows indeed how far our ideas on the Imperial character of the bourgeois Fatherland have penetrated the workers at large.

With its resolution the Friends of the U. S. S. R. Congress confirmed:—

(1) That the victory of the Social revolution and the building up of socialism was possible in one country.

(2) That throughout the world the U. S. S. R. has real, and by no means platonic friends.

(3) That the "Red Imperialism" of the U. S. S. R. is simply a baseless lie of the social-democrats.

(4) That the exploited classes and oppressed peoples throughout the world consider the U. S. S. R. their Motherland.

(5) That the U. S. S. R. has honest friends and ardent supporters behind the enemies lines.

(6) That every honest worker prefers proletarian democracy under the form of a Dictatorship to bourgeois Dictatorship under the form of democracy.

(7) That war against the U. S. S. R. will raise throughout the world such strata of the people, and such forces that it may well end in catastrophical results for the war-mongers themselves.

(8) That the united front is no invention, no bolshevik ruse, but a reality which looms up large every time the working class desires to defend and retain the positions it has won in the past.



This character of the Congress will be especially distasteful to international reformism. In point of fact, these individuals for ten years past have been proclaiming that there is no social-revolution, that in the U. S. S. R. there is no workers democracy--all that exists there they allege is bolshevik demagogy. And suddenly a congress is held, where the majority attending are social-democratic and non-party workers, which adopts decisions that in effect deals the Second and Amsterdam Internationals smashing blows. It is not surprising therefore that this Congress has met with the hostility of the Social-democrats. Neither will it be a matter of surprise if after this Congress international social-democracy increases its campaign of slander against the U. S. R. tenfold.

But no matter what international reformism may do it will be unable to smother the voice of those honest social-democrats and non-party workers who have announced to the world;

**"HAND AND BRAIN WORKERS; FIGHT WITH EVERY MEANS IN YOUR POWER TO DEFEND AND PRESERVE SOVIET RUSSIA-THE MOTHERLAND OF TOILERS EVERYWHERE, THE STRONGHOLD OF PEACE, THE HEARTH OF FREEDOM, THE CITADEL OF SOCIALISM!"**

MOSCOW, November 15, 1927.

P. 707.

*Rejected*

## **DISARMAMENT.**

*By. A. G. E.*

### **The proposals of the Soviet Republic, at Geneva.**

On November 30th last, immediately after the opening of the meeting of the preparatory Commission for the League Disarmament Conference, Mr. Litvinov, the chief delegate of Soviet Russia, presented the complete proposals of his Government.

Before putting forward the detailed statement Mr. Litvinov, prefaced it by moving a resolution inviting the Commission to declare that,

**"Whereas the existence of armaments, and their tendency to growth, by their very nature inevitably lead to armed conflicts**

between Nations, diverting the workers and peasants from peaceful productive labour, and bringing in their train countless disasters, and whereas an armed force is a weapon in the hands of the Great powers for the oppression of the peoples of small and colonial countries, and whereas the complete abolition of armaments is at present the only real means of guaranteeing security and affording a guarantee against the outbreak of war :—

This Fourth session for the preparatory Commission for disarmament resolves

(1) To proceed immediately to the working out detail of a draft Convention for complete general disarmament of the principles proposed by the U. S. S. R. Delegation.

(2) Proposes the convocation not later than March 1928 of a Disarmament Conference for the discussion and Confirmation of the proposals provided in clause one.

Mr. Litvinov then dealt with the history of post-war international relations :—

“ The Government of the Soviet Union adheres to its opinion that under Capitalism they could not count upon the removal of the causes which give rise to armed conflicts. Militarism and Big Navies were the natural consequences of Capitalism. They intensified existing differences and gave a vast impetus to all potential quarrels. The peoples of all countries, however, enfeebled and impoverished by war, were imbued with the determination to struggle against new Imperialist wars.

This made it possible for the Soviet Government to accept the invitation to the Commission.

The solemn promises of the treaties had not been even partially fulfilled. The League had systematically evaded setting the question of disarmament in a practical light. The work done so far had been purely decorative.”

He then referred to the continual delays and to the fact that though the decision to call a conference was taken in 1925, no date for it had even now been fixed.

“ The methods adopted had evoked endless, fruitless arguments on “ Military potentials”, and had afforded opportunity for indefinite postponement of the decisive question. The Soviet Government had several times tried to get the question definitely and practically formulated. But its endeavors had always encountered determined resistance. It had not been invited to the Washington Conference. The Genoa Conference had rejected its proposals. So were its proposals to the Border States in Moscow in 1922.

The Soviet Delegation is authorised by its Government to propose the complete abolition of all Land, Marine, and Air Forces."

#### DETAILED PROPOSAL.

The Soviet Government proposed:—

(a) "The destruction of all Land, Sea, and Air Forces, and the non-admittance of their existence in any concealed form whatsoever.

(b) The destruction of all weapons, military supplies means of chemical warfare, and all other forms of armament and means of destruction in the possession of troops or military or general stores.

(c) The scrapping of all warships and military airvessels.

(d) The discontinuance of the calling up of citizens for military training, either in armies or public bodies.

(e) Legislation for the abolition of Military service, either compulsory, voluntary or recruited.

(f) Legislation prohibiting the calling up of trained reserves.

(g) The destruction of fortresses and naval and air bases.

(h) The scrapping of military plants, factories, and war industry plants in general industrial works.

(i) The discontinuance of assigning funds for military purposes both in state budgets and those of public bodies.

(k) The abolition of military, Naval and Air Ministries, the dissolution of General Staffs and all kinds of Military administrations, departments and institutions.

(l) The legislative prohibition of military propaganda, military training of the population, and military education both by State and public bodies.

(m) Legislative prohibition of the patenting of all kinds of armaments and means of destruction with a view to the removal of the incentives to the invention of same.

(n) Legislation making the infringement of any of the above stipulations a grave crime against the State.

(o) The withdrawal of, or corresponding alteration of, all legislative acts, both of national and international scope, infringing the above stipulations.

"If the capitalist states rejected the immediate abolition of standing armies, the Soviet Government would be prepared to

propose that complete disarmament should be carried out simultaneously by all States by gradual stages over a period of four years.

National funds freed from war budgets would be employed for productive and cultural purposes."

The further important addition:—"While insisting upon the view just stated, the delegation is nevertheless ready to participate in any and every discussion of the question of the limitation of armaments whenever practical measures really leading to disarmament are proposed."

Mr. Litvinov in conclusion said that, "His plan might seem utopian; but all less complete schemes were hopelessly complicated". He was aghast at the complexity and confusion of the questions with which that of disarmament had been entangled.

"It might be said that the Russian plan was propaganda. But if the Commission was not a suitable place for peace propaganda, he was there under a misapprehension".

The whole proposals fell like a bombshell in all the camps of the Imperialist Forces. The newspapers of Britain were staggered and could not collect their wits for a while under the staggering nature of the schemes.

The very vitals of Capitalism depends on Arms. Its conquests abroad, and the retention of colonies and subjugated people is absolutely dependent upon the armed forces of the Imperialist Nations. Thus these plans knocked the bottom out of the previous quibbles that had been carried on in recent disarmament meetings.

The "Morning Post" simply said that the Soviet Government is "sorely in need of some argument which will uphold its tottering power".

The "Daily Mail" offers up the solution that its "All a Soviet Plot".

The "Daily News" made a violent attack upon the proposals which they describe as "obviously impudent", and a "clumsy and cynical farce". The very idea of disarmament was ridiculed "There cannot be many persons who do not realise that to ask England to disarm completely, and to leave her trade routes (on which very life of her thronged cities depends) utterly defenceless is not exactly the same as to ask Russia, which is practically self-supporting, to do so".

The rage in which the Capitalist Newspapers received the Russian proposals show clearly that Capitalism will not attempt to

discuss real proposals for disarming, but the problem will always face, "Labour Governments".

By this simple and honest action, on the part of the Workers' and Peasants Government, all the pleas of capitalist statesmen regarding international peace have been exposed as hollow and dangerous mockeries.

The proposals of the Soviet Government for universal disarmament also unmask those Labour Statesmen of the Second International who keep taunting the Russian Workers upon their "Red Imperialism". These gentlemen when they were in office—as was seen in MacDonald's policy during 1924—could only help capitalist Imperialism by building traitors and enforcing slave plans like the Dawes scheme upon the German Workers.

The latest act of the Soviet Government has infuriated the capitalist world. It is all the more necessary for workers and peasants the world over to rally to the aid of the Russian Workers' and Peasants' Government against the armed wrath of the Capitalist Governments.

P. 708.

**Dramatic Scene at Albert Hall Meeting (London.)**

December, 5 1927.

**Workers' Guards at a Wonderful meeting.**

By. A. G. E.

Over six thousand workers gathered in the Albert Hall on Sunday at a great meeting organised by the International Class war Prisoners Aid to celebrate the Tenth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution, to greet the Workers' Delegation on its return from the U. S. S. R., and to demand an amnesty for the prisoners still in jail for their activities during the general strike.

Seated on the platform, a vivid reminder of the realities of class—"Justice" were the wives and little children of the Cramlington miners now serving long term sentences in Maidstone jail. Thanks only to the help of the I. C. W. P. A. Had it been possible for these women and children to come from Durham to visit the prisoners.

The entry of the British delegation, who had returned from the U.S.S.R. the day before, greeted with loud applause.

Three striking features of this historic demonstration were the beautiful decoration of the hall with gigantic streamers and Labour Party, Trades Council, Trade Union I. L. P. and Communist Party banners; the use of the loud speakers, which made it possible for the speeches to be clearly heard by those in the cheapest seats; and the number of workers who had made up parties for the occasion - many having hired charabancs - coming from the suburbs of London.

But perhaps the most inspiring moment of all came when, two members of the Labour League of ex-service men, wearing for the first time their uniform (khaki tunic and breeches with red tie and armband) stepped forward and unfurled giant banner of Lenin.

They were greeted with tumultuous cheers and the audience as one man rose and broke into the "Internationale".

J. W. Brown (late secretary of the I. F. T. U.), in moving the resolution welcoming home the Workers' delegation from Soviet Russia and sending greetings to the Russian workers on the Tenth Anniversary of the Revolution, said it was a tragedy that the great workers' experiment in Russia, encompassed by the hostile forces of capitalism, was not helped but hindered by the European Labour Leaders, who were the most backward in the world.

Helen Crawford said that it was remarkable that the capitalist press, which was always describing the terrible state of Russia, nevertheless joined with the government in putting every obstacle in the way of a workers' delegation going there.

As one who had three times been the guest of His Majesty she had a special interest in visiting the Russian prisons. She found there no solitary confinement, the prisoners smoking and playing games and every effort being made to help them. One criminal with a five years' sentence had composed two operas, others formed an orchestra, facilities were given for photographic work, etc.

Jagger, (President of N. U. D. A. W.) said he gone as a plain business man to see what Russia had done in the last ten years. He had seen India under British Imperialism and he had seen Russia's Eastern States, i. e. Georgia, and he would rather live in the latter.

A wholesale mass attack was preparing against the U.S.S.R. and official figures showed that the six capitalist Powers were spending 70 per cent more on armaments now than in 1913.

*J. T. MURPHY*, in the name of the Communist party of Great Britain, brought greetings to the Russian workers and saluted the Tenth Anniversary of the Revolution "the Revolution which refuses to collapse and which is marching on to Socialism despite the prophecies of Labour Leaders, who say it is marching to capitalism." For the first time in history the toilers had become rulers.

Litvinov's disarmament proposals at Geneva had unmasked the league of Nations' hypocrisy and revealed Russia's sincerity for peace. Capitalism would never disarm, for it could not live a single hour without the force necessary to hold down the workers.

*Until we had got the spirit of Revolution and were prepared to work, to fight, and if need be die for revolution, there would be no world peace.*

The present discords within the labour movement, not only in Britain, but in every country throughout the world, were a sign of growing pains. But in thinking of revolution and of the Russian Revolution we should miss the greatest lesson of the last ten years if we overlooked the role played by the Communist Party in guiding the revolution and building up the Socialist State.

*A. J. COOK* (Secretary of the Miners' Federation.) in moving the resolution calling for an amnesty for all class-war prisoners imprisoned as a result of the General Strike, said that living evidence of the brutality of British "justice" was shown whenever there was real class issue.

The resolution as it stood was of little use for it spoke of "Appeals" to the Home Secretary. The Parliamentary Labour Party and the General Council; we could appeal, but they were all alike determined not to hear us.

As secretary of the M. F. G. B. he wished to pay a tribute to the I. C. W. P. A. which had done more to preserve the spirit of Trade Unionism than thousand of speeches.

The I.C.W. P. A. brought bread where others only brought instructions.

He was proud too, of the miners' march - the March which succeeded, the March which challenged the right of officialdom to interfere—and, as the Miners' Secretary, he paid tribute to Hannington, the Leader.

Hannington would say he only did his duty—but he was one of the very few who were ready not only to advise but to do.

(When Hannington's, (the national organiser of the Unemployed Movements, name was mentioned), the applause was deafening, the audience showing their appreciation of his work) "Hannington" went on Cook, "had defied the filth of the capitalist press and went on with his work. The miners would not forget either the sort of treatment given them by the "Daily Herald", but the answer of the organised workers must be to take this paper—their own paper—out of the hands of the reactionaries.

When war came the labour leaders, who had already betrayed the workers, would never advise them not to fight, for that would mean civil war and revolution, which they would never face. We must be prepared to face it.

A collection was made which came to over £50 and about 455 new members of the I. C. W. P. A. were made.

The enthusiastic meeting ended up with singing the Red Flag and finally "The Internationale".

---

## P. 709.

### Mr Fenner Brockway And The United Front.

A paragraph in the "New Leader" for December 9 states that Fenner Brockway, secretary of the I. L. P. has just attended a conference in Paris with representatives of the Norwegian Labour Party, the Maximalist Party of Italy, the Polish Bund and other "Socialist Groups". The object of the conference, initiated by the I. L. P., was to invite signatures "from Socialist parties, groups and individuals in all parts of the world to an appeal advocating international working class unity."

The appeal was drawn up, signed, and despatched to all parties affiliated to the Second International and to the Third International.

In the face of such actions it is becoming more and more difficult to believe in the honesty of Brockway and the so-called "left" wing of the I. L. P.

*The appeal is sent to all parties affiliated to the Second International, but not to all parties of the Comintern.*



Why ? Because Brockway and Co, do not want unity, which can only be built up from below, not from above.

The I. L. P does not write to the Communist Party of Great Britain, offering a united front, because it knows the offer might be accepted, if based on a working class programme of action.

Already the Communist Party has offered a united front to the I. L. P. in support of the locked out miners, on the Chinese Revolution and many other issues: each time it has been refused.

"International Unity", according to Brockway, simply means for the revolutionary workers to abandon the fight and accept the liberal class collaboration of the I. L. P.

In Russia it means the abandoning of the dictatorship (witness Brockway's letter to Rykov, in the New Leader, where while eulogising Russia's great achievements under working class rule, he criticises them for defending it against counter-revolutionaries. Thus following the official Labour attack upon Russia) and the end of socialist construction,

In China it means support for British Imperialism against the Chinese workers and peasants ( witness the refusal of the I.L.P. to take action against the despatch of the expeditionary force), in Britain it means deserting the workers in the interests of "Class Peace". (Witness the miners' struggle, the Trade Union Bill, the unemployment question as exemplified in the Miners' March and so on ).

#### ARE THE I. L. P. PREPARED HERE AND NOW TO FIGHT WITH THE COMMUNIST PARTY AGAINST THE THREATENED WAGE CUTS IN THE WOOLLEN TEXTILE INDUSTRY ?

Are they willing to join us in a mass unemployed campaign against the new repressive measures of the Baldwin Government ?

Will they take a firm stand against the splitting tactics of the General Council and Labour Party Executive, who here and now at home are deliberately creating disunion and disruption of working class forces ?

Will the I. L. P. live up to its own resolutions on India, mild though they are, and join the Communist Party in its fight against the Royal Commission, insisting that its members in Parliament obstruct the Commission, that Major Attlee and Vernon Hartshorn, both members of the I. L. P. resign at once ?

Will the I. L. P. join the Communist Party in a campaign of preparation against the danger of war on the U. S. S. R. and in defence of the Chinese Revolution ?

The I. L. P. will not. Brockway's move is deliberately calculated to deceive those masses of workers who genuinely desire unity and are becoming intolerant of the Imperialist Bureaucracy who now lead and disrupt the Labour Movement, a bureaucracy largely composed of the I. L. P.

But Brockway has moved too late. The workers are not likely to be taken in by such obvious trickery, least of all the working class members of the I. L. Party.

Phraseology convinces for a while but action and real activity in support of working class demands are necessary. The workers are finding this out for themselves.

---

P. 710.

A Manuscript article in Urdu entitled "Roos-ki Maujuda Soviet Hakumat".

---

P. 711. (1)

<p>Affiliation Fee: £1 1s. od. per annum or 1d. per member per annum when less than 250 members.</p> <p><i>President:</i> DR. K. S. BHAT</p> <p><i>Treasurer:</i> MR. K. SHELDRAKE</p> <p><i>Secretary:</i> MR. J. E. POTTER-WILSON</p> <p><i>Indian Secretary:</i> MR. SH. SAKLATVALA. M. P.</p>	<p><b>Workers' Welfare League of India</b> <b>The Agent of the Indian</b> <b>Trade Union</b></p> <p><b>18 Featherstone Buildings, High</b> <b>Holborn, London, W. C. 1</b></p> <p>OBJECT. Independently of all political movements or aims, to advocate the institution in India of provision for the Welfare of the working population equivalent if not identical with that granted to the workpeople of England.</p>	<p>Individual Subscription : 1s. per annum (minimum)</p> <p><i>Representative on Council:</i> MR. A. PUGH,</p> <p>Iron &amp; Steel Trades Confedera- tion MR. J. JACKSON,</p> <p>London Society of Compositors MR. A. G. TOMPKINS, Nat. Amal. Furn. Trade Assoc. MR. H. BROWN, Nat. Union Packing Case Makers, etc.</p>
---	---	---

August 24th. 1927.

To the Editor,  
The Michnatkash,  
C/o Mr. Ram Chandra, B. A.,  
Mochi Gate, Lahore, (Punjab), INDIA.

Dear Sir,

Your publication has been brought to our notice by

Mr. N. M. Joshi, M. L. A. the Secretary of the All India Trade Union Congress, in view of which I am instructed by my Council to ask you to favour the above League by placing us on your free mailing list.

As you will note this League is the duly accredited Agent of the all India T. U. C. in Great Britain, and we feel certain that your paper will be of considerable help to us in our work.

Thanking you in anticipation.

Yours Faithfully,

J. E. Potter Wilson.

P. S. Enclose please find copy of Report as read at our Annual Meeting.

---

P. 711. (2)

## Workers' Welfare League of India,

18 FEATHERSTONE BUILDINGS.  
HIGH HOLBORN, LONDON, W.C.1.

<i>President:</i>	<i>Secretary:</i>	<i>Treasurer:</i>
DR. K. S. BHAT.	MR. J. E. POTTER-WILSON.	MR. K. SHELDRAKE.
	<i>Indian Secretary:</i>	
	MR. SH. SAKLATVALA, M. P.	

THE  
NINTH ANNUAL REPORT.

For the Year ending December  
31st, 1926, as presented to  
the Annual Meeting held in  
London, on January 15th, 1927.

## **Workers' Welfare League of India**

18 Featherstone Buildings, High Holborn, London, W. C. 1.

*Agent of Indian Trade Union Movement in Great Britain*

The past year has witnessed a significant increase in the attention paid by the British Labour Movement to questions relating to Indian labour organisations.

### **LEAGUE ACTIVITIES IN BRITAIN.**

During the Year the League has been active in bringing information on Indian workers' conditions and on the activities of the Indian Trade Union movement before all sections of British workers, working-class organisations and Members of Parliament.

Circulars issued during the year include, among the subjects dealt with, the enforcement of weekly (not monthly) payment of wages, fines, the truck system, the organisation of Indian workmen, factory inspection, conditions obtaining among railwaymen, cotton workers, jute workers, plantation workers, seamen, waterside workers, minimum wages, the formation of a Central Wages Boards and Conciliation Boards, the Workmen's Compensation Act, educational facilities for workers, abolition of racial discrimination, the recognition of trade unions, complete adult suffrage and Labour representations in the Legislatures and Councils of State, maternity benefits, health and allied insurances, the eight-hours day, women working underground in mines, the various strikes and matters pertaining to each, and so on.

### **FRATERNAL DELEGATES TO CONGRESSES.**

We note with great pleasure that Mr. D. Chaman Lall, member of the Executive Council of the All-India Trade Union Congress, was present as a fraternal delegate at the British Trade Union Congress at Bournemouth. Mr. D. Chaman Lall was one of the founders of the all-India Trade Union Congress and is one of the Indian members of this League.

Mr. Saklatvala, M. P., the Indian Secretary of our League, was present at the Scottish Trades Union Congress at Inverness as a fraternal delegate on behalf of the League. His speech was a powerful plea for closer co-operation between the British and Indian Labour Movements, and was much appreciated by the Congress.

We are pleased to record that fraternal relations continue between the League and the Irish Trade Congress, although it was not possible, owing to time and expense involved, for a fraternal delegate from the League to be present at the last session of the Irish T. U. C.

## INDIA AND THE BRITISH MINERS' DISPUTE.

One of the most gratifying features of the year was the interest taken by all sections of Indian workers in the British miners' lockout and in the General Strike. It is especially gratifying evidence of the growing solidarity between the British and Indian Labour Movements, that in spite of the terrible poverty of the Indian workers, they were prompt in collecting and sending financial assistance to the British miners. Our League is proud to feel that its activities have played a part in creating this solidarity.

## TEA PLANTATIONS.

In our last Annual Report we drew the attention of co-operators to the visit of a deputation of the Joint English and Scottish Wholesale Societies to their tea plantations in the East, and we pressed for a report to be given of the conditions of labour of the workers employed.

During the past year by the courtesy of the Joint Co-operative Wholesale Societies, we have received a report of the Labour conditions of their workers and we are pleased to be able to state that the report demonstrates that their workers have considerably better conditions than the average on Indian tea plantations.

## RELATIONS WITH INDIA.

At the last All-India Trade Union Congress held in Madras on January 9th-10th, a resolution was passed confirming the appointment of the League as the agents of the All-India Trade Union Congress in Britain.

During the year we have been in constant correspondence with the Indian Trade Union Congress and with various Indian trade unions on all matters concerning the activities of the League, and the work of the League in attracting more attention than heretofore in the Indian press.

The present visit to India of Mr. Saklatvala, our Indian Secretary, should prove a very helpful stimulus to the work of the League and very materially assist in cementing the relations between British and Indian Labour.

We wish Mr. Saklatvala every success in the work that he has undertaken.

It is with great regret that we have to draw the attention to certain attempts to prejudice the work of the League, both here and in India, through the statements of some men prominent in Labour circles. The allegation made that the League is a "communistic" organisation is entirely without foundation. The League is a non-political body, including among its members representatives of all working-class organisations. It is not concerned as to whether its members are Communist or non-Communist

but only as to whether they are interested in helping to improve the Conditions of Indian Labour.

#### MEMBERSHIP.

Three additional affiliations have been secured during the past year, namely, London Area Joint Council, National Union of Clerks, Central London Guild, East London Branch Y.C. League.

This brings the total to 78 with the addition of three Indian Unions, makes a total of 81 societies. Three individual members have also joined, making a total of 70 individual subscribers,

#### CONCLUSION.

The continual support given to the League during the past year is evidence that the League is performing a useful work in promoting solidarity between the British and Indian Labour Movements, and in putting the case for Indian Labour prominently before the workers in this country.

During the coming year we hope that great advances will be made. We confidently appeal for the co-operation of all our members in making the work of the League a bigger success than ever before, especially by attracting new supporters for our work, and we cordially invite all sympathisers to help us by joining the League and by securing the affiliation of their societies.

---

P. 711. (E)

The cover which contained P. 711 (1) and P. 711 (2)

Postal Stamp

Leicester

Aug. 25

9—A.M.

1927 A.

To the Editor,

The Mihnatkash,

C/o Mr. Ram Chandra B.A.

Mochi Gate,

Lahore, (Punjab), INDIA.

**P. 712.**

12 printed copies in Urdu of the Presidential Speech of the Second Punjab Navjawan Bharat Sabha Conference Dated 22nd Feb. 1929, held at Lahore.

---

**P. 713.**

Issue of the "Kirti" Magazine in Urdu for the month of January 1929.

---

**P. 714.**

Issue of the "Kirti" Magazine in Urdu for the month of February 1929.

---

**P. 715.**

Issue of the "Kirti" Magazine in Urdu for the month of July 1928.

---

## P. 716.

Issue of the "Kirti" Magazine in Urdu for the month of June 1928.

---

## P. 717.

(a) 4 copies of a pamphlet in English entitled "Workers' and Peasants' Party Principles and Policy".

Note :—already printed, vide Exb. P. 138.

(b) 4 copies of a pamphlet in English entitled "The Trade Union Movement."

This is presented to the First All India Workers' & Peasants' Party Conference, December 1928.

Note : Already printed, vide Exb. P. 51.

(c) 2 copies of a pamphlet in English entitled "Political Resolution."

Note : Already printed, vide Exb. P. 56.

---

## P. 718.

5 copies of:—  
Presidential Address of the First All-India Workers' & Peasants' Party Conference.

Calcutta, December 21, 1928.

Delivered by  
Comrade Sohan Singh Josh.

Note:—Already printed vide Exb. P. 596.

---



P. 719

M. A. MAJID

*Socialist Series No. 4.*

# COMMUNISM

BY

R. PALME DUTT.

Price Ans. 2.

## COMMUNISM.

---

(By R. PALME DUTT)

**Communism.**—a term used loosely to cover all forms and theories of social ownership of wealth, but having a more specific current meaning to denote the type of revolutionary socialism first expounded in “The Communist Manifesto” of Marx and Engels (1847) and to-day held by the various Communist Parties that exist in most countries and are united in the Communist International. Communism is thus both an old term and an old theory; but the practice of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia and the subsequent propaganda of the Communist International have given it a significance that is in many ways new.

It is important to distinguish at the outset the various senses in which “communism” is often used, in order to avoid further confusions on that beset term. Mr. Sidney Webb, has distinguished five senses of communism: (i) the communism of free use, or “all things in common,” as exemplified on a limited scale in public roads and bridges, and as aimed at on a general scale in religious or utopian “communities” of all ages; (ii) communism by rationing, or the equal distribution of some particular thing or things among the whole population; (iii) communism in treatment, or the supply of population; (iii) communism in treatment, or the supply of some particular service, not equally, but according to need, as in the public provision of medical care or education; (iv) communism in the sense of nationalisation or municipalisation; (v) the communism of “The Communist Manifesto.” To these should possibly be added the Communism or “Communist Anarchism” of Kropotkin and his school (with its special conception of “the commune” or small voluntary self-supporting community) for which reference should be made to the article on “Anarchism.” It is only the last of the five senses given above

which will be treated here, since the other senses either do not cover a specific political theory or else are co-terminous with socialism in general. It is only in this last sense that Communism has a continuous history and a present significance.

**The Historical Development of Communism**—The conditions which gave rise to Communism began with the Industrial Revolution. The social transformation produced by that event, the emergence of a new middle class and its rise to power, and the creation of a growing town population of wage earners in large industry, led to numerous movements of unrest in the early nineteenth century and to all kinds of social theories and questionings. At this time the term Socialism became applied to various types of theories of a benevolent or co-operative economic order. These theories, however, formulated mainly by individual thinkers in England and France, had no direct relation to the movement of the masses. The new feature introduced by Communism was its direct correlation of social theory with the struggle of the working class. The necessity for this was making itself felt in various quarters; but its first clear expression was given to the world in what is still the classic statement of Communism, the *Communist Manifesto* of Marx and Engels, written in November 1847. 1847 may thus be taken as the starting point of Communism as conscious force.

**The Communist Manifesto**.—The Communist Manifesto opens with the statement that the history of all hither, co-existing human society has been the history of successive class struggles, which have on each occasion either resulted in the revolutionary transformation of society or in its collapse. From the slave systems of ancient civilisation to the feudal system of mediaeval society, and from that in turn to the rule of capitalism or the bourgeoisie, there has been on each occasion a new class rising to power out of the conditions of the old society after a violent and revolutionary struggle with the preceding class. The rise to power of the bourgeoisie is described in rapid outline, its origin from the bosom of feudal society, its beaking of the bonds of feudalism and monarchy, its revolutionising of the methods of industry, agriculture and communication; its establishment of modern industry with its accelerated and concentrated production, extended franchise, the national state and the international trade and finally its subjugation of the whole world to its mode of production. "It has achieved greater miracles than the construction of Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts or Gothic cathedrals; it has carried out greater movements than the migration of peoples or the crusades . . . . . Although it is scarcely a century since it became the dominating class, the bourgeoisie has created more powerful and more gigantic forces of production than all past generations put together."

Yet to-day the bourgeoisie finds itself threatened in its turn

by the class of the proletariat or wage earners which its own method of production has created. Like the systems which preceded it, capitalism has created the forces which will lead to its overthrow: the proletariat, ever growing in numbers and in the insistence of its demands, and an anarchical system of production in the midst of famine and misery, and (a modern communist would add) in its last phase the fierce struggles of imperialism and havoc of world-war. These contradictions of capitalism\* reveal that the forces of production have outstripped the existing conditions of social organisation, and are producing goods faster than society can control the use of under the existing laws of property. Social production has been established, but individual appropriation of the results still remains. The contradiction receives expression in the class-struggle of the workers against the capitalists. The proletariat, being without property and living in a regime of increasing social production, can no longer fight for individual ownership, but only for the socially conducted utilisation of the means of production belonging to the community and of the goods produced. Thus capitalism has created in the proletariat a social class which can only have as its object the abolition of the capitalist system of ownership and its replacement by the proletarian system of common ownership.

\*To explain the "contradictions" of capitalism would demand an examination of Marxian economic theory for which there is here no room. It must suffice to say that Marx saw in the wage system a system by which monopoly in the means of production is used to compel those outside the monopoly (the proletariat) to sell their labour in return for subsistence and forego all rights to the actual value produced. The resulting surplus provides new capital for yet more production on the same system, but always with the need of finding new markets, since the workers themselves, only receiving in wages a portion of the value produced, can only buy back a portion of the value produced; with the result that, while the early stages of capitalism show rapid expansion and development, opening up the whole world and forcing every nation and race into the circle of its operations, the later stages show increasing crises of overproduction and rivalry in markets, tremendous concentration of financial power, and, in the last phase, the continually intensifying struggles of imperialism culminating in world-war and world economic disorganisation. In this progress capitalism by its own development has completely destroyed the basis of private property from which it began. Originating in private property and competition by monopoly, it has eaten up the independent small proprietor and replaced him by tremendous combines replaced competition by monopoly, reduced the masses of the population to the position of proletariat which in a regime of private property is without private property, & finally

reached a stage of production whose forces it is no longer able to control, any more than it can control the proletarian masses who now begin to rise against its domination. Thus it is ready for its dissolution and for the replacement of its worn out basis of private property by the new basis of social ownership in accordance with the new mode of production and through the agency of the new class, the proletariat, which has no knowledge of private property.

But there is this new feature in the struggle and future victory of the proletariat, that, whereas all previous class-struggles have resulted simply in the rule of a new minority....the rise to power of a new separate stratum of society—the victory of the proletariat carries with it the emancipation of the whole of humanity, because there is no remaining class below them to be freed. The struggle of the working class is thus the struggle of the humanity of the future, and this is the secret of the class-asis of all communist thinking.

It is with this struggle that Communists identify themselves, not as any special party, but simply as the champions of the interests of the working class. They believe that just as each succeeding class has only won to power after violent and revolutionary struggle with the preceding class, so the working class can never realise its aims save by the violent overthrow of the capitalist class and its whole system of power. "The Communists disdain to conceal their aims and intentions. They declare openly that their ends can only be attained by the forcible overthrow of every obtaining order of society. Let the ruling classes tremble before a Communist revolution; the workers have nothing to lose by it but their chains. They have the world to win. Workers of every land, unite!"

**The Later Period of marxism.**—In the Communist Manifesto may be traced all the characteristic conceptions of Marx: the Materialist Conception of History (not to be confused with either materialism or economic determinism) the doctrine of the Class-Struggle, and the theory of the revolutionary transference of Power to the Proletariat. At the same time the analysis of the rôle of capitalism, which was to be worked out later with a wealth of detail in the pages of "Capital" (1867) is already briefly indicated: and in a rapid forward glance the prospect is presented of a transition through the revolutionary rule of the proletariat to a classless society. It remained in his later work to give elaboration and precision to these original conceptions in the light of the experience of European history and the working class struggle for the next generation. These writings have particular reference to two dominant events, the revolution of 1848 which led in Paris to the first distinct attempt of the working class to seize power in "the days of June" with the consequent coalition of all the bourgeois forces into a single "Party of Order" and the Commune of Paris in 1871 when for the first time the working class held power for six weeks. The later

developments in Marx's historical and other writing are of especial interest for the new light they throw on the practical questions of the communist attitude to the State and the conception of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat ( a phrase which did not take shape till after the writing of the Communist Manifesto, its first appearance in Marx's writings coming in 1850).

The modern State had already been described in the Communist Manifesto as the "executive for administering the affairs of the capitalist class as a whole." The experience of the nineteenth century revolutions appears to have convinced Marx that it was idle to expect any fundamental change so long as the apparatus of the existing State was left unaffected. Alike in writing of 1848 and 1871 he stresses the necessity for destroying and shattering the existing machinery of the State. The one and only amendment of substance to the Communist Manifesto that he makes in his last Preface to it before his death, written in 1872, is to declare that "One thing especially was proved by the Commune, namely, that the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready made State machinery and wield it for its own purposes." But he demands not merely the destruction of existing State, but its replacement by a new type of State, a Workers' State or the Dictatorship of the Proletariat as the transitional organ to carry through the change to communist society.

"Between capitalist society and communist society there lies a period of revolutionary transformation from the former to the latter. A stage of political transition corresponds to this period, and the State during this period can be no other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat."

(Critique of the Gotha Programme, 1875).

This new State will be based on the workers' organisations.

"Against this new official Government," Marx wrote, in describing the tactics for communists during a revolution in its first stages, "they must set up a revolutionary workers' government, either in the form of local committees or workers' councils, or workers' clubs or committees, so that the democratic middle class government not only immediately loses its support among the working class, but from the commencement finds itself supervised and threatened by a jurisdiction behind which stands the entire mass of the working class."

(Address to the League Communists 1850.

On the other hand the Proletarian State is in its nature temporary: because, in proportion as it carries out its task of suppressing class-distinction it destroyed its own class basis, and the State as a special organ of class-power and coercion gives way,

to the machinery of a homogeneous communist society. It is only in this second phase of communism that freedom becomes realisable.

**The First and Second Internationals** :—While the main body of communist doctrine was thus receiving its completed form, the first attempts were being made at giving expression to communism in working-class organisation, the first international (1864-1872) was not a Marxian body: it was a coming together of various types of working class organisation and theory; but from first Marx played a leading part in it, he drafted its principal declarations, and his ideas became more and more dominant within its ranks, until the controversy with the anarchist Bakunin led to its break-up. The First International was the battle ground in which Marx established its supremacy as the social philosophy of the working class. By the time of its demise in 1873 the seed of Marxian socialism had been sown in the working class movement of Europe.

When the movement towards international working class organisation was resumed with the formation of the Second International in 1889, Marxian socialism was now assumed as the natural basis. Henceforward the class-struggle and the transference of power to the proletariat were the statutory objects of international working class organisation. But meanwhile, beneath this apparently rapid victory of Marxism, a deep change in conditions had taken place. The movements that came together in the Second International were no longer the scattered sections of a handful of pioneers in working class organisation. They were powerful national organisations of the workers, numbering their adherents in millions. Thus the second stage had been reached of winning the masses to organisation; but the work of training in the principles of the revolutionary struggle still remained. This was the task begun, but never fully achieved, by the Second International, as the war revealed. The peaceful conditions of the period led to hopes of peaceful progress and a gradual transition to socialism without the disastrous necessities of catastrophic change. It was not until the war, with the collapse that it brought to the ideals of peaceful progress, that Communism appeared once more in its full force and with all the revolutionary implications with which Marx had left it.

**The war and Bolshevism**.—The war, then, is the starting-point of modern Communism. The war forced to the forefront in an acute form the issues and divisions that had been latent in the socialist movement. It was no longer possible for the great national movements to maintain their dual allegiance, at once to the existing national state which they hoped some day to control, and to the international class-war which they had still continued to proclaim in their resolutions. So there came the division of forces, the division of Majority and Minority which manifested itself in every belligerent

country. The bulk of the official parties supported the war, and in consequence found themselves involved in closer and closer alliance with the governments. Sections in each country, and in some cases (notably Italy and Russia) the majority were in opposition.

