

P1203
— P1220

1525

Meerut Conspiracy Case.

1929 — 32.
SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S
BRANCH LIBRARY
BOMBAY

23785

- 201
 202
 1203 Political Tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East. Page. 2
 1204
 1205
 1207(2) Two Tactics — P. 16.
 1207(3) Death of Lenin — 23
 1207(4) Lenin Day — 25
 1207(5) Lessons of the Boycott Campaign — 28
 1207(6) British Ind. Question at the VI W. Congress — 35
 1208
 1208(1) Indian Trade Union Question at the RILU Congress — 65
 1208(2) The Third International — 70
 1208(3) The Constitution of 3rd — 75
 1208(4) Role of the C.P. — 81
 1209 Our attitude to the Ind. N. Congress. (W.P.P.) a/c etc — 83.
 1210 to 1219 Items.
 1220 — Criminal Code of Russia — 97
 Thermidor — 113
 The World Revol. in S.S.R. — 130
 Notes of the Month — 135
 The Red Army — 150
 Literature in S.R. — 154
 Biographies — 159
 Relations of Workers' Party to Religion — 162
 Brit. War preparations in India — 171

23785

Z 2, 5W-7 N29

43

23788

P. 1201.

4 Issues in English of the Eastern and Colonial Bulletin issued by the Red International of Labour Unions, U.S.S.R. Moscow Solianka, 12, Palace of Labour, for the following dates:—

15th January 1928.

24th August 1927.

1st October 1927.

15th October 1927.

P. 1202.

6 issues of the Social Economic Labour Review in English— a bulletin of the R. I. L. U., Labour Research Department, for the following months:—

May 1927.

July 1927. (2 copies).

August 1927.

September 1927.

Oct. November 1927.

December 1927.

P. 1203.

Political Task of the University.

Of the Peoples of the East.

(SPEECH TO THE STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY

on May. 18, 1925)

COMRADES.

First of all I would like to congratulate you on the fact that you are celebrating the fourth anniversary of the founding of the Communist University of the Peoples of the East. I need hardly say that you have best wishes for success in the difficult task your university has shouldered, the task of training communists for work in oriental lands.

I want, furthermore, to claim your indulgence in that I have so seldom paid you a visit. I know that I should have come more often. But what can I do? I am up to my eyes in work, and there has literally been no possibility of visiting you more frequently.

Let us proceed at once to examination of the political task which confront the University of the Peoples of the East.

On analysis, we find that there is a certain duality in the composition of this university. Fifty nationalities and racial groups find a home under its roof. Still, the students are all children of the East. And yet these statements do not give us an adequate picture, a clear and complete description. There are, in fact, two distinctive groups of students at the university. One group is made up of those who came to us from Soviet lands in the East, from lands which had thrown off the imperialist yoke, from lands where the workers had overthrown the bourgeoisie and had seized the reins of power. The other group is composed of those who have come to us from colonial and vassal lands, from lands where capitalism is king, where the imperialism is as strong as ever it was, where the peoples have still to win their independence and clear out the imperialists.

Thus we have, as it were, two Easts, living different lives and developing under different conditions.

This two fold grouping of the students must of course leave its mark upon the work of the university. It explains why the university has one foot on Soviet ground and the other foot on the soil of the colonies and dependencies.

Two tasks, therefore, confront the university. One task is to train up citizens competent to minister to the needs of the Soviet republics of the East. The other task is to train up citizens com-

potent to minister the needs of the toiling masses in the colonial and vassal lands of the East.

Let us examine these tasks separately.

TASKS OF THE UNIVERSITY IN THE MATTER OF THE SOVIET REPUBLICS OF THE EAST.

In what way do these countries, these republics, differ from colonial and dependent lands?

(1) These republics are freed from the yoke of imperialism.

(2) They are developing and consolidating themselves as national units, not under the aegis of the bourgeois regime, but under the aegis of the Soviet power—a fact unprecedented in history, but, nevertheless, a fact.

(3) Though these republics are but slightly developed from the industrial point of view, they can count upon the support of the industrial proletariat of the Soviet Union.

(4) Having thrown off the yoke of foreign colonisers, protected by the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia, and being themselves members of the Soviet Union, these republics can and must participate in the work of upbuilding socialism in our country.

The fundamental task is to help the workers and peasants of these republics to take a hand in the establishment of socialism in our land, and (conforming to the special circumstances of life in each republic) to create and develop conditions which will quicken this movement of participation.

The following tasks are, therefore, to be immediately undertaken by all active workers in the Soviet East.

(1) The creation of industrial foci in all the Soviet republics of the East. These foci will become rallying points around which the peasants can group themselves side by side with the proletarians. As you are already aware, this work has been set afoot, and its development will run parallel with the economic growth of the Soviet Union. We are assured of success in this direction, even if it takes time to achieve, for we know that these republics are rich in raw materials of many kinds.

(2) The development of agriculture and, above all, of irrigation. This work, too, as you know, has been begun in Transcaucasia and Turkestan.

(3) The support and advancement of cooperation among the broad masses of the peasants and artisans. This is the most trustworthy way of ensuring the entry of the Soviet republics of the East into the general system of Soviet economic reconstruction.

(4) The creation of closer ties between the soviets and the masses; care that these soviets, by the composition of their membership, shall be truly representative of the respective nationalities. By such means we shall inaugurate a Soviet national State in close touch with the toiling masses, understood by these same masses.

(5) Encouragement of the respective national cultures; inauguration of a wide network of courses of lectures; schools for elementary education and for professional training where the teaching shall be given in the appropriate native languages; these measures will help in forming communist battalions and technical experts recruited from among the native populations.

The accomplishment of these tasks will greatly facilitate the work of socialist construction in the Soviet republics of the East.

There is talk of "model" Soviet republics of the East what is a "model" republic? A model republic is one which honestly and conscientiously performs all its tasks, thereby rallying the workers and peasants of neighbouring colonial and vassal lands into the movement towards their own emancipation.

I said a moment ago that the soviets must create close ties between themselves and the toiling masses of their respective republics, that they must become national soviets. What does this mean and how are we to set about the task in practice? It seems to me that the recent delimitation of the Turkestan frontier is an excellent example of how to set about creating closer ties with the masses. The bourgeois press sees only a bolshevist trick" in this delimitation of frontiers. Yet it ought to be clear that there is no trickery in the matter. Our one desire is to satisfy the deeply rooted aspirations of the Turcoman and Uzbek masses, which are eager to manage their own affairs. Before the revolution, both these countries were divided up among various khanates and States, and were an easy prey to exploitation by the wielders of power. The time has now come when these snippets of land can be united to form independent States, when the toiling masses of Uzbekistan and Turkestan can realise their aspirations towards selfgovernment. The most important result of the recent delimitation of frontiers in the Turkestan has been the welding together of these detached portions of land to form independent States. If subsequently, these States enter the Soviet Union as fully qualified members having equal rights with all the other States in the federation, this merely signifies that the bolsheviks have found the clue to the aspiration of the toiling masses in the East, and that, throughout the whole world, the Soviet Union is the only voluntary federation of the toiling masses of various nationalities. In order to reunite partitioned Poland the bourgeoisie has had to enter upon a series of wars. In order to reunite disintegrated Turkestan and Uzbekistan, the communists have needed but a few months of peaceful propaganda.

That is the way to bring the masses into contact with the administrative apparatus; the way to make the masses of workers participate in the life of the soviets.

In so far as we are successful in carrying out this policy we shall know that our line of action is the right one.

I mentioned earlier that the national cultural level of the oriental masses would have to be raised. What is a national culture? How are we to make a national culture compatible with a proletarian culture? Lenin, in pre-war days, said that we had two cultures; bourgeois culture, and proletarian culture. He maintained that the bourgeois cry of "national culture" was a reactionary one, that it intended to infect the minds of the workers with the virus of nationalism. How are we to reconcile the development of national cultures, the inauguration of schools where the teaching is carried on in the native tongue, and the creation of communist cadres from among the indigenous populations—how are we to reconcile this line of action with the upbuilding of socialism, with the upbuilding of a proletarian culture? Are we not enmeshed in contradiction? Of course not. We are now engaged upon the task of upbuilding a proletarian culture. There's no denying that. But proletarian culture (which is socialist at bottom) can assume different forms and different means of expression according to the various dispositions of the peoples participating in the work of socialist construction, according to their language, their local customs, and so forth. The culture may have a national form and a proletarian content. Such is the general culture towards which socialism gravitates. Proletarian culture, far from hindering national culture, actually provides the latter with a content. On the other hand, national culture, far from hindering proletarian culture, actually provides it with a form. So long as the bourgeois held the reins of power, the catchword of "national culture" was no more than a bourgeois slogan helping to consolidate nationalities under the aegis of the bourgeois system. But when the proletariat seized power, this catchword of "national culture" became transformed into a proletarian slogan aiming at the consolidations of nationalities under the aegis of the Soviet power.

He who has not grasped the difference of principle between these two situations will never understand Leninism, and will therefore, never be able to complete the nationalist question from Leninist point of view.

Certain persons (Kautsky, for instance) talk of the creation of a language common to all mankind, a language which will, by degrees, replace all other languages during the period of socialism. Personally, I am rather sceptical on this point. Hitherto experience has shown the theory to be a fallacious one. The socialist revolution, far from cutting down the number of languages that claim to be something more than dialects, languages that demand a place in the

world, has actually increased the number ; for, by arousing the broad masses of humanity, by leading them to take an interest in political life, socialism has stirred up a veritable hive of hitherto unknown or quasi-unknown nationalities. Who ever realised that tsarist Russia harboured no fewer than fifty nationalities and ethnic groups within its borders ? By breaking the chains of a series of forgotten peoples and nationalities, the October revolution has breathed into them a new life and new possibilities of development. It is customary to speak of "India" as a homogeneous whole. Yet, when the revolution breaks out in Hindostan, many hitherto ignored nationalities will emerge from their seclusion, will come forward, each with its own language and its own distinctive racial culture. As for the participation of the various nationalities in the general proletarian culture, this much is pretty certain, that such participation will take place in conformity with the Language and customs of each national participant.

Not long ago I received a letter from some Buriat comrades. They asked me to explain the important and complicated question of the relationship between the culture of mankind as a whole and the cultures of the various nationalities. Here is what they wrote:

We beg to explain the following questions which are very serious ones, for us and very difficult for us to answer. The aim of the Communist Party is to establish one universal culture throughout the world. How do you conceive of the transition from the national cultures of the various autonomous republics to one of the universal culture for all humanity ? How will peculiarities of the various national cultures (language, customs, and so forth) be assimilated.

What I said a moment ago could very well serve as answer to those comrades. They wish to know how the assimilation of various nationalities into the wide stream of proletarian culture will take place. Undoubtedly, certain nationalities may be and should be absorbed into the general culture. History is punctuated with such assimilations. This process of absorption of minor stocks tends to promote the development of more powerful races, for partial assimilation is the result of a general process of national growth. It follows that the possible assimilation of certain isolated nationalities does not run counter to our theory but, on the contrary, confirms it. Proletarian culture in no wise excludes, but fosters national culture, just as these latter round off and enrich the proletarian culture of mankind.

Such, in broad outline; are the immediate tasks confronting the comrades of the Soviet republics of the East.

Such is the nature, such the content of these tasks.

The present period of intense economic activity and of fresh concessions to the peasantry must be turned to good account in order to hasten the performance of these tasks and thereby to facilitate the participation of the Soviet republics of the East (essentially agricultural countries) in the general work of upbuilding socialism in the Soviet Union.

We are told that the new policy in regard to the peasantry (short-term leases, employment of wage labour, etc.) is retrogressive. There is some truth in the contention. None the less, the Soviet power and the Communist Party still remain their preponderant position and influence. Stable currency, industry and transport rapidly developing, credit system more and more consolidated (by the judicious assigning of credit, or by the withholding of credit, this or that stratum of the population may be raised or degraded in the most inconspicuous way possible) all these constitute for the proletarian dictatorship, reserves thanks to which a withdrawal on part of the front may facilitate the preparation of a general advance. That is why concessions made by the Party to the peasantry may, at a given moment, help rather than hinder the work of inducing the peasantry to participate in the upbuilding of socialism.

What may this signify for the Soviet republics of the East? It furnishes the active workers in these republics with a new weapon which will lighten the task of bringing them into the current of Soviet economic development, and will hasten this desirable achievement.

Such is the link between the Party policy in the rural areas and the immediate tasks confronting the active workers in the Soviet East.

Consequently, the duty of the University of the Peoples of the East in regard to these eastern republics is to train its students in such a way as to ensure their maximum efficiency in carrying to a successful issue the tasks I enumerated earlier.

The University cannot cut itself off from every day life. It is not and must not be allowed to become an institution standing aloof from common experience. It cannot, therefore, afford to ignore the immediate tasks confronting it in respect of the Soviet republics of the East. It must ever keep these things in view, while forming the contingents destined for work among the peoples of these republics.

In this connection I may mention two deviations in the practice of the active workers in the Soviet East. If the University hopes to form contingents of truly revolutionary workers it will have to guard against these two deviations.

One of these deviations is the excessive simplification of the tasks I have summarised, and the endeavour to apply mechanically to these eastern lands, lying on the outskirts of the Soviet Union, methods of economic organisation which are admirably adapted to the conditions at the centre of the U. S. S. R. but which run counter to the development situation of these eastern republics. Comrades who stray into this path have failed to understand two things. First of all they have not realised that conditions at the centre and conditions on the periphery are far from being identical; in the second place, they have not realised that the Soviet republics of the East do not form one homogeneous whole, that certain among them, for instance Georgia and Armenia, have reached a high stage of national development, that others, such as Chechnya and Kabardia, are on a much lower plane of national integration, and that others, such as Kirghizistan, stand midway between the two extremes. These Comrades do not understand that unless one adapts the work to local conditions, if one fails to take into account all the peculiarities of the various countries, the upbuilding of a really solid and stable structure is impossible. Those who wander off into the byways are cutting themselves adrift from the masses and are becoming nothing better than leftwing phrasemongers. The University of the Peoples of the East must wage ruthless war against this undue simplification.

The second deviation consists in exaggerating local peculiarities, in forgetting the common bonds which link up these eastern republics with industrial regions of the Soviet Union, in ignoring the tasks imposed by socialism, in working in a spirit of narrow and purblind nationalism. Those who are guilty of this deviation are little concerned with the internal organisation of their country, preferring to leave this to the natural course of events. They look upon "foreign" politics, the extension of the frontiers of their republics, litigation with neighbouring republics filching territory from the people next door, as of greater importance than the internal organisation of their country. Thus, I need hardly say, they delight the bourgeois nationalists of their country. Worse still, those who stray into this path are breaking away from socialism, and are tending to become bourgeois nationalists themselves. The University of the Peoples of the East must fight tooth and nail against this latent nationalism.

Such, then, are the tasks which must be undertaken by the University of the Peoples of the East in regard to the Soviet republics of the East.

TASKS OF THE UNIVERSITY IN THE MATTER OF COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES IN THE EAST.

I will now examine the second question, which concerns the tasks of the University of the Peoples of the East in relation to the colonial and vassal land of the Orient.

What is the difference between these lands and the Soviet Republics of the East ?

In the first place, the people in these countries live under the yoke of imperialism and developing under the aegis of imperialism.

Secondly, the revolutionary crisis in these lands is far more acute because of the double yoke imposed upon them, on the one hand by their own bourgeoisie, and on the other hand by the bourgeoisie of foreign countries.

Thirdly, in certain of these lands (India, for instance) the capitalist system is developing rapidly and is creating a native proletariat.

Fourthly, as the revolutionary movement progresses, the national bourgeoisie in each colonial or dependent land, tends to divide into two sections, a petty bourgeois section, which is revolutionary, and a great bourgeois section, which aims at compromise. The former continues the revolutionary struggle; the latter makes common cause with the imperialists.

Fifthly, confronting the imperialist coalition there is formed another coalition, the coalition of workers and revolutionary petty bourgeois. This is an anti-imperialist coalition among at the complete liberation of the country from the yoke of imperialism.

Sixthly, the question of proletarian leadership, and the question of enabling the masses to shake off the influence of that section of the nationalist bourgeoisie which would fain compromise with the power that be are questions of ever increasing actuality in these lands.

Seventhly, the last named fact greatly facilitates the linking up of the nationalist movement for the liberation of the countries with the proletarian movement in the more advanced countries of the West.

At least three deductions are possible from these seven points of difference.

(1) The liberation of colonial and vassal lands from the yoke of imperialism is not possible save by a victorious revolution. Independence does not come as a gift.

(2) If the advent of revolution is to be hastened, if complete independence of capitalistically developed colonies and dependencies is to be achieved, the compromising section of the bourgeoisie must be isolated, its influence upon the revolutionary section of the bourgeoisie must be annulled, the leadership of the proletariat must be ensured, and the advanced elements in the working class must be organised in an independent communist party.

(3) No lasting victory is possible in these lands unless the movement for their liberation—is effectively linked up with the proletarian movement of the more advanced countries of the West. The fundamental task of the communist in the colonies and the dependencies is to make these deductions the starting point of their revolutionary work.

What, then, are the immediate tasks confronting the communists in these lands?

In earlier days it was customary to look upon the colonial lands of the East as a homogeneous entity. This outlook no longer corresponds to the actual state of affairs. To-day there are no fewer than three categories of colonial and vassal lands. First of all there are the countries (like Morocco for instance) where there is no proletariat, or so small a proletariat as not to be worth mentioning; countries where industrial life is extremely backward. Secondly, there are countries (like China and Egypt, let us say) where manufacturing industry is little developed, and where the proletariat is, comparatively speaking, not very numerous. Thirdly, there are countries (like India) which are fairly well developed from capitalist point of view, and possess a proletariat which has attained noteworthy proportions.

It is obvious that each of these countries will need separate treatment.

In Morocco, for instance, the native bourgeoisie has as yet had no reason for splitting up into a revolutionary and a compromising section. The communist should, therefore, do everything to promote the creation of a united nationalist front capable of fighting against imperialist encroachments. A separation of the communist elements from the general movement for emancipation to form a communist party can take place in these lands only in the course of the struggle against imperialism, and more especially after that struggle has been waged to a successful conclusion.

In such countries as Egypt and China, where the native bourgeoisie is already split into a revolutionary section and a compromising section, but where the compromises have not yet made common cause with imperialism the communists are faced by other tasks than the formation of united nationalist front against imperialism. They will have to transcend the policy of the united nationalist front and adopt the policy of forming a revolutionary coalition between the workers and the petty bourgeois. This coalition may find expression in the creation of a single party whose membership will be drawn from among the working class and the peasantry, after the model of the Kuomintang. But such a party should be genuinely representative of the two component forces, the communist and the revolutionary petty bourgeois. This coalition

must see to it that the half-heartedness and the duplicity of the great bourgeoisie shall be laid bare, and that a resolute attack shall be made upon imperialism. The formation of such a party, composed, as we have seen, of two distinct elements, is both necessary and expedient, so long as it does not shackle the activities of the communists, so long as it does not hamper the agitational and propagandist freedom of the communist, so long it does not prevent the proletariat from rallying round the communists, so long it does not impair the communist leadership of the revolutionary forces. But the formation of a such a party is neither necessary nor expedient unless all these conditions are forthcoming; otherwise the communist elements would become absorbed into the bourgeois elements and the communist would lose their position as leaders of the proletarian army.

Somewhat different in the situation of affairs in a country like Hindustan. Here we find, not only that the native bourgeoisie is served into a revolutionary fraction and a compromising or reformist fraction, but in addition, that on all important issues of the reformist fraction has already rallied to the side of imperialism. The section of the native bourgeoisie dreads revolution more than it hates imperialism, it is more concerned about its money bags than about the interests of the fatherland; it is the wealthiest and most influential class in the national community, and it has wholeheartedly thrown in its lot with the irreconcilable enemies of the revolution, has made common cause with the imperialists against the workers and peasants of its native lands. The revolution cannot be victorious unless this alliance is broken. If we are to break it, we must concentrate our attack upon the reformist section of the native bourgeoisie, must expose its treachery, must withdraw the toiling masses from its influences, and must systematically prepare the way for the leadership of the proletariat. In other words, the proletariat of such lands as Hindustan must be trained to become the leader in the movement for nation emancipation, whilst the bourgeoisie and its spokesmen must be gradually dislodged from the leadership. The aim, therefore, must be to create a revolutionary, anti-imperialist coalition, and to ensure that, within this coalition, the role of leader shall be played by the proletariat. The coalition may (there are alternative possibilities) take the form of a single, united party of workers and peasants voicing a joint program. But the advanced communist elements will need to insist upon the independence of the Communist Party in such lands, for the proletariat cannot be prepared for its task as leader, nor can the proletarian leadership be realised, by any other than the Communist Party. Yet the Communist Party may, nay must, openly cooperate with the revolutionary section of the native bourgeoisie, if it is to succeed in isolating the compromising and reformist section, and in rallying the masses of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie to the fight against imperialism.

To sum up. The immediate tasks confronting the revolutionary movement in colonial and vassal lands where capitalism is well developed are as follows:

- (1) To win over the best elements among the workers to the cause of communism and to form independent communist parties.
- (2) To set up a nationalist and revolutionary coalition of workers, peasants, and revolutionary intellectuals, as a counterpoise to the coalition of the great bourgeoisie with the imperialists.
- (3) To guarantee that the leadership of the revolutionary coalition shall be in the hands of the proletariat.
- (4) To free the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie from the influence of the reformist native bourgeoisie.
- (5) To secure the linking up of the national liberationist movement with the proletarian movement of advanced countries.

We see, therefore, that the tasks, facing the communists in the colonial and vassal lands resolve themselves into five groups.

These tasks, considered in the light of the present international situation, are of exceptional importance. For the movement the salient characteristic of the international situation is that the revolutionary movement has entered a period of calm, of truce. What is the meaning of this state of calm? It means that the pressure on the workers of the west has been redoubled, that the oppression of colonial lands is more ruthless and that, above all, the attacks upon the Soviet Russia (the standard bearer of the revolutionary movement) have been reinforced. The imperialists have already begun preparing their onslaught against the Soviet Union. The campaign of calumny embarked upon at the time of the rising in Estonia, the campaign against the U.S.S.R. in connection with the explosion in the Sofia cathedral, the general and continuous campaign against Soviet Russia carried on in the columns of the capitalist press—one and all are the prelude to an offensive. Public opinion is thus to be prejudiced against Soviet Russia; these campaigns constitute, as it were a clearing of the ground as a preliminary to more drastic action; they are meant to create a "moral justification" for intervention. The future alone can tell what will be the results of these campaigns, and whether the imperialists will venture upon a serious offensive. One thing is obvious, that these attacks foreshow nothing but evil to the colonial peoples. The preparation of a counter offensive by all the forces of the revolution as an answer to the probable onslaught of the imperialists is, therefore, an urgent question of the day, and cannot be postponed.

It is for this reason that a systematic endeavour to accomplish the more urgent task in colonial and vassal lands is of such prime importance to the revolutionary movement.

In view of the foregoing considerations, we may ask what is the mission of the University of the Peoples of the East in relation to the colonies and dependencies? The University must study all the special characteristics of the revolutionary development in these lands, it must educate the student coming from these countries, must educate them in such a way as to be sure that they will be able fulfil all the tasks enumerated above.

The University of the Peoples of the East has opened its doors to about ten groups of students from these multiform colonial lands. We all know how eager these comrades are for the light and knowledge. The University must see to it that the students shall become genuine revolutionists, equipped with all the theories and all the practical experiences of Leninism, and capable of accomplishing the immediate tasks facing the movement for national emancipation, not as the out come of fear, but thanks to the promptings of conviction.

Here it is well to draw attention to two deviations into which the militant workers in these lands are liable to stray, and against which is essential to fight with the utmost resolution if genuinely revolutionary troops are to be created.

First of all, the revolutionary possibilities of the nationalist movement for emancipation must not be underestimated; on the other hand, the likelihood of a united national front comprising all the elements in the colonies and dependencies must not be overstressed, or looked forward to regardless of the conditions of the modes of life and the degrees of development in these regions. This is a deviation to the right which threatens to set back the revolutionary movement, and to merge the communist elements into the general welter of the national bourgeoisie. The University must combat this straying from the path with the utmost determination.

In the second place, the revolutionary possibilities of the nationalist movement for emancipation must be overestimated, nor must the importance of the alliance between the working class and the revolutionary bourgeoisie against the imperialists be underestimated. The Javanese communist seemed to suffer from this deviation when they, recently and quite wrongly, raised the slogan "All power to the soviets" in their country. This is a deviation to the left which threatens to sever the Party from the masses, and to transform it into a clique. A resolute fight against the deviation is essential if truly revolutionary battalions are to be formed in the colonial and vassal lands.

Such, in broad outline, are the political tasks facing the University of the Peoples of the East in relation to the workers in the Soviet Republics and the colonial lands of the East.

We may hope that the University of the Peoples of the East will be able to accomplish these tasks creditably.

P. 1204.

A file with the heading "VI WORLD CONGRESS." and containing several issues of the "International Press Correspondence" of the following dates:—

30-7-28	23-8-28	4-10-28	12-12-28
1-8-28	25-8-28	9-10-28	28-11-28
3-8-28	13-8-28	17-10-28	
8-8-28	1-9-28	30-10-28	
11-8-28	19-9-28	8-11-28	
16-8-28	27-8-28	21-11-28	
18-8-28	25-9-28	17-9-28	
	4-9-28		

P. 1205.

A file headed "Spark," containing issues of "Spark" of the following dates:—

27-1-29
10-2-29
17-2-29
24-2-29
3-3-29
10-3-29

P. 1207 (1)
OFFICE BEARERS

Presidium.

Muzaffar Ahmad	... 37, Herrison Road, Calcutta.
J. P. Begerhotta	... Rewari.
G. R. Darveshi	.. Mahnatkash, Lahore.
K. S. Iyenger	... Labour Kisan Office, 22, South Beach Madras.
S. A. Dange	... Fanaswadi, Bombay.

General Secretary.

S. V. Ghatey	... Krishna Lodge Bombay, 4.
S. H. Mistry (Treasurer)	... Trinity Lane, Dhobitalao, Bombay.

Executive.

M. Singaravelu	... Labour Kisan Office, 22, South Beach, Madras.
Hasrat Mohani	.. Cawnpore.
R. S. Nimbkar	... Bombay, 4.
M. A. Majid	... Mochi Gate Lahore.
K. N. Joglekar	... Congress Office, Bombay.
S. N. Tagore	... Workers and Peasants Party, 37, Harrison Road, Calcutta.
H. A. Halim	... Workers and Peasants Party, 37, Harrison Road, Calcutta.
S. D. Hasan	... Labour Publishing House, Mochi Gate, Lahore.

Organs (NonOfficial)

Ganabani	.. 37, Harrison Road, Calcutta.
Mahnatkash	.. Mochee Gate, Lohare.
Kranti	... Dwarkadas Mansions, Bombay, 4.

*Printed by M. N. Kulkarni at his Karnatak Printing Press.
318A, Thakurdwar Bombay.*

sk-38
P. 1027 (2)

TWO TACTICS

(“Wperjoa” No 6, 1. February, 1905)

By. W. I. Lenin.

Since the beginning of the mass movement of the Russian working class, that is since about ten years, wide differences of opinion existed among the social democrats on the question of tactics. It is well known that in the latter half of the nineties, differences of opinion of this nature gave rise to the tendency of Economism which led to the splitting up of the party into two wings: the opportunists (Rabotscheje Djelo) and the revolutionists (the old “Iskra”). Still the characteristics traits of the Russian opportunism distinguished itself from the West European one. It reflected very grossly the point of view or if one may say so the want of any point of view what so ever, of the intellectual wing of the party, which was full of enthusiasm for the catchwords of Bernsteinism and for the immediate results and the outer form of pure working class movement. This enthusiasm led to an epidemic of betrayals on the part of legal Marxists who drifted to Liberalism and to the invention of the famous theory of “Tactics as process” by the social democrats, which earned for our opportunists the nick-name “Choestists” (Tale tacticians). They always drag themselves helplessly behind the trend of events, threw themselves from one extremity to the other, underestimated in all cases the impetus of the revolutionary proletariat and the faith in its power, and above all defended themselves with the appeal to the selfaction of the proletariat. It is curious but it remains a fact. No one talked so much about the selfaction of the workers and no one narrowed, limited, and degraded with its preachings this selfactivity. So much as the man behind the “Rabotscheje Djelo”. Talk less about increasing the self-activity of the toiling masses” said the class conscious worker to their enthusiastic but unwise advisers, “We are much more active than you suppose”. We are ready to support our demands in an open street-fight which promises more tangible results. It is surely not you who are going to strengthen our activity for it is you who are lacking in activity. “Think less of theories gentlemen and turn your thoughts in increasing your own activity!” Such is in fact the relation that characterises the revolutionary worker from the opportunist intellectuals. (compare “What to do?”).

The two steps backwards taken by the new “Iskra” to remain in line with the “Rabotscheje Djelo” have again lent new life to this relation. In the columns of “Iskra” was unfolded again a sermon on Chwostism, which was full of such abominable

pledges: I believe, O Lord, in the self-action of the proletariat. In the name of self-action of the proletariat, Axelrod, Martynow, Martow and Liber ("Association for the emancipation of the working class) defended on the Party day, the right of professors and students to be members of the Party without belonging to any organisation whatsoever. In the name of self-action of the proletariat was the theory of "Organisation as process" invented, which justified disorganisation and praised intellectual anarchism. In the name of self-action of the proletariat, the equally famous theory of "Highertype of Demonstration" was invented as an agreement between the workers Deputation sieved by means of a threefold selection and the Somstwo people for carrying on peaceful demonstration without creating any panic. In the name of self-action of the proletariat the idea of an armed rebellion was misrepresented, vulgarised, distorted and perverted.

Considering the practical importance, we would like to draw the attention of the reader to the last question. The development of working-class movement has given the lie to the wiseacres of the new "Iskra". Hardly was their first publication circulated in Russia, a publication which recommended "the delivery of the declaration of the workers per post to the houses of the members of parliament and the distribution of the copies in sufficient numbers in 'the Meeting Hall'" as a higher type of demonstration in the name of "the process of systematic development of class-consciousness and self action of the proletariat", hardly had their second writing reached Russia—the writing in which the crushing discovery was made that in the present "historical moment the political arena is a scene of the strife between the organised bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy" and "the object significance of every (hear! hear!) revolutionary movement is always the same (!) and consists in the defence of the paroles of that one these two (!) forces which stands for the removal of the regime in question "(these democratic intellectuals were declared as "force"!)."—Hardly had the class-conscious workers read these magnificent letters and had time to make fun of them, than did the events of the real struggle of the proletariat swept away with one stroke the whole political trash of the publicists of the new "Iskra" to the dustbin. The proletariat proved that there is a third *force* (really speaking, not a third but according to number the second and according to the militant capability, the first which not only stands for the removal but *is prepared* to go to the extent of abolishing Absolutism. Beginning from the 9th of January, the working-class movement is growing before our eyes into a popular uprising.

Let us now consider how this transition to an uprising, which to social democrats formerly treated only as a question of tactics, was made use of by them, now that the workers themselves began to solve the question in practice.

Three years before, on the slogan of an uprising, that determined our immediate tasks, we said as follows: "Let us imagine a popular upheave. At present everyone will probably admit that we all think about it and must prepare ourselves for it. But how to prepare for it? We can not expect the Central Committee to place its agents in all the places to prepare the upheaval. Even if we had a Central Committee, it would not be possible under the present Russian conditions, to attain anything by this procedure. On the contrary, a net-work of agents that would come into existence through the process of organisation and distribution of popular newspaper, could not "sit and wait" for a parole of rebellion but must be continually doing their regular work, which would guarantee the greatest possible success in case of rebellion. It is just this work which would tight the bond of union between the broad working masses and all classes that are dissatisfied with Absolutism and which is so important for the rebellion. It is just this work that would enable us to rightly judge the general political situation and consequently too to chose the opportune moment for the uprising. This will for instance, accustom *all* the local organisations to react simultaneously on equal political questions events and happenings that are of common interest in the whole of Russia and to answer these events as energetically as unequivocally unitedly and as suitably,—for an insurrection is, in fact, the most energetic, the most unequivocal and the most suitable reply to the government. Only this will ultimately accustom all revolutionary organisations in all nooks and corners of Russia to maintain standing and at the same time highly conspirative connection which all practically create a real unity of the Party—and without such connections it is not possible to collectively concert a plan of insurrection and to take the necessary preparatory measure which must remain absolutely secret.

"In short, the plan of an all-Russian political is not only the chamber work of persons who are infested with Doctrinarism and Literaturism, (as it may appear to some people on superficial consideration) but on the contrary it wants to be the practical plan, *in order to take up from all sides imediate the preparations of an insurrections, without at the same time neglecting the everyday work*". (What to do)?".

The closing sentence given by us in italics, gives a clear reply to the question, how the Social Democracy thought on the preparation of an insurrection. The question is clear enough but still the old Chwostistic tactic manifest itself even on this point. Martynow has recently published a pamphlet—"Two Dictators" which was warmly recommended by the new "Iskra". The auther is indignant from the very depth of his Rabotschaje-Djelo-spirit because Lenin could speak of "the preparation, *fixing* and the carrying out of the armed popular rebellion. The strict

Martynow opens fire on the enemy: 'The international Social Democracy has on the strength of historical experiences and of scientific analysis of the dynamics of the social forces always recognised that only palace-revolutions Pronunciations can be *fixed up* beforehand and carried to a success according to a fixed programme just because they are not popular revolutions, i.e. revolutions in social relationship, but are simply regrouping of the ruling cliques. The social democracy has always recognised that a popular revolution can not be *fixed up* beforehand, that it can not be artificially created but that it takes place.

The reader may say after perusal of this tirade, that Martynow is clearly no serious opponent and that it would be ludicrous to take him seriously. We would do thoroughly justice to such a reader. We would even admit to such a reader that there is hardly anything more painful on earth than to take all the theories and arguments of our people of the new "Iskra" seriously. What is only worse is that this tomfoolery shines in the columns of the "Iskra". Still more worse is that there are people in the Party (and surely not very few) who block their heads with this sort of stuff. Thus we have to dwell on things which are not serious just as we had to dwell on the theory of Rosa Luxemburg, who invented the "organisation as process". We have no other alternative left but to explain Martynow, that insurrection is not to be mistaken for a popular revolution; to explain to him that his weighty indications on the revolution in social relationships in connection with the solution of the practical questions of the methods of obliteration of Russian Absolutism are worthy of a narrowminded provincial man. This revolution has already set in Russia with the obliteration of serfdom and it is just the backwardness of our political super-structure compared with the accomplished revolution in social relationships that makes the break-down of this suprastructure unavoidable; this makes sudden collapse with a *single* blow thoroughly possible, for "the popular revolution" in Russia has already dealt a hundred blows to Tsarism and the question is, whether it would collapse with the hundred and first or the hundred and tenth blow. Only the opportunist intellectuals who want to shuffle their own narrowmindedness on the shoulders of the proletarians, can boast over their schoolboy knowledge about the "revolution in social relationship", at a time when the methods of delivering the first of the two hundred blows are being practically weighed. Only the opportunists of the new "Iskra" can hysterically yell at the frightful "Jacobinistic" plan, whose centre of gravity lies, as we have seen, in an all-round mass-agitation with the help of a political paper!

It is true that a popular revolution can not be fixed up. Martynow and the author of the leading article of No 62 of the "Iskra" ought to be praised for the knowledge of this truth.