This division, which began as a difference over the issue of war and peace, soon developed into a deeper opposition. It was not possible for one side to support the war without entering into closer and closer relations with the whole administration of the existing governments: It was not possible for the other side to oppose the war without implying a denial of the whole conception of the existing national State. As the division developed, its revolutionary implication became more and more manifest: the Zimmerwaldian organisation of anti-war socialists which had been founded as a temporary substitute for the collapsed International at a conference at Zimmerwald in Switzerland in 1915, gradually evolved from an organ of international peace and working-class solidarity into an organ of international revolution and working-class struggle.

It was the Russian Revolution that finally brought this new division to a head. The Russian Revolution forced into the realm of actual division the old controversies of class-war or class-peace, working-class government or democracy. The party which proclaimed its stand on the Marxian principles of class-struggle and working-class government was the Russian Social Democratic Party (Majority) or Bolsheviki. (From this title of Bolsheviki or Majority, derived from their holding the Majority at the Brussels-London Conference of the Russian Social Democratic Party in 1903 has been formed the word "Bolshevism" as a current popular expression for Communism and a loose journalistic term all forms of extremism and violence). Against the other socialist sections who maintained a coalition with the bourgeoisie, the Bolsheviki carried through the second revolution of November, 1917, and established a new form of government based on the Soviets or workers' councils. With this government they proclaimed the inauguration of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and maintained their power against a series of attacks from without and within. From thenceforward they became the natural leaders of the revolutionary working-class movement of the world. As the revolution spread to other countries, the division in the socialist world became more and more complete, and in 1919 the Third or Communist International was founded on the basis of the revolutionary working-class struggle. The old Marxian term Communism was thus revived against the Social Democracy which Marx and Engels had always declared as unsuitable description for a movement which stood for the suppression both of the State and of democracy, and which the communists regarded as having been a cover for the betrayal of the socialist cause. At the Second Congress in 1920 a detailed statement of communist aims, policy and tactics was drawn up; and Communism finally came into existence as a fully organised world-force.

**The Modern Communist Outlook.**—The First Manifesto of the new Communist International describes the modern communist outlook. It sees in the ruin of the world-war and the peace that succeeded it the fulfilment of the Marxian prediction of the catastrophic destiny of capitalism. Capitalism, it declares, torn by its own contradictions, has plunged into the agony of world-war: but war has brought no solution to its problems, just as peace has brought no relief. Hardly has the last war ended before the next war is being prepared: imperialist rivalry continues with more intensity than ever: economic disorganisation spreads apace. There is no way out save the complete ending of the system of imperial capitalism that compels these results, and its replacement by the world organisation of production on the basis of the workers. "This is the epoch of the decomposition and break-up of the world capitalist system, which will mean the break-up of European culture in general if capitalism with its irreconcilable antagonisms is not destroyed". The war has brought the population of the world face to face with the realities of capitalism: what was before the theory and speculation of a few has become the bitter experience of millions. "The contradictions of the capitalist system were converted by the war into degrading torments of hunger and cold, disease and savagery for all mankind". They have seen the vanity of the hopes of peaceful progress in face of the iron onward sweep to destruction of the existing system. "The catastrophe of imperialist war has with one swoop swept away all the gains of experts and of Parliamentary struggles". Not only the populations of Europe, but the colonial population of Asia and Africa, have been dragged into the vortex, and are now finding their only chance of liberation in the international communist revolution. In the midst of this world-upheaval there is need of a strong revolutionary power that can alone form the coherent force to carry through the necessary change and establish the new system. Reaction solves nothing, and half measures are fatal. "Only the Proletarian Dictatorship, which recognises neither inherited privilege nor rights of property, can shorten the period of the present crisis: and for this purpose will mobilise all materials and forces, introduce the universal duty to labour, establish the regime of industrial discipline, and in this way heal in the course of a few years the open wounds caused by the war and raise humanity to undreamt of heights". It is the conditions of society that are producing chaos and revolution; it is the object of the Communists to end those conditions by giving conscious direction to the instinctive forces of revolt, instead of vainly seeking to stem them. No error in fact could be greater than to suppose that the Communists are out to "make" a revolution in order to impose their system upon mankind. "The Communist Parties, far from conjuring up civil war artificially, rather seek to shorten its duration". In the Communist conception the alternative to the proletarian dictatorship is not peace. It is war and blockade, famine and disease, blind revolts and the break up of civilisation.



**Communism and Democracy.**—It is from this point of view that the controversy of Communism and democracy should be approached if the communist position is to be understood. The Communists do not reject the current conceptions of democracy because they believe in the superiority of the few, but because they believe that the phrases of democracy bear no relation to present realities. The divorce between the realities of power and the theory in modern democratic states has been noted by observers of all schools; it is the special point of the communist to insist that this divorce is not due to accidental and remediable causes, but is inherent in the nature of capitalist democracy. Democracy in fact is held to be unrealisable in capitalist society because of the fundamental helplessness of the propertyless man; the parliamentary forms only serve to veil the reality of the "bourgeois dictatorship" by an appearance of popular consent which is rendered unreal by the capitalist control of the social structure; and even this veil is cast aside in moments of any stress by the open assumption of emergency dictatorial powers. The plea that this situation may be remedied by education and propaganda is met by the reply that all the large-scale organs of education and propaganda are under capitalist control.

On the other hand Communism, while rejecting current democracy, differs from syndicalism and others revolutionary philosophies which proclaim the right of the "militant minority" to endeavour to change society. The glorification of the minority and of the coup d'etat really belongs to the Blanquist school, which was always vigorously opposed by Marxism. Marxism taught that the liberation of the workers could only be the act of the workers themselves, and that all the Communists could do was to endeavour to guide the struggle of the workers into its realisation in the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. In this way the Bolsheviki did not carry through their resolution of November 1917, until they had gained the majority in the Soviets and the trade unions.

\* \* \* \*

Where the Communist differ from other believers in the ultimate victory of the working-class is that they do not believe that victory will be achieved until after a very much more severe struggle than is ordinarily contemplated. They believe that the ruling class will use every means, political, economic and military, to defend its privileges, and that the final decision will not be reached without open civil war. In support of this they quote evidence to show the readiness of the ruling class in many countries to fling constitutional considerations to the winds when their privileges are in danger. To mistake dislike of this prospect for evidence of its improbability they regard as a fatal policy: and they believe it necessary, therefore, to make preparations for the event, considering the best guarantee against the chaos of prolonged social disorder (otherwise

inevitable in the period of capitalist dissolution) to be the existence of a powerful revolutionary party.

It is this aspect of Communism which has led to the current distinction between Communism and other forms of socialism as a difference of method: but it will be seen that this difference of method arises from a far more fundamental divergence in outlook and philosophy. The methods of the Communists are not comprehensible save in relation to the whole philosophy of the Communist Manifesto.

**Communist Organisation.**—From the above considerations certain conclusions follow as to the role and character of the Communist Party in any country. The fully organised Communist Party, it is stated, is to be the "advance guard" of the working class, never regarding itself as separate from the working class, always working in and through existing working class organisations on the plane of the struggle of the moment, but always co-ordinating and giving conscious direction to the different aspects of the working class struggle with a view to the larger ultimate issue. For this purpose it must be based on the strictest internal discipline, and on severe conditions of membership: but internal strictness of theory and discipline must be accompanied by an external policy of revolutionary opportunism which is in contrast with the usual "purism" of the revolutionary sect. This is the explanation of the alternate charges of "doctrinairism" and "opportunism" which are levelled by other socialists against the Communist Party. This discipline is ultimately international in character, because the struggle is regarded as international. To the Communist the International is more than a coming together of sympathetic parties in a common struggle: it is the union of different divisions in a single army, each with its own tactical problems, but all with a single ultimate directing centre. For this reason an absolute ultimate authority is vested in the International Executive, subject to the World Congress. This authority of the International is regarded as of particular importance, not only for the immediate struggle, but as the nucleus of future international authority in the World Soviet Republic.

#### **Bibliography.**—

The classic statement of Communism are contained in the writings of Marx and Engels: In particular, "The Communist Manifesto" by Marx and Engels (1848). "The 18th Brumaire" (1852), "Capital" (1867), "The Civil War in France" (1871), and the "Critique of the Gotha Programme" (1875) by Marx; and "The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State" ( ) by Engels, "The Life and Teaching Karl Marx" by Max Beer (1918; English translation, 1941) gives a valuable short summary of his theories. The controversial literature of Marxism is very extensive,

and would need a special bibliography. The most important documents of modern Communism are the writings of Lenin, especially "The state and Revolution" (1927) and "Left Communism, an Infantile Disorder" (1920); the writings of Trotsky, including "The Russian Revolution to Brest Litovsk" (1918), Bukharin's "Programme of the World Revolution" (1920); and other writings of the Russian leaders; and the publications of the Communist International, including the Congress Manifestoes (1919 and 1920), the "Theses and Statutes of the Communist International" (1920) and the monthly organ "The Communist International. A criticism of communist theories will be found in "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat" by Karl Kautsky 1919); "Parliament and Revolution" by J. R. Macdonald (1919); and "The Practice and Theory of Bolshevism" by Bertrand Russell 1920)

---

*Printed at the Indu-Prakash Press, by A. G. Shekdar, and  
Published by S. A. Dange, for The Hindustan Ltd., at 12-16, Bank  
Street, Fort, Bombay.*

## **SOCIALIST SERIES.**

No. 1 GANDHI vs. LENIN

by

S. A. DANGE

Price Ans. 12

No. 2 THE COMING of SOCIALISM

by

LUCIEN

Price Ans. 6.

No. 3. LOGIC of the MACHINE

by

W. F. HAY

Price Ans. 3

No. 4 COMMUNISM

by

R. PALME DUTT

Price Ans. 2

For Copies, write to

Liberty Literature Co. 434, Thakurdwar Bombay,

2, or The Hindustan Ltd., 12-16 Bank

Street, Fort, Bombay.

or Bhandare & Co. Girgaon Bombay.

## Resolution on the need for Workers' and Peasants' Party.

The Imperial Government of India, representing the Capitalist class of Great Britain, exist to maintain the exploitation and political subjection of the peasantry working-class and lower middle class of India, and has shown itself to be in opposition to the promotion of their real interests.

2. The National Congress and the parties within it, equally with the liberal, Independents, and other non-congress parties, while at times advocating the improvement of the condition of the masses have shown in practice a complete lack of interest in the political economic, social and educational needs of the peasantry and working class, and by their actions have proved themselves to be parties promoting the interests of Imperial and Indian Capitalists.

3. The peasantry, constituting the bulk of the population, suffer exploitation in three main directions, by excessive taxation by high rents, and by the exactions of usurious money lenders, and in consequence of their illitracy, and the dual character of their oppression, are incapable of taking the first steps towards their emensipation from these evils.

4. The industrial working-class, subjected to intense exploitation in the absence of adequate protective lageslation, and the lack of means to enforce that which exists, has failed to organise affectively its own struggle, against these conditions, and has allowed its Trade Union movement to fall largely under the leadership of middle-class elements which exploit it for their own religious, political and personal ends.

5. Thus the overwhelming majority of the population, consisting of classes whose interests, though not identical, are not fundamentally opposed, is economically exploited, held in political subjection, and denied educational and social advancement, by the Capitalist class of India, and the foreign Government.

6. The need is therefore urgent for the establishment of a political party of worker and peasants, which by voicing the demands of these classes whithin in the National Congress, by promoting the organisation of Trade Unions, and wresting them from their present alien control, by advancing the organisation of peasants on the basis of their economic and social requirments and by presenting a determined and pertinent opposition to the Government shall secure the social, economic and political progress of these classes.

7. Since an essential condition for the ful-filment of this programme is the attainment of complete economic and political

independence from Imperialism, the party will co-operate for that end with other organisations which profess to desire it, and are willing to struggle for its realisation.

8. The exploitation and subjection of the workers and cannot finally cease until economic and political power have been taken from the present rulers, and transferred to the workers and peasants. It shall therefore be the ultimate object of the party to obtain Swaraj, where in the means of production, distribution and exchange are publicly owned and socially control.

#### RESOLUTION ON ORGANISATION.

The structure of the party shall be, provisionally, as follows :

(1). The unit of organisation shall be the individual members grouped together in town, village or local branches.

(2). The entire membership in the branch shall be grouped in accordance with their specific party work e. g. in a Trade Union group, a peasant group and educational group etc. Each member must belong to at least one of the several groups.

(3). Each group shall appoint a group leader, who shall be responsible to the executive committee of the local branch.

(4). The office-bearers in the local branch shall be :—The chairman Secretary and E. C. members who shall be elected by the entire branch membership, and with the group leaders shall constitute the executive committee of the branch.

(5). The branch Executive committee shall co-ordinate the entire work of the branch locality, and be responsible for maintaining contact with the District Committee, and shall on the basis of reports received from the group leaders and in line with the general policy of of the party, direct the work of the various group.

(6). The branch shall meet at least once per month, to receive the report of executive committee and outline the future work of the branch in accordance with the general policy of the party.

(7). The work of the party groups operating within the Trade Union the National Congress Committee etc., shall in the main be guided by the programme and policy of the party. The demands of the party should be pressed forward for acceptance by these bodies, adherents and members gained, and the propaganda of the party thus advanced. Groups operating within local and provincial organisation of T. U. C. or National Congress shall meet regularly and under guidance of the group leader discuss the work to be done within these bodies.

8. The group leader is responsible for conveying reports

of group work to the branch committee to the group, and instruction from the branch committee to the group. Decisions taken by the group, and instructions from the branch committee must be carried out by all members of the group.

9. District committee shall be formed in any suitable District or area, consisting of delegates from the branch situated therein. Such district committee shall be authoritative bodies within the party until the holding of the first All India Congress.

10. The districts committee shall coordinate the party work within their areas, and shall be responsible for the publication of such periodical and other literature as may be advisable and possible. They shall further be responsible for the training party membership in the fundamental principals of the party.  
ADDENDUM.

The basis of membership shall be the acceptance of the party programme, the payment of dues decided upon by the District committee and the performance of the organisational work. Admission to the party shall be subject to the approval of District committee.

## PROGRAMME OF IMMEDIATE DEMANDS.

### *A. Political Demands.*

1. Adult suffrage.
2. Abolition of Racial discrimination and caste distinctions.
3. Freedom of speech and press and right of Association.
4. Removal of all restrictions on the rights of Trade Unions to the standard of existing British Laws.

### *B. Economic Demands.*

1. Abolition of indirect taxation and the introduction of a steeply graded income-tax on all incomes exceeding Rs. 400/- per month.
2. Nationalisation of Land.
3. All cultivable land to be leased by the Government direct to the cultivator.
4. Rent of land holdings not to exceed 10% of total produce.
5. Establishment by the Government of state co-operative Bank for the provision of Credit to peasants at interests not exceeding 7% and the legal limitations of the rate of interest on private loans to the same figure.
6. Prevention of the confiscation of land in lieu of payment of debts.

7. Provision of adequate means for training cultivators in modern methods.

8. Establishment by law of the 8 hour day and 6 day week for industrial workers.

9. Establishment by law of minimum wage rates fixed at 33% above the basic cost of living.

10. Establishment of schemes of insurance for sickness and unemployment.

11. Extension of the laws regarding workmen's compensation and Employers Liability to the existing British standards and the provision of adequate machinery for their enforcement.

12. Legal enactments providing for the installation of modern safety appliances in factories, mines etc.

13. Weekly payment of Wages.

*C. Social Demands.*

1. The complete elimination of illitracy and the provision of adequate facilities for free and compulsory, liberal and vocational education for all upto the age of 14.

2. Establishment of Hospitals, Health Centers, free medical treatment and manernity benefits.

3. Training and education in the principal of Hygiene.

4. Provision of adequate housing for workers and peasantry at rents within their means.

5. Legal prohibition of the employment of women in dangerous occupations.

6. Legal prevention of the employment of children below the age of 14.

---

P. 721

30 hand bills advertising the book entitled "A call to Action".

P. 722.

A book in English entitled "A call to Action". Being the Resolutions, Theses and Report Presented to the Third Annual Conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal.

Bhatpara—March 1928.

Already printed, Vide-Exb. P. 523.

---

P. 723.

To

The Secretary,

Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party,  
Calcutta.

DATED, \_\_\_\_\_ 192 .

DEAR SIR,

I desire to be a member of the Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party. I am willing to subscribe to the object (printed overleaf), constitution and programme of the Party and Pay the prescribed subscription. I am an actual worker or peasant.

Yours truly,

- 
1. Name
  2. Address
  3. Native village, residence or place of business
  4. Post Office
  5. Thana
  6. District



7. Occupation  
8. Actual Worker or Dependant  
9. Age                      Sex                      Civil Condition  
10. Race and Religion
- 

Placed before the Executive Committee on

Approved or Refused

Secretary.

### **The Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party.**

"The object of the Party is the attainment of Swarajya in the sense of complete independence in India based on economic and social emancipation and political freedom of men and women."

I do hereby agree to accept the above object of the Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party of which I desire to be a member.

Signature.

---

**P. 724.**

A copy of an Urdu Weekly paper "Payam-i-Mazdoor" dated 10th March 1929.

---

**P. 725.**

A poster in Urdu advertising the "Kirti" Magazine. The poster exhibits the same picture as that on the frontispiece of the Magazine.

## P. 726.

Issue of the "Kirti" Magazine in Urdu for the month of October 1928.

## P. 727.

### A page from the Russian Revolution.

#### SOCIAL REVOLUTION.

What is <sup>a</sup> Social Revolution? Is it the science of bomb-throwing or street-rioting, or the manufacture of some deadly chemicals? Nay, never, a thousand times, No. It is in no way synonymous with these, nor is it the apostal of violence or non-violence.

Revolution in its widest terms means a change from one system of Govt. to another. Karl Mark defines it as; "more or less a rapid transformation of the foundations of the juridical and political superstructure of society arising from a change in its economic foundations. 'Karl Kautsky says' 'it is a complete transformation of the wonted forms of <sup>associated</sup> activity among men.'

As there is a good deal of misconception in India about revolution which is so often being confused with rash individual actions, we ~~will~~ <sup>desire to</sup> clear such prejudices. Not more injustice has been done to the use of any other single word than revolution. It has so often been misinterpreted and misused that it has cap-a-pie lost all its true scientific value. On the contrary it has become a dreadful technique: revolutionary crime, revolutionary propaganda, revolutionary conspiracy, revolutionary leader are the common terms in the police dictionary. This is one side of the issue.

Then there is another class of pious thinkers and philosophical minded hoary sages who try to take away every thing dynamic out from it i. e. all <sup>is</sup> essential for effecting this change. They try to shape it according to their pacifist conception and icy cold temperament. They present to the world this legitimate offspring of their imagination as a pacific gradual transformation of the society.

It is neither the one nor the other.

In simple terms "It is the coming into power of the hitherto oppressed and goverende majority, which (after coming into power) radically changes the existing institutions and moulds them according to the requirements of the majority".

Now we have to distinguish a social revolution from a political on A political revolution is one thing and a social one another.

For example the process of coming into power of Shah Amanullah Kahn in Afghanistan and of Raza Shah Pahlwi in Persia is revolutionary. But both are revolutions of a political nature. They change the governing bodies but in no way disturbre the wanted forms of administration. Societ<sup>ies</sup> ~~do not undergo any~~ <sup>are not</sup> change ~~whatsoever~~, as a consequence of this transference of power rom one group to the other.

The abdication of Kaiser in Germany the dethronement of Tzar in Russia both were political revolutions. They were not social in that the society underwent no change as their result. The actual reigns of Governments remained in the hand of the Herra and Gospoddins. The only seemingly difference was that from monarchies the states came to be known as Republics-although the public had no hand in shapening them.

Raza Shah may introduce some radical reforms, he may overhaul feudalism yet we can not say that he is effecting a social revolution. <sup>we cannot confuse social reforms with social revolution</sup> It can not be a social revolution unless power passes into the hands <sup>alone are capable of</sup> of 90% who <sup>popular will</sup> thereby mould the society according to their ideals. It can not be termed a social change unless it proceeds from the economically and politically oppressed class, which capturing the political power rapidly transforms the old order of things and creates new form of social co-opration.

How does this change come then? Does it come accidental-ly? No. Social revolution is an historical necessaty. It comes in the same way an earthquake comes. The period of the preprations of both is imperceptable. Just a lay man can not determine the process of an earthquake or a volcanic eruption likewise is he incapable of determining the time and process of a social revolution.

Who can predict a Solar or Lunar eclips but an astronomer. Similarly who can predict a social revolution but a student of dialactics although he can not do with the same precision as the astronomer, the social scine being not so much devaloped as the natural one. The velocity of the natural accidents is on the forefin- gers of the astronomers, the velocity of social changes is in the mental drawers of the students of social sciences. Both ~~these~~ <sup>lines</sup> ~~classes~~ are the masters of their ~~own~~ <sup>own</sup>. Both penetrate into the causes of these Phenomnea.

The causes of Natural and Social accidents. Earthquake and volcanic eruptions happen because the rain water reaches the impenetrable layers of earth. As the interior of earth is hot to the boiling point, the rain water turns into <sup>steam</sup> vapour and <sup>explodes</sup> causes havoc. If it is an earthquake it shakes the very foundation of the highest of mountains and if it is volcanic eruption it drains fiery lava and sweeps to ashes what ever comes in its way.

The causes of revolution are to be sought in collision between the productive forces and <sup>the production relations</sup> economic. We can not better define them than to put it in the words of N. Bucharin "The cause of revolution 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 brake on the evolution of the productive forces that they simply must be broken up if society is to continue to develop. If they can not be burst assunder they will prevent and stifle the unfolding of the productive forces and the entire society will become stagnant or retrogressive i. e. it will enter upon a period of decay".

Social revolution happens because there is oppression, there is inequity because the people who produces the thing do not get any thing to consume because the taxes are too cumbersome for the average man to bear; because every protest is dealt with reprisals, ignorance of the people is exploited and last of all, every means are adopted to thwart the consciousness from coming to the people. The producers starve while the pockets of Rockefeller, Rothschilds and Co swell. The natural consequence of all this is the prepration of lava within every soul which bursts out when the patience to contain it any longer ~~is~~ exhausts. It bursts when the people refuse to bow down sheepishly. All tarrany exists on the tolerance of the tyrانىsed. The moment they resist, it crumbles down.

\*Turning now to the proletarian revolution i. e. the transition from the capitalist form of society to socialism (we shall again put it in the word of N. Bucharin)" that the princial cause for this transition is the coflict between the evolution of the productive forces and the capitalist production relations. The monpoly of the capital (i. e. the previledged position of the capitalist class with regards to the means of production) becomes a fetter upon the means of production which has sprung up and flourished along with and under it. Centralisation of the means of production and socialisation of labour at last reaches a point where they become incompetable with their capitalist integument. The integument bursts assunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators <sup>are</sup> expropriated socialism ( Communism ) is thereby established".

It is what a prolaterian ~~social~~ revolution is.

With one stroke it over-hauls the entire social system and state organisation and puts the oppressed into power, who thereby control the means of production and distribution in the interest of all.

Class struggle so very keen and sharp during this intermediary period of preparation, automatically disappears. There remain no classes in the end. The society turns into living paradise.

Apparently the change seems to be a sudden one, yet it is the outcome of a gradual continuous process. It is the influx of the evolutionary process. For example we take a little water and heat it. The water is not changing rapidly. With gradual deliberateness it turns into steam, the quantity of the steam constantly increasing. For a long time the water does not stir at all. But having reached the boiling point it begins to boil. We consider it a sudden change; while in fact it is the outcome of a *deliberate gradual continuous process*. So do develop the revolution.

Having this in mind we shall be able to understand the changes in Russia fully.

#### THE CHANGE IN RUSSIA.

This change came in Russia in 1917, in the guise of the second revolution. It began during an intense period of the world war, when the furnace of carnage was blowing full blast on the plains of Flanders, of Poland and the vast areas round about the Danube and the Tigris-Euphrates.

This change in Russia tore to shreds all the pages of old history.

No account of those days of Russia would be complete without the history of revolutions and the underlying causes which made them possible and a success.

On the other hand no history of the revolutions would be complete without defining the word Bolshivism (Almost a dreadful technique) and its origin.

Bolshivism means majority: the root is "Bolshoie" meaning major, big. This is the literary side of the word, but how it happened to become a political/technical term is a mystery yet unsolved to many an Indian.

But for those who are acquainted with the history of events in the last 30 years there is nothing ~~mysterious~~ <sup>mysterious</sup> in it.

The Russian Social Democratic <sup>Party</sup> split into two in 1903 on some vital fundamental questions of organisation and party tactics. The majority thereafter came to be known by the name of the Bolshevik party and the minority as the Menshevik one.

*of Duce*

The failure of the sporadic uprisings of 1905 revealed more lucidly the Action and immediate seizure of state machinery by the organised workers and peasants and enforcement of socialism thereby. The Menshevik insisted on a religiously nonaggressive program of attaining Socialism by stages; by legislation and through the Duma.

*To save*  
The ~~same~~ themselves from the ignominy of being called deserters, they ~~swore~~ <sup>shook hands</sup> of revolution and swore by Markian theory. But their repeated assertions of ~~having a political and a political change~~ <sup>adherence to the policy of having a gradual pacific</sup> ~~alone~~ exposed them fully.

Ever since the advent of the Bolsheviks Menshevik party (which still sanctified itself under the ~~old~~ name of "Social democratic labour party") dwindled into oblivion.

The divergences <sup>grew</sup> of opinion evolved into complete cleavage and open hostilities. The Mensheviks went so far as to take an open stand against the Bolsheviks during the risings of 1905-6. This sounded a death knell to Menshevism.

The hollowness of their <sup>Menshevik</sup> program was further revealed at the unity conference of the social democratic labour party of Russia held in London in 1907. The object of the conference was to bring together all the radical elements in the fold of one single organisation with one solid program. The Mensheviks veered away, and showed no tendency to take cognisance of the growing formidable organisation of the workers and peasants. They knew no other thing than the epithets:—Russia is not ready for social revolution masses are incapable of wielding power.'

Thus the conference came to an abrupt end; the gap between the Bolshevik and the other parties widening with tremendous speed. Of all the parties the Bolsheviks were the only staunch group <sup>that</sup> at all ~~the~~ risks and hazards remained true to the cause of proletarian. They ~~were~~ the only party whose members were torched <sup>the</sup> most. It were the members of this party who had been shot down from the walls of Kremlin and buried enmass under it.

This is the last phase in the development of russian revolutionary movement. To give a vivid picture of the revelation we will have to <sup>retrace</sup> ~~reset~~ our imagination to the period as far back as the year 1825. The arrogance and absoluteism of Tzar and his retinue of officials, landlords, merchants and the Okhrana (Secret police), became almost intolerable by the year 1825. The army officers were one such class which received the attention of the Okhrana the most. On trivial charges they were severely taken to task. Every move towards the betterment of their lot invited the wrath of Tzarism. Every attempt at reformation was considered insubordination.

Tired almost of these brutal dealings the army officers made

a common cause with the nihilist (who afterwards came to be known as Social Revolutionaries) and revolted. This uprising better known as the Decabrist revolt, failed. The failure meant intensified repression. The ~~stage~~ <sup>period</sup> of cruel reprisals ~~and~~ <sup>was</sup> ended. On the other hand the cruel legalised murders created a country wide discontent. Intensified terrorism was the Nihilists reply. This drove panic in the Tzarist court. Fifty years of terrorism and counter terrorism tried the patience of the people <sup>of Russia</sup>.

The most successful and notable of the acts of the Nihilists was the assassination of the Tzar Alexander II in 1881. The net result of this act was colossal onslaught and concentrated oppression. The Okhrana was enormously enlarged. Even the ~~state~~ <sup>Tzarist</sup> officials were not immune from its perfidious influence.

Life became impossible. It became dangerous for a man to associate with his very neighbours.

The Okhrana, this death bureau, became so potent a factor that it looked like a huge secret society, which permeated and poisoned the whole Russian social life. Not to speak of common people, the Tzarist ministers-even were not free from its rigid vigilance and continual surveillance.

In 1890 the foundation of two open parties was laid-One based their doctrines on Karl Marx, the other one followed Bakunine and Kropotkin. The fundamental difference between the two was that the former ~~believed~~ <sup>had faith</sup> in the organisation of industrial workers and peasants organisations and ~~the strength of the mass action~~ <sup>had full confidence in</sup>, while the other one had a secret branch with a section advocating personal terrorism.

Perceiving the growth of industrial workers' consciousness <sup>of organisations and of workers</sup>, the group ~~believing in~~ <sup>following</sup> Marxism inaugurated a party in 1898. It was the well known social democratic labour party. Simultaneously with the growth of capitalism this party assumed huge dimension.

This was intolerable for capitalism. The organic repression inherent in capitalism combined with the barbaric ruthlessness of Tzarism and made furious attempts at nipping in the bud the workers movement. Legislation after legislation was enacted to throttle the effort of the down trodden mass. Every meeting of protest was dispersed by forc shooting and trampling of the workers by the Kossaka cavalry were very common. A mass meeting of the workers of the Petrograd held to protest against the severity of legislation with wholesale massacres. This is the <sup>known as</sup> ~~bloody~~ <sup>bloody</sup> Sunday (the Jilianwala Bagh massacre of Russia) well known in the history of the Russian revolutionary movement.

This unprecedented colossal massacars killed all hopes in

the constitutional methods. Evil could not be extirpated but by evil.' A tooth for a tooth an eye for an eye" became the people's slogan. Militant strikes broke out through <sup>out</sup> all the industrial areas. The revolt spread with the velocity of the lightning. Agrarian areas fell in with, the army & navy were affected. Workers and peasants, soldiers and sailors all set on building their committees known afterwards as the Soviets. <sup>They</sup> This was the birth day of Sovietism in Russia. This was in year 1905.

Although all the symptoms preceeding a Revolution were there but the campaign led by untried men failed. The desire to end this system of oppression was very keen in the masses, but there was not a right lead. The leaders like the Labour M. Ps. were not lacking in Russia, rather there was a <sup>group</sup> of such gentlemen. The consequence attendant upon such opportunistic leadership was disastrous failure.

An era of repression, very familiar in Russia of those days, followed. <sup>As we already read, heads were cut.</sup> Those who escaped the gallows Siberia was their lot. Torture, oppression became the watchwords of Tsarism. Absconding, jail-breaking became the slogan of the people.

However, by the <sup>end of</sup> ~~year~~ 1907, Tsarism was again firmly established in Russia. Thereafter followed the decade of political desolation. People could not easily recover from the shocks of those on-slaughts, <sup>regimented by</sup> terror, drove desperation and dismay in many a sincere hearts: there were many suicides (of political nature) during this period. People steeped in ignorance give way to superstitions. Torture, oppression, came to be regarded as the wrath of the Almighty on the 'sinful'.

Aye: Who was the sinful tee people or the Tsar?

The evils of Imperial autocracy were so sorely heart-rending that such beliefs could not last long. Life became a burden. Belief in the imminence of a general upheaval became general. In buffets, in cafes, in bazars in theatres people talked of one thing and that was of an inevitable <sup>universal change</sup> revolution this great change, became a substitute for faith in religion. <sup>They pinned their faith on change.</sup> Faith in revolution became a substitute for faith in religion.

But it was the war which came first. Lenin the brain of Russian emancipatory movement <sup>they were</sup> ~~then~~ from the place of his exile. Not that way, not that way Russia wants revolution and not war". The people responded alright we are preparing it. This was a leaderless period for Russia. Trotsky was in exile Stalid was in Siberian prisons, almost all the leaders were either rotting in the snows of Siberia or were hunted from place to place in exile.



War created a new spirit of defiance in the people. Con-  
scription war-taxes redoubled repression after all exhausted the  
patience of Russian masses. Mass demonstrations before the  
Winter Palace became <sup>The order of the day</sup> ~~general~~. The threatening attitude of  
infuriated mass stuck terror in the hearts of Okhrana and  
the Tsarist Court. How long <sup>after all</sup> could the people bear  
it. Imagine the revalry of the court and the gospodine (capitalist  
gentlemen) and compare it with the condition in the trenches, without  
amunition, food and clothing. Soldiers were swelling in the snow  
the bourgeoisie were revelling in luxury in the best of the hotels of  
Moscow and Petrograd. Peasents were drivin to the front without  
training or rifle, simply to be mown down by the German machines.  
The rural areas were all a heap of ruion and desolation and the  
cities outside Paris and London in gaity.

How long could it last?

Demonstration ~~after demonstration~~ after demonstration of the  
loosered mass took place before the winter palace. One of the  
prince uncle of his Tsarist majisty approached him after all,  
trembling with awe Your Majisty the crowd is surrounding the  
palace" furious with rage, the Tzar ~~retorted~~ <sup>retorted</sup> "Shoot them all",  
The prince uncle retreated with almost the speed of mercury. *Show them all.*

The Tzar was no true reader of the situation but the cabinitt  
realised what danger was taking shape. But all powers rested with  
the emperor. With ~~all~~ his holiness the revolution has taken birth.  
It came shaking all foundations. shattering, sweeping, crumbling,  
all state organisim to dust. It was an earthquake, an unprecedented  
volcanic eruption, which shook and swept away Tzarism like <sup>a great</sup> bundle  
of hay.

Another demonstration held. A deputation of the delegates  
of the entire country was appointed to demand the abdication of  
Tzar. His Majisty came stroling in the balcony and seeing the  
crowd <sup>heard</sup> "We ordered them to be shot. Why they are still  
there." The ministers and courtiers: 'Your Majisty, the Cossak  
would not fire'. 'Would not fire?' Thundered the Lord, 'Let me  
sign an order for their anihilation'. 'Nav Sire it is the abdication  
that you have got to sign this time'. Tzar was all aflame now.  
His eyes red hot. <sup>He quivered</sup> 'My abdication'. His majisty began to wreath  
and coil. Peoples representatives remained calm and firm. Yes  
abdication, the country is unanimous. 'The <sup>Tzar</sup> surveyed all in  
contempt. But <sup>perceiving it was his last day</sup> ~~seeing~~ the peoples representatives <sup>determined</sup> he  
cooled <sup>down</sup> himself. 'May I grant the constitutional assembly to my  
people?' <sup>demanded</sup> the Tzar? 'Nay that time is passed'. Replied  
the deligates.

The Tzar collapsed in delirium, he felt the ground under  
his feet ~~now~~. 'All right, may I do <sup>it</sup> in favour of ~~Prince Michael~~?  
*Crown Prince*

*Began the Tsar*  
asked he. 'No; in favour of the people now. The water has passed over head. Was the reply. The Tzar, ~~he~~ <sup>he</sup> swooned ~~and~~ <sup>signed</sup> it was 15th of March 1917.

Thus the tyrinical Romanov <sup>dynasty</sup> came to an end.

### MARCH REVOLUTION.

This triumph of the Russian people is commonly known as the Mass <sup>Revolution</sup>. The Russian Republic was declared. M. Miliukov formed the ministry. Kerensky the leader of the Trudviki (Populist Socialist) and the the chief hero of the ensuing reaction was given the portfolio of war Office. Not much time was given to Miliukov that he was forced to give way. Thereafter Krenskey formed the Provisional Govt. (Pending the all Russian Congress) and became the premier President.

It was mainly the workers, peasants, sailors and soldiers who made the revolt <sup>and</sup> forced every change in its course. It were they who hurled the Miliukov ministry down. It were through their efforts that Krenskey came into power. But the power seized by the sweated masses passed away into the hands of lawyers and bankers, professors and polititions of the worst stock. A crop of opportunists propped up. The Mass in farvour and enthusism did not understand any such moves.

The March revolution was essentially a social revolution, but the propertied classes turned it into a political one. They wanted Russia to be a constitutional republic. With the help of Krenskey and general Kornilov (Who plaid a notorious and mürdorous part in this period of revolution) the bourgeoisie succeeded in putting down the masses who wanted a socialist republic. The revolution turned into reaction, life became stagnant. The parasaitic upper strata flourished, the lower layer went deep into distitation. The greviances of the peasentry remained unredressed, the land lords still fleeced the peasants. The workers were struggling for the minimum wage, the capitalists still retained the propriorship of the factories. The soldiers still died in trenches <sup>of cold & hunger</sup> the war continued with the same furry. The soldiers were brutally feated by their officers. Peasents, workers, soldiers, sailors all felt the pangs of these ravages sorely.

What revolution was it after all ?