(What preparations for an insurrection can our Party at present afford to talk of?" Asks a loyal champion or a disciple of Martynow, who feels himself weighing a war against the "Utopians"). Still to start an insurrection in case we have actually prepared for it and in case the already accomplished revolution in social relations make such a popular uprising possible, that is surely a situation that can be realised. We will attempt to explain it to the people of the new "Iskra" by means of a simple example. Is it possible to start a workers movement? No, not because, it consists of a thousand single actions which are the results of a revolution in social relationship. Is it possible to start a strike? Yes certainly, in spite of that, Comrade Martynow, fancy it! *in spite of the fact* that very strike is a result of a revolution in social relationship. When is it possible to start a strike? At that time when an organisation or a circle which starts it enjoys an influence among the masses of workers and know how to judge the right moment of growing dissatisfaction and excitement among the masses of workers. Have you understood it now Comrade Martynow and Comrade editorial writer of No. 62 of the "Iskra"? If you have understood it, compare an insurrection with "a popular revolution can not be fixed beforehand". An insurrection can be fixed up, in case those who fix it enjoy influence among the masses and know to judge the right moment.

Fortunately the self-actions of the progressive workers go further than the chvostistic philosophy of the new "Iskra". Until these people have connected theories which help to prove that an insurrection can not be pre-calculated by those people who have prepared themselves for it who have organised the vanguard of the revolutionary class events are showing that the people who have not prepared themselves can, may, had to start the insurrection.

Here is a pamphlet which we received from a comrade from Petersburg. It was set, printed, and distributed to more than 10,000 copies by the workers themselves, who on the 10th of January possessed a legal printing press.

"Proletarians of all lands unite!

CITIZENS.

Yesterday, you have witnessed the brutalities of the absolute government! You have seen the blood that flowed in the streets! -saw hundreds of murdered fighters for the cause of the workers-saw the death—you have heard the groanings of the wounded women and helpless children! Worker's blood and Worker's narrowstained the pavement, the pavement laid by the worker's own hands. Who direct the troops, the guns, and the bullets against the breasts of the workers? The Tsar, the Dukes, the Ministers, the Generals and the rabble of courtiers.

They are the murderers ! Death on them ! To arms, comrades, occupy the arsenals, the munition depots, the munition shops and the magazines ! Bombard the prisons to pieces, comrades ! Set free the fighters of freedom ! Destroy the police and military stations and all official institutions. We shall pull down government of the Tsar and establish our own in its place. Long live the Revolution Long live the constitutional gathering of the people delagation !

The Russian Social Democratic
Workers' Party.

The appeal for an insurrection on the part of handful of workers who took the initiative, proved to be failure. A couple of unsuccessful appeals for an insurrection or "pre-destined insurrection would not bluff or discourage the workers. We leave it to the new "Iskra" to take the opportunity to expand on the necessity of "revolution in social relationship" and to condemn in high-sounding terms the "Utopism" of the workers, who set up the cry: "We want to establish own government! Only hopeless pedants or muddle-headed fools could see in this cry the centre of gravity of the appeal. It is important for us to recognise and emphasise this striking, bold and practical step towards the solution of this task, which lies before us.

The appeal of the workers of Petersburg has not been realised and could not be realised so quickly, as they liked it to be. The appeal has to be repeated more than once, the attempt at an insurrection may still lead to repeated failures. But the fact itself that the workers themselves have taken this into their own hands is of tremendous importance. The achievement which to working-class movement has attained by creating a consciousness for the practical urgency of this task and by putting it on the working programme of every popular movement, this achievement can not be taken back from the proletariat.

Three years ago, the social democrats, on the ground of general arguments, brought the slogan of preparation for an insurrection. The self-action of the proletariat led to the same parole under the influence of the direct lessons of the civil war. There are kinds of self-action. There is a self-action of the proletariats with revolutionary initiatives and there is a self-action of an undeveloped proletariat walking in the leading strings. There is a conscious social-democratic self-action and there is a Sabatwistic self-action. There are social democrats who even at the present movement regard this second kind of self-action with ocstacy and beleive that one could avoid giving direct answers to the actual question by simply repeating the word "Class" for innumerable of times. For

example, we take the No. 84 of the new "Iskra" "Why asks triumphantly the writer of the leading article "why was it that the conference of workers and not the closer organisation of professional revolutionaries that set this avalanche (9 January) in motion? *Just because conference was actually (hear, hear!) the broad organisation which was based on the self-action of the working masses.*" Had the author of this classical sentence not been an admirer of Martynow, he could have probably been able to understand that this conference was able to serve the movement of the revolutionary proletariat just because it went over from the Sabatowian self-action to the social democratic self-action. (Just after this, it also ceased to exist as a legal conference.)

If the people of the new "Iskra" or those of the new "Rabot-schje Djelo" were no Chwostists they would have seen that the 9th of January had justified the prophecies of those, who asserted: "The legislation of the working class movement would in the long run be to our advantage and not to that of Subatows. (What is to be done") It is the 9th of January that has once again shown the who important of the tasks formulated therein: To prepare reapers who would be able to mow down the weeds of today" (i. e. to paralyse the present Subotawian corruption)" and to harvest in the wood of tomorrow" (i. e. to lead the movement which has already made a step forward due to its legalisation in revolutionary channel). But the clowns of the new "Iskra" talk of an abundant wheat harvest in order to be little the significance of the solid organisation of the revolutionary reapers.

"It would have been criminal!" continues the writer of the leading article of the new "Iskra," if were to attack the hinterland of the revolution. Heaven knows what this sentence means. We will have to dwell once more on this sentence and on its relation to the general opportunistic character of the "It suffices to point out that the real political significance of this sentence only be this, namely the writer crawls on his belly before the rear-guard of the revolution and turns his nose at the "narrow" and "Jacobinistic" vanguard of the revolution.

The contract between the tactic of Chwostism and the tactics of the revolutionary social democracy becomes the more apparent the more the new "Iskra" fires up in the spirit of Martynow. We have already explained in the first issue of the "Wperjod" that the insurrection must combine itself with a primary movement: Thus we have by no means forgotten the importance of "securing the rear" to use a military terms. We spoke in the 4th issue on the correct tactics of the members of the Petersburg committee who from the very beginning directed their tire energy to support and develop the revolutionary elements and always shown a restrained and suspicious attitude towards the Subotowian rear-guard. We will close this article with an advise which we will have repeat more

than once to the new "Iskra": Do not underestimate the tasks of the advance guard of the revolution, we must not forget your duty, of supporting this vanguard through our organised self-action. Less platitudes on the developments of the self-action of the workers—the workers reveal an immeasurable amount of revolutionary which you fail to notice—take more care that the backward workers do not get corrupted by your own Chwestism.

Item 38

P. 1207. (3)

TO THE WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

The great genius of the workers-revolution has left us. A man of will thought and action is dead. Hundreds of millions of workers, peasants' and colonial slaves lament the death of the mighty leader.

The enslaved peoples of Asia called him the father of humanity. The revolutionary proletariat of Europe and America, the great civilised continents of our times, saw in Lenin their wise and beloved leader. And in this unheard of world-historical contact, in this world-wide union of all enslaved, of all oppressed, and of all workers alone lies the guarantee of the victory over capital, over that satanical hindrance in the path of social development.

An uncontrollable volcano of revolutionary energy was Lenin; a tide of submarine revolutionary lava-currents encircled him. But possessing the best what the old culture could give him, with the mighty weapon of the Marxian theory in his hand, Lenin, the man of thunder and storm, guided the seething and all sweeping element of mass'-movement into the granite bed of revolutionary utility and revolutionary reason. His ability of foresight was unheard of. His gift to organise the masses was astonishing. He was the greatest generals of all countries, of all times and of all peoples. He was the general of a new humanity-which is emancipating the world.

The old world is dying. Distorted, crippled, and helpless stands to-day that ancient Europe, the mother of capitalist civilisation. For centuries worked European capital, created with the hands of workers wonders of technics and underjoched millions. But caught in its own net, it transformed its technic and its science into an enormous instrument of self-destruction. The operations on capital are drawing entire Europe and the whole into an abyss. And only one power, one great emancipatory victorious power alone can save the world; the power of the working masses, their energy, the will

of the working class, which welds hundreds of millions together and leads them.

And Lenin was the leader of these masses who are chosen to save humanity. Before the eyes of the powerful of this world, he threw among the uprising masses the simple almost foolhardy slogan "all power to the Soviets". And this miracle became reality. The union of our states consolidates and grows. The realm of work, the realm of workers and peasants grows.

We have lost in Lenin the best helmsman. This loss is surely irreparable. Because in the whole world there is not today such a clear brain, with such an immense experience, such an indomitable will as Lenin. But we look fearlessly into the future. Lenin's masterly hand guided us safely through the greatest dangers. We have been placed on the right way. Hundred thousands pupils of Lenin are holding the banner, and millions close round it. And with his death itself Lenin gives us his last command:

Proletarians of all countries unite !

from the manifesto of the 11. Soviet Congress of U.S.S.R.

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, MEERUT, U. P., INDIA.

P. 1207. (4)

LENIN—DAY

2-1-29.

Comrades,

How often you are told by your learned professors that, marxism is a narrow, onesided point of view which the intellectual world of today has outgrown. How often you are told that Marxism is divorced from all practice is unreal and utopian ! And it is today but five years since the death of that man whose thirty years of life, work and achievements is a living lie to the croakings of these helpless wiseacres. The thirty years of life and work of Wladimir Ilitsch Lenin is a brilliant record of achievements, beginning with the masterly and scathing exposure of those currents of thought which at the early years of this century was attempting a revision (perversion) of Marxism, leading to a scholarly analysis of the present epoch of capitalism an epoch of imperialism (i. e. of the monopoly of finance capital, an epoch of the sharpening of imperialist contradictions of imperialist world-wars) and finally culminating in forging that formidable weapon which in the hands of the working class is an instrument of its own emancipation and of the removal all hindrances in the way of growth of society and its productive forces the formidable weapon of the theory & practice of proletarian revolution in the present era, the Formidabli weapan which we call Leninism. These are the three salient features of Lenin's life-work! The exposure of revision and perversion of marxian doctrines, 2) the theory and analysis of the modern phases of capitalism, and finally 3) theory and tactics of a proletarian revolution in capitalist as well as in semi-capitalist (agrarian) countries. It would not be possible or me to do full justice to these three features but I shall endeavour to touch the main points:

To the beginning of the latter half of the last century, Karl Marx gave an analysis of the capitalistic society, showing the nature of the production relations and the class forces engendered by it. On the strength of this analysis he formulated the laws of motions of the capitalist society. He showed that the restricted ownership of the means of production and the nature of the market economy on the one hand and the nature of the expanded apparatus of production on the, develop certain contradictions inside the society leading to a series of recurring crises of over-and under-production. The greatest sufferer in these crisis is the proletariat. The proletariat because of its unique position in the process of production developes its own organisational form enabling it in the event of an acute crisis to capture the machinery of the state and to establish its own dictatorship under the hegemony of which a transformation in the production-relationship takes place leading to the construction

of a socialist order of society. Half a century elapsed and the announced workers' revolution did not come. On the other hand it appeared as if capitalism was stabilising itself, overcoming its inner contradictions, and eliminating its crises and widening its markets. The end of the last century and the opening of this saw the opening of immense colonial markets in the east and in Africa and in America. To the observer situated in the main capitalistic countries the immanent contradictions of capitalism appeared to vanish. It was at this time that the ideology of revisionism raised its head. It was at this time that professors and petty-bourgeois scholars who called themselves marxists began to preach that capitalist society is gradually and automatically growing into a socialist society, that democratisation of political institutions was progressing and that the working class can achieve its goal without a revolution and that the dictatorship of the proletariat was not necessary as an intermediate stage. The champions of this ideology went on further to point out that imperialism operating in the colonial countries is benevolent agency transforming feudal and pre-capitalist societies and creating in them pre-conditions of a socialist order of society. The apologues of revisionism went further to improve upon Dialectical Materialism that bedrock of marxian theory, and tried to introduce god by the back door.

Born and brought up in a semi-capitalist country, where he could workings of the finance-capital, its shameless alliance with feudal oligarchy, its reactionary repressive and absolute rule to which his own brother fell a victim, Lenin saw in this growing tendency a dangerous undercurrent which threatened to grow, paralyse the workers movement and set back the clock of progress for a considerable period. Twenty year years of his life are devoted to the merciless exposition of this school, which as he correctly anticipated found its political expression in the opportunistic betrayal to the cause of the working class on the part of a section of working-class leaders on the continent. Lenin pointed out that the apparent stabilisation of capitalism was due to the temporary shifting of the lead of exploitation from the shoulder of the proletariat of the capitalist countries to the shoulders of the colonial slaves. That a sharp competition was going on among the predatory capitalistic nations of the world as regards the distribution of colonial markets and colonial monopolies. Lenin pointed out that the whole world was already distributed among the robber cliques of the world, what the conflict aimed at was at the best redistribution, which meant war, and a war which must develop into a world war creating an atmosphere of dislocation throughout the world. Thus in the apparent stabilisation the dialectical mind of Lenin saw the seeds of a new world-crisis exorted the proletariat of Europe not to listen to the soporific doctrines of the revisionists and traitors of marxism, but to be awake to organise and to turn the coming Imperialists war into a civil war, to capture the state machinery

to destroy it and to erect in its stead the dictatorship of the proletariat. And the war came, and the revisionists of yesterday developed social-patriots and social-chauvinists, yelled at the top of their voices "The fatherland was in danger" thus unmasked themselves as agents of the bourgeoisie by leading the working masses to slaughter in the interest of capital. Three years of starvation and slaughter brought home to the workers who were now soldiers in the trenches, the hollowness of the patriotic phrases and they wanted to end war. Lenin raised his voice once again from the place of his bannishment-Switzerland—"War is a product of fifty years of the development of the world capital and its myriad relationships and connections. One cannot jump out of the imperialist war. There is no way to establish a democratic non-violent peace without the overthrow of the rule of capital and the transfer of the authority of the state to another class—the proletariat. This quotation is taken from the thesis which Lenin wrote in April 1918, just after he got the news of the first Russian revolution ending in the abdication of the Zar. This thesis entitled "The tasks of the proletariat in our revolution" gives a masterly analysis of the equilibrium of class forces at the time of the first Russian revolution, shows the inherent instability of this equilibrium, the necessity of the shifting of this equilibrium in favour of the proletariat, of the organisation of its dictatorship, of the formation of a new International—the Communist International the organ of the world-revolution.

The triumph of Lenin's life consists in this that he lived to see each of his Marxian predictions come true. No, it is a triumph of the science of Marxism as well. He lived to see pseudo-Marxists turn traitor, the imperialist war, its turning into civil war, the Bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia, its conversion into a proletarian revolution, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and finally the march onwards socialism under the hegemony and leadership of the proletariat.

The last seven years of his life Lenin, sat no more in his chamber of bannishment, trying to study and gauge the international situation from News paper cutting, but he stood at the head of the First, Workers and Peasants Republic, facing a bitter class-war within, and a hand predatory capitalist states without, face to face with actual problems of a Socialist reconstruction, face to face with acute problems of colonial revolution. The essential feature of the after-war development is, as Lenin recognised, the sharpening of revolutionary situation in the Colonies. ... this contribution to the Theory and practice of Rev. in the Col. and semi-Colonies are of a fundamental nature.

1) Impéria

2) National Revolution in a land must be led by the proletariat:—

- because 1) most oppressed
- 2) unity.
- 3) discipline
- 4) advance progressive

3) Proletariat in a National democratic

- 1) peasantry
- 1) petty b.

3)

SERVANTS OF INDIA SOCIETY'S
BRANCH LIBRARY
— BOMBAY

P 1207. (5) ³⁷

Lessons of the Boycott Campaigne

By G. A. & A. B.

The feverish attempts of British Capitalism to reorganise and rationalise its forces and to overcome its inner economic contradictions are the motive forces behind its increased offensive against the rising tide of national revolution in China, Egypt and India. The appointment of the Indian Statutory Commission with the studied exclusion of Indians of every shade of political opinion is but an expression of the same offensive. In order to realise the increased aggressiveness of British imperialism which dictated this insolent challenge against the rights of the Indian people for self-determination it is necessary to examine its underlying economic forces.

The disorganisation of British industries and the loss of equilibrium between the different forces of production resulting from the war and the post war crisis of Capitalism compelled the British imperialists to pursue a policy of "rapprochement" with the Indian bourgeoisie to strengthen their hold of monopoly of the Indian market threatened by Japanese and American capitalism. This policy found its expression in the comparatively rapid industrialisation of India during and a few years after the war, the erection of protective tariff walls for the furtherance of Indian industries, and the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms which enfranchised and vested a show of power in the upper-classes. This was followed by a "period of gigantic profits for the Indian industry, increasing

accumulation of capital in India and a deflation of the value of the Rupee which provided the basis for a frictionless co-operation between the Indian and the British bourgeoisie. In a few years however the Indian industries have to face a keen competition with the capitalist countries who were slowly recovering from the post-war crisis in their industries by rationalization and were proceeding to capture the world market by lowering the prices. The Indian industries could not however withstand this competition and a number of them are at present in a state of serious crisis. The British industries too could not recover itself post-war crisis owing to its peculiar nature of property ownership, and lack of modern methods of organisation and production. According to Vargar "the great staple industries Coal, Iron and Steel, Cotton and Machine industries are in a state of chronic crisis since 7 years. Hence the tendency of restricting the policy of supporting the industrialisation of India. During the last two or three years strenuous attempts are being made to reorganise and rationalise the home industries and to do everything to increase export. "Efforts to stabilise the home industries are leading to economic conflicts between the British and the Indian bourgeoisie. The united national bourgeois opposition on the issue of the Reserve Bank Bill, is an open expression of this growing conflict between the interests of Indian Industry capital and British Finance capital. The British bourgeoisie anticipates that such conflicts in which the Indian industry capital always suffers a defeat being the weaker, may tend to throw the nationalist bourgeoisie in a radical attitude which might seriously embarrass the British Government in India. The open provocation caused by the exclusion of the Indian politicians from the Commission is however calculated to measure the strength of the Indian nationalists that is to judge their command over the masses and their willingness to lead them in the struggle for national independence.

On the otherhand this antagonism between the Indian and the British bourgeoisie compels the latter to use democratic phrases and come out as champions of the Indian peasantry against the former. The nationalists having failed to rise to the occasion and stand for the cause of the peasantry, the British bourgeoisie finds it necessary to come out hypocritically as the "trustees of the dumb millions". Thus a writer of an article on the Indian Statutory Commission in the *Edinburgh Review* of Jan. 1928 remarks :— "The active politicians do not represent all India and their withdrawal from the field if it should eventually occur, would set the commission free to devote a large share of its attention to the classes who are still some what overshadowed by lawyers, journalists and educationalists, to the landed and commercial interests, to the military races and *most important of all the peasants and the rural labourers* who taken together constitute the absolute majority of the population. "Proceeding in this

manner, he waxes eloquent on the democratic mission of the British in India. "In other words" he says, "the objective which has been declared by the Parliament implies that *one day* the peasant must be the king, and it is the commission business to open for him a road leading *gradually and peaceably* to the throne. Furthermore he advocates "*a large extension of the franchise as the most effective way of training peasants to be masters instead of slaves*". This hypocritical cry over the slavery of the Indian peasantry is but a mask to hide the ugly face of the newly planned capitalist exploitation of Indian agriculture. The same economic difficulties resulting from the crisis at home, which drive them into a conflict with the Indian bourgeoisie compels them to secure the *hinterland*, the peasantry. The latest phase of the British agrarian policy in India which is characterised by the appointment of an agricultural expert as a viceroy and an Indian Agricultural commission, is calculated firstly, to intensify the production of raw-materials in India by introduction of machineries and secondly, to increase the purchasing power of the Indian peasant, in order to extend the market for British finished products. The apparent benefits of these reforms are bound to be illusory, firstly, because the British bourgeoisie holds the buying as well as the selling monopoly in India, which means that the British capitalists would buy the rawmaterials cheaper and sell their manufactured goods dearer. Secondly these reforms are calculated to extend systematically the capitalist exploitation of Indian agriculture, leading to the disappearance of the class of small land-holders and to the increase of the already huge army of landless peasants. Thus the economic exigencies at home compel the British bourgeoisie into friction with the Indian bourgeoisie on the one hand and a show of alliance with the Indian peasantry on the other. : I.

The bourgeois nationalist answer to this "insolent challenge" of the British imperialists is the complete boycott of the Simon Commission. The main characteristic features of the boycott movement are *firstly* the united front of all the parties resulting in an unprecedented success of "parliamentary obstruction" in the Central as well as in the provincial legislatures, *secondly* the radicalism of bourgeois nationalists as expressed in the speeches of the leaders and in the resolutions of the Madras Congress and *thirdly* careful handling of the mass movement. It is for the first time that the Liberals, Responsivists and Swarajists have made a common cause. The recent success of the nationalist opposition in the Central Legislature on the issue of the Reserve Bank Bill, on the boycott of the Simon Commission, on the refusal to bear the expenses of the same, on the reduction of the grant to the India Office and military Budget to Rupee 1 are a result of this alliance. The Comments in the British Conservative Press give room for the surmise that a hostile attitude was not expected from the Liberals and this united front was but a temporary move.

Thus "The New Statesman" in an article entitled "The Confusion in India" remarked:—"Dr Ansari and Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru do not mean the same thing and nothing is more sure than that they will come once again to realise the fact before the Simon Commission has completed its season's work." This expectation of "The New Statesman" has not come to be true for the most simple reason, that the question of the Simon Commission as has already been pointed out, is but an expression of the increased conflicts between the economic interests of the Indian and the British bourgeoisie. It is no wonder therefore, that the Liberals Responsivists and Swarajists representing the interests of the class of industrialists and land-lords stands solidly united in the rejection of Simon Commission in every form and in every stage. There is further, another common basis for an understanding between all these parties. Openly or secretly all these parties do stand for Swaraj within the Empire, to be attained gradually and peacefully by legal and constitutional means. The common tactic of the bourgeoisie parties are and have always been negotiations leavened with with different proportions of empty threats. This may appear irreconcilable with the radical resolution passed at the Madras session of the Indian National Congress such as for instance Independence resolutions, the resolution against India being used as a basis for War for British imperialist interests, the resolution of solidarity with the Chinese revolution etc. During the last three months the reading public of India are being regaled with radical speeches and radical newspaper articles but the proofs of the emptiness of these effusions are generally contained in the effusions themselves. As for example, the Complete Independence resolution loses all its force because of the clause of the Congress creed relating to the "legal and constitutional means." Another noteworthy instance are the recent utterances of Pundit Motilal Nehru. The Pundit is reported to have said in Berlin that India will win her independence either by armed revolution or by negotiations. On his arrival to India he however said: "The truth is that England can not afford to set India free if she is to maintain her present supremacy in the world and it is idle to expect her to forego that supremacy in a fit of generosity." These two quotations taken together seem to accuse the Pundit of being an advocate of armed revolution. But in the same speech he takes pains to dispel any such doubt." I don't mean he assures, to close the door of negotiation, *the door must always remain open* but what I object to is the making of a fetish of the British connection and giving it the first and the foremost place in our programme for Independence' "(Forward, 8th Feb., 1928). The more avowed worshippers of this "fetish of British connection" are also using a similar threatening language. For instance, Mr. B. C. Pal, an exponent of "moderate opinion" said recently, "What this foolish attempt (to keep India in political subjection, referring to the Simon Commission) will inevitably result in, is to *destroy the possibilities of a peaceful settlement* of the present disputes between India and her foreign rulers and drive

into a physical context.....at the end of which the British Empire will go definitely the way of the older Empires of the world.....that will be *a distinct loss to humanity.*" Sir Sankaran Nair, a pillar of Indian Moderatism, in an article on the Simon Commission in the "Fortnightly Review" February, 1928, prophetically remarks. "The next world war already looming on the horizon, will make India the master of the situation (meaning better chances of favourable negotiations) if for any reason these hopes are disappointed India would sever the connection with England and the latter would, *in the words of Mrs. Besant*, sink into second Holland." All these quotations definitely prove that there is very little difference between the radicalism of the Liberals, Responsivists and Swarajists. They all talk of severing the British connection but are all willing the price of a suitable negotiation to save the British Empire and thereby to render an immense service to humanity !!!!!

No better proof of the of emptiness of this pseudo radical attitude of the bourgeois leaders can be given than the careful and cautious handling of the masses. During last three months of the boycott movement. The Hartals were a success but the leaders dared not give out slogans which could rally the peasants and the workers to militant mass action. In fact this was to be systematically avoided. Commenting on the boycott of the Simon Commission Mr. Gandhi wrote in "Young India" :—"I recognised the force of the appeal made to me by a *leader of Allahabad* not to meddle or influence the Boycott movement but to let the various parties manage it themselves. I recognised that my influence was bound to *bring in the masses more prominently into the movement* and might possibly *embarrass the promoters.*" "This frank confession lays bare a preconceived secret conspiracy to prevent mass-action. The slogan of the "Constituent Assembly" which was given out by the Workers and Peasants Party was sabotaged by the bourgeois leaders and carefully suppressed by the nationalist bourgeois Press. The rallying of the masses under this slogan instead of restricting the movement under the negative slogan of "Boycott" would have been a tremendous political education for the masses preparing them for the immediate democratic national revolution. To save the movement from utter political bankruptcy, two slogans were given namely "Nonpayment of enhanced taxes" and "Boycott of British Goods".

The first one is only been used for isolated districts like Bardoli where the taxes have recently been enhanced and can not therefore be an all-Indian slogan. Mr. Gandhi carefully distinguishes this parole of non-payment enhanced taxes from the revolutionary slogan of 1922. "This campaign" he says," can not be properly deemed to be a no-tax campaign launched for the attainment of Swarajya as Bardoli would have done in 1922."

The boycott of British goods is a slogan which has been used in the partition movement as well as during the non-co-operation days without any success. In the present movement it serves the following purpose. It gives the "common people" something to do and keeps them away from troubling themselves about the commission, as "Maharatta" (Feb, 5, 1928) puts it:—"In the actual boycott of the commission the *common people* can take no part as in the observance of the Hartal, so in the boycott of British goods they can participate most actively." Any appeal to the sentiment and patriotism of the merchants and the middle class did never lead to an effective boycott and is bound to end in failure till cheap British cloth is directly eliminated as a commodity that is thrown for free competition in the Indian market. Not having the weapon of protective tariff to achieve this, the Indian national Congress who is responsible for issuing this slogan, can only take recourse to a weapon that was successfully used by the Chinese bourgeoisie who organised and supported the strike of dock-workers employed for us, unloading British goods. The only positive step taken by the Indian bourgeoisie is the future constitution of "the Commonwealth of India" as laid down in the Report of the "All-Parties conference Committee." This new document formed to provide a basis for new negotiations with the Imperialists contains further proofs of the emptiness of the pseudo radical attitude of the Nationalists bourgeoisie. For instance the first clause of the declaration of Rights which was unanimously passed provides that all power of government and all authority, legislative executive, and judicial are derived from the people and the same shall be exercised through the organisations established by and under and in accordance with this constitution." The supreme authority of the British Parliament is hereby refused recognition by the future government of India. This demand of the All-Party Conference, if it is seriously meant can only be achieved by armed rebellion. An armed rebellion can only take place with the revolutionary participation of the toiling masses, fighting for their political and economic freedom. But the Nationalist bourgeoisie born and brought up in the lap of British imperialism do not stand for any such uncompromising struggle against British imperialism, do not want to bring the masses into the political arena as is definitely proved by the non-inclusion in the Declaration of Rights of the same constitution, the most elementary political right of the masses, the right of universal adult suffrage. Thus the Nationalists bourgeoisie in their fight against the Simon Commission, have not achieved any tangible results on their consistent refusal to organise and lead the masses, whose historical task it is to throw off the imperialist yoke.

The lessons of the boycott movement which has ended in a fiasco must not be lost sight of. Firstly, the nationalist bour-

geoisie has once again failed to give the Indian movement for freedom from foreign yoke, the revolutionary leadership it needs. In spite of their radical utterances they still believe in the theory of "benevolent imperialism." Secondly, though commanding the field, they had to make a show of radical attitude towards the imperialists, because of the pressure from within. The boycott in the Trade Union Congress, the successful organisation of the Hartal by the Workers and Peasants Party, the militant attitude of the Madras workers on the Hartal day are clear signs of the appearance of a new force in the political arena of India. The revolutionary tendency of the working class & of the rank and file of the Swaraj Party consisting largely of petty-bourgeois intellectuals, is pressing the leadership towards the left. The disaffection of the petty bourgeois rank and file of the Swaraj Party against the reactionary leadership of the Party and the unrestiveness of the orthodox no-changers have already crystallised in the form of the republican Party, whose spokesman Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru added a note of dissent to the Report of the All-Party Conference, demanding "that the aim of the constitution should be to establish a democratic Socialist Republic in India. "Can this aim be achieved by drafting a constitution which even does not contain the very fundamental demand of bourgeois democracy, universal adult suffrage, or is it going to be achieved by pious radical resolutions backed by actual sabotage of any mass-action as evidenced witnessed by the indifference and want of support of all "left" forces except the Workers and Peasants Party for the recent gigantic strikes.?"

This aim can only be achieved by rallying the forces of democratic national revolution. The left wingers who already showed signs of unrest against the reactionary bureaucracy of the congress pay lipa-homage to the cause of the workers and peasants fail to realise that the independence is identical with the overthrow of imperialism which in its turn means rallying the forces of agrarian and social revolution. The rise of industrial proletariat and the landless peasantry as driving forces of national revolution in colonial countries are a direct product of a new class differentiation and class conflicts following in the trail of the rise of capitalism and the consolidation of its power in these countries. The colonial bourgeoisie come out as the champion of national revolution in order to replace the imperialist exploitation of their country by their own capitalism which can only be realised by rallying the forces of social revolution, that is making united front with the workers and peasants fighting for the emancipation of their class. This however means going against their own class interests. Hence the colonial bourgeoisie pretend to lead the national revolutionary movement as long as their class interests are not actually endangered but as soon as the workers and peasants

organisation threaten to become unwield and go out of their control they turn over to the camp of counterrevolution and make common cause with the imperialists to liquidate the revolution. as has been clearly shown by the history of the chinese revolution. The Indian bourgeoisie, conscious of their class interests, is therefore straining their nerves to lead the organisation of the Indian industrial proletariat, the Trade unions into Reformism and Economism, has therefore systematically prevents the masses in playing a political in the boycottmovement, and thus historically fulfills its mission as liquidators of national revolution.

P. 1207. (6) X
ON THE INDIAN QUESTION
IN THE VI. WORLD CONGRESS.

The polemic against the so-called theory of "de-colonisation" cast a shadow of unreality over the otherwise high class discussion of the Indian question in the Sixth world congress. Therefore, it is necessary to begin with a few remarks about this theory: more correctly, about the scare-crow of this so-called theory.

I do not propose to answer the polemics of Comrade Kuusinen and others. It will not be possible to correct the inaccuracies of facts cited in Comrade Kuusinen's report within the limits of an article. If necessary I will be prepared to do so in a future occasion. For the present it is sufficient to observe that Comrade Kuusinen was not well advised as regards facts. It is not the picture of the India of 1928, but of a quarter of a century ago that he drew before the Congress. This he was bound to do because of his admitted "lack of the necessary knowledge of the entire subject." But he was certainly extravagant in imagination, if he sought to accuse me of having ever maintained, openly or by implication, that imperialism under any circumstance could be a progressive factor in the colonies. Happily, in the corrected version of his concluding speech he emphatically stated that he did not identify "this false theory (of de-colonisation) of our comrades" with the "apology of colonial regime made by the lackeys of imperialism." This eleventh hour statement, however, does not alter the fact that in his report he asserted that the comrades, who maintained that there was a change in the economic policy of British imperialism in India, "even visualize de-colonisation of India by British imperialism". This is a misreading

and misinterpretation of what I wrote even in this connection. The very passages quoted by Comrade Kuusinen to condemn me as an apologist of imperialism, prove that I do not hold the opinion that British imperialism will lead the Indian people by the hand to freedom. What I pointed out is that owing to the decay of capitalism in the metropolis, imperialism is obliged to find means and methods of exploiting India more intensively, and is thereby creating a situation which its weakens very foundation. Comrade Kuusinen asks: if it is so, why is British imperialism doing such a thing? This is a very simple way of looking at the situation. It is trying to understand the operation of capitalism (in its highest stage of imperialism) separated from its inner contradictions. In the light of such simple logic Marx also becomes ridiculous by virtue of having said that capitalism creates its own grave-digger in the form of the proletariat. If capitalist mode of production lays down the conditions for Socialism why did the bourgeoisie introduce it in society? These apparent contradictions are explained by Marxian dialectics. To have a correct appreciation of the situation it is necessary to distinguish between the subjective and objective forces operating upon it. British imperialism does not wish to lose an iota of its power in India. This is the subjective factor which has very great significance; but it alone is not decisive. The objective factor, that is, what, in the given situation, is possible for the British bourgeoisie to do to maintain their domination in India and the effects of what they do, reacts upon the subjective force. If the subjective were the decisive factor, there would never be a revolution; for the ruling class would never want to abdicate its Power. There is of course the opposite subjective which wants to overthrow the existing order. But its wish alone is not sufficient. It can be realised when other objective forces are in operation on the situation. The degeneration of the ruling class, the decay of its system of production and the decomposition of its state-power are the objective conditions for a successful revolution. The establishment by a close analysis of facts that these objective conditions are maturing in India, in spite of the desire of British imperialism, does not prove, as Comrade Kuusinen said, that "our conception of the nature of the imperialist colonial politics should be revised." On the contrary, Marxist and Leninist conception of the nature of imperialism does not exclude the maturing of conditions indicating degeneration, disorganization and decay of imperialism as preliminary to its final overthrow. Otherwise, it would not be a revolutionary conception of the dynamics of the situation, but a static view without any perspective.

"As is evident from the very passages quoted by Comrade Kuusinen, I used the term "do-colonisation" (within inverted commas, because it is not my creation) in the sense that imperialist power is undermined in India creating conditions for its successful revolutionary overthrow. India is a colony of the classical type. She will never cease to be a colony until the British

power is overthrown by revolutionary means. No compromise (however far-reaching) between the Indian bourgeoisie and the British imperialists will give real freedom to the Indian people. These are all truism. But it is also true that India of today is not the India of a quarter of a century ago. It is simply ignoring facts to maintain that the Indian bourgeoisie is as economically suppressed and politically oppressed as twenty years ago. To recognise the fact that, simultaneously in spite of and with the saruiotion of imperialism. India now travels on a path of economic development closed to her previously, is not a violation of Marxist and Leninist conception of the nature of imperialism. On the contrary, such developments are not foreign to this nature. Indeed Lenin did presage such developments in the colonies towards the latest stages of imperialist domination. In showing the ever-growing parasitic character of imperialism he approvingly quoted the following from Schulze-Gaevernitz's book: "Europe will shift the burden of physical toil—first agricultural and mining, then of heavy industry—on the black races and will remain itself at leisure in the occupation of bondholder, thus paving the way for the economic and later, the political emancipation of the coloured races". (Imperialism).

What, after all, is imperialism? It is the domination and exploitation of the backward races by the bourgeoisie of other capitalist countries. It is so as far the colonies are concerned. Imperialism, as a whole, has a much wider scope. That, however, does not directly concern us here. For the purpose of dominating and exploiting the colonial people the same means and methods are not, cannot be, applicable always. The object of the imperialist rulers is to get the greatest possible profit out of the colonies. How this profit is derived is immaterial. The way British finance capital get profit out of its Canadian and Australian possession is different from the way it does the same from the East & west African colonies. The methods of exploitation applied in these are again not the same as in India. The change takes place not from place to place but from time to time as well. The methods of deriving profits from Canada or Australia today are not the same as they were previously. There is no reason why the same change should not take place in India, if the interest of imperialism demands it or the exigencies of imperialism force it.