The Krenskey rule culminated in the utter ruin of the workers and peasants. The fundamental <sup>character of</sup> oppression remained the same. The Govt of Krenskey was nothing <sup>than</sup> short of the reflection of the Tzarist rule. To add insult to injury the political exiles returning from aborad were prosecuted and sentenced for the revolutionary criems committed in 1905-6.

Lenin and his comrades returned from their exile on April 3rd 1917. All hailed them. A public reception representing all the political parties was accorded to them.

Hereafter the Bolshvik program came to the forefront. Soviets sprang up all over the country. In factories, in villages, in trenches, in towns, every where these Soviets came into being. Red guards (out from the factory workers) were organized armed. The impetuous given to the reaction by the Krensky Govt, made it imperative for the Bolshiviks to carry on unerring work in this direction.

The same mass which had but Krensky & Co into saddle were deadly turned against him. 'Down with Krensky' To hell with the War.' Piece land & factories became the slogans of the people.

Soldiers began to desert, the peasants began to seize land, the workers sabotaged the factories. Chaos was the simple outcome. Krensky's supremacy was threatened. Taking to flight he committed many an insane deeds. Emergency regulations were ~~issued~~ *promulgated* Frantic efforts were <sup>made</sup> to suppress the Soviets.

The terror developed into consternation. The Red Guards were declared illegal. General Kornilov was given full power to cope with the situation. He was given the initiative of capital punishment. Seven thousand veteran soldiers were called for from ~~the~~ trenches to suppress the growing movement. But all in vain.

The soldiers already under the sway of their Soviets refused to open fire on their brethren. Without a single shot fired the troopers of Kornilov melted away. It was in July. Thus Bolshivism gained strength. It came to be regarded as their saviour by the people. It was the Panacea to all their troubles.

But alas in spite of all this the Bolshiviks were divided and the July rising failed. The failure reacted heavily on its organisers. Public opinion was turned against them. Wholesale arrests commenced. Several hundred peasants were put into prison. All the radical newspapers were proscribed. The Bolshiviks were hunted down from place to place. Trotsky & Kamenov were arrested. Lenin and Zonoviov descended under ground. All the moderate parties joined hand to hang Bolshivism on the nearest post. The Bolsheviks were branded as the German Agents. But this groundless allegation and the monstrous calamity could not gain ground. *And Trotsky & Kamenov were released.*

As a consequence of unheard of repression the movement ran under ground. Once more the subterranean fabric set in all the forces and began to work with increased vigour.

## THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION,

Having recovered full from the shocks of July desator by this

time the popular movement again took a sudden turn, and the Bolsheviks once more found themselves at the helm. With the slogans: 'Peace bread & Land they launched their battle afresh.' It was in September.

The masses undauntedly demonstrated in the streets of PETROGRAD and the other industrial towns with the motto: 'Factories to the workers, Land to the peasants, Down with the War. Down with Krensky. All powers to the Soviets'.

A considerable part of the army had gone over to the sides of the Bolsheviks. The masses came flocking to them and full confidence was reposed <sup>in their programme</sup> Realising the growing importance of the workers and peasants organisation the bourgeoisie bent on breaking down railways, closing down factories. The direct result was that transport was disorganised, food became scarce robberies and house-breaking became common.

Day by day Petrograd was becoming the hot bed of Bolshevism. This terrified the bourgeoisie populace. In September general Kornilov marched on the town with his hords of Cossaks to proclaim himself the military dictator of Russia.

However danger forced all the parties to make a common cause against this arch defencer of the bourgeoisie. The general was arrested in his own lair by the soldiers committee. The officers of his army were dismissed. Some of the ministers suspected of implicity were suspended and the cabinet was dissolved.

Krensky formed another cabinet, as shaky as the past one. But something greater than KRENSKY WAS taking shape. Having gain a majority in elections of Petrograd, Moscow, Kiev, Odessa & Sevastopol Soviets the Bolsheviks demanded the summoning of the All Russian Congress of the Soviets and taking over of power, thereby by them.

Krensky was reluctant to do that. And all the moderate parties were aghast at such a move of the Bolsheviks. Although the congress was due in Sept. yet seeing the sudden rise of the Bolsheviks the request was refused point blank and instead the dissolution of the Soviets was demanded by them. This counter demand made the Bolsheviks more alert. With their usual promptness they summoned the all Russian congress of the Soviets to meet at Petrograd on the 7th of November 1917.

The capture of the State Machinery by peaceful and non-boilient means was reckoned next to impossible. At a meeting of the CENTRAL Committee of the Bolsheviks held on the 23rd October the question of insurrection was considered. Lenin and Trotsky unswervingly stood by it; Zinoviev & Kamenov were determinedly against it. The first voting decreed in favour of the

opposition. But Lenin was persistent. He <sup>exhausted</sup> retorted again & again: 'Comrades now or never'. 'We can not wait any longer'. Saner counsels prevailed in the end, and the entire opposition passed over to Lenin's view-point. Two days later they passed the formation of a Revolutionary Military Committee.

Now the Soviets came into actual clash with the Govt., everywhere. Armed Red Guards patrolled the cities and seized by force arms wherever they could find out. People in revolt have a way of defying every thing. Law crumbles to pieces. Chaos reigns supreme.

Krensky was studying all this in awe. He had not the audacity to face facts as <sup>they were</sup> facts. His fickle mindedness and hesitant nature brought about his ruin earlier than possible. He yielded to the pressure of bourgeoisie and <sup>desperately re-calculated</sup> re-assesed Kornilov. Conspiring with him he ordered the Petrograd garrison numbering 60000 to front. This garrison was the <sup>most</sup> ~~best~~ revolutionary element in the whole of the army.

The natural consequence of such an imprudent order could but be the collision. The soldiers defied the Krensky Govt. A meeting of all the regiments was called in Petrograd and the following most important resolution was passed without a single dissident:

"The Petrograd garrison no longer recognises the Provisional Govt. The Petrograd Soveit is our Govt. We will now obey the orders of Petrograd Soveit through the military committee".

November 6th was the eve of the fall of Krensky-Govt. It had everything similar to the 14th of March when Tzar had to abdicate.

<sup>Perceiving the</sup> Seeing this stupendous rise of the Soveit <sup>Krensky</sup> he feverishly sent representative after representative to Smolny (the camp of the Bolsheviks) <sup>to ask them</sup> to send their elected members to the Govt. Staff, but <sup>it</sup> was too late.

### THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT CRUMBLES.

The night of sixth November resembled the day of resurrection. It was endless. Here in the halls there in the streets people were contesting, debating, planning. Firy speeches here, hot arguments there; the talk of insurrection this side the problem of retaining power that side. It was a fateful night.

The dawn of 7th saw a new power in Control. The winter palace was besieged. All big institutions were surrounded, ministers arrested but Krensky fled. The Proletarian <sup>revolution</sup> triumphed. The vanquished vanished. The power passed into the hands of legitimate heir to the people.

The hilarious 'crowd exaltant with the pride of victory paraded in the streets; ~~Down~~<sup>Down</sup> Dloai Krensky ( Down with Krensky ), Salava Naroda' ( Glory to the people) Salava Karasni Amiya' ( Glory to the red army); 'Me Sovobodnem' (We are free).

~~But~~ the rose is never without thorns: simultaneously with the success of the Soveits there sprang up the notorious committee of public Safety, compareable with the Aman Sabha of the Nonco-operation days of India. They were formed by the reactionary element of the country to undermine & counter act the revolutionary current.

Before taking a fling to the other events it would be just worth while to narate the development of 7th of November in a bit more detailed form than we have done hitherto:—

On the night of 6th the Red Guards captured the telegraph office. Later on the Post Office was also occupied. Before dawn Military hotel and telephone exchange were taken over. In the morning Winter Palace was besieged.

Krensky frantically ordered the military commander to mobilize the regular army. Futile attempts were made at recapturing the post and telegraph offices. On an order of opening fire the Govt. army revolted and announced their determination of ~~remaining true~~<sup>adhering</sup> to the Soveits.

Krensky was no brave man. He took to flight and went to the front. Winter Palace fell to the people. A workers and Peasents Republic known as the Soviet Republic was declared. The era of social revolution opened.

Krensky met with failure after failure in his manovers with the army at the front. Division after division, regiment after regiment refused to help him in recapturing Petrograd. After experiencing lot of trouble he succeeded in collecting some 5000 cossaks. Capturing Gatchina ( a small town south west of Petrograd ) he marched on Petrograd. He pitched his camp at Tzarsk Silo ( 20 miles south of Petrograd ).

The Gospuddin plunged ahead. Bourgeois students and the holligens formed what is commonly known as the Wite Guards ( It was the birth date of facisim ). Being emboldened by the move <sup>of</sup> Krensky they began to harras the Red Guard in the rear. They seized the military hotel and telegraph office. Frequent street fighting took place.

Twelveth of November was a fateful day. Massed against the Soviet forces were the Cossaks, landlords, nobelity, white guards and a crop of hologans. But fired by the zeal of revolution the ragged revolutionary army ~~looted~~<sup>wrote</sup> the forces of Krensky in a

*Krasnov*

bloody combat. The Cossaks and the Cossaks general <sup>^</sup>surrendered and they advised the same thing to Krensky. But Krensky would not do it. There upon the Cossaks declared to arrest him and deliver him to the Red Guards. This upset him. He was in a very agitated frame of mind. He meditated; he pondered; he thought of committing suicide.

Pale and ghastly with tears in his eyes and sobing like an old woman the honourable gospodin approached General Krasnov and asked him to advise the best course under the circumstances. The General told him in plain words ;- 'If you are an honourable man you will go immediately to Petrograd with a white flag and present yourself to the military revolutionary committee enter into negotiations as the head of the provisional Govt.'

But Krensky was a hide and seek player. He realised that the game was lost pretending to be agreeing with his proposal he asked the General to give him a guard to escort him ~~to the city~~ in safety. <sup>the city</sup> But when the general <sup>out</sup> went to give order for the guard the honourable gospodin made his way in the guise of a sailor.

These clouds having been cleared the news from other parts of the country began to penetrate in to Petrograd. There came the tidings that the local ~~Govt~~ <sup>Soviet</sup> at Sevastopol had captured the power. From Kazan came the news of a terrible battle between the white guards and a brigade of artillery against the Bolsheviks. About Moscow: the struggle was more complicated and deadly there. White Guards held Kremlin, the revolutionary Army some strategic points in the city. The importance of Kremlin layed in that there was an arsenal inside it; unless that could be captured the REDS would not succeed. They started the bombardment, the bourgeois citizens started pin pricking in the rear. It ensenced the red guards. Disperation and furry increased and the garrison surrendered. Moscow fell.

In Finland also the triumph of Soveitism was announced. Nizni, Nove Gorad Kazan, Saratov & many other industrial towns vested the power to the Soveit,

But the Don Cossaks still tenaciously hold <sup>^</sup>ing. The Cossaks Govt. sent telegram after telegram of allegiance to Krensky. The Ukrainian Govt. assumed a hostile attitude towards the Soveit and undertook to organise an offensive against the Reds. Finish Soveit collapsed and ~~she~~ <sup>followed</sup> suit. Both these countries began secret negotiations with Germany. The Entente also gave them a hasty recognition de jure.

Inspite of the hostile propaganda about the Bolsheviks the truth about their ideals began to spread through out the length and breadth of the country. The peasants and Cossaks began to

hurry to their fold. On November 27th a deputation of the Cossaks waited upon the Bolshevik leaders. They put direct questions to Lenin and Trotsky if they stood for the confiscation of the land of the Cossaks and the soldiers. The reply was in the negative. Then did they stand for the confiscation of big landed estates and their distribution among the peasantry. <sup>The reply was in the affirmative</sup> The Cossaks were satisfied and went away to their head quarters. There they waited upon their General Kaledan. They put him also the similar questions 'Will you promise to divide the great estates of the Cossaks landlords among the working Cossaks?' 'Only <sup>over</sup> on the dead body of Kaledan.' Was the General's reply. There upon the Cossaks began to desert him and the General committed suicide.

Along with the success of Soveitism there developed the <sup>spirit</sup> ~~state~~ of defiance in the bourgeois populace and petty officials of the dead provisional Govt. The telephone exchange girls refused to work for the Bolsheviks, the railway officers refused to carry Red Guards from one place to another.

Nearly all the Govt. employees (whom together with the bourgeois students I have named the fascists) struck. The sabotage financed by the bourgeois was well organised. The Sveitism seemed to be paralysing before becoming mature. Foreign office staff refused to hand over the keys to Trotsky who was appointed the peoples Commissars for foreign affairs. All the people's Commissars met with the similar hindrances. <sup>all this</sup> ~~The counter~~ Revolution was stimulated by the direct support of the committees of public safety (Aman Sabhas).

To crush the opposition by repression was an easy task but the Bolsheviks did not want to mark the success with these methods. They ~~bolsheviks~~ were wiser than their adversaries. They new of other measures to crush the opposition. They fully realised that all this was due to the ignorance of the employees who howsoever skilled <sup>may be</sup> were after all <sup>given</sup> the working class. They began to popularise the decrees regarding the nationalisation (Socialisation) of all the means of production. They declared the Banks national property, the land the property, of the peasants, over railways they recognised the control of the railway workers.

Factories were long ago declared the property of the workers. ~~So~~ collapsed the opposition. The Railways submitted, the Government employees called off <sup>strike</sup> their trade. All the offices began to work smoothly. The moulding of the Proletarian Republic began. Some of the Left Socialists who swore allegiance to the Soveit ~~Government~~ were admitted in the Govt. A council of Peoples Commissars came into being:—

President of the Council: Lenin.

Foreign Affairs: Trotsky.



Military and Naval Affairs: a 'Commissia' composed of:  
Krylenke, Dybenke and Antonov.

Interior: Rykov.

Labour: Shilianikov.

Education: Lunacharsky.

Finance: Stepanov.

Justice: Lomov.

Chairman for Nationalities: Stalin.

Commerce and Industry: Nogin.

Post and Telegraph: Glibov.

### Counter Revolution, Interwoven and Blockade.

"Basic causes of conflict between the Allies and the Soveit Govt. grew out of the Soveit attitude towards the socialisation of natural resorces and the repudiation of the Russian loans, held so largely by the French. A decree of February, 8, 1918. read:—

1. 'All loans contrateted by formar Russian Govts.....are cancelled as from December 1, 1917. The December Coupens will not be paid'.

2. 'All guarantees for these loans are cancelled'.

3. 'All loans made from abroad are cancelled without exception and unconditionally.' (Russia Turns East. by Scott Nearing).

The first notable act of the bosheviks after coming into power was the nationalisation of all the means of production, and the concellation of debts. The second one was the conclusion of peace treaties with the Central powers (Germany, Austria, Bulgaria). These moves of theirs dealt heavy blows to the hopes of the Allies. The Entente were incensed the wrath descended upon, Bolshevisim. Counter revolution was foster by them.

Armed Intervention and blockade stepped in next, every where counter-revolution raised head. Don Orenberg and Ural Cossaks were the first to intiate. In Ukraina counter-revolution was in fullswing. It was in the end of 1917.

General Alexyev, formerly commander of the Tzarist army on the German front, gathered together all dismembered elements of the White Guards in the Don area. General Kornilov was also busy there. The workers and soldiers let against them by Antonov fought with the zeal of crusaders and crused them near Rostov, which they captured. They also took Kiev by storm and dissolved the Ukraenen Govt. Urals and Volga areas followed fast <sup>with</sup> its heels. The Constitutional democrats <sup>later known as the</sup> took a heavy somersalt at <sup>the</sup> <sup>Caesars</sup>

Irkutsk. Without any resistance whatever they fled, leaving the town into the hands of the workers and peasants.

But this in no way spelt the end of the counter-revolution it had just begun. The real-counter revolution started in the spring of 1918. It bottled up the vast area spreading from Baltic, white seas and the Arctic ~~Sea~~<sup>Coast</sup> to the Black and Caspian Seas on one length, and the whole western boundary stretching from Archangel, Breast-Litovsk and Odessa to Vladivostok down to Turkishtan on the other.

A hot wave of reaction surged all round this vast continent. All the remanants of war materials were distributed against the Soveit Govt. by the Allies. In the North the British landed troops at Archangle and threatened the outskirts of Moscow and Vlogda. The weak garrison of Red Guards had to evacuate Ukraena. On the Don front General Krasnov (the same gentleman who had surrendered to Soviet troops near Tsarskoi Selo) headed the Cossaks in place of the deceased Alexyev and the murdered Kornilov. General Doutov of the Tzarist army appeared at the head of Orberg Cossaks. The Suberian White Guards and the Czeko—Slovaks captured the most important towns of Omsk and Ekaterinborg, Samara—Simbersk, Kazan <sup>also Ukraena</sup> all were lost to the Soviet in succession. Nizni—Novogorod was ~~at the brim of fall~~. By the beginning of April the Japane troops occupied Vladivostok.

The summer of 1918 was a furnace for the soviet Govt. Ukrania the granary <sup>land</sup> coal basin of Don lost, Bakee oil lost, Turkistan cotton lost every thing lost, except the industrial areas round about Moscow and Petrograd. There came the news of the capture of Yareslov ~~came~~ as a thunder bolt. It caused terror and dismay. The capture of yaroslov <sup>meant</sup> the linking up of the British forces in the North with the White <sup>forces</sup> in the south, consequently culminating in the overthrow of the Sov. Government.

A critical moment, a death struggle. The ~~scouring~~<sup>and</sup> of the Soveits <sup>slain</sup> seemed eminent. But the revolution decreed it otherwise. The workers and peasents were <sup>all</sup> prepared for eventualities. Danger velded them into an invincible army. Fired by the zeal of freedom and with renewd energy they advanced on all the fronts. The lack of officers was augmented by the appointment of the Communist Commissars.

The campaign ensued with geat furry. The workers held up the offensive of Czako-Slovaks and the white Guards in the Urals, In the North the Red Sailor from the Baltic Fleet and Red army repulsed the offensive of the British & Northern Whites <sup>aiming</sup> at Vologda. Finally Trotsky marched in Kazan and occupied it. This effusion of success infused a new spirit in the heroic workers of Petrograd and Moscow. These victories were followed

close by the capture of Symbirsk and Samara, where the counter revolutionaries had made their head quarters. Volgan region was cleared off the whites; Ufa and Ekaterinborg fell without a combat.

By the end of 1918 the Soveit Govt succeeded in organising a strong Cossak army. The call to arms to the peasents was enthusiastically responded all over the rural areas. Peasents flocked round the Soveit more because they were conversant <sup>with the fact</sup> that the fall of Soveitism meant ~~the~~ the loss of their lands and the subsequent ruthless measures of the landlords and the Tzarist generals.

But through the treachry of the old officers this newly organised army proved unstable. The Soveit suffered blow after blow. There after the whole ~~regions~~ <sup>regions</sup> of the Communists were mobilised. They took their position in the first rank. This first successful encounter between this army and the counter revolutionaries was in the south. Krasnov was crushed; his entire army surrendered and swore alligance to the red army. Second success was in Ukraine where once more soveit republic came into existence. Petlura forces were routed on the Polish front. Soveit Republic sprang up in Asthnia and Latva.

On the eve of 1929 the territory of Soviet ~~Russia~~ <sup>Russia</sup> increased considerably in all directions.

~~But this even did not sound~~  
~~But in no way sounded~~ the collapse of counter-revolution; it <sup>was in its full swing</sup> had just begun. Armed intervention and blockade began with ~~with~~ <sup>renewed</sup> vigour next,

#### COLLAPSE OF COUNTER REVOLUTION INTERVENTION & BLOCKADE.

The last and mostly deadly stage of counter revolution with its parafernall of intervention, blockade, fratricidal war, intrigues, cliques commenced, with arms and provisions the Allies flooded the streets and fields of the devastated Russia. Every nook, every corner, every field resounded with the roar of the Entente guns.

Volga was again a region of fire, Ufa became a furnace. Kazan and Samarav were again on the <sup>verge</sup> ~~brink~~ of fall. Petrograd was manaced. White Estonians the bands of the notorious bandit Balakhovitch and the Finnish Whites made a Common cause.

All round the Soviet was surrounded.

Reshuffling all the forces at its command, the Soviet made one last desperite attempt. Trotskey bolted forth and made it public:—"Even if we have to go, we will slam the door behind us with such a vigour that it will shake ~~off~~ the foundation of the entire Imperialist world".

The words were historical. They did not slam the door

behind, instead hurled it on the intruder, hitting hard straight in the face.

The military strategy of the untrained Red guards baffled all attempts of the enemy. This time the first encounter was with Admiral Kolchak, who in no time was dealt with a crushing blow. His army revolted and surrendered. The Admiral fled.

Matters having been settled in the North East, all the available reserves were mobilised again in the South, where the situation had once more become critical. <sup>from General</sup> Krassnov's place had been taken up by General Denikea who had recruited and organised a huge volunteer corps. Defeating the Red Caucasian Army he developed his successes by the capture of Don Region and Ukraene. The Cossaks joined hands with him. Capturing Tsaritzin and Orel in October 1919, he threatened Tula and Moscow. At the same time Yudenitch advanced upon Petrograd. Animated by the move of Yudenitch, Kolchak again gathered a corps and marched upon Kurgan.

Danger was once more <sup>very</sup> appalling. Hordes of peasants swelled the ranks of the Red Army. Once more the danger of Counter-Revolution rallied round the Soviet all the sincere element. The Omnicreative will of people — the Soviet — proved equal to the task all along this trouble period.

Offensive of the Reds began. Deniken was undone by incessant blows. His forces were utterly routed at Tula. The Red Army pursued him diligently and hurled him into the Sea, <sup>where</sup> ~~where~~ he embarked on British vessel and went to London to be pensioned by his masters. Next came the turn of Baron Wrangle. Gathering together all the forces of counter-revolution, the Baron raised the standard of revolt in Crime. But to the ill stars of the Baron, his chief Ally Yudenitch was defeated and peace was concluded with Estonia. Peace terms were offered to Polish White guards as the Soviet was anxious to pass over to the <sup>new</sup> peaceful industrial era. It was in the beginning of the year 1920.

The Polish White Guards did not heed the peace proposals and attacked the Soviet Republic in the spring, when almost a large part of the Red Army had been demobilised. The Poles took Kiev and marched on Smolensk. The Reds were infuriated at the insolent behaviour of the Poles, and compelled them to retreat to Warsaw with almost the same speed they had come. The defeat ~~which~~ the Poles suffered in this bloody combat was irrecoverable.

~~But~~ On the other hand the movements of Wrangle made it imperative for the Soviet to direct all energy in the south. Taking advantage of the difficulties of the Soviet on the Polish frontier the Baron <sup>had</sup> considerably consolidated his power. Subsequently the turn of the Soviet towards south afforded a respite to Poland. She seized

this opportunity and attacked the Soveit in the rear. The Red Army had to retreat on this front. But it pursued the Baron with vengeance. Wrangle lost ground and met with the fate of Denikin and shipped off to Constantinople.

By the winter of 1920 all fronts were cleared once for all.

~~Now~~ We have seen how well planned was the country revolution armed intervention and blockade and how they all came to a miserable termination. How very furiously the imperialist forces ~~down~~ the Entente interventionists had started their drive on Moscow and Petrograd from all <sup>directions</sup> ~~sides~~ and how very triumphantly the organised workers and peasants of Russia drove them all back to their respective ambushades. It is all thrilling and dramatic to recall how:—”

“In the East advanced the hords of Lolchak, in the west the Armies of Finland, the Lets & the Lithonians. From the North <sup>here</sup> descended the British, French & Amricans. Up from the south had rushed the tanks Airo Planes and death battalians of Denikio. Out of Asthonia Yudenitch out of Poland the well trained legions of Petlura. Out of Crimea proped the cavellary of Baron Warangle.

In short the blockade was complete from all the four sides. The allies had used every nerve to throttle the Soviet Republic.

But how the Soveit with stood all this:—

“The forces of Kolchak were hurled back. The Allies were forced back Archangle to get themselves shipped for home across the frozen water of the White Sea. Denikin was crushed at Tula; driven back to black Sea he escaped on board the British Crusier. Yudenitch was cut to pieces, and the Baron hurring back to the sea of Azove fled to Turkey.”

Thus the intervention and clunter revolution came a desastrous and calamitous end. The Soveit triumphed all over the vast country from Vladivostock to Brest-Litovsk; from Archengale, Siberia to Oxus, Crimea & the Caucasus.

Ah ! White a nice shock ?

In the darkness of night, in the dawn of the morning, collaps was what the imperialists of the World were praying for the Soveit system. Eager eyed and with compationate zeal they waited for the down fall of the Soveitism. They wept and cried, they burnt incenses, they moaned and vailed and called all the <sup>gods</sup> devils on earth to reck the wicked Soveit. But all invain. God & Satan both refused to intervew where the will of the people was Supereme. All attempts to smash the revolution were smashed themselves.

'Man proposes God Disposes'. It was the revolution to depose otherwise. The cause of the people showed the signs of success. By the United efforts of the Workers and Peasants of Russia a new, quite new system of Government came into existence.

### KRONSTADT RISING, THE LAST ~~HOPE~~ Hope

The blockade intervention cast the Allies much. Great Britain alone had to spend £100000000. Now all attempts to crush the Soveit having been foiled the Entente devised to creat a *Cordon Sanitaire* all round the Soveit Republics. This China wall, composed of the states of Finland, Asthonia, Latvia, Lithonia, Poland, Gzecho-Slovakia, Hungry & Romania shut up the Soveit from all communication with Europe. This economic blocade almost suffocated the vast country. But the French capitalists were not satisfied with this sort of gradual pasafic process of suffocating. They were in favour of giving a short shrift. Their belief was that if well co-ordinated action of political as well as economic blocade with well planned intervention could be carried out consistantly the Soveit would not last longer than 10 days.

The Allies had to fall in and with this point in view they fostered discontent in the most vulnerable island of Kronstadt.

In February 1921 there broke out an open rebellion of sailors on board a War vessel in Kronstadt port. The bourgeoisie populace of the island joined hands with the rebils. This uprising was primarily a prelude to a second intervention and on the success of this depended the whole of the policy of the interventionists.

It was one of the many experiments which the Allies undertook to throttle Soveitism in Russia. The Tzarist Generals who were kept as Royal Guests of Paris & Rome were ~~dispersed~~ <sup>deported</sup> as the leaders and organisers of the rebellion.

But the days were numbered for all such counter revolutionary projects. Before the rebellion could assume any dimension the Krasni Army (Red Army) succeeded in quelling it: The ill equipped & almost in taters the Red Guards walked chivalrously on the frozen Baltic and took the enemy by surprise. The colasp of this rising completed the list of Entente failures.

As to the imperialists backing of this rebellion there can be no gainsay. The London times, Chronical & The Manchester Guardian are the recognised magaphones of World Imperialism. It were they to hereld the rising. <sup>think</sup> The big captions of the fall of Moscow, burning of Kremlin, blowing of Kommintern and death of Lenin, they created a sensation in the streets of Paris, London and throughout the World.

"Wish is the fater of thought," These papers did nothing extraordinary than complying with the bid of their financiers.

They had to depict the wishes of their masters.

Thus in the failure of Kranstadt rebellion the vessel of Ententes hopes foundered.

### THE SECRET OF BOLSHEVIK SUCCESS.

The secret of the Bolshevik success does not lie in the superiority of their armaments; it is to be sought elsewhere, viz. in the superiority of their ideals. More exactly it is to be sought in the conflict between the excessive oppression and absoluteism of the Tzar, landlords, Officials and capitalists and the exhaustion of the patience of the people to suffer any longer.

*The conflict between the oppressor and the oppressed.*

All revolutions are the outcome of class conflicts, i. e., the conflict between the oppressor and the oppressed, the exploiter and the exploited, or say the governing and the governed. These conflicts are as much a social necessity for a Revolution as the development of capitalism.

The fundamental difference, as we have shown in the beginning, between any social revolution and Proletarian Revolution is that the former is more or less a property revolution while the later is a Socialist revolution. To make it clear: most of the revolutions of the 18th & 19th centuries were social revolutions. In this case the conflict was between the rising forces of capitalism and the absolute monarchy and feudalism. In each of these cases the merchant class was the one which attacked the aristocracy of course with the support of the lowest layer of society. Having seized the reigns of power this very merchant class rose to the stupendous height. Capitalism developed with all its fangs of misery and distitution to its producers. In the process of its development it concentrated into fewer and fewer hands till it swelled the ranks of the Proletariate. Its tides rose and ebbed, throwing while receding a large part of the petty merchants into the folds of the working Class.

The intellectuals who at one time regarded themselves hart and soul with the governing class were hurled into the lowest depth of wage earners. For a considerable time they did not recover from this shock and kept themselves as a loof from the manual workers as could be possible with undue strain. But the consciousness of their lot made them to join hands with the proletarian. This ment the intensification of the Class antagonism. The flow of the intellectuals into the ranks of the Working Class visualised the Class consciousness.

The sharpening of competition between the capitalists of different countries makes it imperative for them to undersell their commodities ( Goods ) in order to defeat their economic adversaries. The direct result of such a move is the cut in the wages

of the Working Class. The Working Class thus sinks deep below the poverty line. Class antagonism is intensified. The Workers now setting themselves on solving the economic problems find that what they are being paid is not even the one twentieth part of what their labour produces. Military strikes break out. The Socialist programme comes to the fore front. The abolition of the private hold on the means of production becomes <sup>an accepted</sup> a recognised fact. Workers demand the control of the factories and peasants (Fleeced by the excessive taxes) demand the control of land.

Capitalism condescends to compromise some times, at others resorts to repressive measures. It sets into motion the entire state machinery against the people. By coercion and compromise the capitalist machine is again set to motion. But how long?

Over production brings in stagnation, competition exhausts the ~~nerve and~~ selling capacity of production. Crisis is the net result. From strikes the matter comes to lockouts.

People starve when there is so much stored up in the bakeries, people go almost naked when there is so much of rammants in the cloth godowns. Workers may <sup>starve</sup> freeze but the sanctity of the stores is not to be violated. *Shipwreck to his pulch*  
Life becomes impossible. Class antagonism reaches its climax. The producers ~~do~~ no longer wish to bear the brunt of all this. They demand their living and necessities of life. But capitalism is no believer in Philanthropy.

The utter distitution places the workers in extremely embarrassing position. But, then, all this is historically necessary for a proletarian revolution. It is <sup>after all the</sup> the means to that end. The workers now fully understand that the capitalist class is superfluous, and that it is in no way capable of elevating their conditions. They analyse it that capitalism is no individual production. Only the control over it is individual while the production is Social. The grasp of this fundamental truth enervates them to resort to direct action. The superflous clique is removed from the control. The means of production are socialised. The State power is assumed by the hitherto oppressed. A transitional era from capitalism to Socialist society sets in.

These are the developments prerequisite to a proletarian Revolution. "But Russia was an industrially backward country. The preliminary conditions were not ripe for such a drastic change", declare the moderate socialists. But they forget to analyse that the concentration of capitalism in the fewer and fewer industrial magnates is not the only essential thing to produce a revolution.

Russia is an agricultural country: Capitalism could not be expected to devalop on the same lines as in England or Germany.



But so far as the concentration of wealth is concerned it rested in the hands of the limited few, who exploited and oppressed all. The peasantry was fleeced, the workers in industrial centers were tortured and oppressed. Living became dear, death was very cheap. 99% of the people lived on the ~~brink~~<sup>very</sup> of starvation. The heart rending repression and forcible conscription during the War set a blaze all the combustible stuff. It threw all the revolutionary element in one line. THE MOST ESSENTIAL PRE-REQUISIT TO A REVOLUTION IS THE FULL EVOLUTION OF CLASS ANTAGONISM AND this in Russia had reached the boiling point.

Unlike the French revolutionaries of the past two centuries the Russian revolutionaries were not contentment about the Republicanism. What they aimed at was the abolition of all exploitation. They strove for a full pledged Socialism. They preached the control and exploitation of all the industrial resources ~~of~~ the country in common. With the slogan Peace, Bread, & Land, they embarked on a totally new system of Government. With the watch words of economic, political & Social equality they won over the hearts of all the oppressed of the Earth.

But how ~~then~~<sup>do</sup> you count for the counter revolution in that land of the oppressed. This is the question which the critics of that system often put to us. The answer is very simple: Counter revolution was primarily an attempt of the waning capitalists and landlords of Russia at the capture of <sup>the</sup> State machinery, there by to crush the rising proletarian State. Secondly, the other Capitalist Governments <sup>of Europe</sup> fostered it in order to crush premature system at consolidation of which meant an example to the workers under their own heels. Therefore they bolstered up the counter evolution and feverishly exerted to remove this perpetual danger. Capitalists of all countries <sup>declared</sup> a Jihad (crusade) to smother this system. Frantic efforts were made to give it a short shrift.

But the sweeping popular cause withstood all this. The chief causes which broke the morale of the counter-revolutionary forces were in no way any huge battalions of the Reds, but the ideal <sup>incarnated</sup> in the Army of Revolution. The Allied Camps were <sup>incarnated</sup> bombarded not by bombs but by ideas.

Literature thrown from the Soviet Aeroplanes was more potential than rocket-bombs.

<sup>were other</sup> The interventionists and counter-revolutionary armies were ~~nothing else~~ than the duped peasants after all. They could not be kept ignorant too long of the supreme noble idea of Soviet System. This ideal broke their morale. They fought half heartedly and mutinied. Whole battalions, not in thousands but in lacs came over to the side of the Soviet. Entire legions of intervention melted away like snow on the Afghan border in the Spring.

Sovietism triumphed all over.

But the havoc caused by the intervention and counter-revolution was irreparable. "For three years", said Lenin, "our whole energy was devoted to the task of war."

The retreating and enraged Allies devastated the land behind them with fire and dynamite. Nothing was left ~~than~~ <sup>except</sup> a heap of ashes and ruin. With their unerring devotion to their cause the people succeeded in making up this loss. Thereafter they set vigorously on construction. Success was followed by organisation.

The victory of the Soviet was hailed all over by the workers of the world. Triumph to the Soviet hymn the international came ringing from all directions the slogan: "WORKERS OF THE WORD UNITE." The Proletarian Republic, in the words of the famous poet J. R. Lowell set on building the International solidarity of the workers of the world:—

Is true freedom but to break  
Fetters for our own dear sake,  
And, with leathern hearts, forget  
That we owe man-kind a debt.  
No! True freedom is to share  
All the chains our brethern wear,  
And with heart and heart, to be  
Earnest to make others free.

#### CONSOLIDATING POWER.

Every interference from outside and inside having collapsed, an era of Soviet consolidation <sup>is set</sup> ~~is set~~. Practically excluded from the countries of the west the Soviet turned East wards. A series of treaties with the Asiatic countries were concluded:—

"With Persia February 26th 1921; with Afghanistan February 28th 1921; with Bukhara March 4th 1921 and with Turkey March 16th 1921."

With Afghanistan the article seven of the treaty runs:—

"The high contracting powers agree upon the freedom of the Eastern Nations on the principal of Independence and in accordance with the general wish of each nation." The treaty also provides that Soviet Union shall give Afghanistan "Financial & Other help."

Perceiving this trend of affairs the capitalist of Britain hastened to conclude a trade agreement with the Soviet Union. But Sir Robert Horne. (The chief British representative) would not sign it unless the Indian Military & Aviation schools at Taskkent

were liquidated. And they were forth with liquidated. The Indians there and the other internationalists resented this move on the part of the Soveit Govt. But such a compromise was felt indispensable for the peaceful development of the Soveit Republic.

According to this agreement the Soveit Union had to supply wood Kerosine oil and other raw materials in exchange for machinery, railway engines and textile goods.

This agreement however did not last even half a decade.

### FAMINE.

Early in the summer of 1921 a monstrous FAMINE broke out in Russia. It ravaged throughout this vast country. ~~Each~~ *Death* became rampant. Shut off from the rest of the world no victuals could be procured for the starving millions. It was an unprecedented famine in the annals of the World.

The Allies now took from piston to pen. Every sort of calumny was spread against the Soveit. Front pages of Newspapers were reserved for broad casting blasphemous lies. Concoted stories of Soveit atrocities were scattered like wild fire.

For a considerable period no relief was permitted by the Allies to pass in to Russia. For two complete years this infernal monster the famine ransacked that recognised granary of the western world. The entire Soveit organism seemed to be gradually paralysed. The Govt. came to the verge of down fall.

*braved these with*  
But the people of Russia were long inured to difficulties and trials, ~~did not lose perseverance in such a perturbed state.~~ They averted the chaos at all costs.

At the same instant the Entente seeing that Soviet did not relapse under such trying circumstances, gave way. Relief was allowed.

### THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY.

The stability of Communism in the Soviet Union without a proletarian Revolution in the adjoining countries became an established impossibility. The triumphant treat was announced by Comrade Lenin, The famous NEP. (The New Economic Policy) was inaugurated. Peasants were given the sanction to sell the produce. Money was re-introduced. The salaries of the workers and officials were fixed. The wage-system, although in much modified form was revived. Shops hitherto used as the godowns of distribution began to sell commodities. New Economic Policy changed the aspect to a great extent. It affected everything except the workers control over factories and the peasants proprietorship on land.

As a result of this, a new class came into existence. This was the "Speculant" now known as the Nep-man—the legitimate offspring of the NEP.

#### EVENTS DURING HALF A DECADE.

The history of the last half decade of the Soviet Union is the history of her internal consolidation, cordial cooperation with the Eastern people and of embittered relations with the western Powers.

The Capitalist powers left no stone unturned in their attempts at bringing the Soviet system to an end. From blasphemies to provocation all nerves were exerted to throttle this new power. Their one aim was to provoke her to war and thereby to strangle her easily. But the Soviet never yielded to such provocations on the other hand she remained contented by exposing the Imperialists to the workers in their own lands and thereby gaining their full sympathy.

In brief, here is the list of some of the events, allegations and provocations:—

In 1922-23 the so called "Bolshevik Agents" were rounded all over the world the hostile attitude of the Allies in the matter of friendly cooperation of the delegates of the Soviet with the Turkish Representatives at the Luassane Conferences. The embittered relation with the British Government on the question of jurisdiction of British fishing in the waters of the Baltic Sea. The cold-blooded and inhuman murder of the Soviet Envoy, M. VOROVSKY, at Geneva, at the instances of the Imperialist powers. The insolent behaviour of the allied delegates at the Conferences drove the Soviet more and more in friendly relations with the powers of the East with whatever program they were.

In 1924, there was a brief lull. With the advent of the labour Government in England, the Heriot Ministry in France, the rise of the labour movement in Europe, a spontaneous *recognition de jure* of the Soviet Union followed. But during all this period, the Capitalist were busy in hatching up one conspiracy after another in the Colonial countries. The Riff war of independence was alleged to have been fostered by the Soviet Union. India being the most vulnerable point of British Imperialism, a conspiracy to connect the Indian Communists with the Communist International and through it with the U. S. S. R. was concocted. The conspiracy based on some scrapes most probably coined in the Cellars of the Scotland Yard failed in its avowed aim, although the four accused were sentenced to 4 years of rigorous imprisonment.

Next came the Zinoviev letter. A forged document the validity of its has so often been challenged. The sensation this document created in the Imperial capitals is unprecedented. The Labour Government in England came down to its knees as its

consequence. The list of allegations against the U. S. S. R. increased.

In 1925, the Chinese movement took a sudden jump. The Allies were understruck and saw in it the hand of the Soviet diplomacy. The struggle there is well-known to all.

In 1926, the patience of the Allies exhausted and armed intervention in the Chinese affairs increased. Primarily the landing of troops on the Chinese Territory was declared as a safeguard against the Chinese aggression, but in due course the Allies utilised these forces against the Chinese Masses. The massacres all well-known.

In 1927, the Chinese situation became appalling, Raids on Soviet Embassies by the counter-revolutionary Government of Northern China with the sanction of Allied Consuls followed. Then there came the notorious ARKOS raid and the break of the diplomatic relations initiated by the British Government and fast copied by some of the Capitalist Governments. Next came the murder of M. Voikoff in Warsaw, in the same cold blooded manner as that of M. VOROVOSKY three years ago.

All this was a prelude to War. But the Soviet did not yield to any of these provocations.

#### FOSTERING A WAR PSYCHOLOGY AGAINST THE SOVIET.

It is undeniable that the Russian Revolution is one of the great events of world wide importance. In every country the Workers and the Peasants have regarded it the precursor of the World Revolution. And in every country the Capitalist class has regarded it a perpetual danger. From intervention to intrigue and blockade they have tried all means to end it.

If one has been studying the trend of political and diplomatic current in the European countries ever since the termination of the Great War, one will revise that the history of this period has been a history of monstrous War preparations in every country.

Cordon Sanitaire, incessant attempts at obtaining Germany's support in the event of the next offensive against the Soviet Locarno Pact, thoiry conversations, multilateral treaties, the flight of War engines of Imperialism from one Capital to another getting attached in the process as many wagons as possible, the murders of Soviet Consuls, the raids on the Soviet Embassys, the machinasation of Armies, the increase in Areal and Naval power and last of all the intereference in the affairs of China, what are these if not the ominous harbingers of a colossal storm.

The concentration and development of Capitalism has reached its last stage. It is on the verge of decay through its inherent contradictions:

Militant strikes, the Coal Crisis, the discontent in the Colonial countries, the sharpening of Class Antagonism and all the industrially developed countries, the exhaustion of markets, the fertility of reckless competition all these are the chronic symptoms of a chronic disease.

The great crisis of the past War, the crisis in economy, the Social crisis which is bringing about the collapse of Capitalism before our eyes-shattering its entire cultural structure to its very foundation is producing in the Capitalist class a psychology of despair, of profound scepticism of pessimism and is breeding almost a vengeance against the only workers and peasants Republic. All this crisis they identify with the "pernicious" Bolshevik Propaganda. While in fact all this is to be traced elsewhere. It is to be traced as the outcome of conflict or more exactly the collision between the productive forces and production relations.

Generally War is the result of competition and of hunt for new markets. But having the experience of last War and perceiving the scarcity of markets and the growing discontents among their employees the capitalists are directing their entire energy to crush the ideal embodied in Soveit. This Ideal of the Workers & Peasants Republic permeates the entire Working Class life all over the World. Having fully grasped this confliction of Ideals the Capitalists are bent on racking the Soveit system. They will compose, may they have composed their differences among themselves and have succeeded in creating a War psychology in every capital and a hatred against the Soveit Republic.

Sooner or later the spell has to break. The innocent World finds itself once more in the throes of a general human slaughter. The attitude of the Soveit in this direction is quite clear. It is honest in as much as their representatives at the recent Disarmament Conference at Geneva declared their unqualified and unsurveying adherence to complete disarmament.

But if War comes.

"The Soveit Government will adopt every measures in order not to be taken by surprise.

"We will, in the future (says A. I. RYKOV) also oppose hostile combinations of every sort with our undeviating and firm policy of peace.

"But even while consistently carrying out this policy neither the Government nor any of us here present can guarantee that the territory of Socialism will not be exposed to attack FOR THIS REASON WE MUST BE PREPARED FOR THE WORST THAT MAY BEFAL."

\*From the report of the President of the Council of People's Commissars, A. I. Rykov at the IV Congress of Soveits of the Soveit Union.

---

P. 728.

The Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party Constitution.

*Note*:—Already printed, vide Exb. P. 549 (8).

---

P. 729.

The Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal Constitution.  
1928.

*Note*:—Already printed, vide Exb. 514.

---

P. 730.

Issue of "KIRTI" in Urdu for May 1928.

---

P. 731.

Issue of "KIRTI" in Urdu for September 1928.

---

## The Chinese Revolution and the Kuomintang.

[Special Editorial for English Edition.]

The great Chinese Revolution is developing. It is developing under extremely complicated and difficult conditions. It has now entered the most serious stage of its development, marked generally by a growing acuteness of the situation.

For some time now there has existed in China, not simply the revolutionary movement of a people fighting to overthrow the feudal military machine and against imperialism, but two distinct struggling Governments. The Chinese Revolution is already organised into a Government, with its army, State apparatus, etc.

While the militarists of the North maintain power by violence against masses, by bribes, intrigues, generosity of the imperialist banks and the assistance of foreign armies, by execution of revolutionary workers, by the suppression of civil rights; while this Government of the reactionary usurpers and puppets of international finance-capital is torn asunder by personal intrigues, by struggle for place and profit; while it is politically degenerating—the power of the Canton Government is being maintained and strengthened by the rise of the masses of the people, is drawing its strength and victory from their powerful revolutionary movement, and is submitting to the pressure of those masses.

At present, the struggle between the Revolution and counter-Revolution, between the State systems of the North and South has assumed a particularly difficult character. The revolutionary soldiers are approaching Shanghai. A struggle is going on for the largest proletarian centre. Now, particularly, the military question is the main political question of the Chinese Revolution.

The situation is becoming most complicated in view of the fact that the Revolution is being compelled to beat out its track in circumstances of actual intervention, when imperialist warships are parading in Chinese waters, when thousands of British soldiers are stationed in Shanghai, when foreign military instructors are supervising the "defence" of Shanghai from the Revolution. The military alliance between Chinese reaction and foreign imperialism, hitherto veiled, is now coming out in the open. This circumstance is still further stimulating the movement against imperialism; but at the same time is creating a military-political situation pregnant with threatening surprises.



It would be a great political error, and a childish simplicity entirely foreign to Marxian theory, to assume that contradictions within the revolutionary camp are not inevitable. Various social elements have been drawn into the anti-imperialist and revolutionary movement in China—the proletariat, the town middle class, the peasantry and a part of the Chinese commercial and industrial bourgeoisie. These social groups have both common and differing interests. Their aims vary, their militant energy is not the same, the strength of their revolutionary conviction and the “degree of vacillation” are likewise different.

This varied combination of social aims and interests is reflected, and cannot help being reflected, in the revolutionary organisations, the Government and the parties of the Kuomintang. On the Right flank of the Kuomintang, there are definitely bourgeois elements who are ready to turn aside from the road and drag the Revolution back, who maintain the ideology of “Tai-Chi-Tao-ism” —for the revolutionary struggle but against the class struggle; for a struggle against the Northern reactionaries, but also for a deal with Imperialism. They are frightened by the intervention which has begun, and the awakening of the proletarian masses, and have no objection to “making eyes” at John Bull.

On the other hand we have a strong Left Wing in the Kuomintang, which reflects the interests of the masses, and which is under the influence of the Chinese Communist Party. The latter is still young: its membership not yet large; but it is rapidly growing, and is already enjoying great influence and, as admitted by the Right Kuomintang opponents, is already playing the role of a real “Locomotive of the Chinese Revolution.”

For quite understandable reasons, the imperialist press is employing all means to exaggerate the strength of the Right Kuomintang, who are alleged to have already turned the Revolution on to “moderate” lines, dispersed the “red workers,” and concentrated power in their own hands. The imperialist press has predicted the complete degeneration of the Kuomintang, its split, the paralysis of the Chinese Revolution, and its peculiar “regeneration.” The imperialist press hopes to capture this “regenerated” revolution with its bare hands.

Some “specialists” on the Chinese question, who are ready to grumble at every suitable or unsuitable occasion, have reacted in a peculiar manner towards this imperialist theory of regeneration of the Chinese Revolution. If the Right Wing is in power, if the Revolution has degenerated, then it is necessary to play the Funeral March, the Chinese Communists must “resign” and give up “great actions” & great plans—such is the tearful & simple logic of those who are dancing to the bourgeois music about the Right Wing having gained the “upper hand” in the Chinese Revolution. They recommend

the Communist Party to withdraw from the Kuomintang—thereby helping the Right Wing. They fail to understand that, without co-operation of the Communist Party with the Kuomintang, the leading role of the proletariat in the Revolution is impossible, and that the Chinese Revolution would thereby be doomed to failure. The liquidators of to-day “don’t notice” that their preaching of withdrawal from the Kuomintang means the preaching of liquidation of the Chinese Revolution.

All the bourgeois noise about degeneration of the Chinese Revolution is built on a very old unsound basis. They pretend to “object” to reaction, yet they do not want to see, or they have no faith in, the strength of the Revolution. They see the Right fraction of the Kuomintang, but they do not see its kernel, and they do not see the masses. They see the situation according to the principal ridiculed by Lenin: “Everything goes well with the bourgeoisie, everything is bad with us.”

Yet it is just recently that the mass revolutionary movement has developed enormously. We shall not speak here of the heroic Chinese workers, who do not spare their lives for the cause of the Revolution. We shall not speak of the splendid conduct of the Shanghai proletariat, the skirmishers of the great revolutionary storm of China. Masses of Chinese working women recently celebrated International Women’s Day with great enthusiasm. We will only point out here the impressive success of the recent peasant conferences (particularly in the provinces of Hüpé and Hónán) which were held under Left revolutionary slogans—against the landowners and gentry, for agrarian reforms, and against imperialist enslavement. This is a symptom of the greatest significance for the prospects of the workers’ and peasants’ bloc in China.

Even the Right circles in the Kuomintang, and those who stand near to the Right Wing in the Kuomintang, the Government and the Army, are forced to yield to the pressure of the revolutionary masses—the workers, peasants and artisans. In this respect the declaration of the Commander-in-Chief—Chiang-Kai-Shek— which was published in the Communist press recently, is a very important document. Evidently, the pressure of the revolutionary rank and file is so strong that Chiang-Kai-Shek is compelled, at this stage, to manoeuvre, to swear his devotion to the principles of the Revolution, Sun-Yat-Sen-ism and Socialism, to submit to the leadership of the mass party—the Kuomintang, and to make declarations not to all in the style of those which he made previously. The plan which the extreme Right Wing of the Kuomintang hoped to carry out, and which the imperialist bourgeoisie regarded as its trump card—namely, the plan of isolating the generals and making them independent of the Kuomintang, has thus failed. Now even the American capitalist press has been compelled to recognise the failure of the Right Wing plot.

The road of the Chinese revolutionaries is difficult and thorny. They have to overcome tremendous obstacles. They have to act, struggle for power, struggle for hegemony within the revolutionary movement, in extremely complicated and contradictory conditions. But the revolutionary tension of the Chinese people is vast; the will of the Chinese working class is resolute and invincible and the outlook for the great liberation movement is immeasurable. Let those whose lot it is to doubt, doubt. The Chinese Revolution will go ahead, breaking down all obstacles, and will itself hold down those who wish to hold it down.

P. 258

## Hindu-Mussulman Strife

**Sardar**

Hindu-Mussulman antagonisms are a great obstacle to the organised struggle of the Indian nationalist movement. This movement has been experiencing a decline since the end of 1922. In 1920 and 1921 it was a serious menace to British imperialism in India. For the first time in the history of the country the movement became a real mass movement. In some places it broke out into open rebellion, in the form of a conflict between the poor peasants and the city workers on the one hand and the authorities on the other. Naturally, at that time neither the government nor the Indian nationalists could devote themselves to stirring up Hindu-Mussulman strife. The movement was so powerful that they were filled with consternation. However, the Liberal leaders of the Indian National Congress got scared at the dimensions and character the movement was assuming and gave the signal for retreat.

The notorious Bardoli resolution says: "(1) The Executive Committee deploras the inhuman conduct of the mob at Chauri-Chara, which brutally killed the police officers and senselessly burned down the police stations. (2) In view of the fact that mass civil disobedience always gives rise to violence, which shows that the country is not yet prepared for the methods of passive resistance, the Executive Committee of the Congress orders that mass civil disobedience shall cease and instructs the local committees of the Congress to advise the farmers to pay the land taxes and all other government taxes and cease all aggressive action . . . (6) The Executive Committee instructs the Congress and its branches to inform the peasantry that a refusal to pay rent to the land owners is a violation of the decisions of the Congress and causes harm to the vital interests of the country. (7) The Executive assures the landowners that the Congress movement does not in the least threaten their lawful rights, and the committee desires that in all cases where the peasantry put forward any claims a way of settlement may be found through the medium of mutual

agreement and arbitration.”

### **Defending the Landlords**

This resolution indicates that the leading body of the national movement at a critical moment considered it its duty to defend the interests, not of the masses whom it was supposed to lead, but of the landlords and the capitalists. Owing to betrayal by the bourgeois leadership, the revolution suffered defeat. Gandhi, the celebrated leader of the Indian national movement, at the time when it was at its height, declared; “Everything is born in order to serve God—the Brahmins by their knowledge, the Kshatri by their strength, the Waisim by their commercial abilities and the Shudra by their physical labour.”

A way out from the cul-de-sac in which the Indian national revolutionary movement found itself after 1922 was found by organising the Swaraj Party. The decline of the Swataj Party, however, was strikingly demonstrated at the last Indian National Congress, at which the Swarajists held a dominant position. Through the mouth of Gandhi it was declared that the aim of the national revolutionary movement was Swaraj—Home Rule on a Dominion basis—and that the Congress and the Swaraj Party did not aim at complete independence of India from the British Empire. Even with regard to its tactics, which distinguished the Party from all avowedly bourgeois parties, the chairman of the Indian National Congress declared that the policy of non-cooperation with the government was not an absolute nor an immutable policy.

### **The Calcutta Fighting**

This implies that the Indian nationalists are prepared to co-operate with the British in the present Anglo-Indian government, and this practical programme is the inevitable consequence of the economic co-operation between British and Indian capitalists in the exploitation of the Indian masses. Under these conditions, Hindu-Mussulman antagonisms inevitably had to assume extremely acute forms.

The main feature of political life in India during recent years, and particularly during the past year, is the break-up of the Swarajist Party and the growing Hindu-Mussulman strife. From all the large cities in India news comes of men being killed and wounded in riots. These conflicts reached their culminating point in Calcutta, where open war broke out between the Hindus and the Mohammedans. The fighting lasted throughout the whole of April and assumed a very fierce character. The combatants employed all sorts of weapons, including stones, bamboo sticks, rifles, revolvers and even bombs. Over 100 were killed and a thousand seriously wounded in these conflicts.

It is not surprising that the whole of India is closely watching these rivalries between the Hindus and the Mussulmen, who together represent 90 per cent. of the population of the country. The Hindus number 217 millions, or 68 per cent, while the Mohammedans are 63 millions or 22 per cent. of the population. The intensity of the hostility between these two religious denominations can be judged from the reports in the newspapers. At the time of the Calcutta riots a Mohammedan organisation issued a leaflet which contained the following:

#### **Incitement to Massacre**

“Mussulmen beware! Since last evening the Hindus have been attacking Mussulmen. The Hindus have killed hundreds of Mussulmen, their homes have been burned down and their shops plundered. Mussulmen must not stand by idly and peacefully; every single Mussulman life must be paid for with 100 Hindu lives. Whenever a Hindu city dweller or peasant is found he must be killed on the spot. Massacre the Hindus as far as lies in your power!”

The present relations between the Hindus and the Mussulmen is having a serious effect upon the national movement. Owing to the development of this religious antagonism, which is the result of the deliberate policy of the British, a special political school of communalism has arisen. Communalism maintains that the Indian people can and should act along the line of common national and religious views. On the basis of this principle special organisations have sprung up both among the Hindus and the Mussulmen. The principal aim of the Mussulmen League and the new Indian Mussulman Party is to protect the interests of their co-religionists as against the interests of the Hindus.

The interests of the latter are protected by a no less powerful and reactionary organisation, the Hindusakaba, and in these organisations even more or less revolutionary nationalists are converted into agents for inflaming the religious prejudices of the masses. A deplorable consequence of this is the split in the national movement in India; even one section of the workers is being hounded against the other.

The British imperialists declare that this strife exists in the country because India does not represent a single nation. Sir John Strachey, the ex-Governor of the United Provinces, once declared that the most important problem that has to be studied in India is that there is not, and never has been, a united nation having, according to European ideas, anything in the nature of physical, political, social and religious unity. There is no Indian nation, no Indian people about which we hear so much. (“India,” by Sir John Strachey.) From this the conclusion is drawn that India must have a neutral foreign government which shall restrain the country

from automatic collapse. The "Times frankly declares that the Calcutta riots are one more proof of the practical impossibility of giving India "Swaraj." and that those who demand Home Rule for India do not understand the Hindu-Mussulman problem, although that problem is of first-class importance.

#### **Economic Causes,**

As a matter of fact, the primary cause of the Hindu-Mussulman strife is not that it is impossible to unite all the nationalities populating India into a united and independent State. The real cause of this strife lies in the economic conditions of the Hindus and Mussulmen respectively. The Mussulman bourgeoisie represents the most conservative section of the Indian bourgeoisie. While the Hindu bourgeoisie, added by the National Congress, was fighting British imperialism in defence of its interests from the end of the last century, the Mussulman bourgeoisie, as such, had then not yet arisen. It is not surprising that at that time the Mussulman League was established as a counter-balance to the National Congress. This League was an organisation of Mohammedan landowners, who represented the social bulwark of British rule in India. The whole activity of the League consisted in combating the National Congress, the majority of the members of which were Hindus. Naturally, the Mussulman landlords found it to their advantage to give this struggle a religious character.

At the present time one of the factors in Hindu-Mussulman strife is the competition between Mussulman merchant capitalism and the more developed industrial commercial capital of the Hindus. This is indicated by the fact that the majority of those who took part in the Calcutta riots were Hindu and Mussulman merchants. The attacks of the Mussulman were directed largely against the Hindu merchants. The situation becomes more complicated from the fact that in some provinces the peasants are Mohammedans and the landlords are Hindus, while in other provinces the position is just the reverse.

#### **The Moplah Rising.**

The Moplah rising on the Malabar coast was purely peasant in character, both in its aims and those who took part in it. As, however, the landlords in this district are Hindus they described the revolt of the peasants as a Mussulman attack upon the Hindus. This they did in the hope that they would obtain the help of other Hindus, including peasants.

A similar state of affairs prevails in Bengal, the centre of Hindu-Mussulman strife. Here, too, the strife is not religious but social, and is a problem of first-class importance. In Bengal the majority of the Mohammedans are peasants, the landlords are in

the main Hindus, the exploitation of the peasants by the landlords has assumed terrible dimensions. If to this is added the exploitation of the peasants by usurers who are also Hindus, it will be clear that the conditions of the peasantry are absolutely intolerable. Nearly 45 per cent. of the peasants are almost constantly in debt to the usurers, who extort interest amounting sometimes to 75 per cent. per annum. Moreover, we must bear in mind the heavy burden of taxation and the extreme shortage of land from which the peasants suffer. The Bengal peasant on the average possesses about three acres of land.

From this it will be clear what measures the Hindu peasant must take in order to emancipate himself from his present slavery. First, the abolition of British imperialism which extorts excessive taxes and fosters Indian feudalism. Secondly, the confiscation of the land from the Hindu feudal landlords. The discontent of the peasantry, however, found expression in quite a different direction. The Mohammedan bourgeoisie of India has taken advantage and continues to take advantage of the discontent of the peasants in order to increase their political and economic influence. The Mohammedans occupy 45 per cent. of the seats in legislative and civil bodies. They preach to the peasantry that they must support them in holding these seats, on the ground that they, the bourgeoisie, will protect the interests of whole Mussulman population of India.

#### **Divide and Rule.**

This brings us to the policy of the British Government which is based on the principle of "divide and rule." Were it not for the system of separate representation for Mussulmen and Hindus in the various legislative bodies, the fight of the Mussulman to obtain 45 per cent. of the seats would not be so acute. The reactionary Mussulmen leaders would not be tempted by soft jobs, and undoubtedly they would cease to preach the sacred ideas of Islam. The British imperialists, however, foresaw that such a system would be of great advantage to them, and it was on these grounds that they introduced the reforms, which from 1909 to the present day have been directed towards creating a privileged position for the Mohammedans. The British have carried out this system in the most cunning manner. The privileged position of the Mohammedans inevitably gives rise to strife between the Hindus and the Mohammedans. A definite number of the seats on legislative bodies are allocated to the Mohammedans "in view of their special position." On the surface the British appear to defend the numerically weak Mussulman communities, but as a matter of fact they sow discord and rouse a Hindu-Mussulman conflict.

The British imperialists stick at nothing in order to maintain their rule in India. At the present time when India is advancing by great strides towards industrialisation, and consequently the division of society into various castes is dying out and religious prejudices are disappearing, the British are exerting every effort to set one religious denomination against the other, for this purpose they set up their special electoral systems.

As Lenin wrote in his article, "Progressive Asia and Backward Europe," when speaking of the imperialist bourgeoisie: "The dying bourgeoisie is combining with the obsolete and dying forces in order to preserve tottering wage slavery." It is precisely the obsolete and dying religious and caste divisions in Indian society that the British are trying to preserve by creating a privileged position for the Mohammedans. The British imperialists by their experience in Ireland know how it is possible to utilise national minorities for the purpose of strengthening and prolonging their rule. In India these national minorities are the Mohammedans. It has long been known that the British were most active in the establishment of the Mussulman League, the fundamental purpose of which is to combat Indian nationalism. The present system of creating "special" Mussulman interests is a continuation of the policy of "divide and rule."

#### **Strengthening the Bureaucrats,**

We saw an example of this mutual strife during the elections to the Indian "parliament." The "Bombay Chronicle," of 25/1/26, was quite right when it declared that there is not a single patriotic Hindu who is not pained by the sight of internecine strife carried on under the guise of an election campaign. This strife demoralises and paralyses the forces working for the emancipation of India. This state of affairs is a source of strength and of rejoicing for the bureaucracy.

The policy of setting one denomination against the other is being continued. There is not the slightest doubt that the Calcutta riots were a result of the provocation of the British Government. Immediately after the riots broke out the British Government began to spread the legend that the Hindu-Mussulman strife and the Calcutta riots in particular show that India would not be able to govern herself if the British were to leave. Moreover, the British press asserted that the Calcutta riots were caused by the fact that the masses of the Indian were dismayed by the prospect of the further limitation of British authority in India. The very impatience revealed by the British authorities in proclaiming to the whole world that India was not ready for Home Rule exposed their real desire.



At the time of the Calcutta riots the city, which usually seethes with commercial life, was a scene of desolation. All the shops were closed. With the exception of a casual vehicle carrying some sower of panic, not a sign of life was seen on the streets, apart of course from the military and police patrols. In the European part of the city, life went on as if nothing were happening. The life of the Europeans represented the very opposite of that of the Hindus and Mussulmen. This the "Times" had to admit when it wrote: "Calcutta always represented a city of contrasts, and these contrasts were never so glaring as during the Hindu-Mussulman riots."

After the provocative role played by the British Government in the Calcutta events had become evident, the latter tried to throw the blame upon alleged agents of Soviet Russia. The editor of an important organ of British imperialism in India wrote: "On April 22, a person of authority asked me in all seriousness whether there was any truth in the story that the rioters had been bribed by Soviet agents in order to discredit the Government. I could not persuade my interlocutor that this was not the case. It indeed Soviet money has been distributed in Calcutta, then who received it? Or perhaps there were Bolshevik agents in both camps? Mussulman and Hindu leaders say that there are heads and organisations which foster the fanaticism of the masses. This is the common opinion concerning the twofold deception of Moscow which supplies both parties with money.—("Capital," April 22, 1926).

#### **British Action**

Here is another example of how Hindu-Mussulman strife is encouraged, and how the Mussulman community is exploited by the British Government. During the Mussulman festival in Delhi; during which a cow has to be sacrificed, the Hindu Mayor of the city prohibited the Mohammedan procession from passing through the streets in which Hindus lived in order to avoid trouble. But a British official intervened and told the Mohammedans that they could pass through any street they desired. This British official himself solemnly marched at the head of the procession, and thus heroically "defended" the Mussulman faith from attacks of the Hindus.

This British official succeeded in achieving his object. A Mussulman daily, which up till then had been attacking the British Government, came out with a report under screaming headlines to the effect that "The Hindu Mayor had prohibited our procession, but a British official on the contrary permitted the procession to take place and even marched at the head of it." This will make it clear by what methods the British carry out their policy of setting Mohammedans against Hindus and Hindus against Mohammedans.

The last reason, but by no means the least in importance, for Hindu-Mussulman strife is the wrong policy conducted by the Indian Nationalist Movement on this question. The attempts of the nationalists to smooth out these differences produce the very opposite results from those desired. The social revolution alone can bring about a complete solution of the Hindu-Mussulman problem.

As we have pointed out already, the root of these disagreements lies in the present-day social relations of India. This means that only a progressively developed India, *i. e.*, an India freed from all religious prejudices and caste privileges, can ensure both communities against a repetition of Hindu-Mussulman strife. Hence in order to remove the disagreement it is necessary that the interests of the combined toiling masses of the Hindu and Mussulman communities should serve as the basis for the national-revolutionary struggle. Instead of doing this the Indian nationalists tried all time to foster and strengthen religious traditions and prejudices, and on the strength of this bring about a compromise between various groups and call it community.

The Hindu nationalist call: "Back to the old days," and the call of the Indian Mussulmen: "Back to the Khalafat," express this tendency of accentuating religious prejudices. This cannot but foster sectarian moods among Hindus and Mussulmen, and these moods inevitably find expression in increased strife between the two denominations. It is absurd to expect that agreement can be reached on this basis.

Even the most revolutionary organisation in India, the Swaraj Party failed to solve this problem. Its attempt to reach an agreement by the proposal to share posts between Hindus and Mussulmen in the Nationalist India of the future is an attempt to smooth out antagonism on the basis of group distinctions. This will not solve the problem; on the contrary, it will make the antagonism between the two national religious groups in India more acute.

#### **How Nationalism Grew.**

The history of Indian nationalism may be divided into three periods. In the first period, Indian nationalists adopted the Western ideology. All that was Indian was rejected, all that was European was to serve as something worthy of imitation.

The second period of development of Indian nationalism marked a reaction against the capitulation of Indian nationalism to European culture. In order to combat capitalist culture, a high type of proletarian culture was required, but traces of the proletariat in India could only be discovered with the aid of a microscope at that time. In the same way as the Russian Narodniki (Populists),

in their fight against Tsarism, based their revolutionary theories on pre-capitalist forms of economy (the "mir" or commune) so the Indian nationalists at that time turned to the feudal and medieval system, its superstitions and prejudices. Out of the decaying relics of religious and metaphysical views, on the ruins of the village communes and out of the relics of the departed glory of a by-gone civilisation they tried to realise the golden dream of an Indian culture, which was to serve as their ideal and guiding star.

The present period of development of the national-revolutionary movement in India brings with it the chance to solve the Hindu-Mussulman problem. The modern Indian big bourgeoisie is allied with British imperialism. The driving forces of the revolution to-day are the proletariat, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie (the artisans, small traders and the petty bourgeois intelligentsia). The economic conditions of these classes are becoming worse and worse, for the compromise between British and Indian capital is based upon intensified exploitation of these classes. The struggle of the latter against imperialism therefore is an historically necessary struggle. In this struggle the proletariat will assume the leadership. This means that the basis of a national struggle will become wider. This will lead to the dying out of group and religious distinctions, for common problems will take supreme place above all others. We see therefore that the solution of the Hindu Mussulman problem is a function of the social struggle of the workers and peasants.

#### **Through the Class Struggle.**

From what has been said it follows that the only way Hindu-Musalman strife can be abolished in India is through the class struggle and the elimination of the survivals of religious ideals in the country. It is the duty of true revolutionaries to introduce, develop and strengthen the conscious elements in this struggle. The Indian Nationalists however, fail to understand the necessity for such work. More than that even, they look expectantly to the government in the hope that they will take measures to prevent the spread of this strife in India.

In their opinion the British Government represents the only ray of hope amidst the gloom that now overshadows India. The "Indian Review," in a leading article dealing with the Hindu-Mussulman question, points out that the situation is not as gloomy as it may appear at first sight. There are forces which will bring about mutual harmony between Hindus and Mussulmen. These forces are a source of re-joicing for they are invincible. It would be as well to bear that in mind at the present time when the cult of separatism is in its ascendancy. First place among those who are striving to weaken communal differences and restore communal

harmony must, in the opinion of the "Indian Review", belong to Lord Irwin!

The character of the "neutrality" of the British with regard to the caste system in India is very well known. The British and Indian manufacturers artificially maintain the existence of the caste system. On the other hand, however, the factory system and capitalist exploitation of the rural districts are destroying the feudal forms of social life. The spectre of the class struggle is beginning to haunt India. Hindu-Mussulman strife is partly an expression of the class struggle.

#### **Workers and Peasants.**

Reports in the newspapers show that in the majority of conflicts in Bengal the Mohammedans were the attacking party. The Indian Nationalists fail to understand why it is that the Mohammedans and not the Hindus are the attacking party. This is due to the fact that in the majority the Mohammedans are subject to the Hindus. In Bengal 90 per cent. of the capitalist employers are Hindus.

This grain of fact is worth more than a bushel of argument. It clearly shows that the Hindu-Mussulman strife is an expression of the spirit of irreconcilable protest on the part of the workers and peasants against their present conditions of life. Our task is to free these masses from the dirty rags of religious and caste distinctions hampering the development of the class struggle. This alone will free India from a recrudescence of Hindu-Mussulman strife.

## **The Second International "Faces Canton"**

The military intervention of world imperialism in China becomes more and more determined in character. The elemental revolutionary outburst of the Chinese proletariat, making a heroic concentrated effort to extract the thorn of Sun-Chuan-Fang from the side of Shanghai has been drowned in blood. It is unnecessary to prove that Sun-Chuan-Fang's executioners would not have dared to execute workers as a punishment for distributing leaflets calling for a peaceful strike, if they had not been sure of the support of the imperialist armies, guaranteed to them by secret agreement. It was not the medieval scimitars of the Chinese executioners but the caterpillar-tracked tanks and the monstrous battle planes that guaranteed the continuation of the counter-revolution, although we are convinced that this position can only be maintained for a few days or weeks, certainly not for years or decades.

The imperialist bourgeoisie have demonstrated in Shanghai how they would act if they could manage to obtain even a temporary victory over revolutionary China. But the Shanghai heroes who fell in this struggle, insufficiently prepared and organised, did not give up their lives in vain. The Shanghai tragedy is not only a grave warning against the horrors of the future, but an imperative call to go to any extreme to stop at no sacrifices, in order to avert this horror. This appeal is primarily addressed to the workers in the imperialist countries. The heads of the executed men exhibited in the streets of Shanghai speak, demand, command!

They demand first of all that the international proletariat shall understand what cursed power paralyses its will in the struggle for the Chinese revolution. They demand that the international proletariat shall crush the monster that holds it in its clutches and prevents it from fighting.

### **Buffers for the Bourgeoisie**

The world bourgeoisie would not, in the face of unanimous protests by the workers of all countries dare so arrogantly to attack the Chinese revolution if it were not sure of the unconditional and unlimited support of the entire traitor-Socialist political and trade union apparatus. Just as the dregs of the Russian counter-revolutionary emigres in China and the other hangers on of the Chinese counter-revolution, would be swept out of Shanghai if they and the workers of Shanghai were left to themselves, so the world bourgeoisie organising intervention in China would be unable to resist the pressure of the working class if they had to face it alone, without the "reconciliatory" mediation of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals. The path of the professional cut-throats, who are protecting Sun-Chuan-Fang's Shanghai, leads through the international head quarters of the Expeditionary Forces to the traitors sitting in the head-quarters of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals.

From this point of view the "minor" war which is going on in Shanghai gains added importance from the fact that it reveals the distribution of class forces and their role in the forthcoming "great" war; primarily the role which imperialism gives to the reformist leaders.

The menacing manifesto issued by the Second International against war is simply the usual product of the prodigal "Left" Social Democratic pen. It is superfluous to point out that this manifesto was issued for the purpose of concealing the principal causes of war, to screen the principal incendiaries and instigators of the conflagration and to throw the whole blame upon the minor personalities. From this point of view the February "note" issued by the Second International is but a repetition of the pseudo-pacifist tricks which

are played from time to time by the reformist leaders, during which each jealously watches the others to see that they do not do anything that would damage their own bourgeoisie. The honourable place given in the February Manifesto to the Chinese revolution denotes an innovation in what one might term super-swindling. It would appear that on February 27th the Second International suddenly discovered that there was such a thing as the Chinese revolution, and became imbued with a belated but nevertheless passionate love for it. In the manifesto special emphasis is laid upon "support for the national democratic movement for freedom among the Chinese people." Bauer in the "Arbeiter Zeitung" and wels in the "Vorwaerts" (the German and Austrian bourgeoisie have every ground for demonstrating their liberalism in China) describe in very high colours the activities of the Executive Committee of the Second International, and place in the forefront its "revolutionary sweep" on the question of China. ●

### **Not Cruel-hearted**

Justice however demands that we should note that even in its attitude towards the minor personalities responsible for the menace of war, the Second International is not nearly as cruel-hearted as may be believed from the manifesto. For example the manifesto selects Hungarian reaction as the "whipping boy," and all those who took part in the conference strove hard to expose it. It turns out, however, that Social Democratic indignation with reaction, even if it is only verbal indignation, does not last very long. Barely had the ink of this fearful manifesto dried on the paper upon which it was written, when one of the kind-hearted leaders of the Second International began to stroke the poor offended Hungarian executioner's head. "Budapest," declared Albert Thomas at a banquet arranged by the mayor of Budapest, "is a city of equality, liberty, labour and progress." "Social and political antagonisms in Hungary are gradually being smoothed out." This is how the "leaders" are combating the monarchist counter-revolution in Hungary.