Instead of considering imperialism as something unchangeable static—, a Marxist should examine it dialectically. By doing that we shall find its weakness more clearly, and thus be able to fight it more effectively. In this examination one should not squibble over the exact number of proletariat and blast-furnaces in India. What is to be established is the general tendency. Is India politically and economically exactly in the same position as twenty-five years ago? Can the means and methods of exploitation applied at the period meet the present requirement of British imperialism? Has there been any inner change in the position of British imperialism which

forces it to adopt new means and methods of deriving profit from India? Is post war imperialism in the position to continue colonial exploitation in the pre-war forms? These are the vital questions to be answered; and the correct answer could be found only by an unprejudiced examination of facts-of the situation as it is.

Obviously, the crux of the question is the internal condition of British capitalism. This was hardly touched in the discussion of the Indian question in the Congress. Colonial politics suitable to the interests of British capitalism before the war, cannot meet the situation in which British capitalism find itself as result of the war. Modern empires are built on capital exported from the metropolis. Britain's ability to export capital depends primarily on the conditions of her industries at home. Therefore, an analysis of the economic situation in Britain should be the starting point of a serious discussion of the Indian question.

Capital is exported from a country when it is "over-developed," that is, when all the accumulated surplus cannot be invested there at sufficient profit. Investment in countries where capital is scarce, price of land relatively small, wages are low and raw materials are cheap, brings higher profits. (Lenin, Imperialism) How is the position of Britain today as regards export of capital? If the facts give an affirmative answer to this question, then we may not look for a far reaching change in the imperialist policy. For, in that case, imperialism would be still in its "normal" condition-super-structure of capitalist prosperity at home. But a different picture in Britain will necessarily mean a readjustment in imperial relations.

It is an established fact that Britain suffers from under-production. Her actual production is much lower than her productive capacity. In other words, Britain produces much less than she could produce. This forced limitation of production has been caused by shrinkage of market as result of the war and growth of industries in other countries. Since the conclusion of the war the total volume of British exports has never exceeded 80 per cent of the pre-war level. In contrast to this the British export trade expanded uninterruptedly during the period between 1880 and 1913. And it was in this period of trade prosperity that the empire was built up and consolidated. An expanding export of manufactured goods (and by far the largest portion of Britain's export has always been manufactured goods) was the main channel for the export of capital which, in its turn, founded and cemented the empire. Therefore, a decline of the export trade is bound to affect the solidity of the empire, unless some other means were found to counteract the weakness resulting therefrom. In other words, the colonial policy evolved in the period of prosperity no longer suits imperialist interests when the conditions on which that policy was based have changed. The colonies acquired and kept as reserve during the period of prosperity should now be so exploited as to make up for the decline in the home country. What will be

the result of this policy, whether it will not ultimately defeat the very object with which it is launched, is a different question. The point here at issue is that changed conditions in the metropolis render the continuation of the old methods of colonial exploitation disadvantageous, and force upon the imperialist bourgeoisie a new policy irrespective of what they would rather prefer. On the question of the ultimate consequence of this policy, my contention is and has been that the new policy will create conditions which will facilitate the disruption of the empire. To deduce from this clearly Marxist contention that I am of the opinion that the British bourgeoisie will willingly "de-colonise" India is simply absurd. What I said and what can be maintained without slightly violating the Marxist and Leninist views of imperialism, is that what undermines imperialist monopoly and absolutism, inevitably operates as a "de-colonising" force as far as India is concerned.

Now, if the fall in Britain's export trade were temporary phenomenon, then, it could not produce far-reaching consequences. So it is necessary to examine more closely the nature and extent of the present crisis of British capitalism. Authoritative capitalist economists themselves have admitted that it is not a passing phenomenon. It is admitted that the present crisis cannot be overcome in the 'normal' course of events. For example, the Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee in its report published a few months ago remarks: "our exports have been obstinately stagnant in the post-war period and show no clear signs of any big recovery in the near future." The ominous nature of the situation becomes more evident when it is known that this admittedly permanent decline affects particularly the key-industries, namely, coal, iron and steel, cotton and shipbuilding; and these industries supplies more than half of Britain's export trade. Discussing the depression in these key-industries the Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee observes: "We cannot be sure that our staple trades will revive to their old dimensions." The grave significance of this situation can be fully judged when it is kept in mind that these staple industries were "the chief contributors to our export trade; and their expansion in the last century was the basis of our national development as a foreign-trading and foreign investing nation." (Ibid).

Similar opinions testifying to the permanence of industrial depression in Britain are forthcoming from other equally competent sources. So, not being a passing phenomenon it is bound to produce abiding consequences. The situation is particularly pregnant, for the process of decay has attacked the most vital sport precisely those industries whose development contributed to Britain's growth as a foreign-investing (that is, imperialist) nation.

Let us examine the consequences of this basic fact in some details. The condition for the export of capital from a given country is its possession of more capital than can be invested at home at a

sufficiently high rate of profit. The period, in which this condition obtained in Britain, coincided with the period of gigantic expansion of export trade. Between 1880 and 1913 the total amount of British capital invested abroad increased from 800 million pounds to 3,500 million pounds. Industrial prosperity at home led to enormous accumulation of capital all of which could not be profitably absorbed inside the country. It was so much so in Britain that since the eighties of the last century the amount of capital exported from Britain rose steadily every year till in 1903 it exceeded the amount invested at home. Ever since 1903 the ratio of capital exported to that invested at home increased year by year, until the war disturbed the situation. Of the total capital issues in London in the period between 1903 and 1913 about three quarters were for overseas investment. In the year immediately before the war broke out the amount of capital exported by Britain was approximately 150 million pounds, whereas 36 millions were invested at home.

The picture changes after the war. The volume of overseas investment (including colonial) showed a decrease absolutely, and what is very important for our analysis, relatively to home investment. According to the editor of the *Economist*. Layton, (in his evidence before the Colwyn Committee on national Debt and Taxation) the total amount of capital exported in the five years preceeding the war was 863 million pounds in contrast to 466 millions' in the same period after the war. Post-war annual foreign issues amounted to 135 millions pounds in contrast to the average 200 millions during the years immediately preceeding the war. The proportion of the total issues meant for overseas investment was 88 percent in 1912, 62 per cent in 1924 and 31 per cent in 1927. Calculating on the basis of the figures of the nine months the proportion in the present year will be below 30 p. c.

One step further in the examination and we reach the source of the disease. Obviously, Britain exports less capital because in the post-war years she no longer possesses so much surplus capital as before the war. In other words, since the war, in Britain capital accumulates in a declining rate. It is not possible to find the exact extent of this decline. On the strength of several estimates made by competent authorities, the Colwyn Committee came to the conclusion that the total of the net national savings of Britain in 1924 was approximately 475 millions pounds as against 375 in 1913. Considering the fall in the value of money the figure should have been 650 to maintain the pre-war level. As it is, it shows a drop of over 30 per cent in the rate of accumulation. "The real savings exhibit a decline which may amount in present money values to something like 150 to 200 million pounds a year". (Report of the Colwyn Committee). Now, the needs of the home industry (refitting

* Footnote—These figures are received by an analysis of the statistical material supplied by the Board of Trade, and London and Cambridge Economic Service.

of the old, and starting of new to make up for the incurable slump in the old) absorbs such a large proportion of the depleted accumulation that the surplus for export gets smaller. Thus, the very roots of British imperialist structure are in a state of decay. This must affect the entire structure, and the imperialist bourgeoisie must make a desperate effort to find new means to support the undermined edifice. In their frantic effort to stabilise a tottering structure they will hasten its collapse. Nevertheless, they must make the effort, otherwise they would not be what they are—they would not be bourgeoisie.

The decline of the rate of accumulation together with the increased demand for home leave very little capital for export. The following table illustrates the situation as compared with what it was before the war.

	1913	1924	1927
	(in millions of pounds)		
Total issues	245.5	475	450.8
Home investment	49.7	350	314.6
Exported	195.5	125	135.2

Presently it will be shown that the figures of foreign issue in these years do not represent the actual amount of capital exported, which is very much less.

With this knowledge of the inner condition of British capitalism one can explain why the flow of British capital to India subsided since 1923. The fact that since 1923 British capital exported into India reduced year after year until it reached an insignificant level does not prove the hostility of the British bourgeoisie to any change of economic policy in India. The slackening in the tempo of industrial development in India is due to the fact that British imperialism is not in a position to provide the capital required for it. Its scheme is to mobilise the capital resources of India for the purpose. This is a very dangerous adventure, and the imperialist bourgeoisie must go slowly. There is, however, no change in the policy. There cannot be any change; for the policy is not the choice of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Inner contradictions of capitalism, accentuated by changed conditions, have forced it upon them. Lenin wrote; "Capitalism, in its imperialist phase, arrives at the threshold of the complete socialization of production. To some extent it causes the capitalists, whether they like it or not, to enter a new social order, which marks the transition from free competition to the socialisation of production" (Imperialism). As the capitalist mode of production, in course of its development and as inevitable consequence of its development, creates the basis of socialist society so it is also possible that imperialism, in its last stages, is forced to

† Footnote—Taken from the Board of Trade Journal and the Labour Research Department Monthly Circular. 1924 figures are represent. The rough estimate of the distribution of the national saving made by the Colwyn Committee.

adopt such methods and forms of colonial exploitation as strike a death-blow to the very colonial regime.

In consequence of the fact that in the post-war years capital has been accumulating in the possession of the British bourgeoisie at a declining rate they are obliged to export capital in decreasing amounts. The check of the flow of capital to India in the last years is a reflection of this general decrease in the export of capital from Britain. The Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee reports: "that the margin which remains available for making fresh investments abroad is materially lower than it used to be. In the last four years our surplus for foreign investment has been fully 100 millions per annum less, not only than it was before the war, but also than it was so lately as 1922-23." As the British bourgeoisie were obliged to devote the reduced exportable surplus, in the first place, to retain their control of the most vulnerable sections of the imperial front, very little was left for India. This fact, while immediately a check to the tempo of industrial development in India, renders the necessity of industrialising India more imperative. For, the whole imperial structure will crumble, unless the British bourgeoisie can find new sources of profit to set off the present decline in the rate of accumulation of capital at home, and India provides such a source if subjected to new forms of exploitation. The gap created by the industrial decay at home absorbs an ever increasing portion of the incomes from abroad. These, in their turn, again, have also decreased. "Our income from overseas investments was seriously impaired by the inroads which were made in these investments during the war in order to pay for munitions and necessary supplies from overseas". (Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee). The report also testifies to a considerable amount fall in the real value of the income from shipping-another main source of income from abroad. Then, the operation of inter-allied war-debt payment leaves a debit account against Britain. Fall of export has swollen the adverse balance of British foreign trade to very large dimensions. On the other hand, the incomes from external sources, with which the adverse balance of trade is met, has also decreased in real value. The position as compared to the pre-war year is as follows:

	1918	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
	(in Millions of Pounds)						
Adverse Trade balance	158	171	195	324	384	475	397
Net income from external sources	339	360	373	410	438	468	488
Net surplus available for reinvestment abroad	181	189	178	86	54	-7	96

This table shows that while the adverse trade balance has increased by nearly 150 per cent since 1913, the increase in the net income from abroad has been only 37%. The consequence of this disparity is very serious inroads upon Britain's position as a foreign-investing, that is, imperialist, country. For this alarmingly declining "surplus is the true measure of the net increase of our ownership of capital abroad" (Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee). The slight recovery in the last year does not represent the reality of the situation. The adverse trade balance is slightly decreased not as result of an increased export, but of reduced import. Then the small increase of export in 1927 does not even make up for the heavy drop in the previous year. Indeed the two years average touches the lowest level of export. Further British imports being chiefly raw materials, their reduction will mean a further fall of export in the next year.

From the above facts it is evident that Britain's ability to export capital has become very limited. Nevertheless, new foreign issues in London since 1925 show a tendency to increase. This is a new problem: where does the capital come from? The following table illustrates the anomalous situation.

	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926	1927
	(in millions of pounds)					
Net surplus from abroad	189	178	86	54	-12	74
Actual foreign issues	135	136	134	88	112	139

This table shows that until 1923 the foreign issues were within the limits of the exportable surplus. Since then the limits have been exceeded. This could have been done either by depriving the home industries of necessary capital or by transference to other centres of world finance (mainly New York) of foreign bonds held in London. If the former were the case, then it would prove that the parasitic nature of imperialism had developed to the extent of eating into its own vitals. But it could not be entirely so, for such large amounts of capital could not be sent abroad except through an increase of the export trade, which has not been the case in the last years. So the new foreign issues, at least the major portion of them, in the last years, must have represented transference of foreign securities, and, therefore were the measures not of an increase but decrease of Britain's ownership of capital

FOOTNOTE—After a partial irregular recovery in the first half of the present year, a heavy all round slump has recurred from September. Commenting on the situation the *Economist* remarks that "recent developments must be considered disappointing". Fall of exports has been accompanied by a further reduction in the import of raw materials. In the opinion of the *Economist* Monthly Trade Supplement (Oct. 27) "it suggests that home manufacturers are not laying in supplies on the scale that they should be if trade were really making rapid and substantial progress."

abroad. The ominous nature of the increasing foreign issues becomes still more evident when it is known that according to the calculation of Cindersley, president of the National Savings Committee, made on the basis of informations received from 60 British banks and 160 companies *only 86 million pounds were available in 1927 for the purpose of investment both at home and abroad.* On the strength of all these facts it can be concluded that since 1924 British capital invested abroad has decreased by well over 300 million.

Now, let us see, how this alarmingly grave crisis of British Imperialism affects its relation with India. Only from this perspective could we get a correct view of the situation. Any examination of the relation between India and British imperialism except in the light of the position of the latter as a whole is bound to be superficial. British policy in India is essentially determined by the internal conditions of British imperialism as a whole. It is not based on any other principle than to extract the greatest possible amount of booty. At present British imperialism must squeeze more out of India than ever. The profits cannot be appreciably augmented by the old methods of colonial exploitation. On the contrary, the old policy of keeping India forcibly in economic backwardness has been lately reducing the value produced by the Indian masses for the benefit of British imperialism. X)

At present India exports as much as before the war to buy much less. This is due to the disparity between the prices of agricultural products, which comprize the bulk of her exports, and manufactured goods which she imports. For Example, now India imports cotton goods 10 per cent less, in volume, than before the war. Agricultural production per capita, also shows a decline.

And, to maintain her position as a first class imperialist power, Britain has lately been obliged to write off a considerable portion of the diminishing profit from India. The amount of tribute from India can be raised essentially on one condition, the production of greater value by the Indian toiling masses. This can be done only by the application of advanced means of production. In other words, with primitive agriculture as her main industry India cannot produce for British imperialism the increased revenue that is required by the latter to repair the decay of its foundation. Therefore modernisation of the means and methods of production in India has become the policy of imperialism.

The result of this policy is clearly visible to a Marxist. It will not only defeat its own object; but it will hasten the collapse of imperialism. And precisely therefore the consequence of this policy can be characterized as having a "de-colonising" significance. It is simply absurd to say that recognition of the far reaching effect of the new economic policy forced upon British imperialism by its inner crisis, is analogous to the believe that imperialism is becoming a progressive force. Such arguments may be useful for

demagogic polemics; but it certainly betrays the ignorance of Marxian dialectics. Neither from the point of view of Marxian theories (their application to the realities of a given situation — not their quotation as dead formulas) nor on the basis of the facts can it be proved that political and economic conditions in post-war India are the same as before the war. Nor can it be disproved that these changes have occurred and are occurring with the sanction of and under the guidance of imperialism. The march of India from the state of "dependency" towards that of a "dominion" is a fact. How long the march will last is a different question. The decisive feature of the situation is that under the present conditions it is advantageous for imperialism to transform India from an economically backward to an industrially developed higher type of colony producing greater revenue. Failure to see these essential characteristics of the situation will prevent us from determining correctly our tactics in the struggle against imperialism.

The tribute from India constitutes a considerable portion of the British income abroad. It is difficult to ascertain exactly the amount of revenue derived by British imperialism from India. On the basis of plausible estimates made by various people the rate at present could be calculated at 150 million pounds a year.

X) A close scrutiny of Britain's international

Shah and Khambata, "The Wealth and Taxable Capacity of India" estimates India's tribute to England to be 146,5 million pounds; Comrade Vargas estimates is 167 millions; whereas other nationalists economists, Wadia and Joshi in "Wealth of India" put it at 82 million. balance sheet, as published, reveals the fact that the entire income from external sources is not usually accounted for therein. A reserve is kept which is not shown in the published accounts. It can be assumed that a large portion of the income from India is put on the reserve account. For example, in the last several years only 15 million pounds were put under the head "Receipts Estimate of the Board of Trade of Journal from services", while at least 20 million were derived from India alone and the same accounts. Further, the declining line of Britain's international credit touched the bottom in 1925, the international balance sheet showing debit of 12 millions in 1926. Nevertheless next year there was shown a credit of 74 million which was increased even to 96 million in a revised account of the Board of Trade published in the middle of 1928. But the improvement in the balance or actual trade did not correspond with the rise of credit, and the income from the external sources was shown as the same in the previous year. The reserve, in which considerable portion of the revenue from India is put must have been drawn upon to restore the equilibrium of the international balance sheet as published. All these prove that lot of book keeping jugglery throws a veil over the actual state of Britain's foreign income. Whatever may be the case, one thing is certain, that an ever:

increasing portion of the revenue from India has of late been absorbed to check the catastrophic fall in Britain's international credit. In this situation it becomes a pressing necessity to increase the revenue from India. Irremediable slump of the export trade and the resulting decline of British capital invested abroad seriously reduce the possibility of augmenting, even of maintaining the level of, the income from countries in which the operation of the forces of production is not completely dictated by British imperialism. The reserves of the Empire must be drawn upon. Hence the scheme of "Empire Development", and India is given the most important place in that scheme. For, on the one hand, the application of this scheme to the self-governing part of the empire (Canada, Australia, South Africa etc) does not depend entirely upon the desire of the British bourgeoisie, and, on the other hand, in the more backward outskirts of the empire (new African colonies) the application of this scheme will not immediately produce result of effective importance. Therefore, the largest and most precious jewel of the British crown must live up to its reputation. India must be economically developed to serve Britain's imperialist interests. Her enormous potential riches (accumulated wealth and wasted labour power) should be harnessed. This cannot be done unless her productive capacity is freed from the antiquated means and methods of colonial exploitation.

India pays her tribute to imperialism in the shape of her excess export. The surplus of her export over import, in the present conditions, represents what is taken away from her without giving anything in return. The balance of India's international trade was upset for the first time in 1920. In that year India's imports exceeded her exports to the extent of 790 million rupees. (X) 15 rupees are equal to one pound at the rate of exchange. In the year 1920 the ratio was 10 : 1.

(The average of surplus export in the five years preceeding had been 780 Millions.) Similar situations continued in the following year, causing terrible alarm for the imperialists. India was on the verge of bankruptcy. She failed to pay her "debts" to the colonial overlords. The antiquatedness of the pre-war forms of colonial exploitation stood revealed. It became clear that India must be allowed to raise her productive capacity, if she were to continue as a profitable domain of British imperialism. It was precisely in the years 1920-21, when India's bankruptcy became evident, that decisions were taken by imperialism to discard antiquated forms in favour of advanced ones for exploiting India.

Far seeing leaders of Imperialism had already during the war been pointing out the need for a new course as early as 1915, Hardinge, the then Viceroy of India, had impressed upon the British Government, that after the war India must be helped to

become an industrial country. The Indian Industrial Commission set up in 1916, on the above initiative of the Viceroy, in its report published two years later recommended that in the future the government should play an active role in the industrial development of India; that the raw products of India should be manufactured in the country into articles necessary in peace-time as well as in war; that agriculture should be modernized; that the government must abandon the old policy of "laissez faire"; and that all the available capital resources of India should be tapped for the purpose. The Reforms act of 1919, which introduced political conditions entirely unknown in pre-war India, also incorporated the new tendency. The Montagu-Chemsford Report, which constituted the basis of the Act, contained the following;

"As the desirability of industrial expansion became clearer, the government of India fully shared the desire of the Indian leaders to secure the economic advantages that would follow local manufactures of raw products... If the resources of the country are to be developed the government must take action... After the war the need for industrial development will be all the greater... On all grounds, a forward policy in industrial development is urgently called for to give India economic stability... Imperial interests also demand that the natural resources of India should henceforth be better utilized. We cannot measure the access of strength which an industrial India will bring to the power of the empire... The government must admit and shoulder its responsibility for furthering the industrial development of the country."

In 1922 the government set up the Fiscal Commission with an Indian Industrial magnate as the chairman, and by accepting, in the beginning of the next year, its findings, that protective tariff should be introduced to help Indian industries, revised the traditional colonial policy formulated, in the word of Pitt "not a nail should be manufactured there" - in the mercantilist days with reference to the American colonies. The transformation of the British economic policy in India is testified by the fact that "protectionism" has replaced free trade. When British trade with India is on the decline, its freedom, maintained at the expense of India, no longer suits imperialist interest. As previously free trade had caused industrial backwardness for India, now its reversion to protectionism must have the opposite effect.

Again be it emphasised that what is important to establish is the dynamics of the situation. The dominating tendency must be noticed. The obstacles to the full realization of the policy, caused by other factors, do not disprove that the policy is there. While up to the war the policy of the British Indian government was to collect a customs duty *exclusively for revenue purposes* not exceeding 5 per cent *ad valorem* since the war the average level of the tax on imports has risen from 7.5 per cent in 1918 to 11 per cent

in 1921, 15 per cent in 1922, 18 per cent in 1924 and it is nearly 20 per cent at present. The duty on iron and steel manufactures is still higher; besides, the industry in the country receives a bounty from the state. The result of protection to the iron and steel industry, the growth of which is the basic condition for the industrial development of a country, is noticeable from the following table.

Production in India

(in thousands of tons)

	Pigiron	Steel
1913	207	32
1920	316	159
1924	891	340
1925	894	456
1926	927	457

(Comrade Varga, Inprecorr, Eng. Ed. Vol. 8 No. 45)

Although, owing to the operation of factors outside India, the tempo of industrialisation has been some what restarded since 1924/25, there has been jump in the production of iron and steel which lays down the conditions for an acceleration of the tempo in the near future. The potentiality of the situation is all the greater because this relatively considerable rise in the production of iron and steel takes place in India when their production in Britain declines or stagnates. That there is a consumate policy of industrialization, applied with caution so that the relation between India and Britain is not suddenly thrown out of gear, can be proved with abundant evidence. For instance, speaking in the Indian Council of State on the Steel Protection Bill (Jan.26.1922) the government spokesman, Charles Innes said:

“It is hoped to make the industry much stronger by attracting new capital and by inducing new firms to engage in it. Already India made the cheapest Pig-iron, and we can look forward to the time when India will become an exporter of steel.”

In 1926, 150,000 tons of pig-iron were exported to Japan from India. The price was 37 shillings 6 pence per ton. At the same time the price in Britain was 79 shillings 6 pence. Obviously, industrialization of India will help Britain to maintain her place in international trade.

The hope with which British imperialism adopted a new policy in the exploitation of India was not misplaced, as far as its immediate consequences are concerned.

"India has now become an important factor in the international trade in pig-iron, and has thus not only gained for herself a practically complete independence of all other countries as regards pig-iron, but has also become a very large exporter. The first stage, that is, the production of pig-iron in the use of enormous natural resources has thus been successfully passed"

(British Board of Trade Journal, Sept. 9. 1926)

When it is known that India's deposit of iron-ores has been estimated at 2832 million tons.

This "successful" first stage open up before imperialism a very encouraging perspective. This enormous potential riches converted into commodities at such a low cost that it could be sold at a price less than half of the British level will mean indeed a very great "access of strength" for the empire. So industrialization of India, in this period of capitalist decay in Britain, - rationalisation of colonial exploitation, so to say, - is not incompatible with the basic principles of imperialism.

The severe crisis of 1921-1922 was tided over. The balance of India's foreign trade was superficially restored. It was done not so much by an increase of export as by a forced reduction of imports. Owing to India's inability to meet her "obligations" Britain was obliged to sell her less. This patch-work on the untenable relation between India and Britain had an unfavourable effect on the conditions of British industries. The limitation of the Indian market put an end to the post-war boom in Britain. The great increase in India's import Trade - 3,350 million rupees in 1922 as compared to 1,910 million in 1923 -- indicated a large export of British capital into India. To restore the balance of trade India's imports were reduced to 2,410 million rupees in 1923. The consequence was shown in the drop of British capital exported to India. Since then the situation has essentially been the same in which the channel of British capital to flow into India is restricted in addition to the basic fact that Britain's exportable surplus of capital is also very limited. In 1926 the exports regained its pre-war level, but the imports still remained very far from recovery. Remarkable of this state of things the official report says:

"At present, about three-quarters of Indian export consists of agricultural produce, and the same proportion of her imports is made up of manufactured goods. With the existing disparity between the price of agricultural and industrial products, it is obvious that India has to make a greater productive effort, than she formerly did in order to secure the same volume of imports."

("India in 1927/28).

Footnote. Geological Survey of India, (1922)

The reason for a change of the economic policy of imperialism in India is stated in the above quotation. The productive power of India must be increased, otherwise her capacity to buy will go down. The trade relation between India and Britain which is the main channel through which the latter extracts tributes from former, can no longer be maintained in a state favourable to imperialism unless India can consume more commodities, and export enough to leave a considerable margin after the value of imports has been covered. The steady decline of British trade with India has been the cause of widespread alarm in the imperialists camp. Commenting on the subject the organ of the most die-hard section of the British bourgeoisie, those who are opposed to any change in the relation between India and Britain wrote:—"Trade is the life and purpose of the Indian empire, if we lose that trade, we have neither the power nor the incentive to remain in India." (The *Morning Post* London, Jan. 19, 1926). The paramount importance of trade is recognised not only by the mercantilists, but even by the financial and heavy industrial magnates whose views (in addition to those of the landed aristocracy) the *Morning Post* represents. From another section of the bourgeoisie views are also expressed appreciating the supreme importance of Indian trade for the empire and suggesting that revolutionary measures should be adopted to enlarge this trade. Discussing the prospects of "imperial development" the Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee writes:—

"It must be enormously to our advantage to encourage the growth of Indian prosperity and Indian trade, India's chief need is an increase of the purchasing power of her vast but poverty-stricken population.... Anything which adds to the gross income of India adds to the trade of the world, and particularly of this country. At present India is endeavouring to achieve this end by stimulating manufactures behind a protective tariff..... For the increase of Indian prosperity a great expansion of capital investment for the equipment of the country with scientific means of production is required...."

Britain's export trade to-day is full 20 per cent below the pre-war level causing a chronic depression of industry at home. This in its turn, causes a decline in the rate of accumulation hindering the flow of capital abroad which could be the means of expanding the foreign market. There will be absolutely no way out of this vicious circle, of British imperialism fails to exploit the colonial market at an increasing rate. Its monopoly even on the

Foot note:—The British Liberal Party disapproves of the introduction of protectionism in India. The economic doctrines of Whigism were the guiding principles of British imperialism in the days of expansion. The practical disappearance of the Liberal Party from the political field proves that its economic doctrines no longer suit the interests of the imperialists bourgeoisie.

colonial market has of late been seriously threatened by new industrial countries with greater competing power. The following table illustrates how Britain is losing ground to others in the Indian market.

Proportion of India's Imports.

From	1913	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923	1924	1925	1926
Britain	63 p. cent	52	62	57	60	58	53	52	50

India's exports to Britain proportionally declined from 31 per cent in 1913 to 21 per cent in 1925. So, British monopoly on the Indian market as well as on her source of raw materials is seriously attacked. It can no longer be maintained in its old forms. Promotion of production in India under the hegemony of imperialist finance capital is the new form the monopoly should assume under the new conditions of capitalists decay in the metropolis. Thus, the measures introduced by imperialism to maintain its monopoly will have a "de-colonising" effect in so far as they will shift India from the state of economic stagnation to that of industrial development.

Discussing the report of the Indian Agricultural Commission which recommends measures for the rationalisation of agriculture with the object of increasing its productivity. *The economist* (Aug. 11, 28) declares bluntly that "British rule is nearing the end of its utility". What is meant by this statement? It would be naive to believe that the most authoritative, well-informed and sensible organ of British capitalism suggests a auto-liquidation of imperialism. What it suggests is that the old type of colonial rule has outlived its usefulness; it should now be replaced by a new form compatible with the changed condition.

A close examination of India's foreign trade throws more light on the situation. As observed above, the surplus of India's export is the medium through which colonial tributes is transferred to Britain. The state of this export - its source, intrinsic value and distribution - is, therefore, of great significance.

International Balance Sheet of India.

(In millions of Rupees).

	1913	1923	1924	1925	1926
Exports	2.490	3.490	3.892	3.853	3.095
Imports	1.910	2.410	2.432	2.242	2.302
Surplus of					
Export	580	1.080	1.460	1.611	793
Deduct value of gold and sil-					

ver imported	370	400	943	519	393
Net surplus available for liquidating obligations abroad	210	680	517	1.092	400

Now, on the basis of various estimates the interests, profits dividends, commissions etc., on the total British capital invested in India can be approximately calculated to be between 800 and 1,000 millions of rupees. (These estimates apply only to the post war years). The above table shows that the net surplus of India's exports, in the post-war years, has never covered this enormous tribute, except in 1925. But this solitary exception is more than counterbalanced by the fact that the year 1920 and 21 there was no surplus, the scale having inclined heavily on the other side. So, in the situation as it is, a considerable portion of the imperialist tribute remains uncollected. The effective collection - its application for the accumulation of capital in the possession of the British bourgeoisie - can take place either by its re-investment in India or by increasing the surplus of India's export. If neither of these can be done, then, India must be declared an insolvent debtor. That is, in that case it would be evident that the recovery from the crisis of 1920/21 has been but superficial. The decline of Indian issues in London since 1923 proves that the uncollected tribute is not reinvested in India. Before the war, even after it up to 1923 reinvestment in India was the prevailing method of collecting that portion of Indian revenue which was not covered by surplus export. In those days, the Indian issues in London roughly corresponded with the uncollected tributes from India. In view of the fact that in the last years the collection through surplus export has not increased materially, except in the year 1925, it can be assumed that the decline of new Indian issue in London indicates that heavy inroads have been made upon the income from India to maintain the equilibrium of Britain's international balance sheet. This mysterious disappearance of a considerable portion of Indian revenue explains how the British Board of Trade showed an appreciable increase of the income from external sources in the last year after it had gone down beyond the zero level in 1926. British credit in India must have been written off to other imperialist countries in order to maintain Britain's position in the realm of international finance. This is a very serious situation. Industrial decay in Britain reduces her surplus of exportable capital. In addition to this, she is obliged to encroach heavily upon her Indian reserves to maintain her international positions.

The above table illustrating India's international balance sheet reveals other features which render the situation still more

* *Footnote*:—This figure is assumed in the absence of exact information at hand.

alarming. For instance, by a forced reduction of imports an export surplus was created to tide over the crises of 1920—21. Until the last year the imports did not reach anywhere near the 1921—22 level. This shows a lasting contraction of the Indian market. 1. Consequently, the inflated surplus dropped heavily again in 1926; for a restricted import could not but adversely affect the export trade. The world cannot buy from India except in exchange of commodities.

Another feature of India's foreign trade is that while the major part of her imports come from Britain, her exports are largely taken by other countries. In 1926 about 51 per cent of her imports were supplied by Britain who, however, took only 21 per cent her exports. Previously this disparity operated in favour of Britain. India's credit in other countries then represented so much British capital exported thereto. Now it is otherwise. Britain's surplus of exportable capital being insufficient, the countries buying from India pay her directly in commodities in ever increasing amount. 2. This means a progressive loss of the Indian market for Britain. That is, of late, an increasing volume of super-profit from India has been absorbed outside Britain. What is still worse for British imperialism is that portion of India's surplus export to other countries, not covered by imports therefrom, now represent so much Indian capital exported outside the empire. Lately, growing Indian investments in American securities have occasioned much disquietude. Commenting on the subject the *Economist* (Oct. 6, 1928) observes that "at present wealthier Indians have extensive interests in foreign securities". The cause of this diversion of Indian capital outside the empire, in the opinion of the journal, is the unattractiveness of the channels of investment in India. Therefore, the necessity of harnessing India's capital resources to counteract the declining accumulation in Britain—to check its flow outside the empire—forces upon British imperialism the previously undesirable and unsuitable policy of industrialising India. Otherwise the accumulated wealth of India will flow out of the empire, and a channel for this flow grows wider as the greater portion of India's exports must go to Britain's rivals. Imperialist monopoly is seriously shaken. The alternatives of the situation are to raise India to the level of a higher type of colony with productive forces less restricted than previously; or to allow her to deviate into the orbit of rival imperialist powers. The British bourgeoisie would be stupid indeed, should they make any mistake in choosing between these alternatives. They have not

Footnote 1:—Cotton fabrics constitute a third of India's total imports. The amount of that commodity imported now is over 40 per cent less than before the war and, the total quantity of it consumed 10 per cent less.

Footnote 2:—The proportion of India's total import coming from other countries has risen to 49 per cent as compared to 37 per cent before the war.

made the mistake. They have made the choice. They have adopted a policy, which in the long run is bound to have a suicidal repercussion upon themselves, under the pressure of condition maturing in the period of capitalist decay.

But the crisis of British imperialism is so deep and complicated that there is no straight way out of it. There are many obstacles in the way of empire development through which the British bourgeoisie seek an exit out of the crisis. It is fraught with potential danger. Particularly is it so in India. Industrialisation of India requires capital. Were Britain in a position to supply the required capital it would be an easy sailing? but in that case, it would not be necessary for British imperialism to launch upon the dangerous new policy in India. The problem is clearly put by the Liberal Industrial Inquiry Committee in the following passage:

"The problem of imperial development, has however, been rendered far more acute, by the very economic difficulties which make it at this movement doubly urgent and important."

The inability of Britain to export sufficient capital renders the industrialisation of India comparatively slow process. At the same time the policy of industrialisation should be realised quickly enough so that it is not too late before its effects improve Britain's position as a first class imperialist power. The problem can be solved by mobilising India's capital resources under the hegemony of imperialist finance. The defeat of the Indian government on the question of the Reserve Bank indicated that the Indian Bourgeoisie could not be drawn into the bargain on the terms of imperialism. But imperialism was not discouraged. It did not throw off the sponge. The policy of industrialising India was not scrapped. Only the tempo has been somewhat slowed down while the conditions for a rapid industrial development are being created. One of these conditions is a fair growth of the production of iron and steel inside the country. There are

Footnote — In 1921 the United Steel Corporation of Asia was formed under the control of the British iron and steel manufacturers, Cannel, Laird and Co. The corporation acquired extensive iron deposits in India, projected railways to open them up, and planned to produce pig-iron and steel in huge amounts in India. In official language, the scheme is "held in abeyance".

"Great capital projects already undertaken or in contemplation in India promise a rehabilitation of British trade. Rising standard of living in India is likely to accommodate English-made luxuries. The growing demand for machinery, industrial plants and materials for mechanical transport caused by the new policy of industrialisation provides cause for hope."