One would have thought that Albert Thomas, as the representative of the Right Wing of the Second International, would alone have enjoyed the privilege of committing such counter-revolutionary baseness. It appears, however that Otto Bauer's "Arbeiterzeitung" does not lag behind this "hostage" given by Social Democracy to the League of Nations.

While Albert Thomas takes the Hungarian monarchists under his high protection, Otto Bauer's paper comes forward as the interpreter and champion of Roumanian reaction—concerning which, by the by, the manifesto of the Second International had something to say that, while not being very clear, was for all that apparently unflattering. An article published in the "Arbeiterzeitung" after the manifesto of the Second International has been issued, entitled

"In Prison Because of Russian Diplomacy" is nothing but a revolting denunciation of the Communist Party of Roumania and a justification of the war conducted by the Roumanian boyars against the Soviet Union. "It must not be forgotten," writes the official organ of Austrian Social Democracy, "that an important culprit exists for the persecution of the Roumanian Communist Party, and that is the Communist International. For to argue that the oligarchy has outlawed the Communist Party out of sheer bloodthirstiness would not be serving the truth. The class interest of the bourgeoisie of course facilitates such persecution, but this is insufficient in itself to explain the severity of these repressions. The terror against the Communists is only to a small degree to be explained by social causes. Its real cause is national and has to deal with foreign politics."

### Defending their Possessions

But who is the attacking side, and who is the victim in this "national" struggle, which in the opinion of the "Arbeiterzeitung" "explains" the frenzied reign of terror that is conducted against the Communists in Roumania? It appears that the Communists are the attackers, and that the Roumanian pirates are the defending side. A plebiscite (in Bessarabia), and not only a plebiscite but also support for the national revolutionary movement which is striving for the separation of Bessarabia from Roumania—these have become the permanent slogans of the Communist Party of Roumania. The Roumanian bourgeoisie which has only just established its national state is resolutely defending its "possessions." Perhaps the slogan which Bauer's newspaper so much censures is the result of the Communists in Roumania quite conscientiously falling into error. But this "Left Wing" Social Democratic newspaper refuses to admit the possibility of such a thing. It cannot agree to "half-hearted explanations" which may not suit the Sigurantza (Roumanian secret police). Consequently it is necessary to represent the Roumanian Communists as the "direct agents" of an alien State. The "Arbeiterzeitung" correspondent is prepared even for that. "Communist tactics," he writes, "have not been cultivated on the local dung-heap but are dictated from Moscow. The resolutions which are printed and distributed intensify still more the persecution and the hatred of the Communists."

Is it by chance that the "Arbeiterzeitung" places its hospitable columns at the disposal of the warriors of the Sigurantza? Hardly. The article referred to was written on the eve of and in direct connection with a "trial," the actual significance of which was that the Roumanian bourgeoisie tortured comrade Tusatchenko to death without any trial at all, and is preparing to continue similar torture during the trial of comrade Stephanov. At this very moment the Left Social Democrats become imbued with the desire to serve the truth.

It still remains to be explained, however, why this "truth" so precisely coincides with the "truth" vouched for by the rabid executioners of the Roumanian reaction and of the cunning British provocateurs, who are preparing for a war against the U. S. S. R. No doubt the authors of the solemn manifesto of the Second International "against the dangers of war and reaction" could reveal this secret without any difficulty.

#### **A Spontaneous Superfluity**

A supernumerary Chinese, Yang Kan Tao, appeared on the horizon of the Second International only after the other reliable Chinese like Wu-Pei-fu and Sun-Chuanfang had been thrown by the revolution into the garbage heap, while those who survive have hired themselves out to Japanese imperialism. European and American imperialism is seeking new points of support in China in order to be able to conduct concealed intervention simultaneously with open intervention. They require more perfect methods of deception in order to disarm the indignation of the workers against the armed attack upon the Chinese revolution. Demand creates supply. The Second International is about to establish its own Social Democratic party in China.

The February manifesto of the Second International contains a large dose of excellent words about the independence of China. But in appraising these words it is necessary to take the following into consideration. First, a considerable portion of them, have already been shouted from the house-tops by such champions of the rights of oppressed nations as Chamberlain and Coolidge. Secondly, the "overweight" which the Second International gives the "liberal" concessions of the imperialists is so belated that at the present stage of the struggle it can no longer be effective in hampering the plans of the imperialists. For example, the demand for the withdrawal of the troops from Shanghai appeared only after the pressure of the workers compelled even the Parliamentary group of the Labour Party to move an amendment to the reply to the King's speech, and after the arrival of the troops in Hong Kong and Shanghai has made this demand inadequate. When Fenner Brockway proposed that the conduct of war be hampered by the declaration of a strike in the munition factories and in the transport of war materials and troops, the Second International sends this proposal along the long road of "to be examined by the respective countries." The "leaders" of the Second International of course are convinced that this proposal will emerge from the various Party headquarters only after the imperialists have managed to bury the liberties of the Chinese people.

#### **Heading to Behead**

But why did the representative of the Independent Labour Party insist upon introducing a proposal the fulfilment of which would imply support to the Chinese revolution? Why did not the leaders



of the Second International bluntly reject this proposal as they would have done a year ago on the pretext that it had not yet examined the social character of the national revolutionary movement? In a word why have the Second and Amsterdam Internationals now adopted the policy of attaching themselves to the national revolutionary movement, of mixing with the friends of this revolution and of inserting their tentacles into the leading organs of the national revolutionary struggle—instead of their former tactics of direct opposition to the struggle of the colonial and oppressed nations? The answer is clear: For the very same reason that Ebert in January, 1918, forced his way into the committee which led the strike in the munition factories, for the very reason that J. H. Thomas got himself on to the strike committee which led the General Strike in 1926.

### **Where Reformists are Needed**

The Second and Amsterdam Internationals are trying to establish contact with the national revolutionary movement in China because they believe this to be the best way to suppress that movement. They are beginning to apply the same tactics with regard to the national revolutionary movement in other countries, and primarily in India. The Second and Amsterdam Internationals have moved to the East. Is this not the best proof that it is precisely on this sector of the war that the world bourgeoisie stands in greatest need of the defence of their reformist agents and servants?

What is the plan for saving the bourgeoisie which the Second International is now about to carry out? It was sufficiently clearly outlined by Yang Kan Tao, the representative of the Chinese Social Democratic Party which "spontaneously arose" in Paris, whose "profound Marxian analysis" so roused the enthusiasm of Otto Bauer. "The Kuomintang," he said, "really consists of three groups: (1) the nationalist groups of the Right Wing of the Kuomintang; (2) the democratic groups—the Left Wing of the Kuomintang, which enjoys the greatest influence at the present time, because it is the centre of all the demands directed against both Peking government and foreign imperialism; (3) the Bolshevik group which cannot enjoy the confidence of the Chinese people because the Russians are not only foreigners but represent numerically the most powerful group of foreigners in the territory of China." Hence Yang Kan Tao's programme is to liberate the Kuomintang from the Bolshevist groups (which following the recipe of Chamberlain he identifies with the Russians). As soon as this operation is performed and the national revolutionary movement has been cut up, it will be easy for the Second International to crush the Kuomintang in its embrace—but without the Bolsheviks. The Chinese revolution, secure against pernicious influences—such is the formula of the Second International developed by the Chinese Menshevik Yang Kan Tao and made more profound by the Russian Menshevik, Abramovitch.

### **"Kuomintang Without Reds"**

But this is the very formula which Chang Tso Lin has inscribed on his banner and which has been adopted by all the imperialist groups in spite of the fact that they have already concentrated a monstrous apparatus for destruction in Shanghai. The Kuomintang without the Bolsheviks is the universal slogan of the counter revolution, just as "Soviets without Communists" was the slogan in the days of the Kronstadt mutiny. It proceeds from Abramovitch to Chang Tso Lin and then further to Chamberlain.

The British Press and the newspapers published with the aid of British money are full of news concerning the pending split in the Kuomintang, about the formation of a reliable Right Wing Kuomintang, about secret negotiations that are alleged to be taking place between the Kuomintang and Chang Tso Lin, of declarations made by intermediaries who are supposed to be taking part in these negotiations, and who invariably give utterance to the Abramovitch formula directly adapted to the conditions in China. It goes without saying that there is much in these communications that is deliberately false and provocative. But there is not the slightest doubt also that they reflect the whole system of tactics of external scare and internal penetration for the purpose of breaking the backbone of the Chinese revolution.

### **The Reformists' Job**

But the imperialists cannot themselves directly carry out the tactics of disarming the Chinese revolution, just as they failed in 1919 to persuade the workers and peasants at the front to give up their arms and to place themselves at the tender mercies of the bourgeoisie with their promises that "your sacrifices will never be forgotten." To-day also the predatory imperialists stand in need of the mediation of Social Democracy, which by adopting a camouflage must penetrate into the camp of the revolution and carry on its treacherous work from within.

The international proletariat, and above all the proletariat of China, must clearly realise this new danger. More than at any previous time is it necessary for the Chinese proletariat to secure the unity, steadfastness and stamina of the anti-imperialist revolutionary front, by systematic, conscious and organised struggle and leadership which takes into consideration all the complexities of the situation.

P. 859.

*Rejected as P.  
D. of Joglekar.*

## All-India Trade Union Congress,

(7th Session.)

### RESOLUTIONS.

The following resolutions were passed by the 7th Session of the All-India Trade Union Congress, held at Delhi on 12th and 13th March 1927:—

#### REPORT AND THE STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS.

1. This Congress adopts the Statement of Accounts and the annual Report for the year 1926 as submitted by the General Secretary and takes the opportunity of expressing its sense of confidence in him and deep appreciation of the valuable services he has rendered to the cause of Indian Labour.

#### GREETINGS TO MR. SAKLATVALA, M. P.

2. That this Congress extends its Cordial welcome and the greetings of Indian workers to Mr. Shapurji Saklatvala, M. P. and takes this opportunity of thanking him publicly for his valiant fight in the cause of millions of Indian workers and peasants and thanks the electors of North Battersea for returning him to Parliament, for the purpose of carrying on a united fight for British and Indian workers.

#### CHINA.

3. This Congress puts on record its whole hearted approval of the magnificent advance made by the people of China towards the attainment of national freedom and in pursuit of the principle of self-determination. Congress warmly appreciates the valuable work that has been done by the Trade Union and the Peasants' Organisations, which under the leadership of Kuomintang have frustrated the aggressive designs of the United Imperialistic Powers. Congress while pledging its full support to the movement of liberation in China, expresses its firm conviction that the cause of Indian Nationalism and the struggle of the working classes against exploitation should profit from the example of solidarity of the Nationalist movement and the workers' and peasants' organisations as set by China.

(b) This Congress vehemently protects against the action of the Indian Government in furthering the aims of Imperialism by sending Indian troops to China and calls upon the Government of India to recall all such troops.

#### INTERNATIONAL UNITY.

4. This Congress views with approval the efforts which

have been made by the Anglo-Russian Unity Committee to bring about unity between the International Federation of Trade Unions and Red International of Labour Unions and expresses a hope that the International Unity will soon be achieved and regrets its inability to consider joining the International movement till such unity is achieved.

#### RESOLUTION AGAINST IMPERIALISM.

5. (a) This Congress looks upon Imperialism as a form of capitalist class government intended to facilitate and perpetuate the exploitation of all workers, both white and coloured, in the interests of the small ruling classes, and declares that the only safeguard against exploitation lies in the creation by the working class of a corresponding measure of unity and solidarity.

(b) Congress therefore expresses its willingness and desire to bring about the greatest possible solidarity and co-ordinated activity on the part of the Trade Unions throughout the British Empire, in order to counteract the ruthless exploitation carried on under the aegis of British Imperialism.

#### SOUTH AFRICA.

6. This Congress sincerely thanks the Trade Union..... Congress of South Africa for giving a hearing to Mr. C. F. Andrews, who was requested to place before it the grievances of Indian Workers in South Africa, and also thanks the Trade Union Congress of South Africa for agreeing to have a conference with the representatives of the All-India Trade Union Congress, but is of opinion that as a result of the settlement arrived at by the Round Table Conference arranged by the Governments of the two countries, such conference is not now necessary. However this Congress hopes that the South Africa Trade Union Congress and Labour Party will support and initiate measures for the organisation and uplift of the Indian Workers in South Africa and instructs the General Secretary to remain in communication with the authorities of the Labour organisations in South Africa.

#### LABOUR REPRESENTATION IN LEGISLATURE.

7. This Congress protests against the failure of the Government of India to give effect to the scheme placed before them last year by the All-India Trade Union Congress for Labour Representation in the Central and Provincial Legislatures though the demand was modest, tentative and far short of the real requirements of the workers in the country.

#### GENERAL LABOUR DEMANDS.

8. This Congress is of opinion that legislation shall immediately be passed providing for all workers working in

factories, mines, —tea, coffee and rubber plantations and in all other organised Trades and Industries.

1. Adult Franchise. Free
2. An eight hours' day
3. Machinery for fixing minimum wages.
4. Sickness and unemployment insurance.
5. Old age pensions and pensions for widows and orphans.
6. Maternity Benefits.
7. Weekly payment of wages.

#### FINES.

9. This Congress reaffirms its old resolutions—protesting against the system of fines prevailing in industrial and commercial firms and railways and request the Government of India to pass legislations making illegal all agreements between the employees and the employer enabling the employers to make deductions on account of fines from the wages or salaries of the employed.

#### PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT BUREAUS.

10. Realising that every adult worker has a right to work and in view of the fact that there is at present widespread unemployment in the country, this Congress urges upon the Government of India to take as the first step the . . . . . immediate establishment of public free employment bureaus in all industrial and commercial towns-

#### MENIALS IN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT.

11. This Congress is of opinion that the workers styled and ranked as menials, employed by Government, Municipalities and other local bodies and by railways, should be given the same privileges as are enjoyed by the ministerial staff with regard to leave, pension, provident fund, gratuity, etc.

#### WOMEN INSPECTORS.

12. This Congress is strongly of opinion that more qualified Indian Women should be employed in the staff for Factory Inspection in all the Provinces of the country

#### RAILWAY MENS' GRIEVANCES.

13. (a) This Congress expresses its deep regret at the unwillingness of the Government of India to carry out the resolution passed by the Legislative Assembly without division on the 5th of

February 1925 for an enquiry into the grievances of the Railway Subordinate employees, at the attitude adopted by the Honourable Member for Commerce and Railways towards appeals preferred by aggrieved Railway Employees, ignoring the fundamental Rules and principles laid down for the protection of public Servants against unjust treatment by Officials of Government or agency companies working State Railways on behalf of the Government of India urges the Legislative Assembly to insist upon the enquiry being made publicly.

(b) This Congress re-affirms Resolution No. 23 of the Trade Union Congress of 1925, and urges upon the Government of India to amend the Indian Railway Act by inserting provisions for the Constitution in India of a Central wages Board for setting disputes concerning wages and conditions of service and for making it obligatory on Railway Administrations to establish Joint Industrial Councils on the lines of the English Railways Act of 1921, Part iv, with modifications to suit Indian conditions.

14. (a) This Congress re-affirms resolution No iv of the First All-India Railway Men's Conference that the daily rate system be substituted by a monthly rate system of pay in the Railway Workshops with all the privileges of the regular staff and all Railway men to work 208 hours which should constitute a month except for clerical staff whose total number working hours should be only 145, Gazetted holidays being reckoned as working hours in the month in which they fall.

(b) This Congress is further of opinion that the work done over and above this should be paid at  $1\frac{1}{2}$  (one and a half times between six and eighteen hours at double the rates of pay drawn by men between sunset and sunrise and gazetted holidays.

15. This Congress regrets to state that notwithstanding the declarations made by the Government of India from time to time regarding the removal of racial discrimination, differentiations are still being practically made in matters of.....appointments, pay, leave, housing, etc., and Indians are.....not appointed generally to certain higher posts even in the subordinate grades, and this Congress, therefore, urges.....upon the Government of India to direct all the Railway Administrations to remove in actual practice all discriminations which have been abolished in theory.

16. This Congress urges the Government of India to insist upon the companies working the State Railways to follow the State Railway Rules and practices relating to matters concerning the Railway Servants. Any failure on the part of the said companies to observe the said conditions should be regarded as mismanagement of the state property and should be forthwith determined.

This Congress observes that the Government of India possess ample powers over the working of such companies, as the Government Director sitting on the Boards of the Directors of the Companies has the power of *Veto* in all proceedings of the Board, besides the general supervision and control exercised by the Government on the Companies.

17. This Congress requests the Railway Board to give in the annual Administration Report, the same statistics relating to Railway servants in receipt of salaries between Rs. 100/- and Rs. 249/- per mensem, as are given for the servants in receipt of salaries of Rs. 250/- per mensem and over.

18. This Congress strongly condemns the practice of Indian Railways employing contractors who levy a fee from porters licensed to handle passengers' luggage at stations and recommends direct enlistment and control of such porters by the Railway Administration without levying any fee from the porters as such fees inflicted hardships upon the porters and the public.

19. This Congress urges upon the Agent of the East Indian Railway to publish the report of the Railway Officer deputed by Mr. Legge, the late Agent of the East Indian Railway to investigate the grievances of licensed porters' at Howrah station and to place it before the East Indian Railway Local Advisory Committee.

#### **Seamen's Grievances.**

20. This Congress while disapproving of the action of the Government of India in not enforcing the recommendations of the seamen's Recruitment Committee by introducing a bill for amending the Indian Merchant Shipping Act in the Legislative Assembly, strongly urges upon the Government of India to introduce the same in the next Session of the Indian Legislature without any further delay.

21. This Congress strongly urges upon the Government of India the necessity of setting up Advisory Committees along with the establishment of the seamen's Recruitment Bureau as recommended by the majority of the members of the seamen's Recruitment Committee on the lines of the Genoa International Labour Conference.

22. (a) This Congress urges on the Government to legislate for eight hours work for Seamen employed in Inland Navigable Rivers on the lines recommended by the Genoa International Labour Conference of 1920, in consultation with the organisations of ship-owners and Seamen.

(b) This Congress while disapproving of the action of the A. O. N. and R. S. N. Companies of Bengal in compelling their employees engaged on steamers, launches ect., to work for 12

hours per day and 16 hours when the steamers are on stop, strongly urges upon them, the necessity of introducing at an early date the system of 8 hours work per day, or, in the alternative, to pay extra wages for overtime work.

23. This Congress urges upon the I. C. N. and R. S. N. Companies (a) to grant holidays allowable under the Negotiable Instruments Act to their employees engaged on steamers, launches, etc., like the Railway Employees and (b) to make proper accommodation for their employees in steamers.

#### *Jute Industry.*

24. This Congress urges upon the Indian Jute Mills Associations or the Municipal Boards in the areas to acquire the Bustees in the Jute Mill area described by Mr. Thomas, M. P. as "Vile, filthy, disease hidden hovels and foul heaps of pestilence" and build sanitary dwellings for housing Jute Mill Labour.

25. The Trade Union Congress urges on the owners of Jute Mills to revise the scandalously low wages averaging Rs. 15/- per month paid to the workes of Jute Industry which has been paying an average dividend of ninety percent for the last ten years.

#### *Mining*

26. This Congress deplores the practice of the employment of women underground and requests the Government to prohibit it immediately.

27. This Congress urges that sundays be observed as full holidays and rules for granting leave on full pay be made for all mines in India.

#### *Shift in Mines*

28. This Congress welcomes the legislation introduced by the Government of India in the Legislative Assembly introducing shift system in Indian Mines, but is of opinion that no shift of a period longer than eight hours shall be permitted.

#### *Telegraph Peons*

29. This Congress calls upon the Government to give immediate effect to the demands of Telegraph peons as made at the last Annual meeting of the All-India Telegraph Workers' Union.

#### *Press Employees' Association*

30. This Congress is deliberately of opinion that conditions under which the piece system is worked in all Government and other presses are inequitious complex, and opposed to the principles of justice and humanity and therefore urges the immediately



abolition of the system or bring it into lines with the system prevailing in Britain.

31. The Congress deplores the insanitary conditions under which most of the press employees in Calcutta and other large cities have to work and urges upon the Government to adopt remedial measures.

32. The Congress considers that the salaries of the press employees all over India are inordinately low and urges upon the employees to grant them a living wage.

33. In view of the universal opposition to the piece system as at present obtains in this country, this congress views with apprehension the steps that are being taken by the authorities of the E. I. R. Press to convert a large number of their salaried workers into piece workers and invites the attention of the Honourable Member in charge respectively of the Railways and of Industries and Labour with a view to stop the extension of the system which is worked in India on the basis of maximum labour for minimum wages.

#### *Provident Fund*

34. This Congress while welcoming the recent order of the Administrations to accept menials drawing—up to Rs. 30/- per month and over to the provident Fund requests that all menials irrespective of pay be allowed the option of joining the provident Fund.

#### *Workmen's Compensation.*

35. This Congress is of opinion that the rates of compensation provided under the workers' compensation Act are inadequate and suggests that the Act be immediately amended to bring it into lines with the British legislation.

#### *Total Prohibition*

36. That this Congress urges Government of India and provincial Governments to take immediate step to reach the goal of total prohibition at an early date in as much as the liquor traffic has considerably affected the general welfare of the working classes in India.

#### *Resolution on Organisation*

37. This Congress deplores the tendency in the Trade Union movement towards the creation and maintenance of small and overlapping Unions with its results in inter-Union Rivalry, unnecessary dissipation of energy, and reduction of the strength of the workers in negotiations with the employers.

38. Congress therefore declares in favour of the development of the Trade Unions on Industrial lines in the direction of one National Federation for each industry, and hereby resolves to appoint a thoroughly representative Committee which shall formulate detailed plans whereby the existing local and sectional unions shall be amalgamated into national industrial organisations. This Committee shall have power to co-opt accredited representatives of Unions not affiliated to the Congress.

#### **APPOINTMENT OF THE NEGOTIATIONS COMMITTEE.**

39. The Congress appoints a Negotiations Committee—National and International—consisting of the following members:—

- (1) Lala Lajpat Rai
- (2) Mr. Jewharlal Nehru
- (3) Mr. T. C. Goewami
- (4) Mr. N.M. Joshi
- (5) Mr. D. Chaman Lal
- (6) Mr. D.R. Thengdi
- (7) Mr. B.F. Bharucha, and
- (8) Mr. K. N. Joglekar

The Committee shall not take any action without the sanction of the Executive Council of the Congress.

#### **Workers' Welfare League of India.**

40. This Congress appoints the Workers' Welfare League of India as the Agents of the All-India Trade Union Congress in Britain for the supply and distribution of information regarding the Trade Union Congress within the limits of the resolutions of the Trade Union Congress.

#### **Change in the Constitution.**

41. The Congress resolves that the following clauses (d) and (e) be inserted in Rule 4:—

- (d) That applications for affiliation of Unions shall be forwarded through the Provincial Committees to the General Secretary, with the decisions arrived at by it; that no applications for affiliation shall be withheld by the Provincial Committee.
- (e) That no Union shall be affiliated to the Congress without being first affiliated to the Provincial Committee. That no Union shall be affiliated which has not been in existence at least for one year and has not had its accounts and statement of paying members audited by a qualified auditor or an authorised Representative of the All-India Trade Union Congress.

42. Add at the end of Rule 3.

“And such other officers as the Trade Union Congress thinks it necessary to appoint from time to time”.

43. In Rule No. 17, in place of the word Provincial Secy: substitute the word, “Provincial Committee”.

44. (a) Rule No. 26. For the words, “Representatives of the Unions or.....Branches”, substitute the words “Representatives of affiliated Unions or Branches of affiliated Unions”.

(b) Omit the last sentence in Rule No. 26.

#### **Election of Office-bearers**

This Congress resolves that the following be elected as office-bearers for the year 1927:—

President:—Mr. Dewan Chamanlal

Vice-President:—Mr. Ernest Kirk

do. Mr. Mrinal Kanti Bose

General Secretary:—Mr. N.M. Joshi

Administrative Secretary:—Mr. D.R. Thengdi

Assistant Secretaries:—(1) Mr. R.R. Bakhale

(2) Mr. S.V. Ghate

Treasurer:—Mr. F. J. Ginwala

Auditors:—Messrs Gharda Davar & Co.

#### **Appointment of Provincial Organisers.**

46. This Congress resolves that the following persons be appointed as Provincial Organisers:—

Bombay	.. Mr. S.H. Jhabwala
Madras	.. (1) Mr. E. L. Iyer (2) Mr. B. Shiva Rao
Central Provinces	... Mr. R.S. Ruikar
Bengal	... Mr. Kishori Lal Ghose
Punjab	... Mr. Ram Chandra
Assam	... Mr. T. R. Pookhan
Sind	... Mr. Naranji Anandji
Bihar	... Mr. P.C. Bose
United Provinces	... Mr. Ramzan Ali
All-India Worker's Organiser	... Mrs. Santosh Kumari Gupta.

## P 1163.

3 Issues of the Newspaper "Spark" in English of the following dates:—

10-3-29.

17-3-29.

17-2-29. (3 copies).

## P. 1164.

A file having the cuttings of the article "A B C of Communism" in Marathi pasted in it. The cuttings appear to have been taken from the Marathi newspaper "Kranti."

---

## P. 1165.

### THE PROBLEMS OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

The Statesmen of the leading countries, which were involved in the catastrophic conflict of 1914-18, have not yet settled their account as regards the responsibility for the war. The effort to shake off that criminal responsibility on the shoulder of others has not been convincing, on either side. The dictated peace treaty of Versailles lays the responsibility at Germany's door. But this legal responsibility depends upon the legal validity of that international diplomatic instrument. Today the impracticability of the Versailles Treaty is generally admitted, in deed, if not in words. It formally concluded the war, but did not - could not - solve the contradictions of the modern world that led to the war. Consequently, when the death and destruction caused by the war still defy reparation, the contradictions of capitalist civilisation again raise their hydra-head. The Versailles treaty becomes a mere scrap of paper, no more venerable than many other diplomatic instruments.

The hair-splitting bickering over the responsibility for the past is brushed aside by the all-consuming anxiety for the problems of the future - indeed of the present.

The statesmen with guilty conscience could not settle the contentious question about the responsibility for the war; but history has given her verdict. And it is this objective judgement that will be abiding. None of the belligerent states was more responsible than the others for setting the world on fire. All of them were equally responsible. They plunged headlong into the maelstrom by virtue of their very existence. The war was the result of the ruthless rivalry among imperialist states for the domination of the world. Race for the world market - scramble for colonies - led inevitably to the fierce clash of arms.

The fact that these root-causes of the war are again operating upon the world situation in ever-increasing degrees, proves that the conclusion of the war was but an armed truce, and the Treaty of Versailles is but a scrap of paper. The war caused by imperialist rivalries, of course, could not solve the problems of imperialism; but it seriously undermined the basis of imperialism and involved it into new contradictions more inextricable than the previous ones. This is particularly true in the case of Great Britain—the classical type of imperialist state. An examination of the post-war problems of the British Empire is, therefore, the correct approach to the situation of the contemporary world.

The chronic industrial depression in the old "workshop of the world" is a phenomenon of historic importance comparable only to the Roman Empire in decay. Year after year, the rulers of the country, political and economic, deplored the depression, but with cheerful optimism held out the hope of coming recovery. The year 1928 was heralded as the turning point. This optimism was based upon the slight improvement noticeable in the beginning of the year. But the new year began with high hopes dashed to the ground, the leaders of imperialist Britain proving false prophets.

Traditionally, the pronouncements made by the heads of the big banks in the beginning of the year, are taken as indicating general line of development. In the last successive years of obstinate depression the new year's message of the mentors of Britain's economic destiny, in spite of everything, was toned to the tune of subdued optimism - pointing out the silver lining of the black cloud. This year, they without exception, spoke a different language. Hardly any hope was held out, all practically endorsing the finding of the Liberal Industrial Enquiry of the last year, "We cannot be sure that our staple trades will revive to their old dimensions." This remarkably pessimistic tone of the men, who

still hold in their hand a considerable portion of the world's purse-string, certainly does not mean admission of defeat - declaration of the failure of capitalist economy to reconstruct itself. This was the swan-song of the old conservative lady of the Threadneedle Street. With this tone of pessimism regarding the "normal recovery" of trade, the British bankers break away from their traditional policy of financing industry through loan and debenture capital, and adopt the more modern method of direct control. The reluctance on the part of the banks to discard the old method of operation in favour of the was been largely responsible for the inability of the oldest and most depressed British industry, namely cotton textile, to rationalise production. The fateful change has at last come. The bankers struck the note of pessimism, in order to prepare the numerous army of middle class bond-holders - the bed-rock of British conservatism for what is coming. The new operation of the banks as monopolist finance capital will ruin the small bond-holders whose particularist interests and conservative outlook today are a dead-weight upon industry. The basic principle of the financial reconstruction of the depressed industries - not only cotton, but iron, steel and coal also - is the transference to the banks of large blocks of shares in liquidation of past loans and in payment for further financial assistance. By heavily cutting down the nominal capital of a concern, its shares are transferred to the banks at a small fraction of their price. Virtually, this is expropriation of the middle class by finance capital.

This change in the operation of finance in industry is a fateful event in Britain, for, its result will be much more far-reaching than the ruin of the small-owners and bond-holders. This change will further weaken the already undermined basis of the Empire. Ownership of capital invested abroad is the corner-stone of the imperialist structure. To maintain and increase this ownership, therefore, is the principle which determine the operation of British finance. Owing to the fact that the small group of islands on the western outskirts of the European continent, was for decades the industrial centre of a world-wide empire in varying grades of industrial backwardness, the operation of British banking assumed forms different from the continental. The monopolist control of industries by finance capital was not similar as in the United States or Germany. It was exercised through overseas investments which opened up markets for the products of home industry. The war wiped up a very considerable portion of British foreign investment. This was partly repaired by heavy export of capital during the short period of post-war boom. In the following years of stagnation and decline, Britain was very hard put to it to maintain her already reduced share of the ownership of capital abroad. This she could do by starving home industries - by delaying the reconstruction of her productive apparatus so as to meet the new conditions of competition in the world market. While Germany and other

continental countries were "rationalising" their industries on the basis of inflated currency, Britain, in order to maintain her threatened ownership of capital abroad, had to deflate. The premature ( from the point of view of industry and trade ) return to gold-standard was a great obstacle to industrial recovery.

The belated agreement of the banks to undertake financial reorganization of industries indicates deviation from the traditional policy of imperialist finance. But this deviation again is not of choice; it is a forced move. The Empire was built on capital exported in over-increasing volume. The exportable surplus was the result of capital accumulated in the industries at home. So after all, the stability of the empire cannot be maintained while the basic industries in Britain wither and decay. Hence the necessity for British finance to deviate from the old channel of operation to a new one. The fatefulness of this deviation lies in that it will increase Britain's inability to maintain her already depleted share of the ownership of capital abroad.

Some basic facts about the economic position of Britain explain the difficulty of the situation she finds herself in. First, let us quote briefly from the new year's pronouncements of the leading bankers.

"It is a matter of grave concern that in any survey of the trade of the country during the past year the picture should be overshadowed by the cloud of depression which still hangs over our great basic industries." ( Sir Harry Goschen, Chairman, National Provincial Bank )

"The year which has elapsed since I last addressed you has been disappointing in many respects. The difficulties in respect of our basic industries have proved very stubborn . . . . . Ours is the only country which has suffered marked diminution in output since 1913, arising almost entirely from the lessened demand iron abroad and from our own iron and steel industries."

( R. H. Tennant, Westminster Bank )

"The four great industries chiefly affected are those of iron and steel, coal, textile and agriculture. . . . . I confess I do not see any speedy method of improving the position. I am much afraid that the process will be painful and slow." ( J. Beaumont Pease, Lloyds Bank )

"The country has lost much of the cheaper trade, and its once-vaunted safe-guards of climate and skill are no longer invulnerable. . . . . The recital of the course of trade in 1928 is gloomy reading. It has undoubtedly been a bad year. . . . . Our post war

trade depression cannot be judged or dealt with on the lines of pre-war depression, for the war has changed the world and our place in the world is no longer such that trade will come back of itself even if we produce the best goods." (Holland-Martin, Martins Bank. Liverpool)

These are authoritative pronouncements made with expert and intimate knowledge of the situation. At last it is admitted that the present depression is not a "normal" passing crisis of capitalist production, but a lasting phenomenon demanding radical readjustments. The secret of the situation is the fact that imperialist rivalry for market and colony (not in the limited territorial sense, but in the wider sense of financial domination) has become much greater than before the war. While the productive capacity of the world has increased tremendously, and most of the leading industrial countries actually produce more than before the war, the world market has been contracted. There are many reasons for this contraction. The present crisis is not a normal passing crisis, because it is a crisis of potential over-production and (in some cases) actual under production at the same time. The difficulty of Britain is that while she is steadily losing ground in the world market, the reconstruction of her industries necessarily imply further reduction of production. Take for example the cotton textile trade:

The export of this commodity, which for a long time constituted a very considerable portion of British export trade, is now approximately 65 per cent of the pre-war amount. Britain has lost her monopoly of the Eastern market. The rationalisation of Lancashire industry does not include a plan to recapture the lost market, but to cut down production still more. Only on this condition the industry can be saved from complete bankruptcy. This loss accruing from the decay of the industry at home could be compensated in only one way: by the investment of British capital in the industry of the new countries that have appeared on the world market with greater competitive power. But precisely in consequence of the industrial decay at home and the decline of foreign trade, Britain's ability to export capital is seriously affected. A country exports capital when its accumulation exceeds the limits of profitable investment at home. So, the problem of the British Empire today is the problem of the accumulation of capital at home. The disagreeable fact of the situation is that the present national savings of Britain hardly leave any exportable surplus, if the capital requirements of the home industry are fully met. The rationalisation of production was so long delayed, among other facts, by this contradiction. Now that the process of rationalisation has at last begun, it does not relieve the situation. On the contrary, it sharpens the contradiction. In the past British foreign trade expanded on the basis of capital export. At present the lower level of foreign trade can be maintained also by continuing



the export of capital. For, otherwise, countries with exportable capital will further encroach upon the market by extending credit. This is evidenced by the heavy decline of British trade in Canada. Britain still owns a considerable portion of the capital invested in that country; but in proportion as she cannot keep pace with the penetration of American capital she loses her ground, in spite of the vast capital she exported there in the past.

The employment of the larger portion of her declined national saving for the reconstruction of home industries will, therefore, still weaken Britain's position as an imperialist power. A top heavy parasitic imperial structure until now hindered the reconstruction of the home industry; and now the attempt to stabilise the basis will dangerously shake the super-structure. The problem of the British Empire is to be found in this contradiction.

Now let us illustrate this contradiction with facts. The victory in the Napoleonic War marks the rise of Britain as a modern imperialist power. It is true before that time through monopolist trading companies Britain had acquired extensive colonial possessions. But the British bourgeoisie as a whole were at that time averse to colonial expansion, because capitalist development had not yet over-grown national limits. Foreign trade was governed by mercantilist interests, and colonial conquest was sheer plunder aiding accumulation of capital through violent means. Treasure robbed from the Spanish conquerors of South and Central America, as well as from India was a great impetus to the industrial revolution in Britain. The booty from America and India enabled England to free her economic life from the control of Dutch financiers. Towards the end of the eighteenth century Britain paid over a million pounds a year as interest on capital borrowed from Amsterdam. The French aristocracy invested in British Government Bonds what they could save from the Revolution. According to Adam Smith, in the beginning of the nineteenth century 18 million pounds of the British National Debt were held by foreigners. The situation had changed already in 1817 from which year foreign borrowers appeared on the London market. London had taken the place of Amsterdam, ruined by the Napoleonic Wars. After Waterloo British capital began to flow into the continental countries, devastated by the wars. In 1860 Britain had 750 million pounds invested abroad. She had become an imperialist country in the modern sense of the term.

During the latter decades of the nineteenth century the export of capital from Britain increased rapidly in volume. In the beginning of the new century Great Britain owned no less than 2,000 million pounds of capital invested in her own colonies and foreign countries. But still the greater part of her national savings was absorbed in the country. Imperialism had not yet become a top-heavy parasitic

structure. In 1903 British imperialism entered a new stage of development. Since then, till the World War, a larger and larger portion of capital accumulated in Britain could not find a sufficiently profitable employment at home, and, therefore, had to be sent abroad. In the meantime, other countries had reached similar state. France and Germany had become capital-exporting countries. The result was the fierce scramble for colonies. The imperialist powers plunged the world into the bloody holocaust of 1914-18, because they had no place to keep their money. The clash of gold resulted into the clash of steel.

The war, however, did not solve the problems that had caused it. On the contrary, it revealed more glaringly than ever that they cannot be solved. As far as England is concerned, as result of the war she is pushed back to a position similar to that she occupied previous to 1903:—to day, by far the greater part of her national savings are needed by the home industry. The margin left for export is very narrow. But this similarity is only superficial. Before 1903, the greater part of capital accumulated in Britain was absorbed in the country to lay and broaden the foundation on which the imperial super-structure was subsequently reared. Now also the greater part of the new capital must be kept at home, but the result will be entirely different. In the present world conditions inability to export capital in sufficient amount will seriously prejudice the stability of the super-structure. Empire no longer serves the purpose of the home industry. Its parasitic existence can be maintained by eating into the vitals of the home industry—which after all is its foundation. So the existence of the Empire is as anomalous as that of a tree living at the expense of its roots. No example of parasitism can be more classical.

On the background of this gloomy picture there is much controversy about the actual state of Britain's national saving, and the amount of capital available for investment at home and abroad. The most optimistic and generally accepted estimate is approximately 475 million pounds a year, which, calculated in real value, represents a fall of over 30 per cent from the 1913 level. This estimate of the Colwyn Committee has lately been corroborated by the report of the industrial census of 1924. On the basis of this rate of national saving no more than 100 million pounds can be actually available as *new capital* both for home and foreign investment. (Calculation of the Liberal Industrial Enquiry also of the Colwyn Committee appointed by the Conservative government). There are authorities who place the figure much lower. For example the president of the National Savings Committee, Sir, R. Kindersley, believes that the actual amount of new capital did not exceed 60 million pounds in 1927.

For the complicatedness of the subject, considerable margin should be left for the accuracy of the estimate, one way or the other. Nevertheless, the general picture does not change materially. The two basic facts are: 1. capital accumulates at a lower rate; and 2. by far the larger portion of this reduced new capital is required at home. The consequence is evident: exportable surplus of capital is less than before the war. And as the Empire was built on the export of capital, the operation of these two basic facts of the situation is highly dangerous- disruptive.

For years, parasitic imperialist finance obstructed the reconstruction of the British industry. From all sides came the cry- "banks are starving the industry." The policy of return to gold standard, dictated by banks holding extensive foreign investments, was introduced and maintained in the face of powerful opposition from industrial and commercial interests. Nevertheless the logic of the situation was inexorable. New capital was absorbed at home at ever-increasing rate, and the outward flow relaxed. The ratio of home and foreign investments in 1928 was 70:30 in contrast to 20:80 in 1913. When we remember that in 1928 the international balance-sheet was made to show a credit of about 100 million pounds in Britain's favour, while in the previous year it showed an actual debit, it becomes clear that the situation actually is worse than it is represented by this ratio. An examination of production and trade in the intervening period does not show any basis for this unexpected credit in 1928. So it is evident that in order to show that she is not "living on her capital," Britain must have adopted the policy of "borrowing short to lend long." Whatever it may be, in both cases the result is the same-Britain's share in the actual ownership of capital abroad is declining. This is decisive for the future of the Empire.

Production is the basic denominator of the situation. In spite of the activity towards the end of the year, in 1928 the index fell below the level of the previous year, being 80 compared to 1913. The index of production per capital is still worse- 84 per cent. So, after a short upward curb violently disturbed by the General Strike of 1926, the line of prosperity, rather of depression, has sunk back to the level of 1925 which year furnished the data for the investigation of the Colwyn Committee. In other words, today as during the last several years new capital for investment, home and abroad available in Britain is hardly more than 100 million pounds, which represents the minimum needed by home industries "if we are to employ our population, not at full stretch, yet reasonably well," (J. M. Keynes). That is, Britain has no capital to export, and the income from her previous investments abroad is barely sufficient to cover the adverse balance of her merchandise trade.

Yet, we find foreign issues in London growing steadily from 88 million in 1925 to 112 in 1926 and 139 in 1927. It is interesting

to note that in 1928 the amount fell to 102, although the year as a whole was no worse than the previous. Evidently, the dangerous effect of this fictitious foreign issues has been felt, and it was necessary to call a halt.

An examination of Britain's international balance sheet reveals the fictitious nature of the foreign issues during the last years. Counting the visible and invisible items the net balance in favour of Britain was 44 million pounds in 1925, 2 in 1926, and 96 in 1927. Last year shows a passive balance of 228 million pounds on the merchandise account. Counting that the income on the invisible items will be the same as in the previous year, the net surplus for 1928 becomes 155 millions. That is, the margin for foreign investment is greater still, actual investment was less. This is an attempt to bring things within the limits of reality, as is illustrated by the following table.

	Net surplus available for investment.	Actual Foreign Issues.	Balance
	(In millions of pounds)		
1925	4	88	-44
1926	2	112	-110
1927	96	139	43
1928	155	102	+53

In 1924 the balance was also passive. So after four years, the foreign issues in London are covered by Britain's exportable surplus of capital. The foreign issues in London exceeding the limits of the next exportable surplus represented a corresponding decline in Britain's ownership of capital abroad. For, these transactions meant transfer of foreign securities held in London to other centres of world finance, mainly New York. Britain was forced to forego an increasing portion of her ownership of capital abroad, in order to maintain international credit which is essential for a country depending so largely on foreign trade. Besides, it is equally essential for Britain's position in the world economy that the exchange value of the pound sterling should not go down. For in that case, London would lose entirely her control of international finance.

In 1928 the position improved slightly; but the improvement is only apparent. The adverse balance of merchandise trade was only 34 million pounds less than in the previous year, which does not cover the portion of capital actually exported from Britain. Then, there is much book-keeping jugglery in the international balance-sheets of the last years. In 1926, the net surplus in favour of Britain sunk to the vanishing point. The next year it was

suddenly brought up to 96 million, although there had been no improvement in trade. The favourable balance was maintained last year, and it is on the basis of this mysteriously manufactured favourable balance that the improvement as regards foreign investment takes place. Whence does this favourable balance suddenly appear? Evidently, the reserves of imperial finance are tapped. This, in its turn, will produce, indeed already produces, disruptive results upon Britain's relation with her colonies. So it is a veritable *cul de sac*. Every effort made to get out of the impasse creates a set of new difficulties, which cumulate threatening to overwhelm the giant.

The empire was built on gigantic expansion of industry at home, huge accumulation of capital resulting therefrom and monopoly of trade created by the export of capital. All these pillars on which the imperial structure was reared are seriously undermined. The plan of rationalising industry will be realised by accepting the present state of depression as permanent. British capitalist economy has decided to settle down on the basis of a limited production. But that is the anti-theses of the empire which was the result of expansion of industry and trade.

Another way out of the impasse is sought in "empire development." But the obstacles to the successful realisation of this scheme are almost insuperable. Development of the colonies in such a sufficiently rapid tempo as might relieve the situation of the empire, requires as its condition large supply of capital which Britain is not in a position to provide. Then, the disruptive forces, which such development is sure to generate, will render the expected benefit for the empire of doubtful value. In any case, the scheme, remains a scheme. The Liberal Industrial Enquiry Committee gives the reason for it. "The problem of imperial development has been rendered far more acute by the very economic difficulties which make it at this moment doubly urgent and important." Here the problem of the British empire is put in a nut-shell.

P. 1166.

A book in German entitled

**“GRUNDSATZE DES KOMMUNISMUS”**

BY

**FRIEDRICH ENGELS.**

---

P. 1167.

A book in English entitled

**“Thomes Spence and his Connections”**

BY

***Olive D. Rudkin.***

---

P. 1168.

A correspondence pad bearing the name of G. Adhikari. The top page is divided into 7 parts, each part containing a label with the words :—

- (1) Spark.
  - (2) Correspondent vach Ansser hall.
  - (3) Partei-Organ.
  - (4) Ubusetzuigan and Propaganda—Schriften.
  - (5) Die Agrar—Frage.
  - (6) Agit—Prop.
  - (7) Die Geweruschafte Bewegung.
-

## P. 1169.

A letter in **GERMAN** dated Bombay 18th February 1928 addressed to one Liebe Genossen. Both the original typed and its carbon copy are together. The words "Propaganda in colonies and semi colonies," "Imperialism," "Proletariat," "Revolution" &c. show that the subject matter must be Communism.

## P. 1170.

### Technical Mistakes made by the Party.

- 1) Individualism in leadership—(Party did not function as such).
- 2) On the executive no Muslim members—Union appears a Hindu body.
- 3) No def. lead was given (up till Tuesday) *2 Handbills.*
- 4) Criticism of individual members hesitating to execute the decisions of the *Party* (Jogleker).
  - a) (Friday 8.)—Party men did not insist on the workers clearly enough to resume work.

.... B. Petit  
(Spring Mill, Maneckji Petit) closed again.  
round Wadi....Saturday 9.

- b) Failure of ind. members (11th....) going to the mills & asking the workers to go to work (30 mills working).
- c) Panic striken and of the Party members ....

*Ghate*

*Nimbkar & Dange*

- d) Party member not striking to their usual union work.

→ { Lalbaug Cen. uncared for  
Mirajkar. }

→ { Ferguson Rd. Centre  
Nimbkar. }

→ { Delisle Rd.  
Joglekar—Kasle }

- 5) { Party members showed a def. Hudoo bias (Bradley)  
 (Throughout the whole situation) witness Handbills  
 questions of arming  
 the workers.
- 6) P. Members not taking the Party decisions seriously  
 (Br. ).
- 7) Weakness of the factory Committees.
- 8) Isolating certain areas... neglecting those areas.  
**Bradley.**

Irrespective of kidnapping the Duty of the Union was  
 to ask the worker, 1) not to assault Pathans } Pathans-  
 2) to go to work } workers.

*Working elements predominate among Pathans.*

**Dange**

Saturday:— Rumour ... in Bhendi-bazaar.

Sunday:—

**Monday morning** :— Workers wanting to come out. *Dange*  
 on spot.....D. P. Mill out.....Ruvade Tank Bunder.....Fazal  
 Bhoy workers out.....Pathan being assaulted.....Pathan rescued  
 .....Meeting at Gokhale Maidan announced.....Situation changed.

G. I. P. workers out.....Pathan outing a lake.....Pathan  
 assaulted. rescued by a Parsi.....Choissy Mill.....G. I. P. workers  
 demand the Pathan.....(Dange on spot). A father claims that the  
 Pathan had been kidnapping. False scare of Armed Police to dis-  
 perse the crowd.

The meeting at Gokhale Maidan.....Pathan Chawl bordering  
 the Maidan.....stone thrown at Pathan by the workers.....50  
 Pathans came out and start stoning.....This gave the impression  
 to the Pathans that the union workers mean to attack them.....

**2 O'Clock.** Pathans *had* prepared to attack the unions... ..  
 Volunteers to defend the Union.....Workers pour in to attend the  
 meeting... ..Pathans again apprehend attack.....attack the workers.

**5 O'Clock.** Volunteers attack the Pathan Chawl.....Sewree  
 men called... ..Delisle Road workers called.....Concentration of the  
 workers.....1) to attend the meeting

2) to defend the Union office (on the false Rumour).

**Was it expedient to ask the Workers to defend the Office  
 against the Pathans?**

*Dange* :—Yes.



*Usmani*:—No.

*Giving a definite lead means foreseeing* the trouble and forewarn the workers against its developing in communal warfare. Against arming with lathis, concentration in streets, assaults on the Pathans,.....and definitely asking to go work. (A)

*One could not foresee the development* (Dange)

*Sewree incident* could have made these anticipation possible  
{ Sewru Pathans were attacked by Muslim } Jcglekar  
{ and Hindoo workers }

In the beginning of the situation, the Pathans were being attacked by Muslims, Christians, Parsis. .... No foreseeing possible .... (Dange)

But this was talked on Monday and Tuesday. (Shoukat Ali's letter in this Herald.

*Shoukat Ali* was seen by Dange on Tuesday evening...Maidan

On Monday the Party could not foresee these developments. Our enemies could foresee this and exploit it (A) .... (D).

---

II. No Muslim on the Executive ... Union appears to be a Hindoo body.

*Nimbkar*:—Majority is Hindoos; other union mainly Moslem. ... remedy is *Comrade Usmani*.

*Deshpande* greater contact with Muslim workers.

---

III. Individualism in leadership (Party did not function as such). regarding. *Usmani*:—Monday, Volunteers attack. ....

---

IV: 8th, 9th } Negligence on the part of the members to go to  
11th } Mill area and to make propaganda about the  
resumption to work.

8-9th)... Handbills were distributed early in the morning at the Mill gates.

1) *Dange* accused of refusing to tell the W. to go to work (Joglekar).

2) ← did reluctantly .....(Bradley)  
(defatist attitude)

3) ← Kasle and others asked people (behind the back) not to go to work.

- 4) Unless we were able to assure protection to the workers it was not possible by any means.....organisation or otherwise.....to centralise the decisions of the Party.  
(Dange).

---

## P. 1171.

A note sheet having the following written on it :-

### DECISIONS.

- 1) To reorganise the Communist Party which is to be the basis of all Communist Work.
- 2) To organise the five departments  
(1) Trade Union (2) Peasant (3) Agit-Prop (4) Polit  
(5) Org.
- 3) To appoint a sub-Committee to submit a detailed plan of work, as regards the work of the 5 departments.
  - 1) S. V. Ghate
  - 2) Adhikari
  - 3) Usmani
  - 4) Khan

# P. 1172.

C. P. MEETING (group)

## AGENDA :

### *Why is it Necessary?*

- (1) Discussion on the immediate expediency of organising a *Communist Party* (for the present for Bombay)—Why is it necessary?
  - (a) What should be its relation with the existing W. P. P. ?
  - (b) How should one set about organising it.
- (1) Trade Union.
- (2) Peasant.
  - (Party organ) Literature
- (3) Agit. Prop (Party Train-) Departm.
  - (ing. )
- (4) Org.—Seretariat Centralisation.
- (5) Polit.— Taking part in Congress and other act.
  - (c) Mass membership—training the Vanguard.
  - (d) Regular discussion meetings open to the wide membership (in Marathi or) (in English.)
- (2) *The Volunteer Corps* should be rigidly organised, a sub-Committee to frame Rules, pledge and a educational ("party") course (printed) should not belong to one Trade Union but be a broad working class organisation.
- (3) *Mill-committees*: Sub-Committee to be at once appointed by the Managing Committee of the G. K. U. to define the duties, Rules of election, and dismissal.— Party training compulsory.

## P. 1173.

### AGENDA FOR A COMMUNIST GROUP MEETING.

#### (1) *The object of this Meeting.*

- (a) Introduction:—The danger of having W. P. P. only two possibilities petti-Bourgeois radical Nab.—or a real comm.—a strong Com. to lead the work of this middle-class org.
- (b) The Tasks of the Comm. Party at the present juncture.
  - (i) analysis of the situation today in India i. e. of the class forces.
    - (a) The princes and the feudal land lords and the vested interest of British Finance Capital.
    - (b) Nationalist Bourgeoisie 

{	(1) land-owing
	(2) Industrial Capital

  
It is anti-imperialist at this stage.  
  
The nature of their opposition, is qualified opp-“National-reformist opposition”-
  - (ii) Analysis of the world situation with reference to India and colonial countries.
  - (iii) The impending crisis and the probable grouping of forces in the world.
  - (iv) Our Tasks today in India.

---

## P. 1174.

March 15,

Dear freind,

Yours of Feb. 20. Received the followings things from you (1) Anti-Kuusinen thesis, (2) art. about National Congress, (3) about w. p. p. (4) German reconstruction, (5) Proletariat in national revolution. I am at present hard pressed for time and it is diffi-

cult also to get an opportunity to send any thing safely. All things you sent expect (5) have been looked thru by the police. I will try to send the data you want. The new Era is published in Madras, Egmore, Post box 752....Your warning is unfounded. He and another man from over there alone understand the necessity of having a disciplined and strong party. The Bombay group has achieved the following result. They have been successful in forming one of the biggest unions in the country. The men have tremendous enthusiasm. They are eager to learn and to act. But there is lot of feudal reaction among them which has not been sufficiently strongly combated by our comrades. Conditions in the group itself are anarchic. It is at present nothing more than left-wing Trade Unionism. The "Times" and "Englishmen" reports are exaggerated. Yes, the objective situation is rapidly developing. But the vanguard is a rearguard. Party-discipline!—? But where is the party?, "Individuals like feudal chieftians form the basis of leadership here" says my friend against whom you warn. He asked me to tell you that "your men" attacked him over there without reason. But the C.I. has cut his feet as well as yours. He has nothing against you. No body is here making any propaganda against you. In fact the question never arises. The party is a political nonentity at present. Want of organised and co-ordinated work. Want of propaganda among the petty-bourgeois intellectuals. Political and party education to the workers. Urdu paper is being edited by my friend. I write in the organ. Iskra is in other hands but we control it to a certain extent, if we could finance it we could get guaranteed control of English material. Hunger for these things in p. b. circle, we must work hard and quick—the crisis is ripening—Strong org is needed if are to lead. The should immediately if he is serious about work. Invaluable here. No job here—no time also for a job, must live any how. So let him come to work and hunger.

---

## P. 1175.

A book in English entitled  
"Leninism"

by

Joseph Stalin.

Translated from the Russian

by

Eden and Cedar Paul.

P. 1253.  
ON THE EVE OF THE CONGRESS.

BY

M. G. Desai.

For this years historic session of the National Congress, Charnock's old city on the Hoogly offers an appropriate setting. From this radiating centre British satraps from Clive to Curzon laboured to consolidate British power in the East. There is thus a poetic justification in the coincidence that India's representatives should be assembling here to come to a final and fateful decision on the question of Independence. Modern Calcutta is again symbolic of the fact that Britain is now entering on the final and frantic phase of capitalist-imperialism. Here the foreigner is not interested in merely importing foreign goods in the country but foreign capital itself and establish a second industrial base in the land on the strength of the cheap coolie labour and protected by national tariffs. At one end of the city these lords of finance have reared structures whose architectural magnificence fairly takes one's breath away. Except for the occasional jingle of the riksha driver, there is little to distinguish for instance between Calcutta's new Park street from say the regent street of London walking along which Bismark is said to have exclaimed "What a street to sack." But behind this flaunting facade of the palaces of the foreign plutocrats, there lies perhaps the most melancholy of human ant-heaps sinking deeper into misery. The pauperized lower-middle class of Bengal is rapidly taking to manual labour. Witness the number of Babu taxi-drivers a field so far monopolized by the Sikhs. The same is true of other trades and industries. At the same time to create increasing surplus value for the foreign masters the workers standards are being cruelly degraded. Thanks to the unorganised & backward condition of the workers, Rationalisation so dear to the Bombay mill-owners is here playing havoc, resulting in fifty per cent retrenchment. At this rate more than million workers in the Jute industry alone will soon be out of job. Add to this the callous and reactionary attitude of the Swaraj members in the Bengal council on the recent Tendancy Amendment Bill, and you realize how from the point of view of the Bengal masses to political programme will be too extreme or revolutionary.

In such a fermenting mill in two important political gatherings were held on the eve of the Congress, namely the All Parties' Convention and the Workers and peasants's Conference. In the former were foregathered all the important stake-holders in the country to discuss thred bare the problem of achieving Dominion Status, while the latter addressed itself to the task of mobilising all the exploited militant forces in the land for attaining Indepen-

dence. The Dominion-wallas gave their case away by devoting the last day of the session to a vehement and unmeasured defence of vested interests. It was Mr. Jitendralal Bannerji, the intrepid and uncorruptible leader of young Bengal who led the attack. He neatly exposed the sinister character of the section inserted by Pt. Malawiy in the body of the Nehru report at the dictation of the Oudh Talukdars. He pointed out that all legitimate rights of private property were guaranteed by the preceding section and it was not advisable to tie up the hands of the future legislature. One of the sacred duties of the first Commonwealth parliament will be he said to unsettle the Permanent settlement of Bengal. But the sleek and subtle Pundit in the end won over the audience predominated by representative of the professional classes by drawing false analogy between the reward of merit and the perpetual tribute levied by zamindars like Burdwan and Durghanga, and made out that the opposition was communist in character demanding confiscations of ordinary property rights, which it certainly did not. In fact not a single representative of the Workers and Peasants party let alone Communism was present and yet the spectre of Communism was continually haunting the All Parties' Convention.

The supporters of the Nehru report know full well that Dominion is in no sense a half way house towards complete independence but a half way house towards complete absorption of Indian nationalism into the bosom of British imperialism. But unnerved by the prospect of the impending class-struggle, they are scuttling for safety under the wing of the imperial power. And as a price for this foreign protection against the avenging wrath of the exploited masses, the Indian upper class nationalists (?) are prepared to extend a guarantee of equal rights of exploitation to the British bourgeoisie which today is responsible for more than 80 per cent of the capital operating in the country. This is made explicit by a special section of the report. Thus the twenty per cent of the Indian capitalists are willing to barter away the country's freedom for a junior partnership in Messrs John Bull and Co. and a share in the imperial loot. That in brief is what Dominion Status comes to.

In sharp contrast to enervating uncertainties and clever camouflage of the All parties' convention were the proceedings of the Workers and Peasants' conference held simultaneously in another part of the city under presidency of the peasant leader of Punjab, Mr. Sohan Singh. This conference did not leave one in doubt as to what it was after and how it proposed to go about it. Another welcome feature of this gathering was its complete freedom from the canker of Communalism.

The thess adopted by this first conference of the Workers and Peasants of India defines its goal as complete independence for the abolition economic exploitation and political oppression. It

emphasises the alliance, already in being and in process of consolidation, among the chief exploiting interests in the country the British and Indian bourgeoisie, the Princes and the landlords. Though at variance between themselves on minor questions as to the division of power and profit, they are unanimous and united on their fundamental question of their privileged class position and no serious division among them can now be expected. The movement for Indian emancipation has thus to face a task of tremendous difficulty, and must therefore be broad-based on the alliance of all the exploited interests in the land.

At the same time the strength of Imperialism need not over-estimated. The world system of capitalism is in process of disintegration and decay as witnessed by the recurrent economic crises in Europe esp. Britain and by the feverish preparations both technical and diplomatic for another world war. The Indian working class which will have to bear the brunt and to assume the leadership of the mass movement is no more illiterate and backward than the Russian or the Chinese working class and numerically is no smaller than the Russian and actually greater than the Chinese. With the rapid impoverishment of the peasants and the lower middle class, the Indian proletariat is winning two powerful allies to its side.

The Workers and Peasants Conference further disposed of the accusation and bogey of a violent revolution by affirming the general utility in Indian conditions of Non-violence as a tactic but refused to raise it to the level of a principal, because it was on this pretext that the Non-cooperation movement was betrayed by the upper-class politicians. Thus denouncing the futility of a secret preparation for an armed uprising, impossible in Indian conditions where secrecy and arms are both unobtainable, this militant party proposes to enforce its demands by a mass movement using the weapons of demonstration and direct action, leading upto a general strike of the workers and a campaign of non-payment of rent and taxes by the peasants.

With the extremist forces on both the sides thus ranged, the cleavage between the two wings of the congress is daily widening. Swami Kumaranand and other radicals have tabled resolutions to change the Congress creed so as to in conformity with the goal of complete independence. On the other hand Pundit Motilal with the support it is said of Mr. Gandhi, Mr. Sen Gupta and Mrs. Beasant is taking up the position that the Convention formula of Dominion Status represents the greatest political advance & should be endorsed by the congress and the campaign for independence should be definitely given up; otherwise he threatens resignation.



In consequence the the thought upper-most in the minds of most in the Congress camp at Park Circus is whether the Congress can effectively aver; another Surat.

---

P. 1254.

Telephones: MUSEUM 9496 & 9578

*Labour's First Sunday Newspaper*

## *Sunday Worker*

Proprietors: WORKERS' PUBLICATIONS LIMITED

74 SWINTON STREET,

GRAY'S INN ROAD,

LONDON,

W.C.1

30th June 1926.

This is to introduce Comrade N. G. Desai, and I trust that all those interested in the welfare of our Indian comrades, will do all in their power to assist him.

( Signed )

Wn. Paul

Editor.

MSS. submitted to the Editor cannot be returned unless a stamped envelope is enclosed. While every endeavour will be made to safeguard them, the Editor cannot accept responsibility for either loss or delay.

The Editorial Board do not make any payment for contributions to the SUNDAY WORKER unless specially arranged.

# P. 1255.

## THE LESSONS of the

### FORTYTHIRD NATIONAL CONGRESS.

(We must begin the New year of struggle for freedom by drawing correct lessons from what happened in the 43rd annual meeting of the National Congress.) These lessons will help us to tackle the problems that arise in course of the development of the movement) The most outstanding feature of the nationalist movement, brought into relief by the Congresses and Conferences that took place during the closing week of the past year, is the sharpening of the process of class differentiation inside the nationalist ranks. (As the future development of the movement will be essentially determined by this process, the revolutionaries must begin by an examination of this process.)

(The resolutions of the *Liberal Federation* and the so-called *All-India Moslem Conference* are the most glaring indications of the regrouping of class forces on the political battle field.) It is not an accident that, while all other nationalist bodies—political, economic, social and cultural, met in Calcutta under the general hegemony of the National Congress, these *two organizations* chose *different places*. This fact alone shows that the social elements represented by these bodies, namely, the *landlords*, *big capitalists* and *officials* are *drifting* further and *further away* from the anti-imperialist movement, and are crystalising into a bloc against revolution.

(The Conference of the Liberal Federation can be considered as a normal factor in the political situation). It is a comparatively old organization growing out of the controversy over the boycott of the Montagu Reform. It counts in its ranks practically all the venerable "fathers" of the Congress. Besides, of late, the difference between the programme of the Liberal Federation and the views of the Right wing leaders of the Congress, has been progressively narrowed down. So much so, that last year the All-parties Conference came into being and, in open violation of the resolution of the Madras Congress, agreed upon a constitution for India as self-governing dominion inside the British Empire. (If the Congress unconditionally endorses the report of the All-parties Conference, the Liberals will come back into the Congress folds.) Meanwhile they stand outside and influence the policy of the Congress through the right wing leaders who are essentially their agents. We shall remember Motilal Nehru saying that he was clearly committed to the report of all-parties Conference, and was, therefore, morally bound to make honest effort for its adoption by the Congress. Even if they succeed in capturing the leadership of the Congress formally, the Liberals as the representatives of landowning and big

capitalist elements, will maintain their independent political existence.)

The so-called All-India Moslem Conference is as extraordinary event; & as such should be given special attention. It is a new appearance decidedly of disturbing and dangerous significance.

Conference. On the contrary, it is a new appearance decidedly of disturbing and dangerous significance. A few words about it will be helpful in grasping the intricacies of the situation.

It is generally known how imperialist policy has always been to foment religious conflict between the Hindus and Moslems. The story of this conflict is woeful. To keep the Moslems out of the Nationalist movement the British government patronised the foundation of the Indian Moslem League in 1905. For years this developed as a rival to the National Congress contesting the latter's right to call itself "national". But eventually the progressive elements of the Moslem community either joined the National Congress or opposed that the Moslem League should be a rival to the Congress. Finally, in 1916 the two agreed upon a common platform, and became allied bodies in the common struggle against imperialism. The *introduction of the communal representation* in the Reforms of 1919 was the countermove of imperialism. But the Khilafat agitation of 1920—21 brought the Hindus and Moslems still closer. This unity was disturbed by religious antagonism and riots provoked by the British police. Last year the *Indian Moslem League split* on the question of boycotting the Commission appointed by the British Parliament to examine India's fitness for further constitutional progress. In spite of desperate efforts on the part of imperialism, the progressive and popular Moslem elements could not be kept away from the struggle for national freedom. *The latest plan of imperialism* is to form a *bloc of the Moslem members* of the Central and Provincial Legislatures as against the nationalists, on the platform of communal representation. Thanks to the system of communal representation already in operation, a considerable portion of the Moslem members of the Legislatures are recruited from the reactionary landowning classes. Therefore, they can be easily influenced by official pressure, lending themselves for the formation of a buffer bloc between the government and the nationalists. But a purely parliamentary bloc will have little political influence, unless a corresponding bloc is created in the general political field. The *object of the so-called All-India Moslem Conference*, which met in the official atmosphere of Delhi when the National Congress assembled in Calcutta, was to inaugurate such a buffer Moslem bloc on national scale. The conference was convened by a group of members of the Legislatures who had advocated cooperation with the Simon Commission; and the modern theocratic potentate, His Highness the Aga Khan, who enjoys special confidence of Imperialism, came

all the way from his usual residence in London to preside over it. The whole affair was obviously officially inspired. Its resolution did not touch the burning political problems of the day, occupying itself with the "security of Indian Moslem culture." The demands made for this security fall in line completely with the imperialist scheme of introducing such "constitutional reforms" as would split up the country into a decentralised political structure, the easier to be held in perpetual subjugation.

Apart from insisting upon the maintainance of communal electorate the conference demanded *recasting of provincial boundaries* so as to create several provinces with a clear Moslem majority. The introduction of this scheme would split up the country into two sectors—one comprising a group of provinces with Moslem Majority and the other of provinces with Hindu Majority. The disastrous consequence of this scheme is evident: It will be the creation of conditions very favourable for the traditional imperialists policy of "divide and rule," a policy which, of late, has become difficult to apply effectively, owing to the development of the nationalist movement. *To stabilise its shaken power*, imperialism seeks to break up the country into three antagonistic sectors—the Native States, Moslem provinces and the rest. Basing itself upon the first, it will operate against the third.

*Class differentiation inside the Moslem community has forced* imperialism to adopt the new tactics. The days are gone when the Moslem community as a whole could be pitted against the Hindus. Development of capitalist production and distribution breaks up the religious homogeneity of the Moslem community. Common economic interests draw the Moslem bourgeoisie ever closer politically to their Hindu confreres in the nationalist movement. *This process split* the Moslem League into two fractions, namely, the progressive bourgeois and intellectual elements on the one side, advocating a united nationalist front and the reactionary landowners and government officials, on the other side, still clinging to the doubtful privilege and imperialist protection conferred by the system of communal representation. *Another line of cleavage* also runs across the community transcending old religious homogeneity. Development of capitalist production eliminates religious antagonism between Hindu and Moslem workers. This process operates even in the village though not nearly so effectively. On the whole, under the pressure of circumstances Moslem workers and peasants progressively outgrow religious prejudice, and unite with their Hindu brethren in the common revolutionary fight against imperialism, capitalism feudalism. The imperialist policy of supporting the reactionary elements as against the progressive bourgeoisie and revolutionary working class, will defeat its own end by sharpening the process of class differentiation inside the Moslem Community. This process supplementing the similar one among the Hindus

cuts across all the apparent intricacies of the situation indicating a revolutionary development.

Nevertheless, these apparent intricacies render the radicalization of the nationalist movement a rather devious, halting & painful process. These intricacies are exploited by the *bourgeois leaders of the Congress to justify their reformist policy*. They are afraid of the revolutionary unity which will be cemented by the process of class differentiation. Therefore, they do not seek the much needed unity in that direction. They get themselves entangled in the meshes of interminable negotiations over terms of a compromise, and thereby fall in the snare of imperialism. The stock argument with which imperialism has always rejected nationalist demands, was that they did not have the support of all the communities. The main concern of the nationalist leaders, of late, has been to meet this argument by finding a common platform. During the last year all the efforts were bent to this purpose, and the result was the Nehru Constitution which was not only acceptable to the moderate nationalist groups outside the Congress, but also won the approbation of progressive section of the Moslem League. Now the whole thing is spoiled by the appearance of the new Moslem buffer bloc which brushes aside the Nehru Constitution. As more than half of the Moslem members of the Legislatures were present at the Dehli Conference and voted for its resolution, this will be, of course, pointed out by the imperialist rulers as a rift in the nationalist flute. It is true that the electorate, on which the Legislatures are based, are ridiculously narrow, and therefore a majority of the members returned by this electorate do not voice the popular demand. But the nationalists cannot use this democratic argument, as they have always presented their demands on the strength of the mandate they received from the same electorate. The same parliamentary standard, which gives their platform a democratic character, invests similar grandeur upon the resolution of the Dehli Conference. Imperialism has thus out-manoeuvred the bourgeois nationalists, because these operated on a narrow class basis, seeking a compromise with native reaction and foreign domination as against growing forces of revolution.

The bourgeois leaders of the Congress spent the last year in the search for a compromise with the frankly anti-revolutionary political, religious and communal groups standing outside the Congress, in open violation of the wishes of the rank and file. In answer to imperialist challenge, in the form of the persistence of the British parliament upon its prerogative to decide the political future of India, the National Congress last year made an epoch-making change in its programme. It not only contested the self-assumed prerogative of the British Parliament by deciding to boycott the Simon Commission; it went further, and declared

complete separation from British empire as the goal of the Indian nationalist movement. It was noticeable at that time that the right wing leaders allowed the passage of such radical resolution reluctantly, in order not to lose the control of the Congress machinery. They beat a stratagic retreat only to check a stormy development of the revolutionary democratic forces that were gathering strength after several years of depression. The last year has been a year of struggle between the essentially anti-revolutionary right wing and the revolutionary democratic forces for the leadership of the National Congress, that is, of the anti-imperialist movement.

The unusual importance of the annual meeting of the Congress just concluded grew out of this struggle. For a time it appeared that the last battles were going to be fought in that meeting, resulting in the defeat of the right wing. But such a stormy development has been checked as the right wing leadership desired. With the help of Gandhi the right wing leaders have managed to out-wit the petty bourgeois left radicals. The check can, however, be only temporary. The process of class differentiation, which causes radicalization of the nationalist movement, is unrelenting. The leadership of the nationalist movement, must be wrested from the treacherous hands of the bourgeoisie, should it enter into the higher stage of revolutionary mass struggle against imperialism. The anxiety of the nationalist bourgeoisie for a compromise with imperialism is dictated by their class interests; and as this compromise can be realised only by intensifying the suppression and exploitation of the producing classes these must revolt against the policy of the present leadership; and this revolt is bound to overwhelm the present leadership eventually.

Although inside the Congress the the process of radicalisation is represented by the petty bourgeois rank and file, and left leaders, its real manifestation is to be found in the tremendous revolutionary activity of the masses throughout the country. As a matter of fact, the petty bourgeois radicalism inside the Congress is but the objective reflection of the growing will of the masses to fight—a will magnificently demonstrated in a series of great strikes taking place through-out the country during the last two years. The struggle for the leadership of the nationalist movement will grow sharper in proportion as the revolutionary activity of the masses will develop. The bourgeois leaders will be able to cope with the opposition, as long as it does not become the conscious voice of the masses. (Till now, subjectively, it remains petty bourgeois radicalism, characterised by timidity, political immaturity and a confused social outlook.) Its strength is in its objective character. Treachery of bourgeois leadership may or may not drive petty bourgeois radicalism to seek strenght at its root—revolutionary awakening of the masses. It is equally possible that failing to seek an alliance with the working class, petty

bourgeois radicalism will land in political bankruptcy, and surrender itself to reaction. The outcome of the last fateful meeting of the Congress indicates to this danger.

The resolution reconciling the two fractions advocating respectively complete independence and self-government within the British empire, essentially implies a surrender of the left wing in principle. According to the resolution, the National Congress does not formally rescind to the resolution relating to complete independence passed at the Madras meeting of the Congress (1927), "but adopts the constitution drawn up by the Committee (of the All-parties Conference) provided however that the Congress shall not be bound by that constitution if it be not accepted on or before December 31, 1929". Being a compromise formula agreed upon by the contending fractions the resolution is open to more than one interpretation. (Its form of an ultimatum to imperialism, which is the reflexion of the revolutionary atmosphere prevailing in the country, has out-manoevred petty bourgeois radicalism which abandons, in principle, its opposition to any compromise with imperialist domination.) In case of self-government within the British Empire should be granted within a specified time, petty bourgeois radicals would be satisfied. So the difference between right reformists and left radicals of the Congress is reduced qualitative, to quantitative. By agreeing to be satisfied with dominion status within the British empire, the left radicals admit that there is no essential difference between it and complete independence. The time limit is immaterial. The question is a question of programme.

(Of course the left opposition has not accepted the compromise resolution conscious of its implication.) Owing to political immaturity it has simply fallen into the trap of the bourgeois right wing. The glamour of the gesture of ultimatum created an illusion and blinded its eyes to the implications of the resolution. And, an imperialism is not going to give in to the ultimatum and the bourgeois leaders, who by out-manoeuvring the opposition retained the control of the Congress machinery, will not permit any revolutionary tactics after the time limit is expired, the process of radicalization of the nationalist movement will go on. Indeed, indications to this effect are already discernible from all the three directions concerned. Commenting upon the resolution of the Congress the most authoritative press organ of British imperialism, *the Time* of London writes: "The British Parliament will not be unduly disturbed" by the ultimatum. The tricky scheme of the bourgeois leadership, which was forced to make some concession to the rank and file to retain its hold upon the Congress, was given away by Ramaswami Iyer in a conversation with the press representatives after the resolution was voted. He said: "the resolution is unfortunate, because in no event can the British government come to a final decision before the end of the year, and as to non-cooperation, it is unthinkable to

resort to a method which has been so calamitous in the past." On the other hand, the leader of the opposition, *Srinivas Iyenger*, characterised the resolution as "ambiguous and unworkable which simply postpones the formal rejection of Dominion status for a year."