(Federick Sykes in a speech recently made at Sheffield after his appointment as the next governor of the province of Bombay.)

facts proving that this condition is being rapidly realised. The second condition is the rationalisation of agriculture with the object, firstly, of raising the purchasing power of the upper strata of the peasantry and, secondly, of driving the poor peasants from their land. The process of pauperisation has reached the limit. India is bankrupt. To hang on blindly to the old policy would be to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. It would be grave mistake on our part to have such a low estimate of imperialist intelligence. By enthusiastically welcoming the recommendations of the Indian Agricultural Commission imperialism shows its determination to act for the fulfilment of the second condition.

So neither facts, nor the perspective of the situation testifies that the policy of industrialising India has been essentially altered. As long as the conditions that forced new policy upon imperialism, are in operation, there cannot be any change of the policy. And those determining conditions have not changed. They operate more disastrously today than several years ago. They are created by the decay of the roots of British capitalism. Imperialism being the ramification of capitalism is bound to be affected by this decay at the latter's root.

Previously Indian government as a rule borrowed large sums in London. Since 1923 practically no India government loan has been floated in the London market. On the other hand the amount of capital raised inside the country has increased considerably. While between the years 1919 and 1924 the total value of government of India securities held in Britain rose from 225.5 million pounds to 326.7 million pounds, the value of those held in India increased from 132.7 to 341 million pounds. When, in addition to this, we take into consideration the fact that since 1923 the government of India has not borrowed in London, it becomes evident that the amount of capital raised in India is very much larger at present. This shows that the mobilisation of India's capital resources, so essential for the full realisation of the policy of industrialisation, is going on. Then the absence of new Indian issues in London does not necessarily mean that no British capital is being invested in India. When any British company plans to undertake the building of an industrial plan or any other business enterprise in India, it does not always appear in the City for the required capital. Such companies are usually already connected with industry or trade in India, and as such are owners of parts of the uncollected proceeds of British capital previously invested there. The operation, therefore, represents investment of British capital in India though not shown through a new issue in London. And such investments are purely for productive purpose; for British capital invested in India as loan bearing a fixed rate of interests is always raised through an issue in London. The form of investment not necessarily through an issue to London is particularly

suitable to the needs of the present situation. British capital invested in India through companies incorporated there with rupee capital, easily multiplies itself by attracting Indian capital. This is another method of mobilising India's capital resources under the control of imperialist finance.

Although the determining factor is the dynamics of the situation, and it has been proved that the dynamics of the situation tend unmistakably and unwaveringly towards industrialisation, the case might be still further strengthened by giving some facts about the actual growth of the leading industries. Figures about the growth of the production of iron and steel, the basis of modern industry, have already been given. Interpreted in relative terms those figures indicate that the production of pig-iron increased by 163 per cent between 1922 (when the protection was introduced) and 1926 in contrast with the growth of 67 per cent during the years 1913 to 1922—the period of excessive war-production; and steel production in the latter period grew by 255 per cent as compared to 170 per cent in the preceeding period. In the end of 1926 the British Board of Trade Journal foresaw continued increase in the production of steel in India and observed that the consumption of the steel produced would require erection of new industrial plant. So, the beginning of the production of the means of production in India is in view. In 1927, the rate of protection to the iron and steel industry was again increased, obviously to accelerate the process of its growth. In addition to the considerably increased production in the country, structural steel imported in 1926 was 64 per cent more than in 1913. The value of the modern means of production (machinery, mill-works, railway—plants, electric-prime-movers etc.), as distinct from the means of transportation, as railway materials, in 1924 was four times as much as in 1913; after a slight downward curb in the following year, it regained the level in 1926 and exceeded it in the last year.

Further, the iron-ores extracted in 1926 was three times as much as in 1919, and most of them were subjected to manufacturing process inside the country. Indian mills now produce finished cloth more than double of what they did in 1913. India's export of finished textile materials increases, simultaneously with the decrease in half-manufactured goods, namely yarns. This shows that the cotton industry has grown not only in expansion, but, what is much more important, in its internal composition. It is no longer an auxiliary to the industrial system in the imperialist-metropolis supplying semi-finished raw materials. It has become an independent productive factor, self-sufficient and competitive. Manufacture of tin-plates is not a basic industry. But its growth in India graphically illustrates the trend of new economic policy of imperialism. The production of this industry has increased more

than four times since 1923 when it received the shelter of the tariff wall. A further increase of not quite a 100 per cent. and the level of present consumption in the country will be reached. Now, the manufacture of tin-plate requires very highly skilled labour, which is not available in India. Nevertheless, by the adoption of the American method of mass production, as against the old British system of production with skilled labour, the industry in India has developed with amazing rapidity. The disparity in the wage-cost in Britain and India is so great that the Indian industry is expected to enter the world market with a very high competitive power even without protection after three years. The protection to this industry in India was granted in the teeth of strenuous opposition from the Welsh Tin-Plate Manufacturers' Association which controls the industry throughout Great Britain. But the influence of the British Petroleum Trust was decisive. The tin-plate industry in India now serves as the connecting link between the British Petroleum Trust and the Indian iron and steel producers, Tata and Co.

Indeed, compared with the vast expanse and population of India, the absolute significance of these figures is not very great. India still remains overwhelmingly an agricultural country. The historic significance of these figures is that they indicate the tendency. They show that the policy of imperialism is no longer to obstruct the industrial development of India. On the contrary, subject to the innumerable difficulties involved in it, the policy of imperialism at present is to foment industrial development of India. The very inner crisis of imperialism, which has obliged it to alter its methods of exploiting India, renders the process of this alternation go on in an uneven tempo and zigzag line.

The facts, on the contrary, clearly and conclusively prove that the theory of "agrarisation" is utterly wrong. In his economic survey of the first quarter of the current year Comrade Varga also came to similar conclusions. We wrote:—

"We can affirm that statistical data establish the existence of tendencies towards industrialization which run contrary to the general tendency of capitalism to turn the colonies into areas of raw material production" (Imprecorr. Engl. Ed. Vol. 8, No. 45.)

Referring particularly to India he rejects the theory of agrarisation, and says:—

"There can be no doubt that India is a more highly industrialised country now than it was fifty years ago." (Ibid).

To-day India is more industrialised not only than she was fifty years ago, but than she was in 1922 which year marks the turning point in the imperialist policy of exploiting her—the year in which the former policy of free trade was discarded and protection was granted to Indian industries. And as this epoch-making event occurred since the Second World Congress of the Communist International, my views of the situation today is not a revision of the passage quoted by Comrade Kuusinen from the theses of the Second Congress. Estimation of the economic and political situation of the world or of a particular country cannot be absolute. It must be constantly readjusted to changing conditions.

The theory that colonies can serve the interests of imperialism only and exclusively as source of raw-material is the corroboration of Kautsky's definition of imperialism as the annexation of agricultural territories by advanced capitalist countries, a definition severely criticised by Lenin. So long as mercantilist and industrial capital remains the dominating factor in the metropolis, economic backwardness of the colonies corresponds to the interest of imperialism. But the situation ceases to be so, as a rule, with the rise of finance capital. And as modern imperialism coincides with the rise of finance capital, it is not possible to assert that colonies must necessarily always remain in an industrially backward state as source of raw material production. The growth of the parasitic character of finance capital and the decay of production in the metropolis render industrial development of the colonies not only possible, but necessary for the existence of imperialism. If production of raw materials were the basic role of a colony, then India can no longer be of much value for the British empire. Indeed, judged from that standard, she could never have been of much value. For, Britain's share in the exports from India has never been very large. Over 60 per cent of India's exports always went to other countries. Now Britain's share is reduced to 21 per cent. Previously Indian exports to foreign countries represented export of British capital thereto. Britain's inability to export capital no longer permits her to be benefited by the raw products of India. Then industrial decay reduces the volume of raw material imported into Britain. So, if colonies were useful only or primarily as source of raw materials, Britain is no longer in a position to exploit colonies. Therefore, it is not possible to lay down a hard and fast rule determining the relation between the colonies and imperialist metropolis in all periods and under all conditions. The relation has only one fundamental principle, and that is the exploitation of the colonies by the imperialist country. When it is profitable for imperialism to hold the colonies as source of raw material for the industrial metropolis, the policy is to obstruct the development of modern means of production there; then the condition change, and owing to industrial decay in the metropolis the raw product of the colonies can-

not be disposed of profitably in the old method, their manufacture in the colonies into commodities becomes the more suitable means of exploiting the latter. As manufactured commodities contain more surplus value produced by the colonial toiling masses than in raw products, the super-profit for imperialism becomes greater, when the new method of exploitation is applied. So, under certain condition, industrialisation of the colonies is in the very nature of imperialism.

Only in the light of this new policy of imperialism can we make a correct estimation of the political situation in India. If there were no change in the policy of imperialism, if it were true as Comrade Bukharin asserted in his political report etc the VI. Congress, that, on the contrary. "British imperialism has increased its colonial oppression of India in general and *of the Indian bourgeoisie in particular*," (italics are mine M.N.R.), then his observation made in the same report that "it is inconceivable that the (Indian) bourgeoisie will play a revolutionary rôle for any length of time", cannot be wholly correct. In that case it would also not be automatically clear that "the politics of the Indian bourgeoisie are not revolutionary politics" as Comrade Kuusinen asserted in his report on the Colonial question. The Indian bourgeoisie cannot be assumed to be fond of being oppressed or constitutionally averse to revolutionary politics. They cannot be expected to take up a revolutionary fight against imperialism, have already practically given up all real opposition to imperialism, because the new economic policy of imperialism permits the economic development of their class. On the background of a compromise as regards the essentials of the situation, certain section of the bourgeoisie is simply manoeuvring to secure the most favourable position possible. The counter-manoevres of imperialism, also to occupy the most favourable position, cannot be called new "oppression", particularly of the Indian bourgeoisie.

The great revolutionary mass movement of 1920/21 could not be suppressed by imperialism. It was betrayed and liquidated by the bourgeoisie as soon as imperialism indicated its willingness to make some economic concession. In the beginning of the year the boycott of the Simon Commission also was not suppressed by imperialism. It was sabotaged by the bourgeoisie who, as a matter of fact, never wanted it. Step by step, the bourgeoisie have abandoned the boycott, and at this moment the leaders of boycottist parties are carrying on negotiation with the Simon Commission behind the scene. Why do the nationalist bourgeoisie act in this way? Because the new economic policy of imperialism makes considerable concession to Indian capitalism. As soon as a way

Footnote : -The quotation from Comrade Bukharin is taken from the Inprecorr. Eng. Ed.

out of the political impasse is found, the bourgeoisie will settle down to work on the basis of these concessions. By conclusively formulating their demand as "dominion status within the British empire", cynically violating the resolution of the National Congress, they have set their face against further political commotion except of the harmless parliamentary brand. They have accepted junior partnership with imperialism, on principle; only the details of the bargain now remain to be settled.

The "de-colonising" effect of the new policy touches only the bourgeoisie. The masses of India will remain in the state of colonial slavery even after the process of "des-colonisation" culminates in the grant of dominion status. But parallel to the economic concessions made to Indian capitalism, there has been a transformation in the political position of the Indian bourgeoisie, and still further transformation is going to take place in the near future. It is still an open question how near to their coveted dominion status will the Indian bourgeoisie arrive in consequence of the constitutional tug-of-war at present in play. But there is no doubt that the result will be a further advance towards the goal. Politically and economically, the burden of colonial regime on the bourgeoisie has been reduced since the war and will be further reduced in the near future. This can be reasonably and historically reckoned as a process of "de-colonisation" as far as it goes, as far as the bourgeoisie are concerned. And this relative liberation of the class interests of the bourgeoisie from the deadening grip of the old form of colonial exploitation, is the cause of their deviation from the revolutionary path towards a compromise with imperialism.

In his report, Comrade Kunsinen purposely did not touch the self-governing colonies like Canada, Australia, South Africa etc., because, in his opinion, they are practically independent capitalist countries. If the self-governing colonies are not to be reckoned as colonies proper, then it is but logical to infer that in proportion as India approaches the status of a self-governing colony, she undergoes a process of "de-colonisation," in limited sense, as far as the bourgeoisie are concerned. Now let us chronicle some facts illustrating the success of political rights, even some power; to the Indian bourgeoisie since the war.

Until the war, politically the Indian bourgeoisie together with the rest of the population were in a state of practically complete suppression. The reforms of 1909 did not alter their position essentially. The net result of those reforms was that some higher grade of the public services was made accessible to the upper strata of the bourgeoisie. But the reforms of 1919 were different. They were much less than what had been promised by imperialism to assure the loyalty of the Indian bourgeoisie during the war. Nevertheless, they did confer upon the bourgeoisie considerable

political rights and even the elements of power. These reforms were relatively of great importance, in view of the fact that until the war the bourgeoisie, as a class, had been as unfranchised, as the rest of the population.

The Reforms of 1919 enfranchised not only the bourgeoisie, but even the upper stratum of the petty bourgeoisie. A very large majority of the Central as well as the Provincial legislatures was subjected to election. The provincial executive was made partially responsible to the legislature no less than 70 per cent of which would be elected. The administration of agriculture, industry local self-government, education and sanitation was given over to Indian ministers under the control of the legislature. In the administrative units lower than the provincial government, much greater place was conceded to the Indian bourgeoisie for example, the administration of the premier city of the country, Calcutta, was completely in the hands of the nationalist bourgeoisie from 1923 to the last year. The municipal government of the city of Bombay has also been largely under nationalist control. Even in the central government the native bourgeoisie can wield a considerable amount of pressure upon the executive if they have the courage.

They are at least in a position to impede seriously the smooth operation of the executive machinery if this would not be somewhat amenable to their influence. This was demonstrated during the years 1924 and 25 when the nationalist members of the legislature acted as a solid opposition block. All these superficial concessions did not alter the fact that the state-power ultimately remained with imperialism; but within this limit, the Indian bourgeoisie were given considerable elbow-room. In view of the fact that the programme of the nationalist bourgeoisie has never been complete conquest of power from imperialism (when India is raised to the status of a self-governing dominion imperialism will still remain the paramount power), this limited accession to rights and power was not negligible from their angle of vision. The Reforms of 1919 were a step towards self-government, as far as the bourgeoisie were concerned. By the upper strata of their class the Reforms were from the beginning recognized as such. The lower strata criticised and for a short time boycotted the reforms, not on their merit, but as not sufficient.

The majority of the members of the Commissions (Industrial Commission, Fiscal Commission, Currency Commission, Agricultural Commission) whose findings constituted the basis of the new economic policy of imperialism, were representatives of the Indian bourgeoisie. The chairman of the Fiscal Commission, on whose recommendation protectionism became the policy of the government was an Indian industrial magnate. The highest state offices, only excluding the Viceroyalty, are today open to the Indians, and not a few of them are actually occupied.

In a number of occasions the Indian bourgeoisie have exercised their political rights to the discomfort of imperialism. So much so that the most short-sighted die-hard elements among the British residents in India have demanded the revocation of the reforms. The following are some of the most note-worthy occasions. The Tariff Board set up by the government to consider the claims of industries applying for protection is composed of three members, two of them are Indians. After admitting the claims of a series of industries, largely or exclusively owned by Indians, the other day the Tariff Board rejected the claim of the Burma Oil Company (subsidiary of the Shell Group). It also rejected the claim of the match industry which has been acquired by the Swedis Trust. The government by exercising its reserve power could disregard the verd of the Tariff Board, but it did not, showing its disposition to concede some power to the Indian bourgeoisie in return for their collaboration in stabilizing the empire. By defeating the Reserve Bank Bill the bourgeoisie demonstrated its power to obstruct the imperialist scheme of mobilising India's capital resources. The bourgeoisie feel themselves in a position to bargain with imperialism for more favourable conditions. Recently a private member's bill providing for the reservation of the costal carrying trade to Indian ships, was carried through the Legislative Assembly in the teeth of government opposition. The government may sabotage the full application of the proposed measure; but it has no power to prevent its enactment. Finally, there is the public safety Bill which the government wanted to pass by all means in order to close the doors of India to foreign Communists. Such an eminently political measure, needed for the exercise of power, was thrown out by the nationalist majority, and the government reconciled itself to the situation dropping the bill so earnestly prepared.

The Indian bourgeoisie are not going to have their demand for "equal partnership within the empire" (dominiom status satisfied in the immediate future. But they are on the verge of a making another considerable advance in that direction. In spite of the exclusion of the Indians from its composition, and the sham opposition of section of the Indian bourgeoisie, the Simon Commission is sure to find that the political rights and power of the Indian bourgeoisie should be increased so that the smooth operation of the new economic policy of imperialism is assured. Since the appointment of the Simon Commission, both the sides have gradually modified their respective attitudes, and at present only formalities and "political face" stand in the way to agreement. Although the composition of the Simon Commission still remains formally purely British, representatives of the Indian bourgeoisie and landed aristocracy have been drawn in to collaborate practically on the same footing with the original Commission. Thus the section of the bourgeoisie boycotting the Commission has been completely outmanoeuvred. For the sake of the saving political face, this section

must keep up a formal opposition; but they are sure to end up as their prototype in Egypt (the Zaghulist Wafd) did in connection with the Milner Commission; they will finally accept the concessions made on the recommendations of the Simon Commission after having boycotted it. Very likely they will do so under formal protest.

The disappearance of the representative of die-hard imperialism, Birkenhead, from the political arena indicates which way the wind blows in the imperialist camp. Other signs are also noticeable in the imperialist camp indicating that the political position of the Indian bourgeoisie will be improved in the near future. For example, the Associated Chambers of (British) Commerce of India in its memorandum to the Simon Commission recommends that provincial administration should be completely (including even finance and police) given over to the Indians (bourgeoisie). It also suggests transfer of some power in the central government subject to the supremacy of the Viceroy. The *Economist* of London, on August 11th. while making the very significant statement - "British rule is nearing the end of its utility" - quoted above, observes that "in the provincial sphere British management of Indian affairs may be visualised as on the eve of complete and compulsory liquidation". At the same time the journal anticipates that in the central administration British control may continue still for a short period. The project of Indian constitutional reform as a self-governing dominion inside the British empire worked out by the bourgeois nationalist leaders has been sympathetically commented upon in the imperialist press. A furtive negotiation around that document is even now going on between the Simon Commission and the bourgeois nationalist leaders.

So, the immediate perspective of the present situation in India is the grant of further political rights to the bourgeoisie. Only in the light of this perspective, it becomes "inconceivable that the Indian bourgeoisie will play a revolutionary role for any length of time". A gradual advance of the Indian bourgeoisie from the state of absolute colonial oppression to self-government within the Britain empire is taking place. Therefore, it is not necessary for them to travel the risky path of revolution. In other words, progressive "de-colonisation" of their economic and political status makes the Indian bourgeoisie averse to revolution, and in the near future, when "de-colonisation" of their class has gone further, it will make them positively counter-revolutionary. Transfer of some political power to the colonial bourgeoisie does not weaken imperialism; because the native bourgeoisie wield this power, not to further develop the struggle against imperialism, but to suppress the revolutionary movement. This has been demonstrated by the experience in other colonial countries.

"De-colonisation" of the Indian bourgeoisie, thus, is not an "Illusion". It is a fact which is the key to the situation. By estimating the situation in the light of this fact can we establish what Comrade Kuusinen very correctly said in his report: "*The mission of freeing India has been confounded by history on the Indian workers and peasants*". The workers and peasant masses cannot be mobilized to undertake their historic mission consciously only on the slogan - "the sahib is a robber". They must know that the native bourgeoisie are the accomplices of the foreign sahib, and therefore, will never carry on a revolutionary fight for national liberation. "The sahib will never de-colonise India" of the workers and peasants; but nor will the Indian bourgeoisie lead the people to national freedom. And this must be courageously told and clearly demonstrated to make the workers and peasants conscious of their historic mission. Comrade Kuusinen or any other comrade will search in vain to detect me ever spreading the illusion among the workers and peasants that "the sahib will de-colonise" them. On the contrary what Comrade Kuusinen today says about the historic mission of the Indian workers and peasants. I began propagating years ago when not a few leading comrades entertained illusions about the role of the nationalist bourgeoisie.

Finally, I am completely in agreement with Comrade Kuusinen's opinion about the immediate tasks and organisational problems of the Communist Party of India. This agreement reveals the unreality of the row raised on the theory of "de-colonisation". A deep divergence in the appreciation of the situation must lead to equally great difference in determining our tasks in the given situation. The conclusions drawn by Comrade Kuusinen can be correct when the situation indicates a transformation in the relation between imperialism and the native bourgeoisie; in other words, when there is a process of "de-colonisation" as far as the bourgeoisie are concerned. Should Comrade Kuusinen or any other comrade challenge the correctness of the analysis of the situation as given above, he could not logically draw the conclusions as regards our tasks, as he did. Looking at the matter dispassionately Comrade Kuusinen will admit that I have not committed such a crime as he sought to depict in his report.

P. 1208.

A file headed "statistics—Industrial Development in India", containing exhibit Nos P 1208 (1) to P 1208 (4).

P. 1208. (1)

Dear Comrades,

The resolution on the Indian TU movement adopted by the 4th Congress of the BILU outlines the task of the revolutionary element in the Indian TU movement. These tasks may be briefly summarised as follows:

(1) To expose the treacherous character of the reformist leadership and to replace it by a Left wing workers' leadership by means of drawing workers into the leading organs of the trade unions, factory committees, strike committees, etc.

(2) To organise the unorganised workers particularly the lower paid and unskilled sections, and the youth.

(3) To form factory committee and Trades Councils and generally to put the Unions on a proper working basis by the issue of membership cards, democratic election of officials, regular meetings, etc.

(4) To publish TU papers in the several vernaculars and establish night schools and study circles for the TU membership.

(5) To draft a programme of immediate demands consisting of such items as:

The 8—hour day;

Minimum Living Wage; with equal pay for equal work.

Abolition of Child Labour;

Improvement of Workshop Conditions and Laws relating to Compensation.

Introduction of protective legislation for women workers.

During the past six months there have been many indications of a growth of the revolutionary spirit in the Indian TU movement. The continuation of the strike wave has served to further expose the

treacherous role of the petty-bourgeois leadership, and the introduction of reactionary legislation—the Public Safety Bill and the Trades Dispute Act—are further examples of imperialist oppression.

Despite the activities of these enemies against the Indian working class movement there are obvious signs of the growth in the influence of the Left Wing and through it of the RILU. Several unions are even now under the ideological leadership of the RILU and in many other unions there are active groups. It must be noted, however, that the strength of our forces is lessened by the absence of a centralised organisation leading and coordinating the revolutionary struggle in all sections of the trade union movement and on a national scale.

The RILU therefore suggests that immediate steps should be taken to form an All-Indian Trade Union Left wing Movement along the lines indicated in the attacked Resolution.

In structure the All Indian Trade Union Left wing Movement must aim at centralising all the militant trade union forces by the formation of Left Wing groups in the unions under Reformist leadership and by direct affiliation of militant Trades Councils, and Trade Unions. When properly constituted the All Indian Trade Union Left wing shall unite all these forces on a national scale and shall in addition establish provincial organisations on which all affiliated bodies shall be represented.

While it may be impossible at the present time for the Left Wing to establish National Industrial Sections it should be kept in mind that such Sections are vitally necessary in the most important industries. e. g. textile, railways and metal.

The initial steps for the formation of the Left Wing should be carried out as speedily and effectively as possible and this can be accomplished by establishing provisional committees in each of the large cities, e. g., Calcutta, Bombay, Lahore, Cawnpore, and Madras. These Committees when formed should outline the policy of the Left Wing and prepare a comprehensive programme of organisational & political demands on the basis of the Resolution of the 4th Congress of the RILU, and by interchange of reports and regular correspondence insure that the movement develops along similar lines in every city. Thereafter elaborate preparations should be made to convene a conference of the Left Wing trade unions, groups and individual in each city, where the policy and programme would be finally ratified and the Left Wing definitely constituted on trade union affiliation and groups membership. This done, it will then be possible to prepare for the inaugural conference on a national scale.

Immediate propaganda must be conducted in the trade union press and in the existing revolutionary periodicals. Meantime, the

Left Wing Committees in the various cities to prepare for the publication of their own papers, pamphlets, etc., in the appropriate vernaculars. In all our propaganda it should be made clear, that the All-Indian Trade Union Left Wing Movement exists to consolidate and coordinate the struggle of the broad masses of the working class. While setting out to organise the unorganised workers, the Left Wing should make it clear that it is in no way conducting a campaign to recruit members from the existing reformist unions into the new unions.

Special attention should be paid to the organisation of the mining, metal and textile industries, the unskilled workers and the youth. Where the Left wing takes the initiative in organising new unions, these should be affiliated to the All-Indian Trade Union Left Wing Movement.

The Left Wing must also take upon itself the task of organising factory committees and trades councils and securing the amalgamation of kindred and overlapping unions.

One of the basic weaknesses of the Indian TU movement is the lack of leaders drawn from the ranks of the workers. To overcome this difficulty the RILU proposes, to forward a training class syllabus for trade union students and recommends that preparation be made for the early establishment of training classes under the auspices of the Left Wing in Calcutta, Bombay, Lahore, Cawnpore, and Madras.

With regard to the *International relations* the Left Wing must maintain contact with the RILU direct and also through the medium of the workers welfare League of India and in the Pan-Pacific TU Secretariat. Regarding the All-Indian TU Congress, we learn from press information that the question of affiliation to the Amsterdam International will appear on the agenda of the A. I. T. U. C. In the event of this proposal being agreed to, it simply means that the AITUC will come more and more under the influence of the British and International agents of imperialism. A virile opposition must be rallied against the bourgeois leaders of the Indian trade union movement that seek to pilot the working class into the harmless channels of class collaboration. Affiliation to Amsterdam must be hotly opposed; the Left Wing to counteract this move should demand the affiliation of the All-Indian Congress to the RILU.

Finally, the Left wing must raise the question of the *workers' welfare League of India* at the Congress, condemning the Executive for exceeding its authority in taking away the right of the League to represent the AITUC in England as granted to it by decisions of several congresses of the Indian Unions. Every effort must be made to reinstate the Workers' Welfare League of India as the official representative of the AITUC in England. The Left wing must continue and intensify the campaign for close contact with the

workers in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and in the furtherance of this policy must make every endeavour to have a resolution for affiliation to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat placed on the agenda of the AITUC and adopted at the coming session of the Congress.

Your fraternally,

T. illegible

RESOLUTION.

PROPOSED BY THE INDIAN DELEGATION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE CI AND ADOPTED BY THE SECRETARIAT OF THE RILU.

The carrying into effect of the resolution on India of the IV Congress of the Profintern, requires the preparation of definite plans of work, both in the establishment of a central direction and in the penetration of the Left Wing programme and organisation into every province and industry. The following tentative plan of work lays down the main lines upon which it must go, while detailed application must be worked out on the ground, in India, and tested by experience from step to step. The principal items in the plan of work must be:

1. To build up a strong trade union Left Wing which, when properly constituted, shall embrace all advanced Trade Union Organisations, Left Wing groups and workers. The immediate tasks in this direction are:

(a) Press and publication; preparations for the establishment of weekly organs in at least four languages—Urdu, Bengali, Maratti and Tamil—in Calcutta, Bombay, Lahore and Madras. Translation of international trade union literature, into these languages, and their publication together with pamphlets written specially for the Indian workers.

(b) Establishing a provisional (organising) Committee of the most reliable leading Leftward inclined trade unionists, which shall set itself the duty of bringing together and establishing definite organisation of the Left Wing, first in the different industries and provinces, and later in a National Left Wing Conference. The programme of this Left Wing should be based upon the resolution on India of the Fourth Congress, but must include in each case detailed economic demands taken from the daily life of the workers, for which the broadest masses will fight. The Left Wing must be separate and distinct from the political Left Wing (Workers' and Peasants' Party, and Communist Party and ideologically led by the C. P. In order so broaden the base of the Left Wing, as many non-Party active trade unionists must be drawn in the national and district committees of it as possible.

(c) The establishment of active Left Wing Groups within each union from top to bottom, working under the direction of the District and National Committees.

(2) Strengthen the struggle against Amsterdam, and for changing the petty-bourgeois and bourgeois—intellectual leadership of the trade unions for a working class leadership by means of:

(a) A strong campaign for the affiliation of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress, as well as of separate unions, to the Pan-Pacific Trade Union Secretariat, and the sending of a delegation to the Pan-Pacific Congress in 1929.

(b) To counteract the plans of the reformists, a move for affiliation of the A. I. T. U. C. to the R. I. L. U. must be started.

(c) Explain by concrete examples from daily life the character of Amsterdam (British General Council, Purcell etc.) as agents of imperialism, and the surrender to British imperialism that follows the unity of the Indian TU leaders with Amsterdam.

(d) Systematic training of workers for leadership, both politically and technically, by means of instructions, training classes, and sending active rank-and-file leaders to the international school. Such training must be combined with active participation in the daily struggle of the workers.

(e) Demanding everywhere the election of officials and functionaries from below, as against all appointments from above, and the selection of actual workers for these posts.

(3) Immediate preparation for organising the unorganised workers in basic industries into new unions, where none now exist, or where it is impossible to use the old unions because of completely reactionary leadership, simultaneously with an organised movement for the amalgamation of the many small and scattered unions within each industry into large, strong, centralised unions under militant leadership.

(4) Immediately strengthen international connections by (a) organising exchange of literature through couriers and seamen, etc., between India and England, India and China, Japan, etc.; (b) systematic preparation of reports on all events in the Indian Labour Movement; (c) stationing of an experienced Indian Comrade in Moscow for a year, to be replaced later by another directly from India; (d) sending of an Indian Comrade to the October Plenum of the PPTUS to participate unofficially and publish a report in India on his return. ||

P. 1208. (2)

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

In 1915, a slight recovery from the shock of war and the betrayal of the International movement took place. In Britain and Europe small minority groups drew together in opposition to the war. (Sections of the B. S. P. and I. L. P. and S. L. P. in Britain groups of Syndicalists and Social Revolutionaries in France, the Spartacist group under Liebknecht in Germany and at a later stage the Independents the Socialist Party in Italy, and the Russian Bolsheviks under Lenin). These groups met at an unofficial conference at Zimmerwald in September, 1915. This conference reassembled at Kienthal in April 1916 where the influence of Lenin is observed in the manifesto which proclaimed the solidarity of the proletariat in face of the horrors of war let loose by capitalist imperialism denounces the action of those socialists who have put themselves in line with their governments and taken on responsibility for the conduct of the war and calls on the proletarians of all countries for united action for peace and Socialism. The resolutions denounce not only the "international" Socialists, but also "Bourgeois Pacifism" the hope of real peace under capitalism is declared to be an illusion and the desirable peace can come only with the triumph of the proletariat.

The Stockholm Conference of September 12th 1917, came to a decision to break away and enter into independent revolutionary action owing to the failure of the International Socialist Bureau to hold a general International Conference, due to the hostility of the right wing sections of the International which were heavily compromised by the independent policies of their irrelative countries. The success of the Bolshevik revolution in 1917, widened the breach and laid the basis for the Third International.

THE FIRST CONGRESS

In January 1919, the Russian Communist Party and the Parties of Poland, Hungary, German, Austria, Letland, Finland and the Bakan Revolutionary Federation Issued the Manifesto calling for the first Congress of the Communist International. Thirty-nine organisations and groups were addressed specifically in the manifesto which also outlined the basis of a programme in three sections.

The first section dealt with aims and tactics, and the other six points were as follows:—

- (1) The disintegration and the collapse of world capitalism.
- (2) The question of seizure of power by the proletariat and replacement of the bourgeois State by proletarian government apparatus.
- (3) The role of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the apparatus of the Soviets.

(4) Dictatorship of the proletariat as the lever for the immediate expropriation of the capitalist classes, the abolition of private property and the socialisation of the means of production.

(5) Disarming of the bourgeoisies and the arming of the proletariat.

(6) The closest possible contact with the various sections of the revolutionary proletariat.

(7) The chief methods of struggle mass action of the proletariat against the capitalist State.

The second section dealt with the attitude towards "Socialist" Parties in five points.

The first point dealt with the fundamental groups of the old international, first, the right who supported their bourgeoisie during the war; second, the unstable centre under Kautsky, and third, the left revolutionary wing.

The second point deals with lengthy struggle with the right merciless criticism of the leaders and efforts made to induce the more revolutionary elements to secede from it.

The third point was the formation of a bloc of those elements who are now in favour of proletarian dictatorship, in the form of Soviet rule.

The fourth and fifth points with the left groups and tendencies and the 39 groups outlined.

The section deals with organisational questions and the name of the Party. It proposed the International to be named the Communist International a fighting organ for directing the international movement, the fundamental principle of which is to subordinate the interests of the movement in each country to the general interests of the international movement as a whole.

THE WORK OF THE FIRST CONGRESS.

The Congress met at Moscow on March 2nd to 6th, 1919. Nineteen parties or groups were present, with full voting rights and in addition, 16 organisations in an advisory capacity.

The business of the Congress was dealt with as follows:—

(1) Presentation of papers of reports.

(2) Programme of C. I.

(3) Bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat (Lenin's thesis)

(4) Attitude towards the Socialist parties and the policy of the Allies.

(5) The international situation and the Berne Conference.

(6) Election of Committee and organisation.

The main features were the manifesto and programme of the C. I. which outlines the policy and the provisional constitution of the International. The decisive step was thus taken and the new International was in being by the adoption of the provisional statutes.

THE SECOND CONGRESS.

During the second congress a definite struggle of tendencies took place. These groups were first the section which came over from the old Social-Democratic Parties; second, the section which had grown up during the war and post-war period (mainly Industrial shop stewards etc.) and third the Communist Party under Lenin.

After the E. C. report the Congress surveyed the world situation and the tasks of the P. Party. Then followed the parliamentary question. The participation of the Communist Party in the British Labour Party met with strong opposition from a section of the British delegates who were supported by the Dutch section, the Italian section and under Bordiga, and the representatives of the American industrial workers. This so-called left was defeated by the struggle of Lenin. His book on left Communism finally made possible a United Party in Britain.

On the trade union question a struggle took place against the demands of the ultra-left syndicalists led by the K. A. P. D. and supported by some American comrades (Reed etc) for the withdrawal from social democratic trade unions. The resolution which outlined the role of the Party in trade unions and the creation of factory committees marked the defeat of the ultra left tendencies. Then followed the role and structure of the Communist Party before and after the conquest of power by the proletariat which is outlined in a thesis.

The national, Colonial and the agrarian theses drawn up by Lenin were adopted, and marked a new phase in the development of the question of allies of the proletariat in the world revolution.

The attitude of the Communist International to the Centre groups who only verbally adopted the programme of the International was finally decided and the 21 conditions became the bulwark against centrism.

The Statutes and Rules of the International were adopted and organisational questions regarding legal and illegal work, work amongst women and the relations of the Y. C. L. to the C. I. completed the work of the second Congress.

THE THIRD CONGRESS

The March rising in Germany gave rise to a struggle against left digressions at this Congress, and represents one of the most important periods in the history of the Comintern. This was the so called theory of the offensive and resulted in the departure of Gorter and the K. A. P. D. (Communist) Labour Party of Germany)

An equally severe struggle was also conducted against Levi who was expelled at the Congress and against opportunist deviations of Serrati and his sections of the Italian movement. The reverse side of this was the defeat of the extreme left (led by Bordiga) Lenin

The question as to ways and means by which general principles could be applied to specific and immediate problems was examined by the Congress. The United Front Policy was ratified and the Congress insisted on the slogan "To the Masses" which included and insisted on the permeation of the trade unions as mass organisations of the workers.