( Obviously, the scheme of the bourgeois leader is to gain time for consolidating the anti-revolutionary bloc and for disrupting the left opposition.) In view of the frank statement repeatedly made by the bourgeois nationalist leaders, inside and outside the Congress, there cannot be any doubt about their future policy. They are definitely in favour of a compromise with imperialism, and opposed to the programme of complete independence. Therefore, their subscription to the compromise resolution is obviously not sincere. It is only a *strategic move*. Several representatives of political groups representing big capitalist and landowning classes were present in the Congress though their organizations stand outside the Congress. They oppose the resolution on the ground that the resolution would "alienate large bodies now supporting the Congress, and cause more people to break away from the Congress." They meant that if the Congress adopted even such a resolution the classes they represented would turn against the Congress. This being the case, the perspective is clear. The bourgeois are so decidedly opposed to even a gesture of revolutionary struggle, that if the National Congress does not unconditionally accept their dictation, it is bound to split. Indeed, one of them told that the resolution "will mean a change of creed ( of the Congress ) and will break the Congress to pieces . "

Nor are the right wing leaders of the Congress itself any less definite and emphatic in expressing their political views. Two months before the Congress met, when the conflict between its two wings had reached the highest pitch, *Motilal Nehru*, in a public speech, condemned the advocates of complete independence as reactionaries disturbing of the unity of the movement, and as disguised Communists. About the same time, a semi-official press organ, *the Pioneer* of Allahabad, publicly asked the Congress leader, Motilal Nehru, if he would content with dominion status. Nehru's answer was as follows :—

"My plain, simple and honest answer to your question is an emphatic yes. This answer is not only mine, but of India as a whole, provided the offer is honestly made before it is too late. I say this inspite of anything that has been or may hereafter be said to the contrary by certain schools of thought, and undertake to see that it shall be the answer of India."

The implication of this statement is unmistakable. It is a challenge to the left opposition and the revolutionary forces behind it in a fight for the leadership of the nationalist movement. It is a clear and emphatic declatration of the will of the nationalist bour-



geoisie to come to an agreement with imperialism as against the movement for revolution, if imperialism would make reasonable terms.

Addressing the annual meeting of the National Congress as its President Nehru declared :

"I am for complete independence, but I am not against full Dominion Status, provided I get it before it loses all attraction. I am for the severance of the British connection as it subsists today, but I am not against it as it exists with the Dominions".

Here the political platform of the nationalist bourgeoisie is stated in a nut-shell. The "attraction" of Dominion status is the guarantee that a strong imperialist state can offer against revolution. But if imperialism delays the conclusion of peace offered by the nationalist bourgeoisie till the democratic forces go out of their control and break out into a revolution, Dominion status will lose its attraction, and the nationalist bourgeoisie might change its attitude to catch fish in troubled waters. This is a possibility; but more probably the statement is but a threat to force the hand of imperialism. As a declaration of principle the statement is clear. The Nationalist bourgeoisie are not opposed to imperialism as such. It only does not like as it operates at present. Given some cession for the development of their class, they would rather remain under the protection of a strong imperialist state that encounter a revolution.

While agents of the bourgeoisie as leaders of the National Congress, are obliged to be careful in expressing their views, in order to deceive the nationalist masses, those in less embarrassing position speak more frankly. In view of the stormy controversy, that nearly resulted in split of the Congress, Nehru had to indulge in some demagogy as regards independence. He sought to impress upon the Congress that there was no essential difference between full self-government within the British Empire and independence. The truth was, however, stated clearly in the Conference of the Liberal Federation. This had subscribed to the draft Constitution which Nehru sought to and partially succeeded in imposing upon the National Congress. While endorsing the Nehru constitution, the President of the Liberal Conference observed :

"I do not see how those, whose immediate or ultimate goal is independence, can have anything in common with those who want Dominion Status. Those who reaffirm independence as the goal and threaten non-payment of taxes cannot be honest believers in Dominion Status".

This reveals the impossibility of reconciling the views respectively advocated by the two wings of the National Congress.

*Motilal Nehru and other right wing leaders of the Congress know it quite well. The reconciliation they seek is not reconciliation, but imposition of the anti-revolutionary programme of the bourgeoisie on the entire nationalist movement.* The President of the Liberal Conference made the speech, quoted above, after the National Congress had adopted the compromise resolution. It throws new light upon the resolution. It reveals the true character of the right wing leaders of the Congress, and proves that the resolution sponsored by them was a trick. The bourgeoisie, as whose agent right wing leaders like Motilal Nehru dominate the Congress, disapprove even of the compromise resolution which commits the Congress, in principle, to Dominion Status. They demand complete capitulation of the left wing. The right wing leaders must work for it. The consequence will be *sharpening of the conflict inside the Congress*. The struggle for the leadership of the Congress cannot be composed. It is produced by the revolutionary activity of the masses. The nationalist bourgeoisie are alarmed by this activity. They move further and further to the right—to wards the position of a counter-revolutionary bloc with imperialism—in proportion as the revolutionary activity of the masses develops.

Polarization of the social forces inside the nationalist movement is so far advanced that the bourgeoisie are building up a decidedly counter-revolutionary system of political philosophy. It has been stated by the spokesmen of the bourgeoisie, in more than one occasion, that the goal of complete independence, however enticing in itself, should be rejected as it cannot be reached except through a revolution. This argument was put forward in the All-parties Conference by the representatives of the parties standing outside the Congress. Lajpat Rai, who was one of the cleverest and boldest nationalist politicians, shortly before his death on the eve of the annual meeting of the Congress, intervened in the controversy over the goal of the nationalist movement, advocating Dominion Status with the following arguments. He wrote in his organ *the People*:

“The question before her (India) then resolves itself into one of expediency, not hypocritical expediency, but one of practical wisdom. . . . Even Srinivas Iyenger would accept Dominion Status if it was granted at once. Some others hold that we should work for Dominion Status as a stepping stone to complete independence. I do not agree. I am of opinion that we should honestly, whole-heartedly and sincerely work for dominion status, whether we get it immediately or in the next few years. I say so, because to me, in our present circumstances, that seems to be the path of practical wisdom. . . .

“Cry of complete political independence leads people away from constructive political & social work and is a disturbing element in the nation-building departments of the country. . . .”

“Any practical active step towards complete independence cannot be taken except in secrecy and through revolutionary violence. The preachers of non-violence may talk as much as they like, but they will not advance an inch towards the goal, unless they actively grapple with the problem of how and by what means. . . .”

This bold statement was endorsed enthusiastically by the entire bourgeois nationalist press. It hardly needs any commentary. The nationalist bourgeoisie must be content with less than what they otherwise would like to have, for any serious attempt to have more is likely to end in disaster. They govern their action by the old India maxim: “Faced with destruction, the wise part with half” The attention of the restive petty bourgeois intellectuals should be diverted from revolutionary politics to social reformism the object of which is to teach the workers and peasants to submit to capitalist and feudal exploitation without grudge. Taking his cue from the late lamented Lajpat Rai, Motilal Nehru in his presidential address to the Congress attached great importance to the work for the reformation of the backward social and religious institutions. There is a concerted scheme to check the development of the revolutionary forces.

*As self-government within the British Empire is not means, but the goal of bourgeois nationalism, and all effective measures for the realisation of complete independence are rejected by the bourgeoisie as dangerous, there cannot be any doubt about the application of the compromise resolution of the Congress. On the expiry of the time-limit of one year right wing leaders will tell the petty bourgeois radicals that they have committed themselves, on principle, to Dominion Status, and argue that the best way of attaining it is the way of constitutional pressure upon the government. They will further argue that any resort to direct action like non-payment of taxes will provoke the government to adopt repressive measures which will delay the realization of the goal of dominion status. There are already signs showing that bourgeois constitutionalism will be successful in corrupting certain elements among the petty bourgeois radicals. For example, Jawaharlal Nehru, who is one of the outstanding leaders of the left opposition, already in October made the following statement in a public speech:*

“Modern development of warfare have made organised states terribly powerful. It is impossible to combat the government by violence. In Europe the new methods of seizing power were based not on violence but on peaceful organization of workers, peasants and others. That is the only way for India also.”

Indeed side by side with the counter-revolutionary bourgeois political philosophy there grows among the petty bourgeois radicals a marked tendency towards Social Democracy. This will be used by the bourgeoisie as a weapon to thwart the revolutionary development of the workers' and peasants' movement.

One more quotation can be given to illustrate the situation. The veteran nationalist leader, B. C. Pal, who in the olden days was imprisoned for revolutionary views, wrote endorsing and elaborating the "practical wisdom" of Lajpat Rai quoted above. Pal is the political ideologist of bourgeois nationalism; therefore, his views are of great importance. He wrote:

"If British statesmanship and Indian statesmanship can visualise the unrevealed future and see all the possibilities of good and evil that it holds in it, both cannot avoid some agreed policy and programme that will offer reasonable guarantee for the protection of the legitimate interests of both India and the Empire.

Admitting that the origin of the "large political and economic stake that Britain has acquired in India" can be traced to some wrong practice, as is also the case with the acquisition of large estates and immense wealth by individuals, the writer observes:

"If we raise the question of origin of these and try to ignore or abrogate them, both society and civilization would at once go to pieces. We admit that our social system is wrong. But it cannot be cured by violent upsetsings.

Further,

"The machinery of administration in India is in their ( British ) hands. Any attempt, on an organized large scale, to wrest this machinery by force from them will mean a continental revolt and an almost root and branch revolution not only in politics but also in society.....Any attempt, therefore, to break up the existing political order by force can only end in disaster. It can never re-establish the disturbed socio-political equilibrium in the country"

Pal, with his characteristic frankness, states what the nationalist bourgeoisie think as a class. In this period of capitalist decline, national revolution in the colonial countries cannot succeed as a bourgeois democratic revolution. This has been proved in China; and the Indian nationalist bourgeoisie have not failed to draw lessons from the development of the Chinese revolution. Destruction of imperialist domination, root and branch, cannot be accomplished except by the revolutionary action of the masses. In a certain stage of development the struggle for national liberation, if it is conducted on the revolutionary way, inevitably

comes under the hegemony, and later under the leadership of the proletariat, thus going beyond the limits of bourgeois democratic revolution. Historically, it still accomplishes the tasks of bourgeois revolution, in so far as it liquidates the remnants of pre-capitalist property relations, and establishes political democratic regime. But owing to the facts that it takes place in a different historical epoch - the epoch of capitalist decline and that it is under the leadership of a class antagonistic to capitalism, it does not limit its scope to these tasks; it advances further towards the realization of Socialism by creating such a revolutionary democratic state as guarantees a non-capitalist economic development of the country as preparatory to the final realization of Socialism, Anti-imperialist struggle, under present conditions, thus, being essentially and directly a struggle for the realization of Socialism, is not supported by the nationalist bourgeoisie fully and to the end. And, as there cannot be neutrality in a revolutionary struggle, the nationalist bourgeoisie become an ally of imperialism as soon as they become afraid of the revolutionary development of the nationalist movement. Even a superficial examination of the events in India shows that this process is in operation there.

The historical significance of the great strikes, that took place during the last two years, is enormous. They indicate the beginning of a new stage of the national revolution. They indicate the appearance of a new revolutionary class which prepares itself to play a dominating role in the anti-imperialist struggle. Ever since the nationalist movement became a mass movement in 1919, the workers and peasants have been its source of strength. But in the past they have played, as it were, the mighty Chorus of a grand opera; they are no longer content to provide the back-ground for the bourgeoisie to play upon. The bourgeoisie sang in complete discord with the chorus. The latter have produced their own leader who has appeared on the stage. This leader is the proletariat. The new leader is bound to oust the bourgeoisie from the centre of the stage, because he will sing in complete accord with the chorus. In plain language, the proletariat has stepped out of the back-ground to the centre of the political stage as an independent factor in the situation. Its activities during the last two years have showed how much more powerful it is, when it acts independently, free from the influence of the bourgeois leaders.

The advance made by the proletariat as result of the revolutionary activities of the last two years is enormous. It has not only liberated itself from the reactionary influence of the nationalist leaders; this has even outgrown the control of the reformist labour politicians. All the great strikes of the last year (on the railways, in the steel industry, in the cotton industry, in the jute industry) were fought more or less under revolutionary, (Communist or left wing) leadership. *The bourgeoisie are very much alarmed by these*

developments and are frankly advocating legislations calculated to check the revolutionary development of the labour movement. *The Indian Daily Mail*, organ of Bombay textile capital writes:

Since the general strike, the attitude of the workers has completely changed. The men have become rebellious, obstinate and somewhat defiant. They are extremely suspicious of the employers, and see something to their disadvantage in everything that the masters do..... They seem to have come to the definite belief that a strike followed up by acts of violence and intimidation is the surest way of calling the attention of the employers to their grievances..... This mighty tug-of-war between the masters and the wage-earners for a period unprecedented in the industrial history of this country, and the way in which labour held its own against their powerful enemies has engendered in the workers' minds an awakened sense of their strength and importance, a feeling that they can meet their masters on equal terms..... The workers have learned such theories as 'labour is the source of all wealth' and 'labour alone creates value' etc. All these and lot more of such ideas have been instilled into the minds of the workers and they now feel most certain that it is not only possible for them to have a better sort of life, but also that they are fully entitled to have it in return for their labour. They now refused to be regarded and treated as a despised class.....

During the general strike and even after it the men were almost wholly under the influence of the so-called extremist leaders, who are either avowed Communist or members of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. To the unceasing and tireless efforts of this handful of young radicals must be traced the source through which the workers have learnt the ideas and theories of Communism and class war ..... Today it would appear that the extremists are going to be the popular leaders of the workers'.

So here are the reasons why the nationalist bourgeoisie are opposed to any form of struggle against imperialist domination which may and will add an incentive to the already alarming revolutionary activity of the working class. *The anxiety for class interest, the so-called long view of things (practical wisdom)—imposes upon them the policy of liquidating anti-imperialist struggle in any form other than constitutional opposition. Afraid of revolution, they cannot help landing in the camp of counter revolution.*

This sharpening antagonism between the two classes standing at the opposite extremities of the nationalist front, also effects the relation among the other sectors of the front. The conflict inside the national Congress is a reflexion of this antagonism. As this antagonism cannot be reconciled, the conflict inside the Congress also cannot be composed.

The task of the proletariat in this situation is to sharpen this conflict, to push petty bourgeois radicalism in the struggle against the capitulation policy of the right wing leaders, with the object of dislodging the bourgeoisie from the controlling position in the nationalist movement. The process of polarisation inside the nationalist ranks should not be allowed to develop into one of atomisation. The process of elimination should go by stages and at present the correct tactic is to fasten all the available forces into a united nationalist revolutionary front free from the restraining hand of bourgeois leadership. The activities for the organization for such a revolutionary democratic army will provide the proletariat, the opportunity to exercise hegemony in the anti-imperialist struggle as preparatory to the capture of the leadership of the national revolution in still higher stages—in the period of its transitation from bourgeois democratic to proletarian Socialist revolution.

- January 11/1929.

---

## P. 1256.

### THE CONFERENCE

### OF THE WORKERS' AND PEASANTS'

### PARTY OF INDIA.

The revolutionary elements in the Indian Nationalist movement are organizing themselves. They have not yet found a unified leadership. But consciously or unconsciously, they all look for it in the right direction—to the Proletariat. The speeches made and resolutions adopted at a number of subsidiary conferences that took place simultaneously with the annual meeting of the National Congress, show to what an extent the conditions are ripe for the proletariat to exercise hegemony in the struggle for national freedom. Only a few years ago Socialism was practically unknown in India. Indeed, the attitude even of the radical petty bourgeoisie towards Socialism was one of suspicion and hostility. The nationalist petty bourgeoisie were decidedly reactionary in social outlook. The revivalist cult of Gandhism ran rampant among them. Consequently, they were not able to oppose effectively the policy of the bourgeois leaders to come to an agreement with imperialism, although they disapproved this policy. They could be easily

deceived and controlled by the bourgeois leaders. The situation has changed. Rude realities of the present and hope for a brighter future are liberating the petty bourgeoisie from the illusions about the the dead past. Breaking away from feudal traditions, they find little solace in capitalism, which under the conditions of colonial exploitation do not offer their class any prospect of substantial economic betterment. They must gather courage to look further into the future. And there the beacon of Socialism attract their vision showing them the only way out of political suppression, economic ruin and cultural stagnation. As a result of this, the most characteristic feature of the political situation in India today is the rapidly growing popularity of Socialism. All the petty bourgeois subsidiary organizations of the National Congress profess Socialism.

Of course, the thing cannot and should not be taken in its face value. It only serves as indicator of the situation. It shows the readiness of all the revolutionary anti-imperialist forces to fight under the hegemony of the proletariat, provided that this is able to take full advantage of the situation. The Socialism professed by the petty bourgeois radical intellectuals, however, is not, on the whole, consciously reactionary reformism having for its object to obstruct revolutionary development of the working class movement. There are individual cases which re resent this danger. But on the whole the movement is more utopian than consciously counter-revolutionary. Nevertheless, it will drift in the Social Democratic channel, if it is not guided in the right direction. And this right direction for petty bourgeois radicalism, historically, is not Socialism, but revolutionary democracy. The Proletariat must establish an alliance with the radical petty bourgeoisie, not as a force fighting for Socialism; but to lead them in the revolutionary democratic anti-imperialist struggle which, under the given Indian conditions, is a struggle directly for Socialism.

It is significant that the profession of Socialism by the petty bourgeois radicals coincides with their revolt against the policy of compromise with imperialism. This shows once again the inability of the petty bourgeoisie to play an independent political role. As soon as they attempt to break away from the leadership of the big bourgeoisie, they, in spite of themselves, tend to come under the influence of the proletariat. They do so in spite of themselves, for the petty bourgeoisie by themselves are not a socialist class. And, as they do so, in spite of themselves, they are not likely to advance in the revolutionary direction unless the proletariat meet them half way, and make a fighting alliance with them for the realization of the programme of national revolution, for betraying which they are revolting against the leadership of the big bourgeoisie. Their profession of Socialism should be taken as indication of the opportunity to bring them under the revolutionary leadership of the proletariat.



In the revolutionary struggle for national democratic freedom under the hegemony of the proletariat, some of them are likely to be entirely de-classed and become consciously Socialist. On the other hand, there is the danger of their relapsing under the control of the big bourgeoisie or developing into a Social democratic party, if their objective (unconscious) advance towards the proletariat is not met promptly and tactfully. The outcome of the National Congress made the imminence of the danger of their relapse under the control of the bourgeois leader, evident. With the situation overwhelmingly to their favour, the left radicals failed to oust the bourgeois leaders. For, they were not properly supported by the really revolutionary classes, while the right wing leaders operated with the entire backing of the parties representing the capitalist and landowning interests. Due to the failure of the proletariat to intervene in the situation by backing up the left opposition, the Congress was dominated by the All-parties Convention which was controlled by capitalist and landowning interests.

The other danger of petty bourgeois radicalism crystallising into a reformist Social Democratic party has been revealed by the views expressed by some leaders of the movement on such vital question as the function of the state, means of capturing political power, relation of classes, confiscation of land etc.

A picture of the situation gives a very clear perspective of future development, and shows out tasks. It is a tug-of-war for the leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle. Which way should it develop—towards constitutional agitation under the bourgeois leadership or revolutionary fight under the hegemony of the proletariat? The petty bourgeoisie which constitute the great bulk of the conscious and active nationalist ranks, stand in the middle, writing to move towards revolution, but lacking a determined, clear-sighted, unified leadership. And as this can alone come from the proletariat, the task before us is clearly defined.

During the meeting of the National Congress the following subsidiary bodies held their separate conferences: 1. All—India Youths League; 2. Swadhin Bharat Sangha (organisation of those who suffered persecution for revolutionary activity); 3. Socialist Youths League; and 4. All—India Volunteers Corps; The numbers of these bodies represent the most active element and majority of the Congress rank and file. Socially, they are all petty bourgeois intellectuals who are, as a rule, in very precarious economic condition. The Independence League, recently formed by the left wing leaders of the Congress, is at present the political leader of this revolutionary nationalist mass. The League also held its meetings during the sessions of the Congress. But being an integral part of the Congress, it did not assert separate existence. Consequently, radical and revolutionary forces, that constituted the majority in all the Congresses and conferences (except the All-parties' Convention)

were without a unified political leadership. The Congress, and incidentally its clearly revolutionary subsidiary organisations, were dominated by the bourgeoisie standing outside it. The following quotations from the speeches made and resolutions passed in the subsidiary conferences show that the outcome of the Congress does not represent the realities of the situation which is decil revolutionary.

In a statement made in the All-Parties Convention in opposition to the Dominion Constitution, the spokesman of the Swadhin Bharat Sangha said:

“Dominion status means that the entire politics of India will in the last resort be controlled by Britain in the interests of British imperialism. We are also of the opinion that the salvation of India and her masses lies in the establishment of Socialist regime. We are afraid that the constitution sketched in the Nehru Report is based on capitalist constructions of society. We are not prepared to accept this constitution.”

In contrast to the compromise in the National Congress on the controversy over Independence versus Dominion Status, the Youths' Conference resolved that

“Complete independence and not dominion status should be the immediate objective of India.”

The Conference called upon the youths to attain this goal by “all possible means”. This is an improvement upon the Independence resolution passed by the Congress in 1927, in which such restrictions were placed upon the means for the attainment of independence as rendered the whole resolution to empty verbage.

By the second resolution the Conference enjoined the youths to “combat capitalism by all available means”. Capitalism was condemned as detrimental to the best interest of the nation”. A third resolution indicated revolt against the cult of reactionary pacifism. This ment repudiation of Gandhi the idol of petty bourgeois nationalism. This resolution calls upon.

“Young India to take up the new challenge of imperialism and to create in the country an atmosphere in which responsive violence should not be deprecated”.

This resolution has a direct bearing on the situation. A few days before the meeting of the National Congress a British police officer was killed at Lahore. The assassination was generally interpreted as an act of the nationalist avenging the death of Lajpat Rai of injuries inflicted by the police during a demonstration. All the nationalist leaders, including those of the Congress, rushed to denounce vehemently the perpetrators of the act, as they had done on previous occasions. This trecherous and cowardly behaviour of

the bourgeois leaders was always resented by the rank and file. Now it is openly condemned. The nationalist rank and file declare their determination to answer Imperialist violence by revolutionary violence. —

The Socialist Youths' Conference met with the slogan "We want Revolution, and not Reformation". We find the following statements in the speech opening the Conference:

"Nationalism is the slogan of the middle class, while Socialism is the cry of the toiling masses. The present social evils can be cured not by reform, but by revolution".

"Dominion status was the cry of vested interest, and it remains to be seen how far the extremist section of the capitalist class will become revolutionary in politics"

Thousands of youngmen went about in military uniform as nationalist volunteers signifying what such demonstration can only signify, that is an enthusiastic will on their part for a real fight for freedom. When this is compared with the previous uniform of loin-cloth and Gandhicap of homespun stuff, the implication of the development of the movement becomes evident.

The climax of the situation was a huge mass demonstration in which over twenty thousands workers participated. Previously, thousands of workers, particularly peasants, used to be herded into the meeting of the Congress to be lectured by the bourgeois leaders. They had nothing to say or do, but only to provide an imposing back-ground for the reformist policy of bourgeois nationalism. They are no longer satisfied with the passive role. This year the demonstration was a part of the general revolt against bourgeois leadership, and it was the most important—the dominating factor in the revolt. The demonstration indicates the readiness of the proletariat to appear on the political scene as an independent force which is the essential condition for its ability to be the new leader in the new stage of the revolution.

Meeting in this atmosphere of revolutionary development from all sides, the Workers' and Peasants' Party, whose driving force are the Communists, was objectively the most important event of the moment. The Workers' and Peasants' Party is not the Communist Party, although the Communists play in it the leading and dominating role. Several years ago it appeared on the scene as the first sign of radicalization of the nationalist masses. As such the Communists supported it, and aided its growth. Practically all the great strikes of the last two years were led under the banner of the Workers' and Peasants' Party. The object of the Communist was to make this new party the rallying ground for all the nationalist revolutionary elements to develop it into a revolutionary nationalist mass Party which is a crying need of the moment. The quickening of

the process of radicalization inside the nationalist rank during the last year placed the Workers' Peasants' Party in a very favourable position. Until now the party functioned in loose, decentralised manner as practically independent provincial organizations. As it were, in response to the development of the situation, it was decided to reorganize the party on national scale in a conference which should meet simultaneously with the national Congress at the same place. The object obviously was to provide a common platform for all the revolutionary elements in the nationalist movement to carry the struggle against imperialism further, over the heads of the bourgeoisie which seek a compromise with imperialism, and thereby betray the national revolution.

It is very essential for the determination of Communist tactics in the situation to examine how far the Workers' and Peasants Party has been useful for this purpose.

The conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party was very well attended. It magnificently reflected the revolutionary atmosphere prevailing in the country. But in doing so, it forgot, or rather neglected, its objective task to mobilise all the forces of national revolution under its banner. Instead of coming out as the leader of the entire revolt, it placed itself in the position of one factor, indeed the most advanced and most courageous factor — of the revolt.

In the main political resolution of the Conference not only the Nehru Report is rightly condemned as "a bourgeois democratic scheme of a not very advanced type but an attitude of hostile criticism is also taken towards the Independence League representing the opposition to the bourgeois right wing of the Congress. Indeed, no distinction is made between the two factions inside the Congress. When the petty bourgeois left radicals are trying to oust the bourgeois leaders from the leadership of the nationalist movement, they are not supported; on the contrary, they also were condemned as the enemies of the workers and peasants, in the same breath with the representatives of big capital and landlordism. The criticism leveled against the programme of the Independence League was essentially correct; but the well-merited criticism should have been accompanied by a positive attitude - an offer of united front on the common platform of anti-imperialist struggle. The relation with the rest of the nationalist movement is defined as follows:

"While the Workers' and Peasants' Party remains relatively weak and unorganised, in the country, it will be necessary to follow the traditional policy of forming fractions within Congress organizations for the purpose of agitation, of exposing the reactionary leadership and of drawing revolutionary sections towards the W and P.P. This policy, however, is only temporary. The W and

P.P. can have no intention of dominating or capturing the Congress. The function of its members within the Congress is purely critical. Our party members, therefore, cannot be allowed to take office in the Congress organizations."

A motion that the members of the party should join the Independence League with the purpose of capturing it was also rejected.

Jan 19.29

M. N. Roy

---

P. 1257.

BENGAL TEXTILE WORKERS UNION

Head Office:—61, Nawabpur, Dacca.

Dated.....13....3.....1929.

Your Ref.....

Our Ref.....

Comrade Editor,

I send herewith an article on 'Imperialist lie'. If you think that it can be helpful for propaganda purpose - which I mean here, then please give it publication, if not please return.

I have other articles on 'Economic development of Soviet Russia' and about 'youth Movement' if you publish such articles, then please reply to say it.

With greetings,

Faternally yours

Gopal Basak

BENGAL TEXTILE WORKERS UNION

Dhamgarh

Your Ref.....

Head Office:—61, Nawabpur, Dacca.

Our Ref.....

Dated.....192

Beware of the Imperialist lie.

---

The socialist revolutionaries and the nationalist revolutionaries are both labouring under some misunderstandings regarding the present Indian situation and the Imperialists' designs in India. And they are so making tactical blunders.

The agents and lackeys of the Imperialist have been successful in stopping the political manoeuvring of the bourgeoisie, convincing them of the danger of the working class revolution which will lead to the destruction of the both and assuring them further constitutional reforms and tariff concessions. So, Mr Gandhi's mysterious theory of change of heart of the British Imperialist has made Messers Nehru and Co spell bound with hopes and this combined upper-strata of this bourgeois nationalists are waiting for their bear's desire - The Dominion Status.

This upper strata of the nationalists bourgeoisie has now extended their propaganda amongs the middle class intellectuals in the National Congress, to damp their revolutionary zeal in bringing in a bourgeois revolution (in India), by which they mean complete separation from the British Imperialists. They are trying to make these nationalist-revolutionaries to put their faith on the theory of (The) promotion of the free development of industries with British Imperialists as their allies. The middle class intellectuals in the National Congress or the Nationalist revolutionaries, who were vasallating from methods of Constitutional agitation or legal agitations, to that of mass revolution if necessary armed - insurrection, have become agitated with the arguments forwarded by the bourgeoisie.

The Nationalist revolutionaries have come to think that the Imperialists are weak in their metropolis and that the Imperialists becoming afraid lest, the Industrialists, who have grown to some considerable extent (thanks to the concessions obtained by the boycott of other agitations during and after war), turn up as its competitors, are now ready to industrialize India working with the Indian Industrialists as its Allies, like that of Canada and Australia and thus when India is industrialised they can easily achieve complete separation from their dependency to the Imperialists and then grow an independent power like America.

While on the other hand, misconception of the real situations have led the socialist revolutionaries to think of the 'Theory of decolonisation of India', to be correct to some extent. We should be in time to become aware of the fallacy and nature of such a theory as we analyse the correct situations. Besides the 6th world Congress of Comintern warns us in its theses on Revolutionary movement in the Colonies, that, "All the chatter of the Imperialists and their lackeys about the policy of decolonisation being carried through by the Imperialist powers about promotion of the free development of of the Colonies reveals itself as nothing

but an Imperialist lie. It is of the utmost importance that Communists both in Imperialist and in the colonial countries should completely expose this lie."

More than in any other colonies, this Imperialist lie has worked to mislead the Socialist revolutionaries and in India, more than in any other province, it has got adherents in Bengal. They are thinking in Bengal, that due to the decolonisation process, the British finance-capital has come to ally itself with Indian Capital working in India and as such politically there is going to be some kind of sharing, whereby the rank and file of the Nationalists in the National Congress will be working hand in hand with the British Imperialists in deepening their exploitation of the Working class and the peasantry. And so they are today directing their attack with more vigour on the Nationalist Party than the bureaucracy and making clear their way to combine, in doing so they are thinking to follow the lead of the C. P. of Great Britain in their attacks on labour party and Conservatives.

A brief analysis of the Colonial policy of the British Imperialists will I think, bring home to both the Nationalist revolutionaries and Socialist revolutionaries, as to the nature of the state of things.

The colonial policy of the British Imperialists differs in relation to their different nature of colonisation.

In Canada and Australia, a surplus population of the Capitalist system in the Metropolis settled by exterminating the native population and developed the same bourgeois system as in the Metropolis. With bitter experiences with their settlers in U. S. A., which has today turned as its formidable competitor in the world Market, it has made those colonies 'Dominions' or members of its latest invention—the commonwealth as a guard that it might not stand independently of it as a competitor.

In countries like South Africa, New Zealand etc—which are most backward and primitive, the immigrant from the Metropolis with the military force of the Metropolis completely enslaved the natives and with forced labour, exploited the colonial resources. The acute form of their exploitation and enslavement has nearly exterminated the bulk of the native populations. The Imperialist strengthens the hands of its subsidiaries there, for the monopolisation of those raw materials and as a guard that its subsidiaries may not by any chance, be cut off from the Metropolis and be in Union with any of its competitors, it at times gives them certain economic and political concessions.

The last and the chief support of the Imperialism as colonial exploiter is colonies like India, China and Indonesia. These are the advanced feudal countries. The brutal repression of the feudal

lords prepares an easy way for the Imperialists penetration in such countries where without either exterminating those defeated feudal lords, money—lenders and trading bourgeoisie, or their economic organism. They They preserve them and sucks the blood of their economic organism as a parasite. These colonies serve as their greatest source of raw-materials and markets for their commodities. As a result the cottage industries of the self-sufficing villages of the colonies being completely ruined and almost all the produced crops being exported to the Metropolis to create the greatest stock of the surplus value of the bourgeoisie in its Metropolis pauperisation of peasantry assumes its acutest forms. The greatest numbers are then swept away by famines and epidemics. As these colonies are vast countries the Imperialist has got to grow here some sort of preliminary industry in the forms of railways, docks, steamship etc and the pauperised peasants fill up in large numbers their cooly lines. The better fertility and speciality in some crops, gets the finance Capital to find in these countries large plantations, wherein those peasants are easy prey to lead beastly lives. The export of the money to grow the preliminary industries to fasciliate transit and sometimes some preliminary process of manufacturing helps the trading bourgeoisie to find some light industries and in special circumstances such as war or national movement compel the Imperialist for the time to concede some concessions, as for example the British Imperialist allowed the Indian Bourgeoisie to grow some large industries during the last world war, for their requirements of war—preparation and some political concessions in order to capture the bourgeoisie to help in subsidising movements that may grow against Imperialist rule due to the contradiction in its process of production, but the moment such movements ceased to exist or loose its revolutionary character the economic policy of the Imperialist power, is immediately directed to suppress the economics development of the colonial industries.

The Imperialist, in order to bribe the Nationalis may today in the face of the growing revolutionary mass movement grant some politico-economic concessions to develop big industries but when they completely seperate the Nationalist revolutionaries with the influence of bourgeoisie and if per-chnance the movement loses its influence they will immediately direct their attention in suppressing those developments in industries. What do we find in colliaries, iron works and other manufacturing concerns which in the war—period rose to a higher levels of developments? Those are but declining by degrees.

While, on the other hand if our socialist revolutionaries try to adopt in their policy the same line of actions as that of the C. P. of G. B. or other advanced capitalist countries they will fail to a great extent in solving the problems which are much more difficult, different and complex than that of those advanced Capitalist



countries and further they lose the help of the Nationalist revolutionaries, specially the middle class youths in their organisations and who are on the process of radicalisation.

---

## P. 1257-E

An envelope containing above letter (P-1257) addressed to "Editor" The Spark' Jariwalla Mansions Sandhurst Road. Bombay 4.

---

## P. 1258.

### **A letter Sun Yat-sen's to the Soviet Government written a few days before his death**

Dear Comrades,

Lying on my death bed my thoughts naturally turn to you as well as to the future of my party and my country. You are the head of those republics which the immortal Lenin has emancipated. If those nations which are today the victims of Imperialism, follow your example they shall likewise succeed in freeing themselves from a social order which has ever been based on slavery, war and injustice. I leave behind me a party which as I always hoped, shall work in alliance with you at the task of freeing China and other subject nations from the yoke of Imperialism..... I therefore charge my party to remain in continual contact with you. I am happy that I can be very confident of your unwavering support which my country has always enjoyed at your hands. In taking your leave I cannot but give expression to the hope that, the day is not long off when Soviet Russia and a free and strong China as its friend and ally, shall march hand in hand to the great battle for the emancipation of the oppressed of the whole world,

With fraternal greetings,

Sun Yat-sen.

## Sun Yat-sen on Lenin's death.

From the point of view of revolution, Lenin was a great and a successful revolutionary, a master of revolution, a great revolutionary ideal.

Now Lenin is no more. What feelings move our heart? What lessons have we to learn? I must say that he has taught many a lesson to the Chinese Revolution.

Although we have many a revolutionary victories to record, we must admit that we have paid more attention to mere military successes. The revolution never achieved its goal, because the party itself was never confident .....

Now we have the Russian methods as a model before us.

Lenin was our leader and our friend. His loss is a cruel stroke.

The peoples lament the death of their Liberator and their Father ..... Lenin is dead but the Idea lives. This Idea shall continue to work through the pupils of the master who is now no more.

(From Sun Yat-sen's speech on the death of Lenin 25 Jan 1924)

---

P. 1259.

**B. F. BRADLEY.**

*Vice-President*,—ALL INDIA RAILWAYMEN'S FEDERATION.

The secession of the Trade Union Congress of this year marks the beginning of a period in the history of the working class movement in India which is characterised by an organised revolt against the conditions imposed upon the workers by the capitalists. This struggle in which the number of the member of workers involved rose at times to 259,900, assumed in certain cases a definite revolutionary class aspect while in others the reformist point of view of class collaboration seemed to prevail. It is my opinion that the T.U.C. have not given sufficient consideration to the analysis of the nature and the tendencies of the struggle and have consequently failed to formulate a policy given a definite lead to the workers in their fight against capitalism.