The principal decisions dealt with were as follows:—

(1) Revolutionary tactics in which was outlined the most important task the attainment of decisive influence among the most important section of the working class and there by the leadership of the struggle. It reviewed also the situation in the various parties and outlined their task in the respective countries. It formulated the question of past struggle and partial demands. It reviewed the lesson of the March struggle in Germany and the form and means of direct action its relation to the semiproletarian elements and international co-ordination of action.

(2) The organisation and construction of Communist Parties dealing with the methods and scope of their activity with democratic centralism and the duties of the Party membership and the building of the Party of the factory group basis. The work of fractions in the structure of the Party organisation was outlined.

(3) The trade union question was exhaustively surveyed the relations of the R. I. L. U. and the I. F. T. U. and a programme of action on the basis of factory committees agreed upon.

The theses on the International Situation presented by Varga and Trotsky gave an exhaustive survey of the decline of capitalism, the emergence of the U. S. A. and Britain as leading groups and the contradictions arising from the postwar period of capitalism. Methods of work among women co-operatives and the relations between the C. I. and the Young Communist movement were dealt with. A question of primary importance was a resolution on the tactic of the Russian Communist Party dealing with the problems arising out of war Communism and the preparations for the building of a Socialist economy.

THE FOURTH CONGRESS

The Congress met on the Fifth Anniversary of the Russian Revolution November 7th 1922, and expressed its gratitude and admiration to the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia. The slogans of "To the Masses and the "United Front" tactics were confirmed. The implications of the capitalist offensive were examined and discussed. A forecast was made of the period of "Democratic Pacifism." which was confirmed by the Herriot and MacDonald Governments. It reviewed the Versailles Treaty and the implications arising from the Geneva Treaty which enslaved the Austrian working class to Anglo-American imperialism and was the forerunner of the Dawes Scheme.

A Commission dealt with the negro and Eastern Questions and education and confirmed the agrarian line taken in Lenin's theses of the Second Congress. It re-organised the Communist Party. The question of the Party programme was discussed and the main lines laid down. It reviewed the development of Fascism and declared war upon all forms of bourgeois dictatorship.

The question of Workers and Peasants Governments was discussed and the slogan adopted. A commission dealt with various national Parties and with the deviations to the right and the left and outlined the Leninist line to these Parties.

THE FIFTH CONGRESS

The period between the Fourth and Fifth Congresses was marked by a struggle against the right Brossard in France; The failure in Saxony of the right wing in 1923 the right digressions of the Bulgarian Party Norway and Sweden also the errors of Trotsky and the discussions in the Russian C. P. the results of the five years were summed up as follows:—

- (1) Half a dozen monarchies overthrown including Tsardom a significant factor for the world revolution
- (2) The Russian Workers Republic consisting of one-sixth of the world has been consolidated.
- (3) Development of National Revolutionary movements in Asia and Africa stimulated as a result of the war
- (4) Capitalism in Europe is still unstable and badly taken
- (5) The Labour Aristocracy represented by social democracy has become a component part of the bourgeoisie.
- (6) The Communist Parties have grown from propagandists so societies into a Communist world Party.

The Fifth Congress made a correct estimation of economic and political development and outlined the partial stabilisation

and its unstable character. The democraticpacifist phase outlined at the Fourth Congress proved to be correct and lines on the trade union and peasants question were confirmed. The Bolshevisation of the Parties was outlined and the Congress supported the Russian Party against Trosky and the rightwing deviations of Radek Brandler Thalheimer in relation to the German situation in 1923.

P 1208. (3)

CONSTITUTION AND RULES OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL NAME AND OBJECTS.

1. The Communist International — the International worker's Association is a union of Communist Parties in various countries; it is a World Communist Party. As the leader and organiser of the world revolutionary movement of the proletariat and the bearer of the principles and aims of Communist the Communist International strives to win over the majority of the working class and the broad strata of the property-less peasantry fights for the establishment of a World Union of Socialist Soviet Republics for the complete abolition of classes and for the achievement of Socialism....the first stage of Communist society.

2. The various Parties affiliated to the Communist International are called the Communist Party of... name of country (Section of the Communist International). In any given country there can be only one Communist Party affiliated to the Communist International and representing its Section in that country.

3. Membership of the Communist Party and of the Communist International is open to all those who acceptt the programme and rules of the given Communist Party and of the Communist International, who jion one of the basic units of a Party, actively work in it... abide by all the decisions of the Party of and the Communist International and regularly pay Party dues.

4. The basic units of the Communist Party—organisation is the nuelces in the place of employment factory, workshop, mine, office, store, farm etc. which unites all the Party—members employed in the given enterprise.

5. The Communist International and Sections are built up on the basis of democratic centralism, the fundamental principles of which are a election of all the leading committees of the Party...

subordinate and superior, (by general meetings of Party members conferences, Congresses, and international congresses);-b-) periodical reports by leading Party committees to their constituents c) decisions of superior Party committees to be obligatory for subordinate committees, strict Party discipline and prompt execution of the decisions of the Communist International of its leading committee and of the leading Party organ.

Party questions may be discussed by the member of the Party and by Party organisations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent Party committees. After a decision has been taken by the congress of the Communist International, by the Congress of the respective sections or by leading committees of the Comintern and of its various Sections, these decisions—must be unreservedly carried out even if a section of the Party-membership or of the local Party organisations are in disagreement with it.

In cases where a Party exists illegally the superior Party committees may appoint the subordinate committees and coopt member on their own committees subject to subsequent endorsement by the competent superior Party committees.

6 In all non-Party workers' and Peasants' mass organisation and in their leading committees (trade unions, co-operative societies sports organisations exservice man's organisation in municipal bodies and in parliament even if there are only two Party member in such organisations and bodies Communist fractions must be formed for the purpose of strengthening the Party's influence and for carrying out its policy in these organisation and bodies

7 The Communist fractions are subordinated to the competent Party bodies.

NOTE:—

I Communist fractions in international organisation (Red International of Labour Unions International Class War, Prisoners Aid Society, International Workers Relief etc) are subordinate to the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

2 The organisational structure of the Communist fractions and the manner in which their work is guided are determined—by special instructions from the Executive Committee of the Communist International and from the Central Committee of the given Sections of the Comintern,.....

II THE WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

8 The supreme body of the Communist International is the world Congress of representatives of all Parties (Section) and organisations affiliated to the Communist Internationa.

The World Congress discusses and decides programme tactical and organisational questions connected with the activities of the Communist International and of its various Sections. Power to alter the programme and rules of the Communist International lies exclusively with the World Congress of the Communist International.

The World Congress shall be convened once every two years. The date of the Congress and the number of representatives from the various Sections to the Congress to be determined by the Executive Committee of the Communist International

The number of decisive votes to be allocated to each Section at the World Congress itself in accordance with the membership of the given Party and the political importance of the given country. Delegates to the Congress must have a free mandate no imperative mandate can be recognised.

9 Special Congress of the Communist International shall be convened on the demand of Parties which at the proceeding World Congress had an aggregate of not less than one half of the decisive votes.

10 The World Congress elects the Executive Committee of the Communist International (E. C. C. I.) and the International Control Commission (I. C. C.)

11 The headquarters of the Executive Committee is decided on by the World Congress.

III THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND ITS SUBSIDIARY BODIES.

12 The leading body of the Communist International in the period between Congresses is the Executive Committee, WHICH GIVES INSTRUCTIONS TO ALL THE SECTIONS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND CONTROLS THEIR ACTIVITY.

The E. C. C. I. publishes the Central Organ of the Communist International in not less than four languages.

13 The Decisions of the E. C. C. I. are obligatory for all the Sections of the Communist International and must be promptly carried out. The Sections have the right to appeal against decisions of the E. C. C. I. to the World Congress but must continue to carry out such decisions pending the decisions of the World Congress.

14 The Central Committees of the various Sections of the Communist International are responsible to their respective Party Congress and to the E. C. C. I. The latter has the right to annul or amend decisions of Party Congresses and of Central Committees

of Parties and also to make decisions which are no obligatory for them.

15 The E. C. C. I. has the right to expel from the Communist International entire Sections groups and individual members who violate the programme and rules of the communist International or the decisions of the World Congress and of the E. C. C. I. Persons and the bodies expelled have the right of appeal to the World Congress.

16 The programme of the various Sections of the Communist International must be endorsed by the E. C. C. I. In the event of E. C. C. I. refusing to endorse a programme the Section concerned has the right to appeal to World Congress of the Communist International.

17 The leading organs of the press of the various actions of the Communist International must publish all the decisions and official documents of the E. C. C. I. These decisions must as far as possible be published in the other organ of the party press.

18 The E. C. C. I. elects a Presidium responsible to the E. C. C. I. which acts as the permanent body carrying out all the business of the E. C. C. I. in the interval between the meetings of the latter.

19 the E. C. C. I. has the right to accept affiliation to the Communist International of the organisations and Parties sympathetic to communism such organisations to have an advisory vote.

20 The E. C. C. I. and its Presidium has the right to establish Permanent Bureaux (Western European South American Eastern and other Bureaux of the E. C. C. I. for the Purpose of the establishing closer contact with the various Sections of the Communist International and in order to Better able to guide their work

NOTE—The scope of the activities of the permanent bureaux of the E. C. C. I. shall be determined by the E. C. C. I. or by its presidium. The Sections of the communists International which come within the scope of activities of the permanent bureaux of the E. C. C. I. or must be informed by the powers conferred on these bureaux.

21 The sections must carry out the instructions of the permanent bureaux of the E. C. C. I. Sections may appeal against the instructions of the permanent bureaux to the E. C. C. I. or to its presidium but must continue to carry out such instructions pending the decision of E. C. C. I. or of its presidium.

22 The E. C. C. I. and its presidium have the right to send their representatives to the various Sections of the communist International. Such representatives receive their instructions from the E. C. C. I. or from its presidium and are responsible to them

for their activities Representatives of the E. C. C. I. have the right to participate in meetings of the central party bodies as well as of the local organisations of the Sections to which they are sent. Representatives of the E. C. C. I. must carry out their commission in close contact with the central committee of the Section to which they are sent. They may however speak in opposition to the central Committee of the given Section at congresses and Conference of that Section if the role of the central Committee in question diverges from the instruction of the E. C. C. I. Representatives of the E. C. C. I. are especially obliged to supervise the carrying out of the decisions of the world Congresses and of the Executive committee of the communist International.

The E. C. C. I. and its presidium also have the right to send instructors to the various Sections of the Communist International. The powers and duties of instructors are determined by the E. C. C. I. to whom the instructors are responsible in their work.

23 Meetings of the E. C. C. I. must take place not less than once every six months. A quorum must consist of not less than one half of the membership of E. C. C. I.

24 Meeting of the presidium of the E. C. C. I. must take place not less than once a fortnight. A quorum must consist of not less than one half the membership of the presidium.

25 The presidium elects the political Secretariat which is empowered to take decisions and which also prepares questions for the meetings of the E. C. C. I. and of its presidium and acts as their exclusive body.

26 The presidium appoints the editorial committees of the periodical and other publications of the Communist International.

27 The presidium of the E. C. C. I. sets up a Department for work Among Women Toilers Permanent committees for guiding the work of Of definite groups of Sections of the Communist International (Labour Secretariats) and other departments necessary for its work.

Iv

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION

The International Control Commission investigates matters concerning the unity of the Sections Affiliated to the communist International and also matters connected with the communist conduct of individual members of the various Sections.

For this purpose to the I. C. C.

(a) Examines complaints against the actions of Central Committee of Communist Parties lodged by Partymembers who have been subjected to disciplinary measures for political differences.

(b) Examines such analogous matters concerning members of central bodies of Communist parties and of individual party members as it deems necessary or which are submitted to it by the deciding bodies of the E. C. C. I.

(c) Audits the accounts of the Communist International.

The International Control Commission must not intervene in the Political differences or in organisational and administrative conflicts in the Communist parties.

The head quarters of the I.C.C. are fixed by the I.C.C. in agreement with the E. C. C. I.

THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE SECTIONS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE E. C. C. I.

29 The Central Committee of Sections affiliated to the Communist International and the Central Committees of affiliated sympathising organisations must send to the E.C.C.I. the Minutes of their meeting and reports of their work, § Re 300 Resignation from the members by individual members or groups of members of Central Committees of the various Sections are regarded as disruption of the Communist movement. Leading posts in the party do not belong to the occupant of that post but to the Communist International as a whole. Elected members of the Central leading bodies of the various Sections may resign before their time of office expires only with the consent of the E C C I Resignations accepted by Central Committees of Sections without the consent of the E.C.C.I. are invalid.

31 The Sections Affiliated to the Communist International must maintain close organisational and informational contact with each other arrange for mutual representation at each others conferences and congresses and with the consent of the E C C I exchange leading comrades. This applies particularly to the Sections in imperial countries and their colonies and to the Sections in countries adjacent to each other.

32 Two or more Sections of the Communist International which (like the Sections in the Scandinavian countries and in the Balkans) are politically connected with each other by common conditions of struggle may with the consent of the E C C I form federations to for the purpose of co-ordinating their activities such federations to work under the guidance and control of the E.C.C.I.

33 The sections of the Comintern must regularly pay affiliation dues to the E C C I form the amount of such dues to be determined by the E. C. C. I.

34 Congress of the various Sections ordinary and special can be convened only with the consent of the E C C I

In the event of a Section failing to convene a Party Congress prior to the convening of a World Congress that Section before electing delegates to the World Congress must convene a Party conference or Plenum of its central Committee for the purpose of preparing the questions for the World congress.

35 The Young Communist International is a Section of the Communist International with full rights and is subordinate to the E. C. C. I.

36 The Communist Parties must be prepared for transition to illegal conditions. The E. C. C. I. must render the parties concerned assistance in their preparations for transition to illegal conditions. Individual members of Sections of the Communist International may pass from one country to another only with the consent of the Central Committee of Sections of which they are members.

37 Communists changing their domicile must join the Section in the country of their new domicile. Communist of leaving their country without the consent of the Central Committee of their Section must not be accepted into other Sections of the Communist International.

P. 1208. (4)

Party organisation

The Role of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party is an organisation of the most active and conscious elements of the working class. It is organised for the purpose of actively leading the working class in the struggle against their class enemy the capitalist class. This involves the overthrow of the capitalist class which at present exercises its dominations over the mass of the workers.

In the period of developing capitalism it was possible for the capitalist class owing to their exploitation of the native population of the colonies to give concessions of reforms to certain sections of the workers. As a result the struggles of the workers were waged along the constitutional lines of parliamentarianism and trade unionism. This was due to the conception that the capitalist system was permanent and gradually expanding into a utopia in the distant future. The reformist leaders at this period referred to a

change which was to take place in some nebulous fashion in the distant future through a process of evolution or gradualism.

Now when capitalism has entered its last phase imperialism and the break up of capitalism is obvious to all, it is found that the organisations which had served their purpose during the period of development are useless for waging the revolutionary struggles in the period of decline. The new conditions demand new forms and out of these there have arisen the Communist Party and the Communist International.

The parties of the second International in the various countries as a result of their corruption by the capitalist class are unable and unwilling to meet the needs of this last phase of capitalism (i.e. the period of wars and social revolution). Their policy, was exposed in their tragic failure and betrayal of the working class in the imperialist war of 1914 as well as the succeeding years following the war.

This policy of the Second International is still expressed in the congress of the Labour and Socialist International and its constituent bodies such as the I. L. P. and the Labour Party in this country. The events of Black Friday (1921), the General strike, the mining lock-out (1926), and the right wing support of the imperialists against the workers and peasants of China (1927) are concrete examples of this policy.

The Communist party i.e. the Communist International the would party of the working class and oppressed peoples is the most complete form of organisation of the workers organised as a class. The Trade Unions for example exist to further the interests of but a section of the workers. They are concerned only with the interests of their members in a particular craft or industry and are often in conflict with the workers in other industry. Their degree degrees of organisation and constitution are many and varied.

The Communist Party however represents the workers not as miners railwaymen dockers engineers etc., but as members of one class whose condition of economic subjection is the same and therefore possess the same political interests. The party is the embodiment of all that is energetic earnest and revolutionary in the working class and welds these best elements into a common organisation concentrating and co-ordinating their forces for the task of leading the masses in their struggle for freedom, for the proletarian dictatorship which is realised through the Party.

P. 1209. 43 Hc

A file headed Worker's and Peasant's Party, containing the following items:—

- (1) A letter dated 2-12-12 of the Executive Committee of the Communist International to the All-India Conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party.
(Vide Exh. P. 602.)
- (2) Secretary's Report, Workers' and Peasants' Party.
(Vide Exh. P. 826.)
- (3) Report of the First Annual Conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party, Bombay.
(Printed below.)
- (4) Resolution on Peasants.
(Vide Exh. P. 885.)
- (5) Thesis on our attitude towards the Congress and Present Labour Leadership.
(Printed below.)
- (6) Resolution on the Trade Union Movement.
(Vide P. 831.)
- (7) Resolution on Youth.
(Vide Exh. P. 833.)
- (8) Resolution on Organisation.
(Vide Exh. P. 832.)
- (9) Resolution on General Political Situation.
(Vide Exh. P. 523 (part).)

REPORT.

FIRST ANNUAL CONFERENCE
OF THE
WORKERS AND PEASANTS PARTY, BOMBAY.

The first Annual Conference of the workers & peasants party was held in the Congress House, Bombay on Sunday, 18th March 1928.

The party was founded in February 1927 by a group of Congress men interested in mass-organisation and mass-action of the workers and peasants and believing that india's emancipation can come only from them.

The Secretary's Report of work showed that the party had taken an active part in the Congress work in the city, there being about 22 men (twenty-two) of the party on the provincial Congress Committee, including the vice-president and the Secretary of the Congress. It has also three members on the A. I. C. C. The Report shows that in pursuance of their Creed the party Members were actively engaged in Trade Union work. The party has amongst its prominent members Mr. Jhabwalla and many others radical Trade Unionists of the rank and file workers. During the year under report Meetings were held to welcome comrade " sak " to condemn Sacco-vanzetti Murder, to celebrate the Lenin Day, the Russian Anniversary etc., The party had also sent Delegations to several places to report on Labour and peasant organizations to enable the party to formulate tactic and plan to work amongst them.

The statement of Accounts showed receipts amounting to Rs2,527-12-3 and expenses to Rs 2,418-5-6 leaving a balance on hand of Rs 109-6-9. The items of receipts were membership subscriptions, donation Rs 1,000/-from Mr. D.R. Thengdi, president of the party, sale of publications and the party organ, " KRANTI ", a Marathi weekly which had to close down, when the Government prosecuted Messrs.P. Spratt and Mirajkar (party Members) for the Book "India and China. "

Then messages were read from R. R. Bakhale of the All-India Trade Union Congress, the British communist party and the peasants League of Moscow expressing a wish of success to party.

The conference, instead of passing Resolutions, adopted by number of theses analysing each problem, in its historical and present aspect, in the light of the party's principles and arriving at a conclusion and programme of work to be followed during the next year. The Theses embraced subjects like the Simon commission' Independence, peasant Movement, Trade Unions, Youth organisations &c. One theses was a statement of the attitude of the party towards the Congress and its present leadership and also the labour-movement. It repudiates the charge that the party is anti-congress and says that it stands for complete independence but trusts that only the masses by their militancy can achieve it and that the present leadership instead of organising is concentrating on constitution, which is framed only by a universally elected constitutional Assembly, after capturing political power. Similarly, the party's attitude towards the present Labour-leadership was determined by the ultimate goal of working all the Industries for the benefit of the Nation and not for profit. The labour-leadership of to-day was guided by a spirit of mere welfare work and redress of grievances.

Theses contained appreciation of the Alibag and Bardoli Movement, with a warning that the peasants must lead themselves

and not be led by the land-lords or their sympathisers; urged concentrated organisation of the Railway workers on a slogan of 100 % increase in wages and condemned the split amongst the Textile leaders as it has facilitated the employers' attack on wages and conditions.

Congratulatory paras regarding the Colonial workers' movements in China, Egypt, Japan, Persia were found in theses.

The party also considered the question of reviving the "KRANTI" or starting some English organ and contesting seats on the Municipalities and Local Bodies on a ticket of working-class demands.

Dwarkadas Mansion
Bombay No 4
20th March 1928.

Yours etc.,
Sd/ S. V. Ghatge
Secretary W. & P. Party.

THESES ON OUR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE CONGRESS AND PRESENT LABOUR LEADERSHIP.

The Workers' and Peasants' Party since its inception has been misrepresented by its foes and many times misunderstood by its sympathisers, who but for the misunderstanding would have joined its ranks and made it ever more vigorous. The deliberate misrepresentation of its enemies, we need not take into account, because if we try to meet them on one point, they will invent another. But we must look into what are sympathisers, admirers and neutral elements have to say and if possible meet them somewhere, without essentially compromising our principles or outlook.

The analysis of their attitude, as presented by Party Members who have toured round the country, shows that we have to consider the following points mainly.

Our attitude to (1) the Nationalist Movement as a whole and the Congress, and

(2) PRESENT LABOUR LEADERSHIP.

From the criticism that the Party has levelled against the present congress leadership and its policy, many have inferred without proper justification, that we are following anti-Congress ideas or are undermining the Institution. When that inference is made, it is forgotten by those who made it, that criticism of the Congress are made by (1) Anti-Congressites and Pro-Imperialists (2) The Non-Congress Moderate Nationalists, (3) the Leftists who want still further more. The utterance of our Party Members and the Official Manifestoes it has issued from time to time must make it clear to every one, who is not interested in misrepresenting us, that so far as Congress attitude towards Imperialism goes, we are more or less

alied with the Leftists. The Party from its very beginning has stood for complete independence of Imperialism and its representatives in the A. I. C. C. whole-heartedly supported the Independence Resolution. But our Party still goes further than the Leftists, Independents, and Republicans in the Congress. These groups at present are content with the adoption of the principle in the new resolution on our goal but are not prepared to take the reins of the Congress in their hands, on grounds of false respect to old Gods. They are prepared to allow the older groups and veterans of the Congress to seriously shut the movements on not the right lines, simply because the veterans have done services in the Past. Our Party is not bound by shackles of traditions. When men have worked for the Nation, we pay them respect for past work but we are not prepared to allow them a premium of dictation in that ground merely. When they are found to be side-tracking issues, leading the movement from Political non-important and to non-political issues, we cry "halt" while others are prepared to submit under the illusion, that veterans are always right. So when we criticise the present leadership, we do it not because of personal considerations or anti-Congress motives, but because we feel it is not now fit to carry us to action and independence. Therefore, it has been our policy to ally ourselves with the most radical section of the Congress ranks like the Independents and Republican groups so far as the political action of the Swaraj movement is concerned. The Toil in sacrifices that the Government has taken of the individual Party Members must silence ever the suspicion of our adherence to nothing short of Independence.

An almost correct interpretation of the Party's views on the matters is lucidly put forth by Comrade Palme Dutt in his "Modern India" published in Bombay.

When we have done that and put forth our firm conviction that Swaraj or Independence is unthinkable without the support of the Masses we are at once confronted by very serious, tried & trusted radical leaders and rank & file workers in the Congress or in other section of the Nationalist movement, with the statement.

Let us first fight foreign Imperialism and then think of class fight between our Capitalists and our workers and Peasants. Till that time let us not embarrass our capitalists, who are as much anti-Imperialists as any advocates of Independence. That statement is common, too common and therefore to be treated more in detail.

The statement reveals an incorrect formulation of the real question and a confused grasp of the real issues. After all for what & for whom is the fight going on and who is going to fight it.

India as a whole is one geographical country and so far as its relations to Imperialism is concerned it has to be one against a common enemy. But when it comes to human aspirations of the

human beings, known as Indians, it becomes a different matter. It comes to ideas & ideals, to every day life, to the problem of living, housing, clothing etc., because just as man does not live by bread alone, he does not live by ideas alone, he lives by bread more than by ideas. Ninety-nine and nine-tenths of the people have to think of mere abstract ideas. For the big mass of human beings known as Indians, whether in cities, villages, offices or elsewhere, the sole criteria of ideas activities is the material yield that everything promises to them. The measure of judgement of the goodness or badness of a course of life, of an ideal is determined more in terms of what kind of ease in life it would mean. The same measure will apply to the ideal of Swaraj.

People live by extracting useful things from nature, moulding them into a useful form that can yield comfort, ease or satisfy some primary want say food, housing, clothing etc., Speak of anything which is not first and foremost concerned with this and let it be grand and imposing and ideal to any length, the majority of people will remain apathetic. Speak of how to get more food from the land to lessen the taxes, reduce debts and it will move that class to action which is mainly suffering in life because of their not having sufficient means to earn living and such a class of being in the country in 80% of this whole people. Speak of more wages, full employment, shorter work and you move 15% of the people, because of the things that matter most, of material things, which are the basis of all life and on which is built culture, ideas, power etc., Thus the everyday problem is better life and the men who most suffer are peasants and workers; They form the bulk of the nation and they alone have the will.

So even if it is a question of mere Swaraj i. e. freedom from foreign yoke, the forces which will really fight are the workers and peasants, so long they have been the real forces and in future also they will command the position.

But you cannot make the fight for a thing which does not contain the solution of their essential need. Their ideas are not abstractings but concrete material reality. The Peasants must have lands, less taxation, no debt, The Workers must have a sufficient wages, decent housing and living and all the comforts that a middle class intellectuals expects on a decent salary. They are everyday thinking of it, working for it, and in their own way making united efforts to get what they want. When they are oppressed too much their shortest method is rebellion. To make them realise the implications of the Swaraj movement, it must have an idealogue, of their class, if they are to achieve it.

Then when you come to identify Swaraj with their demands, the conflict within the class, within what was known as a one whole Indian mass becomes revealed. It is found then the Workers and

the Peasants as a whole have two matters. The Imperialists and their Indian Masters, some of them in the most advanced nationalist ranks. The class interest comes to the front. The Workers and Peasants unhesitatingly judge both the masters by the same rod and deliver the same blow. Therefore in the most heightened period of the Swaraj movement the workers and the peasants took to grind down the police, military, landlords, factory-owners and all in one and the same mill. The process revealed that the Swaraj movement cannot be separated from the class movement, the two are inseparable.

The hesitation of choosing sides comes up before the intellectuals and owning class nationalists and the cultural adherents. They would have the big mass of humanity, half clad and half fed to appreciate the great moral idea of the struggle, offer sacrifices, till it is achieved and speak of the sordid things like the land, wages hours, etc. The press which governs ideas, belongs to the owning class, the key positions of the social and political life belong to the owning class. The influence the intellectuals, who vacillated once their way, once that way. Radically or lukewarm as their position gets better or worsened in social life.

The Capitalists don't hesitate. If it comes to choose between Imperialists and Labour, they side with their bigger masters and class-mates. They would rather not have the overthrow of Imperialism than grant relief from oppression to agriculturalists or more wages to workers. If you leave aside the Government members of all the Legislatures all the elected men are Indians and yet majority of them have consistently opposed Peasants and Workers' Bills. Their interests have more in common with the Imperialists than with the other class. So, when they have found that the poorer class are getting more radical in their demands, they have abandoned the real organisation of the rank and file fighters and have reverted to more or less to constitutional wrangling.

It is plain from what has been said up to now that the fight for Swaraj cannot be diverted of the class conflict, if it is to be really fought by the people, who are the most capable of it and have in the whole history of India done it.

Radical rationalist Movement can only be built, if in material terms of every day it shows unity between the working class demands, their achievement and the achievement of Swaraj. And this cannot be done on mere promise. Because the first instalment of the sincerity of the promise is related directly to present conditions and can be worked out in reality immediately. How can the 25 crores of the Peasants and five crores of Workers believe that Swaraj is better than the present life when they find that its best advocates are their very oppressors and refuse the most minimum needs of life to them ?

Therefore, the Workers' and the Peasants' Party cannot divert its nationalist activities of their working class character. The two are inseparable. The Congress predominantly belongs to the working-class big and small. Therefore, it is that our Party in its role of Working-Class championship in many a time finds itself appeared to best Nationalists. And we unhesitatingly choose for the most oppressed as they are the real Nation. At the same time when the Indian oppressors of the Indian Masses oppose Imperialism when their interests are threatened, we unhesitatingly lend out support to the anti-Imperialism section and strengthen their hands. That is why we were most emphatic in the absolute and complete boycott of the Simon Commission.

Thus the only class that is capable of anti-Imperialist struggle is the exploited class of Workers and Peasants, and the lowest ranks of the Petty-bourgeois. This class will not fight for a thing which means Utopia to them, which does not hold out to them definite prospects of better condition of Society. Nor can we do without the active participation of this class. So, the Swaraj agitation can not be separated from the economic emancipation of the exploited Poor. We do not expect the Congress ever to become the champion of this class. Our constant harping on the Congress failure to organise the masses does not mean that we believe the Congress to be capable of it. It is only done to make it radical as far as possible, to eliminate prejudice against the Workers demands. That is our answer to the most common question put to us. Next come the questions of relations to the existing Labour Parties and individual Labour Leaders. We do not doubt for a moment the sincere desire of any of these Groups and individuals to do some good to the Workers and Peasants. Many of them have been the first to start various Labour Organisations in the country, when we have to consider and analyse their position, we do not look to their personal motives. We only look to the *ideology*, with which they enter Labour field.

And that ideology has the most serious defect, that is unscientific and therefore unnecessarily merely humanitarian. By unscientific, we mean, they do not know the social currents that underlie the Workers' Movement, they do not know the very ideology of the Worker, whom they wish more to dominate and mould according to their light than according to his class ideas. They leave the fundamentals and run after the minor details. They do not see the contradiction between the Workers' interests and their Masters' interests. They believe the employers would be angels if they could manage to convince them of the Workers' rights. They believe that all would go if they could just satisfy the employers and just get more wages of a few pias, just one or two windows for the Workers' dingy room and so on. They have not yet grasped the essence of the movement and that is that the

employers cannot go on profiting, if the Worker is to go on demanding more wages, shorter hour and better life. And when it comes to that, the existing Labour Parties think more of the Employers profits and safety than the Workers' interests. We differ here.

We know that the economics of capital is such that the Employer can go only to a certain length in given enemies of life to his servants. The employer may be very religious, god-fearing, may found hospitals and nurseries for his servants, but he must have profits, he must be employer and when competition forces him, all his goodness gives way to profit-hunting. The worker remains a worker always threatened with dismissal, cuts etc., for the safety of the Industry that is profits. There is no reconciliation between the interest of the two.

The dignity of Labour, culture, ease, comforts, literature, and intellectual life for the big mass of the toiling people are mere Utopia and false promises, when the Worker is a worker, the employer is the owner, the boss.

We ask for a fundamental change in those relations. The whole must become a co-operative of the people, who serve and work. In the words of the President of the Trade Union Congress Society must own the things that produce its bread and living.

This essential difference in ideas leads to difference in methods. We agree with the existing Labour-Leadership that the immediate need is organisation, one organisation from one industry. But we do not want to harp merely on redress of grievances. The Leaders are content to write a letter to the employer, if his manager kicks a worker. We want the worker to be so conscious and fearless as to reply insolence with a fitting reply. While the present leadership's last faith is in the goodness of the system, our faith is in the goodness of spirit of Workers and Peasants.

Then, many do not want the workers to think of politics, and even if they want, they want them to think of the employers politics. By all means the Workers should have vote, a seat in the Councils and all that. But, what is he to legislate for? He must think how the industry can prosper!! Others say politics is no concern of his, though it is politician that forces on him all the laws, the police and law courts to help the employers.

With all these fundamental differences, we believe in the need of the moment, that of organising the workers and peasants on the basis of certain reforms. And therefore, we always offer co-operation. We do not go with the spirit to break the organisation, therefore it is that we disallow formation of rival unions; we are not aiming at overthrowing the leaders as such, but we do not aim at changing the outlook of the present trend of the movement. We know, we

cannot immediately transform conditions in a day. Therefore, it is that we immediately ask for more wages, shorter hours for the workers, more land and less taxation for the peasants. So, long as these demands are not realised, and so long as the present leadership genuinely wants these to be realised not by conviction of the employers, but by the solid organisation of the workers, there is no reason why they should reject our co-operation or misunderstand us.

We have had differences with many personalities on many occasions in the labour field. The differences mainly centred round the correct reading of the situation and the goal. We have misrepresented as advocating General strikes and no compromises, violence and so on at every time and place. But is gross misrepresentation. When we speak of compromises etc., we make plain to the workers the implications of the struggle, the goal that he is to aim at, and the necessity of sectional strike or compromise or whatever the measures are to be adopted in the particular situation. We are particular about sharpening the mind of the worker, make him class conscious, a still harder fighter and unbeliever in the goodness of a system that wants to starve him. We make him see that the particular occasions are a skirmish in a general campaign. And then with his consent, we determine the issue or its end while to-day the trend is to make the monetary issue as the sole thing and decisions are foisted upon the rank and file and resolutions put forth more for adoption than for discussion. The workers level is not raised. These have been our grounds of differences with other organisations and none others.

The other parties on the contrary have attributed the misdeeds of the individuals to our Party as a whole. There might be many, who may go and do something individually without a mandate from the Party, there may be many who may not be our Partymen, yet declaring themselves to be ours. How can we or our principles and theories be held liable for personal deviations and lapses? A principle cannot be vilified because its exponents turned sometime a wrong way. When an offensive was anywhere taken against us, we have only retorted. We only warn our friends and sympathisers not to be duped by such misrepresentations and attacks.

P. 1210. 49

7 copies of the booklet in English entitled "A call to Action."

Being the Resolutions, Thesis and Report presented to the Third Annual Conference of the Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal.

Bhatpara, March 1928.

(Vide Exh. P. 523).

P 1211. 71

A small file containing the following printed English pamphlets:—

- (1) The Workers' and Peasants' Party of Bengal constitution, 1928.
(Vide Exh. P. 514.)
- (2) Presidential Address of the First All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party Conference, delivered by Comrade Sohan Singh Josh, at Calcutta on 21 December 1928.
(Vide Exh. P. 596).
- (3) The Trade Union Movement.
(Vide Exh. P. 51.)
- (4) Workers' and Peasant's Party, Principles and Policy.
(Vide Exh. P. 161).
- (5) Political Resolution.
(Vide Exh. P. 162).
- (6) A call to Action.
(Vide Exh. P. 523)
- (7) Manifesto of the Workers' and Peasants' Party to the Indian National Congress Madras, December 1927.
(Vide Exh. P. 23).
- (8) The Bengal Peasants' and Workers' Party constitution.
(Vide Exh. P. 549(8)).

P. 1212. 72

7 issues of the Labour monthly in English for the following months:—

January 1928.

February 1928.

March 1928.

June 1928.

September 1927.

November 1928.

December 1926.

P. 1213. 73

A book in English entitled.

“Historical Materialism”

A system of Sociology.

by

Nikolai Bukharin.

P. 1214. 74

A book in *German* entitled.

Lenin

Über das Genossenschaftswesen.

P. 1215. 77

Three issues of Labour monthly in English for the following months:—

November 1923.

April 1928.

May 1928.

P. 1216. 94

A booklet in English entitled.
"Problems of the Chinese Revolution"
by
N. Bukharin.

P. 1217. 95

A booklet in English entitled.
"Communism"
by
R. Palme Dutt.

P. 1218. 101

A Magazine in English entitled.
"The Communist International"
for July 1928.

P. 1219. 103

A file containing several issues of the International Press
Correspondence, in German of the following dates:—

28-8-28	13-9-28	22-5-28.
4-9-28	3-9-28	12-11-28
21-7-28	23-8-28	13-9-28
25-7-28	3-9-28	
27-7-28	28-8-28	
31-7-28	18-9-28	
2-8-28	10-9-28	
4-8-28	7-9-28	
16-8-28	19-7-28	
21-8-28		

Saraswati Machine Printing Press, MEERUT, U. P., INDIA.

P. 1220.

A pilot file containing typed copies of the following amongst others:—

- (1) Criminal code of Russia.
- (2) Thermidor: The turning point of a Revolution.
- (3) The world Revolution and the U. S. S. R. by N. Bukharin.
- (4) Notes of the month. Signed R. P. D.
- (5) Red Army of Russia.
- (6) Literature in Soviet Russia.
- (7) Biographies of Kalm, Rykov Stalin & Voroshilov.
- (8) The relation of Workers Party to Religion by N. Lenin.
- (9) British war Preparations in India by A.N. Bhadari.

At the top of these articles there is a manuscript Sheet giving a list of articles sent to Deogiriken, Editor of the Chitramaya Jagat for preparing notes on "Indians in Russia", "League of Nations" and "the third International".

There is also another manuscript Sheet mentioning the number of Sheets typed and the charges paid for the typing.

ARTICLES SENT TO DEVGIRIKAR.

- | | |
|----------|---|
| P. P. 7 | 1. Literature in S. Russia. |
| P. P. 12 | 2. How they fight Illiteracy in Russia. |
| P. P. 5 | 3. Red Army of Russia. |
| P. P. 21 | 4. Criminal Code of Russia. |
| P. P. 5 | 5. Biographies. |
- One Issue of New Masses containing
Photos of (Issue of Nov. 27)

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------|
| To prepare notes | 1. Lunachersky. |
| on Indians in Russia | 2. Trotsky. |
| League of Nations and | 3. Radek. |
| 3rd Inkr. List of best | 4. Voroschilov. |
| books on Russia. Trotsky. | 5. Meyerhold. |
| V/s Stalin. Roy's block. | |

COSTS. Ans. 2 P. 3 per sheet.

BOOKS SENT TO HIND.

1. Village life in S. R. V. Press
2. Religion " "
3. Neighbours of S. R. "
4. How Soviets work ,, "
5. Lenin by Trotsky,
6. Trotsky by Gastman.
7. Ten days.
8. Insurrection.
9. Three Issues of Rus. Bank.

ARTICLES

TYPED.

	No. of sheets	Charges	Index
1. The Red Army in Russia.	5	0-10-0	A
2. The Literature of Soviet. Russia.....	7	0-14-0	L
3. Criminal Law in Russia.....	21	2-10-0	L
4. Thermidor.....	23 22½	2-13-0	T
5. Biographies (4)	5	0-10-0	B
6. How they fight Illiteracy in S. Russia	6	0-12-0	E
7. British War Preparations in India.....	10	1- 4-0	W
8. The Relation of the Workers Party to Religion Lenin	13 12½	1- 9-0	R
9. Marxian Economics	17	2- 2-0	E
10. World Revolution and U. S. S. R.....	9	1- 2-0	R
11. Neomalthusiamism	3	0- 6-0	B
12. Canton Happenings	9	1- 2-0	C

Criminal Code of Russia.

One of the many calumnious lies that are spread against the Communist order in Soviet Russia is that there is no "Justice" in the land, that the land is subject to tyranny and that the courts are a mere farce Surely, there is not that kind of "Justice in Russia, which you find in free" England, America or any democratic country in the world. Bourgeois capitalist education teaches the people that "Justice" is blind, holds the scales impartially, and strikes merci-

lessly. But, when you come to actual administration of this abstract Justice, you find it weighing heavily on the side of the propertied, the respectable that is that *class* which controls that society and state power. Justice remains impartial, perhaps, while administering the law as it is, but as the law itself is framed by the bourgeoisie, Justice also comes, bourgeois Justice. Now England, America and the subject countries like India are all governed by the bourgeoisie. But, the state in Russia is controlled by the workers and peasants. This difference at once changes the basis of law in Russia. In the Capitalist country, the Judges and the courts whine, becomes-submissive, and find all sorts of loop-holes when they have to deal with a big financial corporation or a big finance king. The latter's guilt may be proved to the hilt, but he will get a mere one day's imprisonment, "looking to the 'status' he occupies in society," i. e. the status of the finance. For a less serious offence, a poor worker will be sent up for five years. In a workers' state the order at once changes. Speculations in food stuff and clothing does not become a crime in a capitalist state but it is crime of the most serious nature in a Workers' and Peasants' State, because in the former those who make the laws are sure of the bread of their class even their dogs' bread; in the latter the framers of law think of the bread of their class, the poor producers and at once speculation in food becomes a crime. Thus you see that Justice is not an abstract thing but is intensely, related to and is directly the product of the ideology of that class which holds the State. In capitalist society it is bourgeois justice, created to suit the interests of property, of the rich few. Therefore it is less democratic and just. In a workers or Communist State, there being no distinction of classes on one side the propertied few and on the other the enormous poor and exploited, all being the workers of the State or Society, justice is more democratic and just, because it is created by the real majority. Therefore, when the anti-Communist and anti-Russian press says, there is no justice in Russia it is right in one sense. There is no justice favouring the rich and no such law can be taken advantage of only if you have millions.

We will here elucidate the basic principles by which the courts in the Soviet Republic are guided.

Before us lies a copy of the criminal code of the R. S. F. S. R. passed by the All Russian Central Executive Committee which serves as the basic law for the guidance of the courts in the largest section of the Soviet Union, namely, the R. S. F. S. R. The code came into force on January 1st 1927. It represents a revised version of the criminal code introduced in 1922. In the period of the civil war, up to the year 1922, the Government of the working class could not spare the time to take up thoroughly questions of peaceful construction. Only after the civil war had subsided to some

extent, and when the most severe period of the struggle against the intervention of international capital had passed, was the Soviet Government able to set to work to regulate question on internal construction, including that of criminal justice and criminal law.

This does not mean of course, that prior to that time there were no courts in the Soviet State, Courts were already established at the end of 1917 that is to say, approximately one month after the October revolution was brought out. At that time the first law establishing the Soviet courts was promulgated. These courts, however, were not guided by any special written laws. There were certain laws governing certain crimes, but complete and exhaustive regulations for the guidance of the courts did not exist. Absorbed in the armed struggle, the proletarian State confidently left it to the courts, which consisted of workers and peasants, to deal satisfactorily with the task of combating crime. It relied exclusively upon the revolutionary conscience of the workers and peasants, called upon to fulfil judicial functions.

The history of the first five years of the proletarian State has shown that this confidence was not betrayed. The overwhelming majority of the workers and peasants, who sat as judges during that time, notwithstanding the fact that they had not been educated in universities, prove quite capable of completely handling their task.

However, as soon as the accurate period of the civil war passed the Soviet Government took up the task of regulating the conduct of its judicial institutions and promulgated the first criminal code. After another five years had passed the Government found it necessary once again to revise this criminal code, to introduce such amendments in it as it found necessary and to instruct the courts to work on the basis of this revised code. The fundamental principles of the criminal code now in operation we will now describe.

COURTS OF JUSTICE IN THE U. S. S. R.

First of all however, we will, in a few words, explain what in principle distinguishes the structure of Russian Courts from the courts in capitalist State. What principally distinguishes Russian courts from the courts in bourgeois States is that their courts consists entirely of workers, for, according to the constitution of the U. S. S. R., only the workers enjoy political rights, and only those who enjoy political rights can reserve as judges or assessors. According to the constitution no bourgeois, Nepman, merchant or capitalist can serve as a judge or as assessor.

Those who are enamoured of the capitalist society will at once disapprove of this frankly undemocratic rule. They will say, see in our State, we give equal rights to all, to vote, to become a

judge by proving his merit. The Bolsheviks deprive the merchants and the capitalist of a vote and every power in the State. "It is absence of democracy". The reply is, "in your state you give rights in paper only. But, you arrange education of the people in such a manner that only the rich get the high places. You may give franchise for all, but the elections are so arranged, that only the capitalists can get above. In fact, every screw in the machine is so arranged under the false name of democracy that only Finance can command. Therefore it is natural that a State of workers and Peasants should retaliate the same way. Moreover, they are the majority. If they deprive the capitalists of power, it is because, they won't remain peaceful and without trying to overthrow the workers state. You have capitalist dictatorship without saying so. They establish workers dictatorship and are honest enough to say it in their constitution quite openly.

So, we think that no one, who is not himself interested in the exploitation of others will deny that this principle is correct. All those who themselves have suffered, and who now suffer from the oppression of capital, must join us in saying that the Soviet proletarian State is right when it grants political rights and political powers only to the workers. The more correct, therefore, is the application of this principle to the structure of courts, which have to carry on the work of combatting crime, i. e., combatting all conduct which disturbs, undermines or destroys the public order established in the State by the workers. Under no circumstances could the working class entrust its class enemy the power to decide which crime should be suppressed and what measure should be adopted to protect the Workers' State from socially dangerous crimes. Hence the proletarian State sees to it that the proletarian courts shall be in the hands of the masses of the workers in order that the courts will always protect the interests of the workers.

The people's courts, as they are called, are built up in the following way: The court is presided over by a people's judge who is elected for a period of one year by the Council of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies. This judge decides cases in accordance with his conscience, and on the basis of the law. He is assisted by two jurors, or people's assessors as they are called who are workers or peasants, male or female, and who are elected by the toilers generally, a certain number for each district court.

After being elected the people's assessors are called upon in turn, and usually serve in about six consecutive days. At the end of the year all the old assessors having served their turn, a new panel of assessors is elected. The Soviet Government strives to have as large a number of working men and women as possible perform its duty of people's assessors in the course of the year. Last year for example, over 500,000 workers and peasants served in the courts as assessors and, jointly with the judge, decided cases, that came before them.

In one of his speeches Lenin had said that the Soviet Government should strive to have *every poor person* in the country serve in the courts. "The courts," said Lenin, "are an organ of State power through which the country is administered." The larger the number of toilers that serve in these courts, either as judges or as peoples assessors, *the more intimately will these toilers become connected with the administration of the country, the more will they regard it as their own, and the sooner will they learn the art of State Administration.*" The fact that 500,000 workers and peasants served in the courts as people's assessors during the past year, and that they took a direct part in deciding cases, shows that in this connection the Soviet State is carrying out the will and testament of its teacher, and proves also that our State is not merely in name, but, in fact, a workers' and peasants' State, a proletarian State in the real sense of the word.

Thus are the courts constructed, and thus do they work. To guide these courts in their work, and to help them in deciding criminal cases, the Soviet Government has promulgated for the benefit of the judges, and the people's assessors a criminal code. This code represents an assembly of laws and regulations for the proper decision of cases from the point of view of the working classes.

THE FUNCTION OF THE COURTS IN THE U.S.S.R.

As we have already said above, in this article we shall outline only the fundamental principles by which the proletarian courts are guided. What function must the courts fulfil according to the criminal code? This is answered by Article 1 of the code, entitled: "The function of the criminal law." The very title of Article, 1 reveals the difference that exists in principle between the workers' criminal laws and the criminal laws of the bourgeois States.

"The function of the criminal law of the R. S. F. S. R. says Article, 1, "is to protect the Workers' and peasants' Socialist State and its laws from socially dangerous acts (crimes) by applying to persons committing these acts the measures of social defence provided for in this code."

What does Article 1 mean? It means first of all that the workers' criminal law must protect the Workers' and peasants' Soviet State. There is no talk of abstract "justice", but, the protection of the Socialist State established by the workers and peasants in the storm and stress of revolution and civil war; to protect the achievements of the October revolution and the rule of the toilers. This is the primary task of the workers' and peasants' courts.

It may be objected that this is not the function of a court at all, that the function of protecting the State should be performed

by the army on the one hand, and the laws on the other. The courts have quite other functions; they must first of all pass "just" decisions equal for all citizens who come before them. But there are various kinds of justices. The capitalists and landlords have one kind of justice the workers and peasants have another. What may be regarded as just by a landlord may be regarded as unjust by a peasant. For example, the confiscation of land from the landlords, and the expulsion of these landlords from the U.S.S.R. and the confiscation of the factories and the workshops from the capitalists, as was done during the revolution—is this just or unjust? From the point of view of the capitalists and the landlords it is unjust of course, but from the point of view of the workers and peasants it is absolutely just.

This does not mean, of course, that the courts do not carry out just decisions. On the contrary, the courts decide according to their conscience, as seems to them just, but this justice is worker and peasant justice, class justice, the justice of the toiling masses. No other kind of justice exist for the Communist about courts having to protect abstract justice in the communist point of view, is at best just foolish chatter. As a matter of fact, it is a fraud which bourgeois governments have always perpetrated in order to justify their acts of violence against the workers and peasants.

The criminal law of the Soviet State clearly and sitinctly declare: The workers and peasants have published their State; against this State are directed from all sides the blows of the capitalists & landlords who have been exiled from the country: the international bourgeoisie are striving to destroy the workers' and peasants' State. The class enemies of the revolution are trying to destroy it from within. The task of protecting this workers' and peasants' socialist state from the evil designs of its class enemies falls upon the proletarian courts. They exercise this protection by applying measures of repression against the enemies of the revolution.

Is this definition of the function of the courts right or wrong? We do not think a single worker or peasant would reply to this question in the negative. Every one of them will say that it is a correct, distinct, clear and comprehensive definition.

As a matter of fact, all bourgeois laws are based on the same principle, only bourgeois legislators never admit this. They talk about "abstract justice" and try to conceal the fact that their courts are class courts, set up for the protection of their State and for the maintainance of bourgeois order. The bourgeois courts cruelly prosecute all those who endanger the security of the capitalist system and capitalist domination. The working class of the U.S.S.R., however, does not resort to lies and hypocrisy. It frankly declares that it criminal laws aim at protecting the proletarian State and the system established by the working class from the acts of those who are socially dangerous to this system.

It may be again objected that it is not only the class enemies of the revolution who have to come before the Soviet courts people who are far from being counter revolutionary, who in no way endanger the workers' and peasants' State, have to come before these courts. These may be workers and peasants who have committed, ordinary not political crimes. Or they may be bourgeois who do not necessarily desire to overthrow the Soviet Government but are simply swindlers, thieves, embezzlers, robbers, murderers, etc. What has all this got to do with protecting the rule of the workers and peasants.

To this we reply. The laws are passed by the workers' and peasants, State. All laws have one aim, namely, to establish a new social order, to organise socialist society and lay the road to communist society. Every violation of the law, no matter by whom committed, disturbs the pursuit of this aim and hampers the work of organising Communist society.

The proletarian courts protect their State only from socially dangerous acts and socially dangerous persons from person who commit acts which damage, or are likely to damage, the proletarian State. No citizen in the U. S. S. R. bourgeois, worker or peasant can be prosecuted for acts which are not socially dangerous.

The second principle determines the whole structure of our criminal code and the whole procedure of our courts. Moreover, it radically distinguishes the Soviet criminal law from the criminal laws of all bourgeois countries. In not a single bourgeois criminal code is the definition of the term "socially-dangerous acts," formulated as it is formulated in the Russian criminal code.

Article 6 of the criminal code says:

"Every act, or abstention from action, designed against the Soviet system or violating the laws established by the workers' and Peasants' State, in the period of transition towards Communism, shall be deemed socially dangerous.

In complete accord with what we have said above, not only are acts directly designed against the Soviet Government deemed socially dangerous, but also are all acts which violate the public order established by the Workers' and Peasants' State. But this is not all—Article 6 declares further that the aim of this public order is to lay the road to the Communist system of the future, it is a means for building the new working class society. Statements like these cannot, of course, be found in any bourgeois code. In bourgeois countries the laws are designed to protect the existing capitalist system, which the capitalist rulers believe was created with the beginning of the world and which must last for ever.

Precisely for the reason that the bourgeois understands that the masses of the toilers are not in the least interest in protecting

the capitalist system for ever and ever, the bourgeois courts and the bourgeois States conceal from the workers the class justice that they mete out and the class nature of their laws. They conceal from the workers the simple truth that their courts and their laws have for their aim the protection of their capitalist system. They din into the heads of the toilers the deliberate lie that their laws and courts exist to protect something else and not the capitalist system.

One of the theories which bourgeois science and bourgeois scientists have employed for decades for the purpose of stultifying the minds of the workers and peasants is the theory that their courts exist to administer abstract justice and to punish those who violate the laws of this "justice" and not to protect the capitalist social system. This "justice" is supposed to spring from the Lord God or some other metaphysical being, and every man and woman is supposed to be conscious of this justice, in their heart or soul and those who violate it must be "punished." The courts exist to inflict this punishment.

A cursory examination of the argument is sufficient to reveal to every thinking man or peasant how hypocritical and false it is. We have already said above that each class understands justice in a different way. It is quite clear, therefore, that bourgeois courts will understand justice in the bourgeois way, and for that reason will punish with exceptional severity all those that violate bourgeois class justice.

Soviet criminal law has rejected this hypocritical chatter, and has obliterated the word "punishment" from the criminal code. In the code entitled, "The Fundamental Principles of the Criminal Law of the Union and Federated Republics", passed by the Central Executive Committee of the Union in 1924, it is stated that the purpose of the code is to protect the existing order, established by the working class in its State. It is from this point of view that the criminal code approaches every act designed against this order, and determines the measures of self-defence to be adopted by the new society, according to the decree of danger represented by the said act. Consequently, in the criminal code of the Federated Republics the word "punishment" has been supplanted by the phrase "measure of social defence", i.e., measures by which the new toilers' State protects itself against the socially dangerous acts of individual citizens—native or alien.

We will return to this theory of "Punishment" further on when we come to examine the measures the proletarian State applies to individual law breakers, and what aims it pursues in regard to these law breakers themselves. We will see, then, how profound is the difference between the Soviet criminal laws and the criminal laws of bourgeois States. Meanwhile we will examine one

other question, which equally distinguishes our criminal law from the criminal law of bourgeois States, namely, what actions are deemed to be socially dangerous?

The criminal code represents nothing more nor less than a list of the actions deemed to be dangerous for the present Socialist system. These acts are: Counter-revolutionary crimes, or crimes designed against the revolution and the state system established by the revolution, crimes which violate the established system of administration, for example, resisting officers in the execution of their duty, highway robbery, etc. crimes against property being attacks on the property of other persons that is protected by the law; crimes in the services, as, for example, dereliction of duty by a public official; economic crimes for example, crimes committed against the work of economic construction in our country, and military crimes representing violations of military regulations by Red Army men or officers in the Red Army, crimes against the person such as murder, assault and battery, etc.

A citizen may, however, commit an act which on formal grounds may come under one of the headings in the above list but the circumstances in which this act is committed do not give it a socially-dangerous character; perhaps it has not led to harmful consequences, or it may have been committed in circumstances which precludes the possibility of the culprit being deemed socially dangerous. How does the criminal code instruct the court to act in a case like this?

The notes attached to Article 6 of the code definitely say on this point that not every act, which on formal grounds comes under one of the headings in the code i. e., is deemed by the code to be socially dangerous, is liable to the application of measures of social defence. If not with standing its formal culpability, the act is not in the fact socially dangerous, or if notwithstanding the fact that the culprit had formally committed a socially dangerous act, there are no grounds for deeming him a socially dangerous person, the court cannot, and must not in this case, because it is totally superfluous, apply any measure of self defence, either against this act or against the person who committed it.

According to the Soviet laws a person may commit a prohibited act—for example, commit forgery or theft but—this act may not be deemed socially dangerous (for example, the forgery may be a very harmless one, or the theft may have been committed in circumstances which preclude the possibility of the culprit being socially dangerous). On the other hand, we can conceive of a situation in which a person who had committed a certain act—for example, participated in counter-revolutionary uprising against the Soviet Government in 1918-19 but who at the time of the trial or

at the time the committal of this act became known, say, 1926-27, had come over to the side of the Soviet Government, had become a loyal worker for the Soviet State, and had fully admitted the impropriety of his past conduct. In such a case the law lays it down that no measures of social defence may be applied.

Take still another case; an act committed in the past which has ceased to be a socially dangerous act. In this case the court has no power to apply any measure of social defence. For example to forge a food ration card was a serious offence in 1918, but it cannot be so regarded in 1927, and it is hardly likely that any court to-day would pass sentence of measure of social defence upon any person convicted or having committed such a forgery.

The wide powers given to the courts in defending the measure of social defence to be applied, and the obligation imposed upon them to examine, every crime from the point of view of the degree of social danger it incurs, of the degree of social danger the culprit may represent, characterises the fundamental attitude of Soviet criminal law towards the criminal. Primarily pursuing the aim of protecting the public order as established by the Workers' and Peasants' State, Soviet criminal law never forgets this fundamental task. From this it logically follows that the Soviet criminal law rejects the principle that every commission of an act prohibited by the law must be "punished," and this characteristically distinguishes the Soviet criminal law from bourgeois criminal law.

How then should people who commit socially dangerous acts be treated? What should be done not only to maintain order, but also to influence the culprit himself so that he will not repeat socially dangerous acts in the future? This is dealt with in our Article 9 of the Criminal Code.

Measure of Social Defence.

Article 9 says that measures of social defence, i. e., measures for the defence of proletarian society against those who may have been or are dangerous, are applied by the proletarian courts in three cases. First, in order to prevent a repetition of crimes on the part of persons who have once-committed socially dangerous acts. In such cases the principal measure is applied, namely, to remove such persons from the society of workers. Such removal means deprivation of liberty, confinement in prison, or deportation, thus directly precluding the possibility of a repetition of crime by the persons sentenced.

The second purpose aimed at by the Soviet law is to prevent others from committing such crimes. This will be achieved if the potential criminal is aware of the fate that awaits him if he commits crimes, i.e., trial and removal from society. The law

aims at "influencing other unstable members of society," and this is stated in Article 9.

The third aim directly applies to the law breaker himself. What should be done with the law-breaker after he has been removed from society? In this connection the Soviet criminal laws aim to fulfill the following concrete tasks. Adapt the criminal to the conditions of Soviet life in a Workers' State; train him for the conditions of life of a workers' society; reform and re-educate him, that is, of course, if he is corrigible.

This formation must be brought forward by teaching him to acquire the habits of labour, and to become a useful member of society. There is one thing which the Soviet law categorically prohibits, and that is, subjecting the criminal to physical suffering or loss of dignity while he is undergoing this training.

The last paragraph of Article 9 in this connection says: "MEASURES OF SOCIAL DEFENCE MAY NOT PURSUE THE AIM OF INFLICTING PHYSICAL SUFFERING OR DEGRADING HUMAN DIGNITY, NOR DOES IT AIM AT VENGEANCE OR PUNISHMENT."

We will deal with this questions at somewhat greater length. It may be argued that, in this respect, the Soviet law does not differ very much from bourgeois laws, for bourgeois laws, too, aim at preventing a repetition of crime by the criminal; at preventing crime on the part of unstable members of society, and training the culprit to habits of usefull labour. But this is not the case at all. Bourgeois laws, it is true, are extremely voluble on this point, but they approach the fulfilment of this aim in an altogether different manner from the way the Soviet laws approach it. From this point of view of the Soviet criminal law, persons committing crimes are either class enemies, enemies of the revolution, representatives of the bourgeoisie, who desire the destruction of the Soviet Government, or workers and peasants who, for various accidental reasons, have fallen into crime.

In the case of the first category, the Soviet laws adopt one line of policy, viz., the application of stern measure, such as removing them from the society of workers, and even going to extent of physically destroying them. In the case of the second category, the Soviet laws aims to correct these casual misdemeanants. From the point of view, of Sovoet law, all crimes originates from the contradictions of class society; it is a result of social disharmony and social conflict. The Soviet State strives to remove the fundamental causes of crime, it strives to reconst ruct the whole of society on a Communist basis, in which crime will not exist. On these grounds, it approaches the worker or peasant criminal not as if he were "guilty" of crime, but as one who needs correction.

Bourgeois laws look at the criminal from altogether different angle. From the point of view of bourgeoisie laws, the capitalist system is the best of all systems of society and is immutable. For that reason the bourgeois criminal law divides criminals into two categories: the "maicious" criminal, whose malice must be *broken*, or hereditary criminal types resulting from generations of criminals.

If it is possible at all to correct such criminals, it can only be done by bringing emphasis to bear upon him over a long period of time lasting decades. Here, bourgeois laws, in complete accord with the theory of punishment, resort to physical measures in order to correct the criminal, and also to measures which degrade his individuality, such as, putting him in chains, separate cells, degrading deprivation, punishments, etc.

It even resorts to strict isolation in order to remove the criminal from society. Hence, the measures permitted by bourgeois law are particularly measures of physical torture. An example of this is the system of punishment cells in American prisons, which have cork ceilings and padded walls, imposing upon the prisoner the seclusion of the tomb, from which men go out of their minds and lose human resemblance.

Nothing like this exists in places of detention in the Soviet Union. They apply the penalty of strict isolation only as a preliminary measure to the most serious criminals, and latter on it is substituted by less severe forms of detention. The penitentiary system of the Soviet Government is based on the principle of the collective labour of the detained, and, what is known as "compulsory labour without deprivation of liberty", is a sentence which the Soviet criminal law strives to apply in the majority of convictions.

"But what about sentence of death by shooting" ? it may be asked. "You sat that the Soviet laws do not aim at subjecting criminals to physical suffering, and yet, as is very well-known Soviet courts pass sentence for the physical destruction of criminals of death by shooting."

Yes, the Soviet courts pass sentence of death, but these are passed upon the class enemies of the revolution, who have set themselves the task of fighting against the revolution, or upon those who have so far abandoned the society of toilers that there is no hope of their return.

According to laws, however, sentence of death, as is stated in article 21, is a temporary measure employed to combat the most serious forms of crimes which threaten the very foundations of the Soviet State and is employed as an exceptional measure for the protection of the State until the Central Executive committee

of the U. S. S. R. shall repeal it. The law contains the provision that under no circumstances may sentence of death be passed on persons under the age of 18 at the time the crime was committed, or on pregnant women. (Article 22).

These are the principal aims pursued by the measures of social defence provided for in the laws of the Union of Soviet Republics.

Correctional Measures.

Let us see now what measures the Soviet criminal law permits. These measures are divided up into three categories: (1) Measures of repression or judicial correction; to these we have already referred, (2) Medical treatment and (3) pedagogical measures. Medical treatment is applied to criminals who have committed crimes while in an abnormal state of health, or when in such a mental state that they were not answerable for their actions.

Pedagogical measures are applied to juvenile criminals. In regard to these the law entirely prohibits the application of any judicial correctional measures whatever up to the age of 14 between the ages of 14 and 16 they may be applied only after a special commission which must include a medical man and a pedagogue, has decided that medical and pedagogical measures will be of no use.

What concrete measures may the court apply? We have already dealt with sentence of death by shooting as an exceptional measure. In addition to that the Soviet laws provide for the following measures; declaring a criminal an enemy of the toilers, deprivation of citizenship of the U. S. S. R., and banishment. This is the most severe sentence that can be passed next to sentence of death by shooting.

The next measure is deprivation of liberty with, or without, strict isolation for a term not exceeding ten years. At one time the Soviet laws prohibited the detention of persons in prison for a period exceeding five years. But since 1922 the limit has been extended to ten years, and this is now the longest term to which anyone can be sentenced. As a matter of fact prisoners rarely serve half the term. According to the laws of the U. S. S. R. prisoners who have served half their sentence are permitted to appeal for indefinite release and, if the court, or a special commission set up to investigate the case have reason to believe that the prisoner has reformed, or that he will not commit any more crimes in the future, he is released from further detention, so that the sentence of ten years' imprisonment can hardly be said to exist.

The next measure is the one which we have already said the Soviet criminal law strives to apply to the majority of lawbreakers, and that is the sentence of compulsory labour without deprivation of liberty. A convicted person thus sentenced is not put into prison but is obliged merely to work at a definite place, provided for the purpose. This place is a labour correctional colony, where the convicted person enjoy complete freedom of movement and from which he will obtain leave of absence for a definite period. It should be stated that leave of absence is also given to prisoners who are deprived of liberty.

In the case of peasants there is a special provision in the law which provides that peasants must be released for field work, so that his farm may not fall into neglect, on the condition, of course, that the local villagers will not object to the culprit coming home, or that the crime for which he is sentenced is not a serious one, otherwise there would be a danger of his not returning.

In the case of fines, the sentence carried out by the courts in the R. S. F. S. R. differ in character from those permitted by bourgeois criminal codes. Not everyone is in a position to pay a fine. A rich man is better able to pay a fine than a poor man. Consequently, the payment of a fine may very often serve as a means of ransom from justice. In order to prevent this, the Soviet criminal code prohibits the substitution of a sentence of imprisonment, as is practised in European courts.

These are the fundamental principles upon which the criminal code of the U. S. S. R. is based. CAN IT BE DENIED THAT THESE PRINCIPLES ARE HUMANE AND THAT ALL THE TALK ABOUT THE CRUELITIES, TORTURES AND THE INQUISITION THAT, AS ALLEGED, IS PRACTISED IN SOVIET COURTS AND SOVIET PRISONS ARE FALSEHOODS?

According to the criminal code the following is regarded as a specially aggravating circumstance: if a certain crime is committed for the purpose of restoring the rule of the bourgeoisie. This is the most serious symptom of the socially dangerous character of the criminal, making him liable to the severest measure of social defence, which would indeed safeguard the society of toilers against the possibilities of a repetition of such an offence.

Such a provision cannot be found in the criminal codes of Western European countries. In them we find the opposite. Although in the majority of cases the bourgeois criminal codes are hypocritically silent on this point, they in fact, apply the severest measures to the workers and peasants when they threaten the bourgeois system. The Russian law is quite frank on this point; and says, openly, that it will severely punish those who attempt to restore the bourgeois system.

Until quite recently still another circumstance was taken into consideration. The law considered that particularly severe measures must be applied in cases of offences committed by persons belonging to the bourgeois class. This, however, has been repealed. The law now says that the mere fact of belonging to the bourgeois class signifies nothing. The fact that the culprit had been a merchant or a capitalist in the past, or that he is now engaged in trade, or has a private enterprise permitted by the law, does not imply that severe measures or repression must be applied to him. Such measures must be applied only if the particular offence was directed against the State, and against the interest of the workers. In such a case the court is implacable, and applies severe measures.

Formerly, Article 48 laid it down that the fact that the culprit belongs to the working class, or is a farmer living by his own toil, must also be regarded as a mitigating circumstance. This point has now been deleted, because the Soviet law considers that the mere fact of belonging to the working class or the toiling peasantry cannot serve as sufficient ground for mitigating sentence. This was an expression of a more profound conception of the class principle than that which prevailed formerly when the courts "taking into considerations the proletarian origin" of a culprit very frequently dealt leniently with dangerous criminals.

This is how the Soviet law approaches the criminal and crime. Needless to say there is hardly another criminal code which reveals the same approach.

PROTECTION OF THE INTERESTS OF THE WORKERS

which also are not included in bourgeois codes. While bourgeois codes prosecute the workers when they go on strike against their employers, prosecute trade unions when they organise a fight for the rights of the workers the Soviet Government code says :

"The infringement of the laws regulating the employment of labour and of the laws for the protection of labour and social insurance by any private employer, or by responsible officials in State or public institutions and enterprises, shall be liable to a penalty of one year's detention or a fine of 10,000 roubles, provided the offence affects a group of not less than three workers."

For placing an employee in a position where he has become or may become, incapacitated in contravention of the law for the protection of labour, the culprit is liable to a penalty not exceeding two years' detention and finally, the infringement by an employer of the collective agreements concluded by him with the trade union and "hampering the legitimate activities of factory and local trade union committees", are also regarded as crimes.

This is how the Soviet law stands in regard to the protection of labour, and every employer must continually bear it in mind.

There is a special article, -Article 97- which prosecutes the exaction of house rent from workers exceeding the legal limit. It prohibits also the sale and purchase by people of property of apartments and rooms in municipal and nationalised premises.

These articles characterise the fundamental tendency of Soviet criminal law.

Thus it will be seen that the Soviet code has used all the best things that have been developed by the capitalist law courts, as in the matter of medical and psychiatric treatment of the criminal; it has rejected the hypocrisy of the bourgeois courts, and has openly befriended the workers and poor in a most thorough manner. This ought to satisfy the question whether there is anarchy or order in Russia and whether a capitalist is hanged and shot only on sight and whether the majority of the people are well-governed or not; whether there those heinous discriminations as are found against Indians, Asiatic or the colonial peoples in the capitalist law of Britain, America etc etc.

Thermidor: the Turningpoint of a Revolution.

On the ninth day of the month of Thermidor, in the year III of Liberty (being the 27th July 1794, as we in our old fashioned "aristocratic and superstitious" way would reckon it.) Maximilian Robespierre, leader of the Jacobins and would be Director of the French Republic was refused a hearing in the National Convention.

Howled down and hooted into gasping, foaming, speechlessness he was declared "under accusation" and ordered under arrest.

A day later, after a night of turmoil, Robespierre mutilated and dying, was with twenty three colleagues, carried to execution and guillotined amid shrieks of exultation.

With him fell the Jacobins and with them died the Terror. Thereafter the French Revolution ceased to ascend from the innovation to innovation, and entered upon its period of consolidation.

Such are the bare bones of the story of "Thermidor" as one may get it from all orthodox history text books.

Revolutions do not happen by chance. They have their cause, and their occasion; they come because they must and their 'must' arise from the nature of human society, and the needs, material and otherwise, of the human units entering into its composition.

It is necessary to say this to guard against a double error.

To the reactionary all revolutions are worse than unnecessary; they are violent interruptions of the logical order of a mystical human "progress" and they are only to be accounted for by folly in high places and the incredible wickedness of the lower orders. They are, from this standpoint arbitrary attempts to achieve the impossible; and may be likened to a fever which runs its course and leaves its victim weaker for the delirium, but wiser for the experience.

As against this view is the theory (really born of a misapplied Darwinism, but occasionally fathered falsely upon Marx) that revolutions are so organically inevitable in the development of human society that any attempt to prepare one is as futile as reading a text book on embryology to a breeding sow to ensure a continuance of the bacon supply.

The truth is that the need for a revolution is created naturally and inevitably by the accumulating effects of an infinitude of detail changes in the basic economic relations in human society. These changes in time force attention by creating antagonisms of interest and outlook between those advantaged or otherwise by the old established political, legal, and social institutions. Carry these antagonisms far enough and the need for revolution appears; add further a critical happenings (a famine, a war, a gigantic failure, or a great public scandal) and the occasion for a revolution is present.

If the aggrieved section of the population have any sort of union, leadership and organised might—all of which may have arisen as part of the proceeding development—a revolution becomes actual. Failing this, the occasion is lost, and a further crisis must be awaited.

It is necessary to stress the point that in its actual achievement a revolution has to be planned and carried through by conscious deliberation.

True it cannot be made out of nothing—and only the organic development of society can prepare the materials; but given the materials, there still remains the need to work them into forms desired. One may have the eggs—but one needs more than intuition to prepare the omelette; they can quite easily yield no more than a fearful mess.

The Emancipation of the Bourgeoisie.

The need that compelled the French revolution of 1789-99 was the need to be rid of obsolete feudal restraints upon the growth of the bourgeois (or capitalist) enterprise.

Agriculture, commerce and industrial production with their concomitants, banking, money lending and investment, were all constrained to the point of paralysis within the rules, regulations, imposts, and exactions left over from the middle ages.

When therefore, the colossal bankruptcy of the French State reached such proportions that a Parliament had to be summoned, it was clear that the chance of the unprivileged had come.

The summons was an admission that the Ancient Regime had exhausted all expedients; the only question left was whether it would be able to effect by compromise any new lease of life.