A review of last years struggle shows that the position of the working class in it was wholly defensive. Almost every struggle was against worsened conditions. Attack, Rationalisation and Retrenchment is the order of the day. This was shown in important industries such as cotton, Jute, Iron and Steel, and Railways, While Mining, transport, Seamen, Dockworkers etc, slave conditions remained unimproved. This was the gloomy picture before the T. U. C. As if this position was not bad enough the capitalists had decided to extend their attack still further and attempt to suppress the growing revolt of the workers by taking away from them the right to strike through the proposed Trade Dispute Bill to be brought in the Assembly.

Within the T. U Congress at Jharia there appeared a strong fraction led by the Communists who were conscious of this position and who put up a fight to make the T. U. C. a powerful organ in the hands of the workers in their fight against capitalism, thus counteracting the attempts of the orthodox leadership to lead the Trade Union movement of India which is still young and weak in reformist channels. We have sufficient example of how the bureaucratic reformist trade union leadership of the British T. U. Movement is using the movement as a bulwark for capitalism against the struggling workers, and inducing them to accept Rationalisation worsened conditions, and "Mondism", instead of organising them for an offensive against the capitalist. Another reason why the reformist leadership has to be fought is this. The expansion of capitalism in India is taking place during the period of decline of Capitalism characterised by the narrowing up of the world market and the consequent intensification of competition. During this period it is not possible for capitalism to give improved conditions and "concession" as was possible in Britain in the early days of industrial development. On the other hand it is forced to introduce rationalisation and oppose any "concessions" or betterment of conditions. These points must be taken into consideration when formulating the policy of the Congress.

What happened at the Jharia Congress, much time was taken up by discussing whether they should recommend delegates to the International Labour Conference to be held at Geneva under the auspices of the I. L. O now every one knows that the I.L.O. is an appendage of Imperialism and as such is not in existence to function in the interest of the workers. Further it is overwhelmingly controlled by the capitalist of the countries most interested. The Communist group took their stand for complete severance with this Imperialist body, the only logical position the Indian Trade Union Congress could take.

Here the vacillating Dewan Chamanlal through his support on the side of co-operation with Imperialism and was assisted by

bourgeois reformists like Mahabubul Huq, Shiva Rao etc; and the congress agreed to nominate delegates.

This showed one of the inconsistencies of the congress because. They carried a resolution on Imperialism pointing out that "Imperialism was a form of *"capitalist class government"* intended to facilitate and perpetuate the exploitation of the workers both white and coloured and declares that the only safeguard against exploitation lies in the creation by the working class of a corresponding nature of class unity, solidarity, and consciousness and desire to bring about the greatest possible solidarity and co-ordinated activity on the part of the Trade Unions throughout the world to oppose Imperialism."

This resolution made it quite clear the position the Congress should have taken, another very important item was International affiliation, on this matter Dewan Chamanlal the champion acrobat appears again. A letter had been received from the International Federation of Trade Unions, "Second International", calling for affiliation to the same. At the same time two large trade union had tabled a resolution calling for affiliation to the R. I. L. U. "Third International."

Dewan Chamanlal said in Europe this year according to Imprekorr. 2-11-28.

That "The British Labour Party, together with the Second International, are the advance guard of British and European imperialism in order to prevent and postpone the emancipation of the Colonial Peoples".

The T. U. Congress decided to affiliate to neither Internationals, The "Times" 1-1-29 says "Dewan Chamanlal again won." Thus preventing affiliation to the R. I. L. U. Again Chamanlal assisted the Congress along pro-imperialist lines, he fought the suggestion to link up with the Pan Pacific Trade Union. Secretariat this body has already done good work in drawing together the organisations of workers from such exploited countries as China, Indonesia, the Phillipines, Korea, Japan etc. He supported the idea which was germinated by the I. L. O. to call an "Asiatic Labour Conference" in 1929, with the assistance of the bought agents of Japanese imperialism such as Bunji Suzuki, Matsuoka, Yonekubu & Co., supporters of the Second International, thus ignoring the P.P.T.U.S. and the work done by it.

By this action Dewan Chamanlal had assisted the treacherous betrayal of the Indian workers through the T.U.C., to the handmaids of Imperialism.

The two important questions I have dealt with broadly are the national and international aspects, on the national basis with

many of these "Trade Union Leaders" preparing to sell the workers to the capitalist through, Boards of Conciliation, and Whitley Councils a vigerious campaign must be carried on against this. The Resolution calling for a General Strike against the Trade Dispute Bill must be carried forward, and the workers prepared to take up a militant offensive for better conditions.

On the International question the workers organisation i. e. the T. U. C. must sever connections with all pro-imperialist bodies that is the L. L. O., and to the Second International and other subsidiary organisations, and link up with those organisations which are carrying on a fearless struggle against Imperialisms and for the freedom of the exploited masses of the world. To make a united Front of all oppressed colonial peoples to effectively fight imperialism.

(Sd). B. F. BRADLEY.

## P. 1260.

### R E P O R T

on the

First Conference

of the

British Section

of the

League Against Imperialism

Held in London on July 7th., 1928

The first Conference of the League Against Imperialism (British Section) was held at the Essex Hall, Strand, London at 3.00 p. m. on Saturday, July 7th. 1928.

*Alex Gossip*, General Secretary of the National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades Association, was in the Chair.

The Secretary, R. Bridgeman, read a letter from *James Maxton*, M. P. apologising for his absence from the Conference which was due to the fact that he had been called to attend a meeting of the Scottish I. L. P. in Glasgow in connection with the CookMaxton

manifesto. In conveying his best wishes for the success of the Conference; Maxton said that "the League, in providing a common ground internationally on which the subject "races of the world can meet on an equal footing with representative men and women from the capitalist and imperialist countries, is doing a bit of work which is not covered by the existing Internationals; and the happenings with reference to the Indian Delegates at the British Labour Colonial Conference show the necessity of an organisation which is independent of any of the political parties."

The Secretary also read the following telegrams:—

*Madame Sun Yat-Sen* in the name of the oppressed Chinese people sent warmest greetings. "We are deeply grateful," she said, "for the valiant efforts of the British working-class, organisations in combatting British imperialistic evils in China. The world has seen how even military terrorism could not destroy "the revolutionary spirit of the Chinese masses." She called for all possible pressure to be exerted on the Government and for a demand for the immediate withdrawal of British troops and warships from China's shores.

*Mohammad Hatta*, Chairman of the Perhimpoean Indonesia, representing the liberation movement of the Indonesian people suffering from the oppression of Dutch Imperialism, expected the British working-class organisations to join the struggle of the oppressed people to free themselves from imperialist domination.

*Dr. Corbach* & other signatories on behalf of the German section of the League called attention to the fact that the Commonwealth Labour Conference had refused effective solidarity with India. The British Workers' Conference in united front with the oppressed was of the greatest significance.

A message from the *International Secretariat* of the League Against Imperialism, signed by Munzenberg and Chattopadhyaya, hoped the British Section would now unite the workers and other anti-imperialist elements into a powerful fighting organisation for the overthrow of world imperialism and the emancipation of all peoples and classes subjected to imperialist and capitalist exploitation.

The existence of a strong anti-imperialist movement in Great Britain as the leading imperialist country was essential to strengthen the world's anti-imperialist forces. It further hoped that the British section would not content itself with academic resolutions, but would expose the reformist manoeuvres of supporting the colonial policy of the imperialist Governments and actively cooperate with the subject peoples in the struggle for national and social emancipation.

*Monsieur Vernochet*, Secretary of the Educational Workers' International telegraphed from Paris in the name of 600,000 teachers. This organisation which had affiliated to the League Against

Imperialism in the very beginning, greeted the British section, and wished every success to the Conference.

*The Executive of the French League* sent confident greetings to the first national Conference in Britain which was of great importance to the movement throughout Europe.

*THE CHAIRMAN:* A. Gossip, regretted that the Chairman, J. Maxton, was unable to be present at the first public meeting of the British Section of the League. He considered that nobody had a right to call themselves Socialists and at the same time to believe in Imperialism—particularly the variety known as British imperialism which, in opposition to all ethical ideas, stood for the oppression of those weaker than themselves. He welcomed the Conference as helping to dispel the effects of the very misleading history accounts given to children at school.

*A. J. COOK* moved resolution No. 1 on "World Imperialism & War":—

"This Conference declares that world imperialism "is a constant menace to world peace and that the increasing control of the capitalist state by the trusts and monopolies whose interests are served by imperialists are served by imperialist policy seriously hampers the industrial and political freedom of the workers, in the 'advanced' as well as in the oppressed countries.

"This conference, therefore, declares that a struggle against world imperialism, in preparation for which the workers of the exploiting countries must ally themselves with the workers and peasants of the oppressed peoples, must be carried to a successful issue before world peace can be secured."

Cook wished to make it clear that the sole reason why his "sparring partner" Jimmie Maxton was unable to be present at the first Conference of the League was because he felt in duty bound to fight for his principles in Glasgow and to face some criticism that had arisen there.

Modern events tended to show that the best interests of the working class in Britain can be served only if we fight at the same time against the exploitation, suppression and murder of the workers in colonial and semi-colonial countries. Of what use is it to defend British miners, if the coalowners and other capitalists of Britain are permitted to use the armed forces of the state to beat down the standards of millions of colonial workers, in order that commodities may be produced at a cost which prohibits the selling of the things produced by members of our Trade Unions at home?

Capitalism has no country; its home is wherever profits can be made, and it is the business of the capitalists and the Capitalist

state, to use the workers of all countries against each other in their own interests.

It is the business of all bona-fide workers to fight against the fake patriotism of our masters and to stand openly and unashamedly on the platform of "class against class."

Therefore I thank the Anti-Imperialist League for the work it is going to do not only in behalf of the colonial workers, but on behalf of our own Miners' Federation.

Take the situation which faces us in this, the basic industry of Britain. See our pits closing down, our men and women being rapidly starved, and a progressively contracting market for our coal.

They made us the victims of a process of mutual assassination, by imposing longer hours and lower wages, in order that, the coal-owners said, Britain could win new markets for coal by selling at much lower prices abroad.

It has all been in vain, for in every coal-producing country the same arguments have been used, whilst in colonial countries—particularly in India and China—the forces of the British state have been ruthlessly used to maintain a condition of slavery and repression, as the means to reduce the costs of production in those countries.

Comrades, how can it benefit us to raise our heads in pride because of the greatest accident in our lives "where we were born." We are only entitled to do this when our people have a standard of life which guarantees every man, woman and child a sufficiency of the things they need, and the economic security without which there is no freedom.

Take the case of China where 20,000,000 is invested in coalmining, 6,000,000 of which belongs to British capitalists and 5,500,000 to Japanese capitalists.

The balance of approximately 9,000,000 is held by Chinese capitalists, jointly with British Japanese.

Coal production in China has increased from 14,000,000 tons in 1913 to 24 million tons in 1924. In 1913 less than one million tons was exported; in 1924. 3,500,000 were sent abroad.

The miners there work a two-shift system; 5:00 a.m. to 5 P.M. and 5 p. m. to 5 a.m. (Figures taken from the Iron & Steel Trades Review, May 5th 1925). Wages vary from 6d per day to 1s/8d per day. What hope is there for British miners if this allowed to continue?

This is not only true of the 420,000 mineworkers of China, but it applies to an equal extent in the metal industry and other trades. Wages differ considerably in China, but recent investiga-



tions show that the average yearly income of the working class and peasantry does not exceed £3. 2s. 6d. and this applies to 75% of the population.

They live on rice and wheat, in hovels which are as terrible as in any part of the world. In Shanghai the average monthly wage is about 12 Mexican dollars (24s. 6d) and the average working day is 12 to 14 hours.

The Imperialist countries—Britain, America and Japan—are each and all engaged in the task of gaining possession and dominance in this China, with its 4,500,000 square miles, a potential market in the 400 million inhabitants, and the ability to exploit the mass of this huge half-starved population.

The Chinese workers have been trying to throw off the incubus of British Imperialism, in order that they may struggle for better conditions, but the British Labour Movement, I regret to say, not only does not assist the Chinese workers, who, if successful, will improve the lot of the workers here, but throws in its weight behind the Baldwin Government, in the sending of armed forces to wage war against our comrades.

Egypt is a further example of the futility of the working-class struggle at home unless we unite with the colonial and oppressed peoples.

India will be dealt with by Saklatvala and Brockway, but in this connection I desire to say that the Simon Commission is, in my opinion, intended to serve the same purpose as that for which the Samuel Commission was used. It is to bluff and fool the Indian workers and to seduce the British working-class movement from its class duty to these comrades.

Hartshorn, I assure you, has no authority from the Miners' Federation to participate in this Commission, and if and when miners have the opportunity to speak they will in no uncertain voice condemn this parallel to Mondism by dealing with Hartshorn, who is acting for Baldwin, against the workers at home and abroad. The Indian T.U.C. have condemned the Simon Commission, their representatives have withdrawn from the Commonwealth Conference this week. Lansbury rebukes them for sticking to their class and carrying out the orders of their organisation, whilst he forms a united front with the most violent and ruthless opponent of the British workers, Lord Birkenhead.

Later we shall see Lansbury and others who profess to be pacifists declaring against the inevitable imperialist wars which they are preparing the way for now. Comrades we are near the 14th anniversary of the outbreak of the Great War. In this war 10,000,000 were killed, whilst millions more were wounded and

ruined for life. The war was no accident, it was only possible result of capitalist development. Capitalist imperialism is impossible without militarism. The struggle for markets and raw materials and the power to exploit cheap labour is part of capitalist imperialism.

The colonial workers will be suppressed and great imperialist nations will commence new "Great Wars," which will bring greater horrors to our people than we have ever before known, so long as this system of capitalist exploitation remains unchallenged and the official labour movement collaborates with the murderers of the people.

The Bengal Ordinance against the Indian workers by a Labour Government, the participation in the Simon Commission by Labour representatives, the sending of cruisers to Egypt which were built by a Labour Government, the sending of troops to China with the acquiescence of the Parliamentary Labour Party, all these are betrayals of the British as well as of the colonial workers,

They may talk of Kellogg Proposals for peace whilst they are feverishly piling up armaments for new wars. If they mean peace then the way was shown by the proposals of Litvinoff at Geneva, in which he offered on behalf of the Soviet Government to disarm with all other Nations.

Only a Workers' Government which has no imperialist aspirations can honestly work for peace. We must follow in the path to peace via a struggle for the overthrow of capitalism at home and abroad. Machinery is needed to enforce our arguments, that machinery can be supplied by the League Against Imperialism. The test of good machinery is in the answer to the question "Did it function in time of need?" A strong and efficient section of the League must be built up in Britain in order to stop war by removing the cause of war.

As the representative of the most oppressed section of the British working-class I stand shoulder to shoulder with the oppressed peoples; I call upon you all to defeat collaboration with capitalism, whether it be Modism or MacDonaldism, whether it operates at home or abroad, and to fight for the right of complete independence for the subject peoples. It is the only way to peace and bread.

HARRY POLLITT, Secretary of the Minority Movement, seconded the resolution. He said that the problem of war was not solved by the Peace Treaties of 1919; on the contrary the very same causes were now operating in a more intense degree. The same basic problem facing each country today is where to find markets for its production which is far and away in excess of pre-war standards. There is the struggle to control raw material, the rival-

ry to set up capitalist industries in undeveloped countries. To the workers of those countries this policy means loss of land, loss of rights, etc., and in countries such as Britain the effects are lower wages, longer hours, intensified production which must lead to new wars on a scale larger than 1914—18. Today there is much general talk of peace, yet every year the amount spent on armaments is increased for every country of the world while a decrease of expenditure on the social services takes place in those countries. But it is a mistake to think of war only as of the war 1914—18. As far as America is concerned there is practically war in Nicaragua, yet we have all the humbug talked about the Kellogg Fact, which the Powers are willing to sign—with certain reservation—that is, provided they can continue to do as they wish. A new driving force for war will emerge when Germany is strong enough to demand new colonies needed to market the goods produced under the Dawes scheme.

But the British Labour Movement must drop its Curzon-like attitude towards the working-classes of the colonial countries:—it must work for the merging of the various unions and for giving equal rights and status for all workers of the world; and it must pay serious attention to preparing the minds of the men who will be called to use arms when the call is given. Serious and detailed attention must be given to the establishment of the movement against imperialism and against war. This is necessary because there is no final solution for freeing the workers of this and other countries unless it takes into account the need for preparing for the overthrow of the imperialist governments and the setting up of alternative machinery of Government.

Pollitt concluded by appealing to all those opposed to imperialism to be prepared to sink some little differences in order to secure the overthrow of war and all that war entails.

Resolution No. 1 was then put to the vote carried unanimously.

#### EMERGENCY RESOLUTION

#### “INDIA AND THE SIMON COMMISSION”

This resolution was moved by Mr. Srinivasa Iyengar, who had been specially appointed to represent the Indian National Congress.

Mr. Iyengar said that he had experienced his first real pleasure since he had been in England in attending the meeting of the League; until then his feeling had been the feeling of despair. But the League was taking hold of a real idealism, and concentrating attention on the welfare of the masses and not on the governing classes.

In England he found that parliament was not the ruler of the people; the government is in the daily press which gives no expression at all to idealism, but only to an unblushing exploitation of the world, including millions of their own countrymen in these islands.

War was brought about by imperialist rivalry. Exploitation begets exploitation. But for the experiment which was being made that they by the League we should be faced with all the problems which have had to be faced for the last two generations here.

The Indian National Congress had had the pleasure of affiliating to the League during Mr. Iyengars' chairmanship. The League Against Imperialism should be made one of the strongest organisations in this country. The League must be made a supreme organisation. He had found the British political movement polygamous, one man might be a member of the I. L. P., another a member of the Labour Party, a man may belong to the Liberal Party, he may also be a conservative. A movement so parcelled out cannot be fruitful, an allegiance so divided cannot possibly lead to a strong policy in international affairs. 'If you are not careful,' said Mr. Iyengar, "by the time you have gained power your party will have merged into something else and you will not know what principles it stands for." You must not put your faith in Parliament. We do not possess the least faith in legislatures."

Mr. Iyengar had visited South Wales and found that the conditions there, having regard to the different standard of necessities, are equally as bad as in India. He reminded the audience that in Madras an unskilled labourer earns 8-10 annas a day.

He looked forward to the League Against Imperialism establishing a new friendship between the common people of all the countries of the world. It must be made a live institution so that it might remove the blight of imperialism which disfigures British culture. Complete independence was India's goal.

S. SAKLATVALA, seconding the resolution, said that in the League it would not be the voice of the oppressed nations only that would be heard but the voice of the working-class of the oppressing nations also. He called attention to the loose use of the term "self-determination" as meaning that an enslaved country should constitutionally express its determination but that when, as today, the whole of India united to condemn the Simon Commission the Labour Party said in effect "You are wrong. We are wiser. Let us do what is better for you." But the Indians, the Chinese and so on wanted to know whether the British Labour Party could be true to its own workers and to the faith of Socialism and at the same time presume to rule other countries. It is no part of a Socialist's duty to govern other countries and as Socialists we should refuse to govern the Indians, the Egyptians, the Chinese,

Referring to the initial difficulties of the League Saklatvala said that the charge had been made against the League-as against other new ideas- that it emanated from Russia. As a matter of fact it was not true but in any case the test was, not whether the idea originated in Chinese, Russian or any other brains but " is it worthy of the working-class ? "

As for the necessity for such a League as the League Against Imperialism, Saklatvala reminded the audience that the Parliament of this country had during the past 125 years equipped and sent soldiers to Spain, to France, to Germany, to Belgium, to the Netherlands, to Turkey, to Russia, to Egypt, to the Sudan, to Persia, to Afghanistan, to Basutoland, to the Punjab, to Bengal, to Ceylon, to Ireland, to Malaya, and to China. This country had organised all these wars in other people's lands, and for the Labour Party to hold up its hands in horror at the Russians and anything Russian while saying they agreed with these murderers was nothing short of hypocrisy. The Englishmen in Parliament do not dare to think, but the others outside do still think.

Saklatvala appealed to the delegates not to be influenced by disparaging arguments about the source of ideas being Russian. He complained that for the past twelve months members of the Labour Party had been playing a double game, pretending to be with the League Against Imperialism, but behind the scenes trying to destroy it. He appealed to the delegates to make the question of Imperialism a test question with their Labour M. P. S. and unless they were in favour of imperialism they should be asked to join the League, attend its meetings in public, and to take practical measures to secure the withdrawal of the Labour representatives on the Simon Commission.

*GEORGE ALLISON* who had recently spent 18 months in an Indian prison, then spoke on his experiences in that country. He had worked in the coalmines in this country and said that in the outposts of the Empire one saw with less talk and camouflage the sufferings inflicted in order that the Empire may be maintained. In India it takes a brave man to be a Trade Unionist and a brave man to be a nationalist. Men are in gaol in Bengal who do not even know what they are charged with: they are even refused a trial. Yet all the Labour Delegations that go to India are strangely ineffective: they fail to strike exactly the right note. There is always the suggestion that the colonial peoples may be treated differently. We must stand for the destruction of imperialism and must extend the hand of comradeship and we shall find the Indian workers nearer to extending that hand than would be believed. The present lack of organisation where Indian and English workers can meet can be overcome by the League. As soon as the British Labour movement puts itself secure as to where it stands with imperialism

the Indian workers will extend their friendship, and we must then get down to establishing organisational contact that will lead to solidarity of action, or we shall be in the same place as the people who go to India apologising for Imperialism.

*Mr. Chandler*, South west Ham I. L. P. asked for an explanation of the inference contained in Saklatvala's speech of the sabotage of the League by Labour members, and suggested that the section referring to Labour members should be deleted from the resolution.

*Mr. Bagnari*, National Union of Clerks, supported the idea that agreement with the League Against Imperialism should be made a test question of Labour M. P. S.

Replying, SAKLATVALA said that as far as the suggestion that the Labour Party's action is one of open union with Imperialism is concerned, Lord Birkenhead's declaration that the Labour Party had loyally helped him in a critical moment was sufficient. During the debate on the Simon Commission it had been said that there were no differences on the Indian question: there was now solid British patriotism: Labour and the Baldwin Government were working in harmony. It would be an insult to MacDonald's patriotism even to raise the point.

With regard to the complaint that Labour Members had attempted to sabotage and have failed to support the League Against Imperialism, preparations were made for the formation of this League in 1926. Its formation was discussed as early as 1924 when it was suggested that the Countess of Warwick might lend Easton Lodge as a place where visitors from the colonies might meet to discuss the foundation of the League. A scheme was prepared and twelve selected Comrades in the Labour movement were appealed to—Lansbury, Wilkinson, Kelly, Thurtle, Malone and others from the Labour benches, including Comrade Bridgeman, who remains the sole survivor of the wreckage. Detailed subjects, for investigation were sent out to various countries, and when the answers were completed and a meeting called only three M. P. S. came; further appeals were made to the Members, but at a later meeting only one turned up. At the International Conference held in Brussels Lansbury agreed with the League, but none of them had been prepared to work with it since.

#### THE RESOLUTION ("India and the Simon Commission")

"This Conference of working class organisations "in London declare its complete opposition to the imperialists policy of the Baldwin Government towards India. It voices its full solidarity with the Indian people in their rejection of the farce of the Simon Commission, which it recognises as an attempt of British Imperialism to fasten the shackles of exploitation still more firmly on India

and it condemns the the participation in the Commission by the Labour Party, which thereby makes common cause with the Imperialists.

"This Conference pledges its support for the "struggle of the Indian people against imperialist oppression "expressed in the Indian demand for complete national independence and for the election of a representative constituent Assembly to decide the political future of India."

Was then put to the Conference and carried with two dissentients.

*The Secretary* then read the following letter from *Mr. Mardy Jones M. P.* who was prevented from attending the Conference and from moving the resolution on "British Imperialism" by the sudden death of the only son at work of his brother, a miner in South Wales, with 10 young children. He had received a pitiful appeal to go down and help them through their troubles and he did not feel able to delay going even by a day:—

"I heartily support the resolution on British Imperialism and I know Brockway will do it justice far better than I can. My own previous conviction of the evils of British Imperialism has been strengthened as a result of my recent tour in India, Malaya and Java.

"It is now evident to me that the Dutch East Indies are being held by Holland solely by the secret backing of British imperialism and a secret understanding exists between the two Governments.

"Singapore base is part of the pact.

"British Imperialism is rampant throughout Malaya and the natives and their native rulers are under its heels, whilst the immense resources of tin ore and rubber in Malaya yield enormous revenues to British capitalism."

"I visited the naval base at Singapore, which is wanton waste of countless millions of money, being built up as the key position in readiness for the next world war in the Pacific.

#### INDIA

"But it is in India that the worst features of British Imperialism run riot.

"Princes and peasants are all pawns in the game, and the world peace is impossible so long as we hold India. For India is being kept in subjection partly as a milch-cow for the Rentier and military castes of Britain; and mainly as a political breakwater

to keep in check the Asiatic upheaval that is rising rapidly all over the East.

"As a result of my tour in India I am convinced that the boycott of the Simon Commission is justified."

*A. FENNER BROCKWAY*, Political Secretary of the I. L. P. and Editor of the *New Leader*, then moved the following resolution on "British Imperialism":—

"This Conference representing over 100,000 London organised workers, sends its sincere greetings to the oppressed peoples of India, Egypt, South Africa, West and East Africa, Burma, the West Indies and other countries exploited by British Imperialism under the Union Jack. It also sends its greetings to the peoples of China, Persia, Afghanistan, Arabia, Abyssinia and other independent countries whose national liberty and economic freedom are seriously threatened by the British Empire.

"We express our belief that the workers in the colonial countries while cooperating with all classes who are prepared to fight for national liberty, will have to take the lead in that struggle.

"This Conference declares that colonial exploitation provides the British capitalist class with its easiest and most abundant source of profits, and thus constitutes its chief reserve of strength in its struggle with the British workers. It declares further, that the sweated labour which the capitalists command in countries such as India, Egypt and China, is proving an ever-increasing menace to British textile workers, miners, metal workers, etc.

"Therefore, we undertake to secure the maximum possible support in the British working-class movement for the struggle of colonial workers, confident that British workers will understand the need for a class alliance with every people fighting our common enemy, the British capitalist class,"

*Brockway* regretted having to take the place of *Maxton*, but assured the audience that the Chairman of the I. L. P. who was also Chairman of the League Against Imperialism stood whole heartedly for the League. In the *Maxton-Cook* rallying call they had concentrated on the industrial position at home, but just as they demanded a bolder attitude by the Labour Party in Home affairs, so they demanded that the attitude of the Labour Party should be bolder in its opposition to Imperialism,

That Britain is the greatest Imperialist country in the world should be to Socialists a cause of shame, not glory. And while we may dislike criticising the Party to which we are affiliated and to which we belong, if the same policy is continued nothing effective will be done to deal with British Imperialism in the world.



The much discussed Bengal Ordinance after all was sanctioned during the Labour Party's term of office.

Egypt was the touchstone of British Imperialist policy. In spite of the recognition of Egypt's "independence" there seemed little likelihood of British troops being withdrawn.

A much sterner anti-imperialist attitude is necessary within our ranks.

India today is an example of the effects of the capitalists using the labour of the colonial countries to cut the wages of the workers in this country. Modern capitalism with its most effective equipment is being entrenched in these Eastern countries. The working-class of those countries should also start with the latest ideas of organisation and strategy, and with those modern conceptions there should be no reason why the working-class of the East should not advance much more rapidly and without the long struggle that took place in the West.

One of the safeguards against the growing Nationalisms in the East—which could be easily diverted into capitalisms—is to build up a strong working-class movement demanding national independence and international solidarity.

*CONRAD NOEL* Vicar of Thaxted, in seconding the Resolution on "British Imperialism," Called attention to the present move in patriotic circles to refer to the Empire as a commonwealth of Nations, as a free association of peoples rather than an aggregation of lands gained by conquest as the older Empires of Rome, Austria, Germany, etc., whereas conquest, the economic drive, the exploitation of the people, the forced labour and so on is the kernel of the whole matter.

*Fung Saw*, of the London Kuomintang, conveyed his best wishes to the Conference, and expressed regret that for the most part of the Labour Movement in the West had been content to pass resolutions. The Chinese workers and peasants looked to the League Against Imperialism as the opening of a brighter prospect for the Peasant nations, particularly the peasants of the U. S. S. R. and of China.

*Tom Mann* said that for twenty-four weeks last year he had been visiting the different districts of China on behalf of the R. I. L. U., and he considered it a hopeful sign that the workers in India and China had realised the necessity for industrial organisation. As a matter of fair play we ought to afford them every possible assistance to obtain for themselves at least as good chances as we enjoy ourselves.

The Chinese workers have only recently been permitted—with the advance of the Revolutionary army—to organise in Trade Unions;

many thousands of Chinese comrades were shot for no other reason than that they were connected with a Trade Union. The right to organise must be granted to the colonial peoples.

*Mrs. Despard* said (after the loud and prolonged applause had ceased) that although she had come to the Conference to listen and not to speak, she was glad for two reasons to be on the platform.

Firstly because, as a woman, she felt that the effects of Imperialism are worse for women than for men. In whatever changes may come to pass the men and women should be standing together. If Parliaments were superseded—and she thought that Parliament had seen its day—the women equally with the men must decide the question.

Secondly, because she was an Irish woman, married to a good Irishman, and listening to the speeches that afternoon, especially those about India, made her feel that Ireland should be one of the first to join the League Against Imperialism. India, in particular, had something in common with Ireland. Both had felt the scourge; in both cases every effort had been made to turn them from the right direction. She wanted the British Empire to die. She wanted every nation to be free to make its own destiny, to pass its own laws, and prepare and carry through its own social order. The civilisation of Ireland was much older than that of Britain: the same might be said of India with its splendid history and civilisation. India will return to itself as Ireland will return to itself; that will be true independence, and it is for that we stand.

The resolution on "British Imperialism" was then put to the vote and carried unanimously.

*B. Bridgeman*, Honorary Secretary of the British Section of the League and a member of the Executive Committee of the International League, moved the following resolution on

#### ORGANISATION

1. This Conference declares its hearty support of the League Against Imperialism and Colonial Oppression, founded at Brussels in 1927. It regards the creation of strong mass organisation of the League in the capitalist countries as essential for an effective anti-Imperialist movement in the whole world; it therefore welcomes the formation of a section of the League in Britain and expresses the hope that this section will be joined by thousands of British workers who will carry on the fight against British Imperialism, the most experienced and most dangerous imperialism in the world.

2. The first step that should be taken in this direction is the enrolment of a large body of active workers as individual members of

the League to prepare the way for further support for the League on the basis of collective membership.

3. Membership of the British Section of the League will be open to all who are prepared:—

(a) To Support the objects and policy of the League.

(b) To pay a minimum annual subscription of one shilling.

4. The British Section of the League shall be an affiliated body of the International League Against Imperialism and Colonial Oppression.

5. The Executive Committee of the British Section shall attempt to establish local groups of the League wherever possible.

*Bridgeman* said that by the constitution of the League which had been drawn up in Brussels last year, all political organisations, all Parties, Trade Unions and persons who were fighting against capitalist—imperialist domination for the self determination of all nations, for the national liberty of all people, for the equal rights of all races, classes and individuals were allowed to affiliate to the League Against Imperialism. A General Council represented the League between Congresses and an Executive Committee also functioned. The present British Section had been formed provisionally and the resolution formally proposed that a British Section of the International League should be constituted.

Although British Imperialism was the most important in the world, there were other Imperialisms working on the same lines and American imperialism in particular was making great strides, in Central and Southern America especially. We were accustomed to connect war solely with warships, aircraft, guns and explosives, but what was happening on the industrial front at the present time was just as definitely a war of the employing class against the working class as a war conducted with the more generally accepted weapons.

*E.R. Pountney* seconded the resolution with the following addendum, which was accepted:—

“that this Conference shall appoint a Committee of seven  
“to carry on the work of getting members and carrying on  
“propaganda.”

The following nominations were accordingly made:

Mrs. Elinar Burns, 68 Hampton Road, Twickenham.

Mr. B. A. Bagnari (N. U. C.) 46 Frewell Flats, Holborn E. C. I. London.

Mr. F. G. Stone (president of the Socialist Forum), 7 Great Ormond Street, London, W. C. I.

Mr. Fung Saw, 4 Denmark Street, Charing Cross Road, London.

Mr. J. Crossly, 42 Sotheby Road, Highbury N. 5, London.

Mr. R. Bishop, 16 King Street, Covent Garden, London.

Mr. D. Capper, 100 Gillingham Road, Gillingham, Kent.

Mr. E. R. Pountney nominated was declined.

Mr. B. Goodyear, Secretary of the London Unemployed Committee, East Willesden Branch, Buckley Road, Bermondsey, volunteered to serve on the London Committee if required.

Mr. A. J. Cook suggested that T. U. Groups should nominate.

After some discussion as to the method of appointing the Committee from the meeting, the formation of the London Committee was agreed to with four dissentients.

The Secretary reported that 170 Branches were represented at the Conference by 343 delegates, representing over 100,000 workers in the greater London area.

It was agreed unanimously to send the greetings of the Conference to Messrs. Maxton and Cook who were holding their first Conference in Glasgow on Sunday, July 8th.

The meeting concluded about 6.30 p.m. with the singing of the Internationale."

---

## P. 1261.

*1261 T Rejected.*

A loose sheet note book, containing the following amongst other entries :—

Page 1	..	Zaske; Palme Dutt.
Page 3	...	War and Communism.
Do.	...	For and against Empire. Lenin's Last Phase.
Page 4	....	Communists and India. Modest Programme. Anti—Imperialist.

Page 8 . ....

*Lenin.*

5th.....

USMANI—1870.

Russian—Czar—Lenin.

India ?

Oppression of peasantry—Similiarity.

Mohuram : The frenzied grief of Russian proletariat at the death of Lenin.

Kremlin.

Lenin is dead: but Leninism servives.

Supplied the ideological back ground to the workers to overthrow imperialism.

Prerequisites for the overthrow of imperialism.

CHINA—1905.

Rrepression leading to organised solidarity.

Page 9 ....

Usmani, Dange, Bradley, Majid.

The movement remains because the ideological legacy.

---

Bradley— isolation of Russia, flow communist literature is kept out.

Analyse correctly the position of the day.

Exile from Russia.

Denikin and koldiak.

British—

Councils of action (A. I. T.)

Cordon Sanitaire.

Dr. Nausen—

Afghan Revolution

War Danger.

Participate in the day Today Struggles of Workers & Peasants.

Dominion Status

Collaboration with imperialism.

Nimbkar : Greatest man in the World.

Rolland : Leppin : Mahdium

Socialism, Communism.

Leninism — foreign.

Knowledge is never foreign.

Marx - German.

Lenin - Russian.

French Revolution & Russian.

---

WORKERS' DEMONSTRATION.

---

- T. C. Goswami - Burdwan and starving Peasants.
- Page 10 ... Lenin & Workers Govt.  
 Bread to the Worker.  
 Land to the Peasant.  
 Peace to the people.  
 Education for all.  
 Times, Pioneer, Stalin.  
 Shin War : British gold.  
 [Communism will not destroy but build up industry.]
- ✓ S. A. Dange—Middle Class.  
 State : Democratic Control.  
 State : Capitalist Dictatorship.  
 If the State is based on violence, it will be overthrown by violence communist cannot believe in communism.
- 9  
 This does not mean murder is recomdd. by communism.  
 No encouragement of anarchism. Violence is to be used at a particular stage.  
 We communists have not made a
- Page 11 ... With the Bengal Annaracist Revolutn.  
 There is no place in our philosophy for individual murder.  
 We Command Parel.  
 Each Mill- 10 Lorries.  
 We can storm the bourgeoisie quarter. We can hold Bombay atleast for a day.  
 Lenins ? Conditions.  
 1905 failed - Why-  
 We cannot be held responsible for the murders at Parel.  
 Materialist Conception of the World. - Anti-religions.  
 Atheism is preached in colleges but colleges are not accused of being communistic.  
 Campaign against communism.  
 Atheist State but religious toleration.
- Page 12 ... Overthrow of Social order.  
 No Secrecy.  
 The present order and not society itself because communists themselves would be destroyed.

Adhikary—

L. arrested the revision of Marxism.  
Imperialism.

- (1) Arrest the corruption of marxism.
- (2) Overthrow of Imperialism.
- (3) Tactics of Proletarian Revolution.

---

## P. 1262.

Several issues of the "Spark" newspaper for the following dates:—

- 27 January 1929 (5 copies).
- 10 February 1929 (5 copies).
- 17 February 1929 (5 copies).
- 24 February 1929 (5 copies).
- 3 March 1929 (5 copies).
- 10th March 1929 (5 copies).
- 17 March 1929 (5 copies).

---

## P. 1263.

*1263 T. Rejected.*

Issues of the Marathi newspaper "Kranti" of the following dates:—

- 24 February 1929.
- 17 February 1929.
- 9 March 1929.
- 10 March 1929.