In the two years and four months from May, 1789 to October 1791, they elaborated a constitution; limited the powers of the monarchy; abolished titles and feudal dues; established electoral municipal authorities, having authority over the local militia nationalised the property of the church; abolished tithes; subjected the church to municipal control; and organised the army.

On the face of it, such a programme shows that the needs of the town and country bourgeoisie (big and little) were actively operating; and doubts to the country would be dispelled by the snowball like growth of the opposition to the revolution, joined in succession by all the expropriated classes—court, nobility, clergy, deposed local functionaries, and displaced army officers.

Negatively the same is made apparent by what they failed to do.

They declared the Rights of Man to liberty, equality and fraternity, but they took care to impose a property qualification for voting and a higher one for candidates for election.

They made all voting indirect; gave the king a suspensive veto upon legislation; and by the law that suppressed feudal trading monopolies forbade workmen to combine in trade unions.

Notwithstanding these limitations they achieved enough to make France far more democratic than any country in Europe,

Yet to the consternation of reactionaries, the revolution went even further. A second Parliament quarrelled with the king, and declared war upon his ally, Austria, only to be swept away by a popular rising and replaced by a new and more radical National Convention.

Faced with half a dozen insurrections and a military coalition of nearly all Europe, the Convention had a task that seemed impossible—an impossibility that grew as army after army invaded France and the strife of parties in its midst rose to the pitch of actual battle. Despite all the Convention survived.

It suppressed the monarchy and executed the king. It levied armies en masse. It conscripted men and materials wholesale to

equip its armies; and by the somewhat Darwinian method of executing all failures found generals who could conquer, and administrators who could enforce obedience. It suppressed aristocratic privileges without compensation, and made drastic inroads into the rights of the wealthy bourgeoisie. It abolished freedom of bequest; it confiscated the property of all emigrants and rebels; it imposed a steeply graduated income tax; and enforced the sale of necessary at a fixed maximum price. This failing to check profiteering it guillotined the profiteers.

It adopted in principle the most democratic constitution known before 1917 and drafted schemes for free education, free divorce, and a number of other equalitarian schemes. And it did all this while hurling back five invasions and suppressing half a dozen formidable revolts.

This was the work of the revolutionary government from the revolt of August 10th, '92 to the crisis of Thermidor '94. It was the period of revolutionary dictatorship and terror at which reactionaries still shudder with a horror only modified by their still greater horror of the Bolshevik revolution of 1917.

Revolutionary Paris.

Driving and dominating the Convention through this period was insurrectionary Paris, whose revolt (10th August, 1792) had overthrown the monarchy and brought the Convention, elected by universal suffrage, into being.

Paris organised, armed and led by its section committees its Commune Council, its clubs, (Jacobin Cordeliers) and its journalists (notably Marat), had led the revolution since the day of the Bastille, when a foolish attempt by the court party at military counter revolution had provoked a furious insurrection.

The news of the revolt had given the signal for the prairie flame of revolt which swept all through France, and before which all the privileges of aristocracy had been shrivelled into nothing less. Later the want of any alternative means of liquidating the bankruptcy of the State had induced the National Assembly to nationalise the property of the church. But beyond that nothing rightly to be called revolutionary had been done.

In plain truth the deputies of the Third Estate in the first Parliament had not come prepared for a social revolution at all. Political changes they meant to have, and above all a constitution; but beyond that their intentions and outlook comprehended nothing but programmes more or less elaborate, of reforms more or less Utopia. It is probable that but for the general revolt which Paris led by the famous 14th of July, 1793, the privileges and property of both the aristocracy and clergy would have escaped much more

lightly. When the national Assembly dissolved and gave place to the Legislative Assembly, even the "advanced" party therein thought that the revolution was complete and all that was needed was the completion of the details of administration.

Paris changed all that; but not because of any special virtue in Paris. Paris was impelled by two great fears—the fear of counter revolution and the fear of starvation.

After the famous day when the women of Paris marched to Versailles, guarded by armed forces of the Municipality, and forced the Royal Family, the Court and the Parliament to return with them (to "ease the price of bread"), the object of the counter revolution became the coercion of Paris and regaining possession of the king's person. Paris, therefore, reacted instantly to every move of the counter revolution.

Paris not only contained of necessity the largest concentration of the middle class, upper, lower, and professional, it contained by far the greatest concentration of the proletariat the artisans, journeymen-craftsmen, labourers, and the odd job, semimendicant population of the slums. All these strata received steady additions to their numbers as the social crisis intensified. Naturally Paris became more and more not only the leader of France but a hot house of revolutionary radicalism.

As Paris grew more radical, the counter revolution grew more aggressively resolved upon its overthrow. The successive inroads into privilege—aristocratic, clerical, legalist and military—were all blamed upon the Parisian "Reds".

When at length counter revolutionary intrigues induced war between France and a coalition of reactionary Powers, and the commander of the Allied arm threatened to exterminate Paris, Paris replied with the revolt of August 10th, which overthrew the monarchy and compelled the calling of the National Convention.

Naturally the Convention was from the first overawed and dominated by revolutionary Paris. At its behest the king was tried and executed; at its behest general conscription was resorted to. And when the moderate Girondin party proved the lukewarm in their Republicanism, weak before the foe and strong only in its resolve to thwart the Parisian Reds, Paris rose again, compelled the expulsion of the Girondin party and the establishment of an instrument of dictatorship—the famous Committee of Public Safety and a ruthless war upon the counter revolution within and without.

Then only was the whole country roused and the triumph of the revolution assured.

The Dictatorship of Paris.

Not at first did Maximilian Robespierre figure as the leader.

When he did so, it was by virtue of his prominence in the Jacobin Club. Beginin as a debating society for the "advanced" delegates to the States General, this club had spread into a national propaganda body of revolutionary ideas, and developed into an organised, disciplined, political force, functioning through France as the striking arm of the Committee of Public Safety.

In its early days, the Committee enforced its authority by the aid of Jacobin influence in the local governing bodies; when that failed, it used the direct coercion of armed forces raised from the revolutionary population of Paris.

Crucial in the development of the revolution was the decision, made at the outbreak of war, to include in the Parisian National Guard battalions raised promiscuously armed with pikes, to place the Guard upon a war footing, and to create a permanent camp of 20,000 men under the orders of the Paris municipality. As the council of the Paris Commune consisted of delegates from the committees of its 48 sections, and these in turn were elected by a direct vote of the inhabitants, it is plain that Paris with its armed forces was, potentially at any rate, in the hands of its proletariat.

That that potentiality become actual was the result of Marat's journalism and the Jacobin organisation. Marat and Desmoulines helped to rouse the storm which brought down the Bastille. Marat inspired to march to Versailles. Marat prepared and Danton organised the storming of the Tuilleries and the deposition of the king. Marat inspired and led the assault upon the convention and the expulsion of the Girondins. Marat prepared for the dictatorship of the Committee of Public Safety, of which the Jacobins, led by Danton, established after his murder.

Marat was the spokesman of the proletariat; hence under his influence the Parisian proletariat dominated alike the Commune the Committee, the Convention and the revolution. Paris roused, organised, armed and led, gave the world a foretaste of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To this proletarian urge must be attributed the outstanding economic measures of the reign of terror—the graduated incomtax, the forced sale of necessities, at a maximum price, the forced levy of foodstuffs, and materials for the revolutionary armies (carried out by armed companies sent from Paris for the purpose) and the payment of a daily wage and a bread ration to every citizen attending the section meetings in arms and holding himself at the disposal of his committee.

Whatever else these measures may have done, they ensured the efficiency of the army and the partial solution of a vast unemployment problem. Naturally they were all furiously resented by

the wealthier bourgeoisie, who to this day execrate the memory of the man who inspired them all—Jean Paul Marat.

Robespierre and the Proletariat.

While Marat lived he not only led the proletariat, but rivalled Robespierre for the leadership of the Jacobin Party.

Robespierre was no proletarian; nor were his sympathies inclined to their direction. He was a petty bourgeois and fought for a Republic of all the petty bourgeoisie virtues. He had little hold upon the Parisian proletariat and disliked the tumultuous energy they brought to the revolutionary struggle. As soon as public circumstances made it possible he looked for a chance to curb their power.

The chance came when the last insurrection had been crushed and the war had taken a favourable turn at once began a curtailment of the independent activity of Paris. The revolutionary armies it had sent into the provinces to crush royalist rebellion were disbanded and their units dispersed through the troops at the front. It was forbidden to send agents into the provinces, its section committees were purged wherever possible of ultra-Reds, and a concerted attack was made in the clubs, the Convention and by the Committee upon the proletarian leaders in the Commune.

Finally, they were expelled from the Jacobins, arrested and executed on a charge of "encouraging the counter revolution".

To cope with the resentment and disruption thus aroused in the revolutionary camp, the terror was intensified to a frightful pitch. Until then its victims had been aristocrats and wealthy bourgeois, or plainly the dupes of these. Now proletarian "extremists" began to fall in rapidly increasing numbers.

Danton, who had ranged in the forefront of the attack upon the "Reds", took fright at the growing ferocity. He called for an end to the terror and to the Committee—which promptly disposed of him and his leading colleagues.

Robespierre was thus left alone and unrivalled, spokesman of the Jacobins, nominal head of the committee in popular estimation leader of the revolution. Naturally his thoughts turn to the idea of a personal dictatorship.

The Crisis Comes.

Some sort of change was inevitable. Insurrection had been crushed, the armies were efficient and triumphant, the invaders had been driven back, defeated, to the frontier and beyond. All fear of subjugation has gone and the possibility of peace was in sight. The authority of the State was established. The finance had been brought into fair order.

Clearly the need for the heroic efforts whereby Paris had saved France and the revolution had passed.

Theoretically it should have been possible for the Jacobins actings vigorously and untiedly as the one great organised political force in France to have maintained their rule; carrying over into peace measures the discipline they had employed successfully that through the war years.

So Robespierre thought, and so he acted—preparing for another Jacobin coup detate. He had brought the Paris Commune under full Jacobin discipline? With it he thought himself able to effect a purging of the Convention and a reconstitution of the Committee in which although the nominal head he was really in a minority.

Accordingly he made his bid. On the 9th of Thermidor his lieutenant Saint Just rose in the Convention and denounced the majority of the Committee and demanded a “purification” all round.

He was interrupted with counter denunciations and charges of conspiracy. The storm rose to a fury. All the long pent-up hatred of the moderates and well to do provincials in the Convention who for two years had been terrified into acquiescence with measure revolting to their class consciousness broke out in a tempest of rage when Robespierre rushed to the rescue of St. Just.

Do what he could he was unable even to hear himself. Hoarse, foaming, gasping, he sank exhausted while the Convention exultantly decreed his arrest and that of his lieutenants.

His friends made their efforts. The Commune released the prisoners, carried them to the Town Hall, and called upon the sections to arm and assemble. A dozen times since 1789 the sections had risen at call, and forced Parliament after Parliament to do their bidding. Once again the call come, but this time it was not answered. On the country, those who marched did so at the call of the Convention and placed themselves at its disposal. By midnight enough had come to enable the Committee to march upon the Town Hall and take it undefended. The conspirators, caught deliberating, made only a feeble resistance and at six o'clock the following evening were guillotined.

Such in rapid outline was the Day of Thermidor.

REACTION TRIUMPHS.

It is clear now that Robespierre himself and prepared the ground for his own destruction by his sacrifice of first the left, and then the right wing of his own party. The Red leaders were no doubt a nuisance, and their attempt to drive the revolution onward in a

Communist direction was historically foredoomed to fail. But they were the accepted leaders who alone could turn the Parisian proletarian mob into an army capable of daring anything. Once these leaders were gone-knifed and guillotined-the proletariat relapsed into a disunited rabble.

While the proletarian battalions of the National Guard had remained in being they held in check overawed into insignificance the wealthy middle class quarters. With the proletarians out of action, the big bourgeois were able to dictate the course of events.

Similarly Danton who had a personal hold upon these latter was also admired for his insurrectionary capacity by the proletariat. When Robespierre sacrificed Danton he threw away his last chance of success.

If he had fought the proletarians of the left and crushed them with the aid and approval of the big bourgeoisie. When he tried to fix the revolution rigidly upon the point of view of the petty bourgeoisie to which he belonged, he found (as all revolutions have proved) that the petty bourgeoisie will not fight. Lacking the fighting force of the proletariat he fell before a bourgeois reaction he had both provoked and encouraged. The split in the Jacobin Party he had created, opened the door to reaction.

The effects of Thermidor were soon apparent. The Committee had its powers curtailed. The terror was suspended. The Jacobin federation of clubs was broken up; later the head society itself was suppressed. The meeting of the sections (with of course, the pay for attending), was limited to one day in ten. Then the pay was abolished. Then the maximum price law went.

Gradually, the suspects were released from prison: the expelled nobles and priests were allowed to re-enter the country; the "rump" of the Gironde was allowed to creep back into the Convention.

One by one the surviving Jacobin leaders were guillotined. Worst of all, an ex-Jacobin organised a volunteer force of "gilded" youth—youngmen of the well to do class who, moving in gangs armed with bludgeons, assaulted every known Jacobin-Red and bludgeoned him unmercifully. Ultimately this "White Terror" reached such dimensions that wholesale slaughters of ex-Jacobins were organised until the victims of reaction exceeded those claimed by the guillotine.

With all unrestrained profiteering reached such a pitch that deaths from starvation took a heavier toll from Paris than even the White Terror.

Reactionary insolence eventually went so far that a military coup d'etat was necessary to save the Republic—only to turn it into an “empire.”

More than a century later, the feat attempted by the proletarians of Paris in the great French Revolution was carried to a triumphant conclusion by the Bolsheviki Party and the workers and peasants of Russia. Many have hoped that they too would meet their “Thermidox,” but the wish remains unfulfilled.

MUST THERMIDOR COME TO RUSSIA

When Trotsky threw at his opponents on the General Committee of the C. P. S. U. the taunt of “Thermidorians” he, possibly, neither meant the change seriously, nor expected it to be so taken. His allies, however, have taken up this taunt and used it seriously as their central slogan against the majority. It is, therefore, of some moment to examine the charge. The enquiry should help at any rate to show both the importance of the controversy and the relative position of the group led by Trotsky and Zinoviev.

The parallelism between the French revolution of 1789-95, and the Russian revolution of March and November, 1917, is best brought out by including in the comparison all the various uprisings of the European bourgeoisie.

From Luther up to and including November 1917, their dominant motive was the destruction of feudalism in one or other of its forms and the consequent liberation of bourgeois property and capitalist production from its control and restraints. But the bourgeoisie could not initiate a revolution, or still less carry it through, without stirring into activity all the lower strata of society the serfs or peasantry of the country and the proletarians and semi-proletarians in the towns.

“Each phase of the emancipation struggle of the European bourgeoisie, therefore, has its episode in which these lower strata press on beyond the demands of the greater bourgeoisie, and make their independent bid for emancipation. Germany had its Peasants' War; the English Reformation its peasants' risings—especially that of Thomas Kent and the Norfolk men. Necessarily, these were vague, ill-organised and confused by inherited and reactionary illusions; yet for all that they were only suppressed by hard fighting involving considerable bloodshed.

In the English Puritan revolution the role of the country peasantry and the town proletarian becomes bolder and more clear. This right wing, led by Cromwell and Ireton, carried the revolution through to complete triumph—further than the wealthier town bourgeoisie had dreamt of going. Their left wing made an effort at a critical stage to go further in a “levelling” direction. Cromwell

acted promptly, and was able to suppress the mutiny with no more than a minimum of bloodshed; but it is clear (if only from Cromwell's recorded concern) that the crisis was far more formidable than its and might lead one to suppose. Even after 12 years there was still enough life in the ultra-left (the "Fifth Monarchy Men") to attempt a rising against the restoration in 1600.

In the great French revolution (as we saw last month) the Parisian proletariat dominated the revolution for two dramatically critical years. By 1845 they had grown so much stronger both in numbers and in class understanding that their endeavour to carry the revolution on a socialist direction was only defeated after four days' furious fighting, followed by a butchery till then unparalleled. Incidents very similar marked the struggle in both Berlin and Vienna of the same year.

The episode of the Commune of 1871 is too well known to need more than mention; as also is the fact that it marked a still further growth of proletarian revolutionary consciousness, and was suppressed with even more revolting brutality.

A further stage can be disentangled from the complex and little known Russian revolt of 1905, while in 1917 a revolution which announced itself as no more than the Russian equivalent of the French 1789 had passed beyond its bourgeois-Liberal stage in less than a week.

The Russian revolution lingered in its "1848 stage" (as we may call its Kerensky period) till November and then passed into the proletarian (or 1871) phase which has lasted until now.

The problem can therefore be formulated thus: other revolutions have presented the phenomena of a proletariat attempting to carry an essentially bourgeois revolution on to a phase for which history had made no adequate preparation. They failed, because the conditions for success had not been created. Is this attempt of the Russian proletariat doomed to fail likewise and for the same reason?

THE PROBLEM OF THE PEASANTRY.

Kautsky and his school have always contended, on the theoretical grounds, that a bourgeois revolution was possible in Russia in 1917. The proletarian revolution "therefore," must sooner or later either fall before a reaction or turn itself into a bourgeois one. Plausibility is given to this theory (to which as we shall see the Opposition give unacknowledged support) by the peculiarities of the economic development of Russia.

Basically, Russia was in 1917, as is well-known, an agrarian country in a highly backward stage of technological development.

But amid its general backwardness was what might be called an onthrust of the most advanced mass production of Western Europe. To bring such an anomalous state of economy under a common plan and direction—to centralise its management and the allocation of its man power, and all by one administrative decree was, of course, impossible. Nobody, least of all the Bolshevik Party, dreamed of making any such attempt.

What they did attempt and claim to have accomplished was to steer the development of Russia increasingly in a Socialist direction.

Bourgeois critics (supported by Kautsky and the doctrinaire Austro-Marxists) have asserted that since the peasantry, working the land by a system indistinguishable from petty proprietorship, form over 80 per cent. of the Russian population, they cannot fail to function sooner or later as the conservative, anti-Socialist force which the peasantry of France (created at a blow by the revolution of 1789-95) have been, and are. Upon the peasantry and their inevitable (as they deemed it) revolt against the hegemony of the town proletariat are built the hopes of every reaction from Korniloff and Kaledin in 1917 down to the emigrant white colonies in every European capital to-day. Upon the peasantry and the problems created by their existence, the present controversy with the Opposition arose, and, in his latest reported speech, Trotsky threatens the majority with a "revolt of the Kulaks" (the wealthier peasants.)

It is, of course, plain to sense that were the Russian peasants left as were the French peasants in 1789-95 to produce as small proprietors for free sale in an open market parallel consequences could be predicted without hesitation. Thermidor would come and after it possibly another Bonaparte (another possibility, by the way, of which Trotsky is fond reminding us.)

But that is just what has not happened and what will not happen so long as the Communist Party retains its leadership of the proletarian dictatorship. The peasantry are not small proprietors. They have an occupying ownership right (which can develop at death upon their kin), but they lack what is the essential feature of peasant proprietorship the power to sell their holdings.

THE DIFFERENCE.

The difference this makes is enormous. Not only is land speculation (which played such a squalid part in the French revolution after Thermidor) cut off at the root, but what is even more important, the customary bane of every small farming community producing for a capitalist market, the money lender with his mortgage, is abolished even more effectively. Competitive rents, therefore and with them the steady growth of the number of uneconomic holdings and of a rural landless class are impossible so far in the U. S. S. R.

This does not prevent the existence of inequalities among the peasantry; since it does not do away with the differing degrees of equipment with which the peasants entered upon their post revolutionary career. Nor does it abolish the varying fertility of the soil itself or the greater or lesser accessibility of profitable markets. From all these sources (to say nothing of varying personal capacity) inequalities arise, and in that respects the situation is petty bourgeois enough. But the main feature of agriculture under capitalist domination—the complete subjection of the country under the ruthless exploitation of the town bourgeois (ground land-lords, moneylenders, grain and produce speculators, rail, and cartage contractors, and vendors of non-agricultural products) is transformed beyond recognition.

The peasant pays rent, but only in form of a tax to the State—which may if he pleases be paid in grain at a periodically fixed price. His need for financial accommodation to develop his holding is met by State grants, by the State Bank and by State assisted Agricultural Co-operative Societies. His difficulty in marketing his produce is overcome by the combined action of the local (selling) and the national (buying) co-operative societies as well as by the State controlled trading institutions. The railways of course, are State railways exclusively.

Similarly, with regard to the goods bought by the peas—He is no longer at the mercy of the ring controlled local vendors. Nationalised industry, the production of the larger co-operative trusts, and of the “mixed” trusts (with partly State and partly private capital) all destroy the possibility of that petty local “profiteering” which is notoriously the curse of a rural community.

While the dependence of the peasantry as a whole upon towns (for anything above a more vegetable existence) is neither abolished nor abated, it is qualitatively entirely different from the dependence obtaining in a bourgeois economic environment. And it will remain different so long as the State pursues the deliberate policy of “interfering” with the sacred “laws of supply and demand” so revered in bourgeois society. The reactionary potentiality is still there so long as the peasant produces as a small proprietor and sells his product in the customary bourgeois commodity fashion; but while the State retains its economic dominance over the markets and its political control of finance, transport and foreign trade (thus localising the peasants within the State-dominated market) it remains a potentiality only, and steadily diminishing one.

Whence Reaction Might Come.

But if for any person the State changed its policy this would cease to be the case. If the State, for instance, used its monopoly of credit to encourage the richer and better equipped peasants to

extend their operations, while simultaneously discouraging the poorest and the worst equipped, they could produce a progressive fall in the price of agricultural produce which would rapidly intensify the inequality between these strata. If to this were added a cessation of the practice of making the tax burdens easier for the poorer peasantry (introducing, say, a flat rate per head instead of a differentiated scale), the conditions of bourgeois society would soon be reproduced. A small class of rich farmer would sharply distinguished from an increasingly impoverished mass. Landlessness among the rural poor would reappear, and, with them, the giant farm worked capitalist likewise by exploited rural wage labour.

Similar effects would be produced by a different route were the State trading agencies to depress systematically agricultural prices and exalt those of the products of the State industry. Just as (to give a negative illustration) the town workers would suffer were the prices of the foodstuff (and textile raw materials) kept artificially high and those of factory produce correspondingly low, so the country side as a whole would be exploited at the expense of the towns were the reverse to take place.

This, it will be seen, is the basic economic problem which the Soviet Government has had to solve in all its schemes of economic planning; and whatever incidental errors may have been made (and it was humbly impossible to avoid any number of mistakes) the general direction has without doubt been that of securing a just balance between the town and the country workers and a steady success in counteracting the inequalities inseparable from the small holder stage of agricultural development.

A third, and more important possibility has to be considered, and that arises from the State monopoly of foreign trade. Were this monopoly abolished and the peasants set free to sell their produce (particularly grain) to foreign speculators all possibility of a State economic plan would vanish, and, along with it, all possibility of abating or modifying the development of Russian agriculture into an unqualified bourgeois scramble. The richer peasants would gain rapidly and enormously, the poor would gain temporarily at the expense of the town workers (from the inevitable rise in food prices) but lose in the long run as much as the rich peasants gained. The moneylender would come and all that he implies. Conversely the produce of the towns would be competed out of the rural market just when they were forced to buy foodstuffs at exalted prices from the foreign speculators. The end of that process could not fail to be the economic relegation of Russia to the position of an annexe of Western European capital, which would bring its reflex in the complete disintegration of the solidarity between the workers and peasants the political overthrow of the Communist Party and with it the Soviet system.

In industry the Soviet Government pursues the exact reverse of its policy in agriculture. Faced with a bewildering array of industrial plants, and techniques, ranging all the way from the most primitive handicraft and domestic production to highly rationalised mass production plants, the government must of necessity do all that it can to intensify competition to the utmost.

In the case of agriculture their concern is to abate and as far as possible abolish inequalities between the differing strata of the peasantry; so that agriculture may become ripe for socialisation by the averaging of the general level of technique and the linking of all in a common dependence upon the Soviet State market. In industry their method must be to intensify competition till the more primitive plants and processes, rendered progressively less and less valuable to their proprietors, must be abandoned as worthless in face of the technical advance of the scientifically organised, equipped and managed State enterprises.

The success or otherwise of the endeavour to "steer the State into Socialism" can, therefore, be gauged by these tests :

(a) In agriculture, by the extent to which the isolation between the peasants is broken down, and replaced by conscious co-operation to supply the State controlled market.

(b) In industry by the rate and mass of the growth of State-controlled mass production (with the concomitant disappearance of the more primitive plants) and the quality as well as quantity of its dominance in the internal market.

(c) Generally by the degree of perfection attained in the social division of labour between town and country, industry and agriculture, so that every advance in technique represents a real gain either in the standard of life of the workers and peasants, the State power of accumulation, or preferably, in both.

Opposition Theories.

We have no need here to detail the high degree of success achieved in the execution of this plan. Nor need we trouble to follow the opposition through the mazes of their ever-changing criticism of its details and incidentals. Passing errors in the design or execution of the State economic plan could not provide a permanent basis for an opposition. This must come, if at all, from an alternative theoretical basis and such is provided in two related propositions fathered by Trotsky and Zinoviev respectively, (with a conclusion in which they both join).

Trotsky advances the theory that, so far, the peasants have gained enormously from the revolution and the town proletariat, little or nothing.

What measure of truth there is in this theory we have already indicated. Agriculture is the pivot of Russia's national economy and its degree of development sets the pace for that of the State as a whole. To secure this development the workers of the towns must, perforce, forego certain immediately attainable gains for the sake of the larger ends of ultimate communal advantage. The Trotsky method of forcing the richer peasants to pay the whole cost of rising the general level of agricultural technique would have the effect of driving the better equipped farmers out of business without any corresponding gains.

Related to it is the Zinoviev theory that the attempt to build Socialism in Russia alone is futile; that to build the requisite system of industrial plants, would take centuries, while they would all become obsolete as soon as the western world joined the revolution. A fraction of the energy devoted to the "illusory" socialisation of Russia would (says this theory) achieve the spread of this revolution and save the Russian workers years of self exploitation.

From this theory is drawn the conclusion—the charge of "Thermidorianism".

The Government (says the opposition, in effect) knows full well in its heart that only the merest illusory veneer of Socialism is possible in Russia while the rest of the world remains capitalist. It is tricking the workers into patience so that it and its bureaucracy may grow into a new bourgeoisie which will arrogate to its personal and class advantage all the gains of the revolution.

Who has the Thermidorians?

It will be seen at a glance that in basis this Zinoviev theory—the main theoretical equipment of the opposition—is none other than the Menshevik Social Democratic theory we noted at the outset, the theory that only a bourgeois revolution was and is possible in Russia. And there is more than Menshevism to be detected in their conclusion.

The charge of evil "Thermidorian" intentions can best be tested by the method of historical comparison.

Thermidor was made possible (as we showed last month) by a splitting intrigue within the revolutionary party and an "underground" alliance between the intrigues and the enemies of the revolution.

The recent revolution that the opposition fraction were not only working in alliance with non-Communist intellectuals, but even in direct contact with white reactionaries, places them on

exactly the same plane as the party of Barrere, Freron and the rest of the Thermidorian reaction.

Just as in the forefront of the "Thermidorian" assault upon Robespierre raged men like Freron, who but a few months before had been too ultra-left to be satisfied even with Marat, so in the forefront of the opposition campaign (outside of the U. S. S. R.) rage Maslov, Ruth Fischer and Urbahns, who pose as being even more revolutionar than Lenin.

Robespierre, the Thermidorians glorified Marat to the point of idolatry. His body was installed in the Pantheon, his bust was placed in every public place; he was for a few weeks idolised. Within six months his body was torn from his resting place and flung (so tradition says) into a common sewer, while parties of "gilded youth" led by the ex-leftist Freron, were smashing his busts everywhere as a change from smashing the heads of Jacobins.

When Trotsky and Zinoviev begin to style themselves the "True" Leninists, one remembers with a shudder Freron and his "adoration" of Marat.

The Thermidorians advanced to the attack with the slogan "an intensification of the terror against the enemies of the Republic within a few weeks they had abolished the Terror and admitted these "enemies" to government posts and valuable contracts. To the official Terror in defence of the revolution succeeded the unofficial "White" Terror directed against its friends.

The opposition advance with the slogans of "More Socialism more revolutionary enthusiasm and a fiercer war upon the non-proletarian elements". Can we fail to see the historic parallel, or draw the inevitable inference?

The Thermidorian reaction was initiated by the trechery of a section of the Jacobin Party who professed that their desire was to "release the party" from the "dictatorship" of Robespierre and St. Just. Within a few weeks they were suppressing the party and winking at the murder of its best revolutionary fighters.

The Opposition cannot raise as they do the slogan of "liberating" the Communist Party from the "dictatorship of Stalin and Co". Without raising memories of the fate of the Jacobins.

On analysis all the fine sounding "proletarianism" of the Opposition reveals an identity of theoretical standpoint with the Menshevik Social-Democrats and their bourgeois imperialist allies. Is it not an inevitable inference that their victory would yield results parallel with those following upon Thermidor? And that the wreck of the Communist Party and the triumph of the new bourgeoisie would create the occasion for that Bonapartism which

Thermidor made inevitable and of whose possibility Trotsky was wont constantly to remind us?

The World Revolution and the U. S. S. R.

By N. Bucharin.

It is well understood, by both our friends and our enemies, that the tenth anniversary of the November Revolution is an event of world historical importance. Our friends will look with yet greater hope on the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, as the firm dictatorship of the working class, that for ten years has successfully struggled for the Socialist cause in the land of former imperial Russia. Our enemies, whoever they may be, whether representatives of predatory imperialism, agents of the reformist internationals, representatives of the big bourgeoisie or landowners, or of the petty bourgeois cliques, are all compelled to recognise the magnitude and significance of this historical fact that the working class has been in power for the space of ten years.

The history of revolution has known other dictatorships. There was the dictatorship of the English bourgeoisie, of Cromwell, in England. There was the revolutionary dictatorship of the Jacobins—the petty bourgeois “lefts” at the time of the great French Revolution, and there were the months of the Paris Commune. But the dictatorship of one or other stratum of the bourgeoisie, have an essentially different significance from that of the dictatorship of the proletariat, for the bourgeois revolution itself has a different significance from that of the Socialist revolution. Our November Revolution stands at the threshold of a new world—historical epoch of humanity because it overturned and reversed the old social pyramid, putting in power the most oppressed, most exploited and, at the same time, most revolutionary class known to history, viz. the proletariat.

The celebration of the tenth anniversary of the November revolution reminds us all that this revolution was the offspring of the world war, and that the banner under which our proletariat conquered in these days was the banner of international revolution. Hence, the first question that we must ask ourselves is whether the Bolshevik party was correct in staking its all on the world revolution, whether the vanguard of the proletariat was correct when, after the March revolution, it came forward with the greatest persistence, energy, strength, and heroism in defence of the banner of world revolution. We are well aware that our opponents inside the Labour Movement answer this question with an emphatic negative. International Social Democracy, through the utterances of its most eminent representatives, has adopted the point of view that the post-war revolutions, and, in the first place, the November revolution in Russia in 1917, were a peculiar product of the rotten falling to pieces of capitalist society as a result of the war, a

specific product of the war, and to a considerable degree, a product which may be characterised as being the result of Russian Asiatic phenomena. Our revolution is interpreted by these ideologists of the Second International, not as a proletarian revolution, but as revolution of soldiers deserters and of peasant soldiers. According to this view, the proletariat only entered this revolution owing to its interest in liquidating the war, and by no means as a class intent on achieving and with the power to achieve, the Socialist revolution. The latter, they say, must occur not as the result of collapse, rottenness and disorganisation caused by war, but as the result of an evolutionary completion of the development of the full powers of capitalism, which gives birth to its own special "grave-diggers on the basis of the ripeness of its powers.

The war, however, is past, and the social reformists believe that the capitalism has marvellously developed. It has not only perished, but is going forward with gigantic strides. It has produced new organisations, like the League of Nations, and there has been a new huge cycle of a new flourishing development of capitalist society. The Bolshevik reliance on a world revolution they believe to be demonstrated as a childish Utopia. This is the judgement of international social reformism.

It must be said that in our own midst it is quite common for comrades discussing the international revolution to ask, "When will it come, when will be the day?" It seems to me that such a formulation of the question is incorrect. It seems to me that it would be correct to say that our Bolshevik Party has fully justified itself in placing its reliance on the international revolution, because the international revolution is not something that will occur in the future, but is something that is proceeding now. It is not something anticipated and hoped for, but something actually existing; it is not something that will come after some indefinite period, but is something that is already actually taking place. It is sufficient to remind ourselves of a few of the characteristic events during the past decade. Here is a short list of some important facts. In March, 1917—the bourgeois democratic revolution in Russia; November, 1917—the proletarian revolution in Russia; March 1918—the workers' revolution in Finland; November 1918—revolution in Germany and in Austria; March 1919—revolution in Hungary; January 1920—revolution in Turkey; September 1920—revolutionary seizure of the factories by the workers of Italy; March, 1921—the so-called March "rising" in Germany; September, 1923—revolution in Bulgaria; Autumn, 1923—semi-revolution of the German proletariat; December, 1924—the rising in Esthonia; April, 1925—the rising in Morocco; August 1925—the rising in Syria; May, 1926—the General Strike in Britain; 1927—the rising in Vienna. Finally, we must mention the Chinese revolution continuing through many years, and now passing through an extremely acute phase. From

this simple list, it is clear that the international revolution is something actually in progress.

It is true that there has been no victory of the international revolution in the sense that there has been no simultaneous victory of the working-class in a series of countries. But whoever predicted that the world revolution would occur in this way? It is extremely probable that immediate risings are imminent in the colonial subject countries, and, while they are not proletarian revolutions, they are yet component parts of the international revolutionary process. How it be said that there is no such thing as the international revolution when there is the victorious Socialist revolution in the U.S.S.R., and while there is the Chinese revolution, both of which are parts of the world revolution.

The incorrectness of the view that the international revolution is something that does not exist but will only come in the future is due to an incorrect idea of the international revolution. There are many people who picture to themselves the international revolution as an occurrence which some fine day will take place simultaneously in a number of countries. This is extremely improbable and unnecessary. Comrade Lenin, even during the war and before November, 1927, insisted that it was necessary for everyone to realise that the world revolution, which would overthrow capitalism, was primarily a protracted historical process. that we are on the eve of an epoch of world revolution which would contain a whole series of proletarian revolutions, colonial risings, and national wars, rising from the combinations of all the factors beaking up capitalism.

The international revolution is then an epoch of revolutions, a long extended process. Now, ten years since the working class in this country first took power in its hands, we can review our historical developments and compare with the changes which took place in the world during the epoch of bourgeois revolutions when humanity was passing from feudalism to capitalism. Looking back on the bourgeois revolutions, we see in the seventeenth century the bourgeois revolution in England, in the eighteenth century a whole series of bourgeois revolutions on the continent of Europe and in the twentieth century the bourgeois revolution in Russia. The process of revolutionary transition from feudalism to capitalism has occupied a number of centuries.

It is naturally comprehensible that, as regards the international Socialist revolution, matters will be considerably different since the connection, between the different countries are now much closer, deeper, and more extensive. Consequently, the working class will be able to carry through its revolutions over the whole surface of the globe in an incomparably shorter time than was possible for the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless

we must also conclude from this historical comparison that the process of socialist revolutions is in the highest degree a long extended process. Further, the world revolution has also a many-sided character, comprising as it does different parts—the revolt of the working class against the bourgeoisie in the leading countries, the revolution of the working class carrying with it huge sections of the peasantry in the more backward countries, wars for national emancipation, revolts of the millions of the colonial and semi colonial people even where there is only an insignificant and semi proletariat &c. Lenin, in an article entitled “On a Caricature of Marxism and on Imperialist Economism,” wrote:—

The Socialist revolution cannot take place in any other form than that of an epoch, uniting the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie in the leading countries with a whole series of democratic, revolutionary, and national emancipatory movements in the undeveloped, backward, and oppressed countries. Why is this? It is because capitalism develops unequally.

Closely connected with the above is a third characteristic, viz., that the world revolution is a process, parts of which occur simultaneously. Thus for example, our proletarian revolution took place in October 1917, the German revolution in 1918, the rising in Esthonia in 1924, the rising in Indonesia in 1926. All these are parts of a single process, all are separate facts of the world revolution.

Turning again to our comparison with the bourgeois revolution, it is necessary to emphasise the fact that the most revolutionary country during that period, almost as in the case of our country during the period of Socialist revolution, was similarly subjected to the blows of all the other most important powers which united again her. The difference is, however, that at the head of the States ranged against bourgeois-revolutionary France there stood a bourgeois country, viz., England, who saw a competitor in France. The armed struggle between the propertied States, headed by England, and the most revolutionary bourgeois State, France lasted with small interruptions for twenty-two years. In this period, 1793-1816, England organised a “united front” of the European States against revolutionary France no less than four times.

I have called attention to these historical examples in order to make more easily comprehensible the extraordinary difficult conditions under which a new social order comes into being, and in order to give a view of the enormous historical perspectives of the world revolution. It is inevitable, that, sooner or later, there will take place a great war of the imperialist powers against us or against a coalition of the proletarian States. This can only be rendered impossible by the working class coming into power throughout the world.

Consequently, to the constituent elements of the international revolution enumerated in the quotation from Lenin, cited above there must be added the war of the Socialist countries defending themselves against the attacks of the imperialist States. This is also a constituent part of the great process of the transformation of the world. Whatever the differences in time and space and whatever the variety in character of the processes of the international Socialist revolution, it is all the same a single process for it expresses in itself the crisis of capitalist society, the decay of the latter, and the revolutionary re-fashioning of the world. It is in this sense that we are able to speak of the international Socialist revolution.

It has been necessary to dwell at such length on this question because the wrong formulation of it has great practical significance, for it is reflected in the consciousness, volition, and thought of parts of the working class and of our party. There is a view that in 1917 we are said to have made a great talk of world revolution, that we staked our reliance on it, but that now it has vanished from the scene and will only come again at some future time. We are supposed to have said that capitalism has entered on a cycle of prodigious convulsions, but that suddenly this expected transfiguration has become far removed, so far, indeed, that it is entirely unclear what has happened to it.

It is comprehensible that if we answer the question in a different way by saying that the revolutionary transformation of the capitalist world is a fact actually taken place that the world revolution while not yet decisively victorious, still exists and is developing then it is natural that from that will proceed a different consciousness, a different outlook, and a different sensation of struggle on the part of the working class and those who stand under the banner of Communism.

If we ask ourselves the question, what are the general characteristics of the present position of the international-revolution it must be answered that the crisis of world capitalism is at the moment developing in a different way from some years back, and is revealing itself in other forms.

The Chinese revolution, with its huge oscillations and with the huge masses that it sets in motion, is nothing but an expression of the crisis of the capitalist system, but "from the other end". The deepening of the revolution in China is a phenomenon of the capitalist crisis. The successful development of our building up of Socialism is also a phenomenon of the world crisis of capitalism can never again be so healthy as it was before the war, if only because the U. S. S. R. already exists appearing like a wedge driven into the body of bourgeois world economy.

P. 1220

Consequently, on the one hand the crisis of capitalism is at present being most acutely experienced in the colonial countries and in particular, in Eastern Asia, and, on the other hand the successful construction of Socialism in the U. S. S. R. reveals itself as a revolutionary fact of deepest significance. On a third side, the crisis of capitalist society is expressed in the especially sharp antagonisms inside capitalist society which is attempting to stabilise itself; for this stabilisation in Western Europe is taking place within the limits of an actual sharpening of the difficulties resulting from the war. The stabilisation is proceeding under circumstances of heavy pressure by the bourgeoisie on the working class, of heavy permanent unemployment, and of a general intensification of class antagonisms.

Finally, the critical situation of the whole capitalist regime is augmented by the great antagonism and sharpening of the contradictions between the imperialist powers and the U. S. S. R. When now, ten years after the conquest of power by the working class, we inquire as to the extent of our achievement on the international revolutionary movement, the question arises whether we are faced, on balance, with a worsening of the position and an improvement from the point of view of the reactionary forces. The answer is emphatically no. Glance at the "Letter to the Comrades," written by Lenin before the November revolution, when, for proofs that the international revolution was proceeding and that it was necessary to support it, he had to reply on a single revolt in German sailors and on the existence of Karl Liebknecht. Contrast this with the Chinese revolution alone—a factor of colossal significance. We possess the Communist International with its mass parties, we have our supporters in every country.

Can there be any comparison with the situation in 1917. Our forces have increased many times over, both from the point of view of material strength and of number of supporters, and from the point of view of colossal experience and of the organisation of our strength. All this is in our favour in the event of a conflict between the U. S. S. R. and the imperialist powers. In the event of such a war, we can count upon, I will not say an immediate rising of the workers in all countries, for that would be a mistaken expectation, but such a rapid growth of revolutionary feeling, such a rapid mobilisation of forces of the working—class against the bourgeoisie, that within a short time a number of bourgeois state would be shattered into a thousand fragments.

Notes of the month. X

The great industrial conflicts now developing in India, as well as the intensified political situation, alike point to the opening of a new period of sharpened struggle in India, which is likely to become one of the central factors of the world situation in the next

few years. The transformation of the situation in India which has been taking place during the past five years, since the collapse of Gandhi and the Non-Co-operation Movement, has been developing for the most part beneath the surface; and it is only when the forces governing it are surveyed as a whole that the full extent of the transformation can be gauged. The India of Gandhi is dead and belong to the past (despite the recently announced attempt of Gandhi, after numerous solemn renunciations of politics, to proclaim his return). A new India is coming into being. The rising consciousness and action of the industrial workers, the growth of Republicanism and victory of the independence slogan at the National Congress, the growth of the Workers and Peasants' Party, the foremost role of the workers in the demonstrations against the Simon Commission... all these are the signs of the new India that is coming into being. The painful and difficult interim period of outer political stagnation and inner growth of new forces beneath the surface is reaching its close. The new period, in which the leading role of the workers and peasants in the national struggle comes ever more clearly to the front, has now already proclaimed itself. This new period in India raises questions and problems as urgent and vital for the British working class as any on the "home" front; for it cannot be too often repeated that the fifty millions in Britain and the three hundred millions in India are natural allies, and the strongest force in the single fight against British Imperialism.

This transformation of the Indian situation, which is still only at its earliest stages, is the most important general characteristic of the present period in India. At the same time certain developments and modifications have taken place in the role and policy of imperialism, in the role of the bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie, and in the inter-relations of the bourgeoisie and of imperialism, as well as in certain important factors of the general political situation, especially with reference to the growing importance of the war question and external relations for India, which need not be taken into review. Questions have been raised with regard to the role of imperialism in India in the present period, in the light of recent evidence, which require to be discussed. In order to gauge the principal changes which have taken place, it will be necessary to survey briefly the developments in the role of imperialism, in the role of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie, and in the role of the workers and peasants. Finally, it will be necessary to survey the role of the British working class and of the existing leadership of the British working class movement as it is developing in relation to India.

The policy of imperialism in India has undergone some modifications in the past few years. The rapid progressive policy which marked the end of the war and the first post-war period the

policy of economic transformation and industrialisation combined with liberal constitutional reforms, has met with an arrest and slowed down very considerably. The basic outline of the new epoch of policy which was initiated by the Industrial Commission of 1916, the Montagu Declaration of 1917, and the Monagu-Chelmsford Report of 1918, and the far reaching transformation that it meant of British policy in India, is sufficiently familiar. The essential character of this policy was that, economically, British capitalism in India advanced from the use of India primarily as an agricultural and raw materials reserve and outlet for British manufactures, with the consequent deliberate restriction of Indian industrial development, to the direct industrial opening up and exploitation of India under the control of British capital; politically, British rule in India advanced from basing itself primarily on the support of the big landlord class and ruling princes, to the new objective of winning the cooperation of this rising Indian bourgeoisie in administration through the form of Dyarchy advancing to Dominion Status. The essence of the new imperialist policy was thus the taking of the Indian bourgeoisie into junior partnership economic and political. Its cornerstones were industrialisation and Dyarchy advancing to Dominion status.

The reasons behind the policy were three fold. First, it provided that the in any case inevitable process of industrialisation, which could not be definitely held up from developing in India as in the other extra-European countries, should be a skilful volte-face in policy be actually taken in hand and turned to the profit of British capital. Second, it provided that the already dangerously threatened and shaking political structure of British rule in India, faced with a growing national movement, should save itself by the familiar manoeuvre of buying off a section of the opposition, and seek to build for itself a new social and political basis of support in the rising bourgeoisie by taking them into a joint-sharing of the spoils and developing a common interest of exploitation against the masses. Third, it provided an outlet and line of expansion corresponding to the general needs and stage of British capitalism as a whole, which was increasingly finding the basic home industries less profitable and offering diminishing scopes, and was interesting itself in the industrial development of the colonial and new countries. These basic driving forces behind the new imperialist policy are important to remember now, when we are having to consider the fresh problems of a further phase in its development.

To day we are faced with a noticeable arrest in the development of the policy. The export of British capital to India, which reached an extremely high level in the year 1921-3, had fallen to a very low level. The figures are sufficiently striking to be worth setting out in full:-

Year.	British capital exported to India £ (millions)	Total British capital New Issues £ (millions)	Percentage to India
1919..	1.4	237	0.6
1920..	3.5	384	0.9
1921..	29.5	215	13.6
1922..	36.1	235	15.3
1923..	25.3	203	14.4
1924..	2.6	223	1.1
1925..	3.4	239	1.4
1926..	3.0	253	0.8
1927..	0.8	314	0.3

After making all allowances for necessary criticism of the basis of figures of capital issues as an incomplete index of all movements of capital, the general tendency revealed remains unmistakable. Are we then faced with a reversal of policy, or does this represent a temporary phase within the general policy, and if so, what is the significance of this phase?

Coincidentally with this, we find a significant change in the political line of the British Government. The line has again moved to a conservative trend, though still within the framework of the new policy. The reforms are minimised; the supremacy of the Executive is mainly stressed; the rate of progress is no longer spoken of in sanguine terms, but with heavy stress on the slowness and doubtfulness of any further advance. A Montagu is succeeded by a Birkenhead. The tone in relation to the Nationalist Movement is one of open contempt and indifference. There is a noticeable hardening against concessions and conciliation towards the Indian bourgeoisie. In the appointment of the Simon Commission, above all, there is a deliberate demonstration of power against all sections, driving into opposition at the outset even the most servile moderate sections which only seek for an excuse to be conciliated, and revealing a manifest aim to display the undivided absolute character of British rule. Again we have to consider how this represents a reversal of policy, or how far a phase within the general policy.

A critical view of the whole process of industrialisation and of the role of the British Government in relation to it has been expressed by E. Varga in an important recent survey ("India the focus of the British Empire" in the International Press Correspondence, German edition, February 15, 1928; English edition, March 14, 1928). Comrade Varga raises the question whether the extent of industrialisation has not been exaggerated, whether it is correct to speak of an economic policy of industrialisation on the part of the British Government in the present period, and whether what has taken place as regards Government policy has not been

rather a temporary wartime policy undertaken for special reasons, military and political rather than economic, which are now no longer operative. Consequently, he puts forward the suggestion that the period of industrialisation policy which opened in 1916 may have come to an end, that we may be now confronted with, not merely a temporary deflection within the general policy, but an actual change of policy and new period, and that, with changing conditions, "there is the possibility of a complete return to the old policy." The suggestion here thrown out, though only in relative form, opens such a fundamental revision of our whole line in relation to the Indian situation as to demand careful consideration.

On the question of the extent of industrialisation there is no dispute. Comrade Varga shows that although the rate of industrialisation has been extremely rapid during the past fifteen years (the census period 1911-1912 showed for the then years a 25 per cent increase in the number of industrial workers in enterprises employing over twenty workers, a 35 per cent rise in textiles, 130 per cent in metallurgy, 100 per cent in chemical & c.), nevertheless the absolute degree of industrialisation is still very low—less than Russia at the end of the nineteenth century (10.7 per cent of the population engaged in industry in 1921, as against 17.4 per cent in Russia in 1897, or 14.6 per cent in Spain in 1910; and within its total the proportion in larger industrial enterprises very low, and in particular iron, steel and engineering industry very little developed). All this is undoubted; and, indeed, the whole policy and propaganda of industrialisation in India starts from the facts that India is relatively backward in industrial development compared to other countries at a comparable stage of development and with anything approaching similar resources (so the Industrial Commission Report which exposes very sharply the failure and neglect of industrial development, and similarly subsequent reports).

But when Comrade Varga proceeds from this to question the role and policy of the British Government in India in relation to industrialisation, and in particular to raise the question whether the Government can be correctly said to be pursuing an economic policy of industrialisation apart from the wartime emergency measures, his line of argument becomes more open to dispute. Comrade Varga argues that the industrialisation policy which opened in 1916 was due to four reasons. (1) home political reasons, i. e. the danger of the political situation created by the war and the necessity of winning the support of the Indian bourgeoisie; (2) military reasons, to secure war industrial supplies; (3) economic reasons, to meet the war inability of Britain to supply the Indian market and prevent the Japanese industrial invasion; (4) foreign political reasons, to make a show of a liberal policy to India for war propagandist purposes. These four reasons, it will be seen, are all directly connected with the war situation. But while these

circumstances were certainly the immediate circumstances giving the stimulus to the change in policy in 1916, it is very strongly open to question whether these reasons can be accepted as a complete account of the reasons behind the industrialisation policy of the government, especially as it has developed since the war (tariff policy).

It is only necessary to consult the Government's own reports to see very clearly set out the more permanent economic reasons consciously underlying the whole industrial Commission Report of the war period, where the situation is examined under very much wider conditions than the immediate war crisis, but also to the post war literature and inquiries. References may be made to such a standard document of post-war economic policy as the Fiscal Commission Report of 1922, especially to Chapter IV. "The Importance of Industrial Development". The Commission reached the conclusion:—

We have considered generally the advantages and the possible disadvantages which would attach to considerable development of Indian industries. We have no hesitation in holding that such a development would be very much to the advantage of the country as a whole creating new sources of wealth, encouraging the accumulation of capital, enlarging the public revenues, providing more profitable employment for labour, reducing the excessive dependency of the country on the unstable profits of agriculture and finally stimulating the national life and developing the national character.

Here there is no longer question of the special wartime emergency considerations, but of a permanent economic policy, "accumulation of capital," more profitable employment for labour," enlarging the public revenues," &c. And in fact Government policy since the war, although very undoubtedly inactive and stingy in any constructive work, and putting on the shelf most of the Industrial Commission recommendations much the same as the "reconstruction" policy in England since the war, has nevertheless followed this general aim in its economic policy, as seen in its imposition of tariffs, bounties to the iron and steel industry, &c. (appointment of the Tariff Board, 1923. Steel Protection Act, 1924; total suspension of the cotton excise duty, 1925; bounties to the iron and steel industry, 1924-7)

Indeed, the Fiscal Commission went so far as to consider not only the general basis and grounds of a permanent policy of industrialisation, but even the problems and dangers arising in the creation of an industrial proletariat. It declared:—

Industrialisation will, however, bring new and real problems, arising from the aggregation of population in large towns, and these will involve new expenditure. The administrative control of a

population of 100,000 in a town is a more elaborate and expensive business than the control of the same numbers scattered through a countryside. Law and order are preserved less easily, the neglect of sanitary rules brings a severe penalty, the necessity for education is more urgent. Poverty and unemployment may assume forms hitherto unknown in India, and may demand new machinery to cope with them. These are possibilities which should not be ignored. But so far as they will involve additional expenditure, they may be set off against the additional revenue which industries will bring.

The menace to the existing order from the creation of an industrial proletariat is envisaged. But it is considered that a little "additional expenditure" will meet the problem, i. e. expenditure on police, administration, social legislation, suitable education, secret service and corruption of labour leaders, after the recognised fashion of the modern industrial state. The whole problem is turned into a profit and loss account; the "additional expenditure" will be more than counterbalanced by the "additional revenue which industries will bring." Thus, the sapient Government Commissioners patiently tread the wheel of history, with the carrot of profit dangling before their eyes.

What, then, is the basis for the interruption or slowing down of the process visible during the past few years, since there is no ground for assuming a conscious reversal of policy? An examination of the evidence will show that the interruption is fully explicable through certain specific reasons which belong to a temporary phase, and which, so far from representing a reversal of policy, are actually in great part bound up with the whole process of British capitalist industrialisation in India. The first and most general reason is not peculiar to India or the Indian situation, but lies in the cessation of the post-war boom, and the reaction after the feverish speculation of the first years following the war. This general factor is common to the wider world depression, but is complicated and intensified in India by special conditions closely bound up with British policy. These special conditions, which constitute the second main reason for the slowing down, lie in the British financial policy in India in the present period.

The British Government financial policy in India, based on the control of the currency, has passed through a crisis in the post-war period, which have reacted with ruinous effect on Indian capital and industry. The disastrous attempt under the 1920 Coinage Act to maintain the rupee at 2s. resulted in a deadly blow for Indian exporters (the export surplus of the first half of 1920 passed into an adverse balance in the second half), a windfall for British bondholders, and the paying out by the Indian Government to London of over £ 50,000,000 in a vain attempt to maintain the rate. Later, the decision in accordance with the 1925-6. Currency Commission to fix the rate at 1s. 6d. has been carried through in face of the strenuous

opposition of the Indian bourgeoisie, who have demanded the old rate of 1s. 4d; and protested again the ruinous effects of the policy of deflation. The financial policy of deflation has hit Indian industry hard, and in particular Indian-owned industry. Here, then, it would appear at first sight that British financial policy has gone against the policy of industrialisation and overridden it.

But, in fact, this financial policy is not a contradiction of the policy of industrialisation, despite its immediately damaging effects to Indian industry; it is, on the contrary, an integral part of it. For the whole character of the British policy of industrialisation in India is to secure industrialisation under British control. The financial weapon is the most important weapon for securing this domination. The currency policy is closely linked up with the policy of establishing a centralised banking system under British control (formation of the Imperial Bank of India in 1920 by the amalgamation of the Presidency Banks of Bengal, Bombay, and Madras, with arrangements to open a hundred new branches throughout the country; present arrangements for establishing a Central Reserve Bank). It is necessary to establish the condition for the complete British financial domination of the whole process of industrialisation and industrial exploitation, which will be carried out mainly with Indian capital, no less than with Indian labour. In the post war boom Indian capital showed signs of accumulating and expending too quickly for control. The subsequent crisis has punctured this; the wholesale mortality and bankruptcies of Indian owned concerns have opened the way for judicious amalgamations with British interests and financial penetration (the experience of Tata's in the post war period, the failure of the ambitious Tata Industrial Bank, and the eventual emerging with the British interests afford a particularly instructive study. Thus, what seems on the face of it contrary to the process of industrialisation is seen on examination to reveal the clearest evidence of the far-reaching and integral character of the whole policy of British imperialism in India in the present period.

Third, Government policy in the last few years has been concentrated, less on the immediate process of industrial development, and more on two corollary processes (1) financial reorganisation and centralisation, as already noted above, and (2) agricultural development. The Linlithgow Agricultural Commission is the distinguishing feature of the present period in economic policy. Indeed, the stages of economic reorganisation may in a measure be traced out through the successive landmarks of the Industrial Commission of 1916-19, the Fiscal Commission of 1921-2, the Currency and Finance Commission of 1925-6, and the Agricultural Commission, appointed in 1926 and still in session. Once again, however, this agricultural concentration is not contrary to the policy of industrialisation, but corollary to it. Already the original Industrial Commission laid down the modernisation

of agricultural methods as the necessary foundation of industrial development. Until the bankrupt Indian agriculture is able to provide some possibility of the expansion of the home market, the necessary basis for further industrial development is lacking. The Agricultural Commission is not appointed to solve the agrarian problem; on the contrary the real question, the question of land ownership, is expressly excluded from its terms of reference.

It will not be within the scope of the Commissions' duties to make recommendations regarding the existing systems of land ownership and tenancy, or of assessment of land revenue and irrigation charges.

The British Government dare not touch the real agrarian question, manifest and increasing though the crisis is, for its own existence is too delicately bound up with the whole existing rotten structure. Only the peasants' own revolution, in union with the workers, will solve this. But the Linlithgow Commission's aim is to discover within the existing structure such means are possible of raising agricultural productivity and so providing an expanded home market for further industrial development.

Fourth, the British home problem of reorganising home industry, restoration of the gold standard with consequent intensified industrial depression, and rationalisation, has restricted available British capital for export. Hence, above all, the heavy fall since 1923 in British capital export to India. If capitalist policy is successful in increasing the surplus available for export, it may be expected that British capital export to India will again rise rapidly in the future. But the interim process of reorganisation and "rationalisation" both in Britain and also in India (for there are signs of a similar process confronting Indian industry) will have to be gone through first before there is a basis of further expansion. Here, again, we have simply a particular phase of the general policy of Britain in regard to the Empire expressed in the Times City Editor's statement: "when our export industries are at last placed upon a competitive basis, and we acquire thereby a larger surplus for investment abroad, we shall, of course, as in the past be able to finance all the requirements of the Empire." (The Times, July 9, 1925.)

In general, the peculiar character of the problem of British capitalist industrialisation in India consists in this that the proportion of Indian capital inevitably increases as industrial development goes forwards, while the actual British supplies of fresh capital are for home reasons growing more restricted, but that at the same time it is the aim of the British capitalism to maintain control of the new industrial era in India and reap the richest profits for itself by use of its dominant position, banking monopoly, shipping and trading monopoly, international connec

tions and machinery of State power. This gives rise to a whole series of special interrelations and interactions of British capital and Indian capital in India, which are also reflected in the political situation. From this peculiar character of the problem follow the apparent zigzags and variations within the general policy of industrialisation.

But this is no ground for drawing from the present situation a conclusion of the abandonment of industrialisation or reversion to the prewar period, with the consequent political corollary which this would mean of abandoning our central political perspective for India based on the certainty of the growth of the industrial proletariat. On the contrary, from every sign of what is going on at present we can build with confidence on our diagnosis of the continuing capitalist and industrial evolution of India, with the accompanying political revolutionising consequences, and in particular on the growth, both in numbers and consciousness, of the industrial proletariat, alongside the intensifying agrarian crisis. Once, however, this central perspective is clear, we can with advantage examine the distinctive character of the present phase, which is a phase of depression, bearing very important political consequences both for the relations of the bourgeoisie with imperialism and for the development of the working class.

For these contradiction between the particular interests of British capital and Indian capital within the general process of industrialisation lead to a process of renewed friction between the British and Indian bourgeoisie, despite their general basic alliance and partnership as exploiters against the exploited masses. In general, and on all fundamental questions, the role of the Indian bourgeoisie since the collapse of the Non-Co-operation movement has evolved in the direction of becoming more and more clearly counter-revolutionary. This is seen in the whole retreat from Non-Co-operation, the transition to the Swarj Party, which was a first veiled step to co-operation, the parliamentary degeneration of the Swaraj Party into a lobby bargaining and more and more cooperation and complete divorce from any mass movement, and the numerous splits and secessions to the Right and growth of political groupings of open co-operation with British rule. But at the same time, within the general framework of capitulation, there takes place a process of friction and antagonism which has recently grown sharper. This has shown itself most clearly in the resistance to the Simon Commission, which at the outset, before the process of bargaining and capitulation has begun, has united even the Liberals or big bourgeoisie elements in a single national front. The same opposition has shown itself in several votes of the Legislative Assembly, notably the rejection of the Royal Indian Navy Bill and the rejection of the Reserve Bank Bill, as well as the carrying of the boycott

vote against the Simon Commission. Thus the role of the bourgeoisie in the national struggle is not yet exhausted, and may even extend under certain conditions; but it remains permanently limited in scope by its fear and hostility towards any wider mass revolutionary movement, and, therefore, very dangerous to the real struggle against imperialism. It becomes the task of the mass movement to exploit to the maximum the opportunities presented to the bourgeoisie resistance, as in the boycott of the Simon Commission but under independent leadership.

Even among the leading bourgeoisie elements there is thus a sharpening opposition as a result of the present situation and tendencies of imperialism. But if we turn to the rank and file of the Nationalist Movement, representing in the main the various elements of the petty bourgeoisie, the sharpening of opposition is much more conspicuous. Here an actual process of revolutionisation is at work among a considerable section, following on the disillusionment after the collapse of Gandhi and Non-Co-operation and on the economic hardships of the present period. The strength and extent of this process is demonstrated by the advance and victory of the Independence slogan, which has steadily forced its way upwards from below against the official loyalist creed during recent years, and after winning a series of victories or striking votes at various provincial congresses against the opposition of the official platform, finally secured unanimous adoption (i. e. with the insincere consent of the bourgeois leadership) at the National Congress at Madras in December, 1927. The Madras Congress also in other words and respects took a marked turn to the Left notably in the resolution of opposition to the British war preparations against the Soviet Union, the demand for the recall of Indian troops from China and Iraq, and the decision of support for the League against Imperialism. All these mark a step forward on the part of the main body of the Indian National Movement from their former isolation and limitations to becoming a conscious part of the world revolutionary fight against imperialism.

The adoption of the goal of "complete National independence as the official goal of the Indian National Congress is a landmark in the history of the Indian National Movement. It is true that the adoption is still hemmed in by many limitations. The resolution in question qualified its adoption by the reservation that it did "not involve any change in the Congress creed regarding Swaraj" (that Congress creed being "the attainment of Swaraj by all legitimate and peaceful means"—as if Britain would provide India with legitimate means" to become independent. The Labour Party, not to mention the capitalist parties, have made abundantly clear that they will employ force without stint to keep India in subjection). The acceptance of the resolution by the official bourgeois leadership was obviously insincere; they have not hesitated since to

characterise the goal of independence as manifestly outside practical politics ("moonshine", in Lajput Rai's phrase), and to treat the resolution as a "moral gesture" (so also the Daily Herald, which would otherwise be faced with awkward questions) for the purpose of better bargaining with the Simon Commission. Nevertheless the strength of the pressure which was able to compel the acceptance of this goal is a powerful expression of the advance of the national movement and its victory is a big step to the clearing and strengthening of national self-consciousness.

One point on the question of independence may be suggested for the consideration of the National Movement, now that its adoption has been secured. In general terms, the battle between independence and Dominion status has represented the battle between a real break with imperialist subjection and exploitation as against a compromise agreement, representing an improved position for the bourgeoisie, but continued imperialist exploitation under an altered form for the masses. But now that the first step to the recognition of the principle has been won, it is necessary to say that the mere abstract opposition of independence and Dominion status does not yet fully express the principle at issue. It is perfectly possible to imagine a formal recognition of complete independence, in which the reality of imperialist exploitation continues unchanged through Indian bourgeois republican forms if financial penetration and dependence on British capital is already complete and remains unbroken. Comparison may be made of the "independent" South American Republics in relation to the United States. In the last resort, the difference between independence and Dominion status, if taken formally and in isolation, may be no more than a constitutional figment. It is the reality that matters. *The reality of independence depends upon the breaking of the power of British capital in India.* That is why the real national emancipation of India is inevitably bound up with the social emancipation of the workers and peasants. But this has an immediate bearing for national agitation at the present stage. In order to make clear the real meaning of independence it is necessary that it must be combined with more concrete demand, expressing its character, i. e. the direct attack on British imperialist exploitation. *The demand for independence needs to be combined with the demand for the repudiation of the foreign debts and expropriation of the foreign concessions and capital holdings in India.* Then alone will the demand for independence take on its real and living character. This is the next stage to which the national movement needs to advance, following on the recognition in principle of the goal of independence.

But the strongest advancing force of the present situation comes from the growing consciousness and action of the industrial workers. The economic depression is hitting the workers hardest. Successive attacks have been launched and are being launched

against their already desperate conditions. The millionaire Indian millowners and their British colleagues are declaring that the only way is to reduce wages. But the attacks are meeting with resistance. Already in 1925 the stand of the Bombay textile workers against the attempted 11 per cent, reduction of wages and defeat of that attempt was an historic event in the battle of the international working classes. To-day struggles are developing on a still bigger scale. The Government is using every means to reduce the workers to submission, alike through their reformist agents in the trade unions who are using every effort to prevent and restrict the fight, and through direct legal repression and armed violence and shooting. But the struggle of the workers has broken all bounds, and gone forward in the face of the opposition, and even sabotage of the reformist trade unions officials, and in face of the armed terrorisms of the Government. In these struggles the Indian Communists have been able to play an active and influential rôle, and establish in action their claim to leadership. Here in these struggles is revealed the force of the future in India.

Even more significant, the struggle of the workers has already taken on a political, as well as economic, character. In the demonstrations against the landing of the Simon Commission at Bombay, on February 3, in which the British "Labour" representatives had the pleasure of assisting in the shooting down by "their" soldiers of the Indian worker, the leading rôle was played by the workers under their own leadership and behind their own slogans. In defiance of the Government prohibition, 30,000 workers demonstrated in the streets, led by the Central Committee of the Workers' and Peasants' Party; and their slogans were: "Eight-Hour Day"; "Living Wage"; "Down with British Imperialism"; "Nothing Short of Independence"; and "Constituent Assembly". As against this, bourgeois nationalism attempted no militant demonstration; and its only slogans were: "Simon, go back"; "No Representation, No Commission"; and "Swaraj is our Birthright". February 3, 1928, is a powerful first signal of the future form of the national struggle.

Faced with the growing advance to consciousness of the Indian proletariat, the Government is making every endeavour to restrict the workers' movement to safe legal economic channels of reformist trade unionism, both by its Trade Union Act (nominally legalising trade unions, actually subjecting the trade unions to close Government control and making class conscious trade unionism illegal) through the development of Labour Departments and officials, and through its reformist agents in the trade unions. For the character of these reformist trade union officials, fastened upon the trade unions from outside and maintained with Government assistance, it is sufficient to quote from their own utterances in order to brand their type, that type may be known also

to the British workers, and that the intrigings of British reformist leaders with these types may not be mistaken for fraternal solidarity with the Indian workers. For example, the Report of the Secretary of the Trades Union Congress to the Cawnpore T. U. C. in December 1927, reads —:

During the period under report no strike was authorised by the Executive Council; but owing to very acute industrial conditions obtaining in different trades and in different parts of India there occurred some strikes and lock-outs in which the officials of the Congress had to interest themselves.

And this is from the declaration of the President of the Bengal Nagpur Railway Union, speaking at Nagpur on October 11, 1927, when confronted with the struggle of the railwaymen against the Kharagpur lock-out;—

The Government of India as well as the Railway Administration know that I am always against a strike, that our union has always been against a strike. The Government know that we have prevented many a strike.

This is the type with whom the General Council members are carrying on backstairs intrigues, and then come home to tell the British workers that they have established fraternal relations with the Indian workers.

And here it is necessary to say something of the role of the British reformist leaders in relations to the Indian working class. The British reformist leaders are nowadays taking a great interest in the Indian working class. The old blank indifference and complete apathy and neglect has vanished, now that the Indian workers have themselves begun to become active and show their power to fight and endanger imperialism. During the past few years there has been an ever-increasing activities of countless delegations, individual missions, advisers, and even a little financial assistance; and now there are plans of sending out organisers. Does this mean that the gulf is broken, and a new era of fraternal relations has begun. Not at all (it is only necessary to look at the parallel machine gun relationship of the Labour Party to see how little there is of fraternal relations). It only means that these agents of imperialism have become aware of the rising menace of the Indian proletariat; they see the growing power that is going to pull down the pillars of the Empire; and they are feverishly exerting themselves to win control of the Indian workers' movement and keep it safe for imperialism before it is too late. That is the character of their propaganda and activities; their every action is directed not to intensifying the workers' struggle and directing it against imperialism, but to confining it to safe channels, to strengthening the Right Wing in the unions, to preaching support

of the imperialist Labour Party and to endeavouring to attach the unions to the Amsterdam International (it is worthy of note that, while all militant working class literature is forbidden entry into India, the Government encourages the Amsterdam International literature and circulars to be spread broadcast to the unions). The recent invitations the Amsterdam International to the Indian T. U. C. to join is worth quoting; it says :

We cannot too strongly urge upon you the advantages which will follow an attempt to bring India into the orbit of European trade unionism.

“To bring India into the orbit of European trade unionism” (how they sink unconsciously into the very language of imperialist diplomacy. Supposing some Gompersites from America were to arrive before the British Trades Union Congress with the solemn announcement of their intention “to bring Britain into the orbit of American trade unionism ”) that is to say, to bring India into the orbit of imperialism.

Even more shameless is the role of the Labour party with its participation in the Simon Commission against the entire Indian nation, and even against the express decision of the Blackpool Labour party Conference a few months before. But the Labour party has long committed itself to complete unity with Tory imperialism in maintaining the subjection of the Indian nation by every means of violence and coercion. All their pacifism, all their democracy disappears, when it comes to dealing with India. Of them such a typical, and not at all extremist, Nationalist leader as Ranga Iyer has declared, voicing the opinion of most: “ Their policy of letters de cachet has made British socialism stink in the nostrils of the Indian people, and shaken their faith once and for all in the so called Labour leaders of Britain, who, they feel and say are only imperialists masquerading as socialists. The difference between the top men in the British Labour party and the top men in the British Conservative party is more than the historic difference between Tweedledum and Tweedledee”. There is no more urgent task than to fight against this shameful misrepresentation of the British workers by the social imperialist in relation to India which unchecked may work deadly and irreparable damage to international working class unity and understanding to make the true voice of the British workers heard for India freedom and for the common struggle against British imperialism and its “ Labour ” agents, and to send true help to the Indian workers in their struggle. It is not the Government feted missions of reformist leaders that are wanted, but the direct delegations of militant workers to assist the Indian workers in their struggle. The example of such comrades as have gone out from the militant struggle in Britain to stand shoulder to shoulder with the Indian workers in their fight, and taken their sentence of imprisonment which shoulders to shoulders with the Indian workers

in their fight and taken their sentence of imprisonment which is the Government's tribute to the true helpers of the Indian workers, shaming by their example the tours of a purcell and a Johnston—that is the type of example and service which will build the true friendly and fraternal relations of the Indian and British workers.

THE RED ARMY OF RUSSIA.

The organisation of the Red Army and its brilliant success are a tribute to the creative work of the proletariat, and the skillfully planned preparatory work of the Communist Party. The Bolsheviks did not wait until the revolution broke out; the commenced organising the Red Army many months before November 7th 1927. Already, in March district staff were in existence, and continued to develop despite the fact that they were declared illegal by Kerensky in June. In the main those units were based upon factories, the training being directed by the factory committees.

When the November revolution took place, the Leningrad Red Guard numbered 13,000 men, and was equipped with machine guns and armoured cars. Similar detachments existed in the other big industrial centres. The Party, of course did not limit itself to the workers in the factories; it steadily built up its influence inside the old army. At the elections of the Constituent Assembly, 1,200,000 soldiers voted for the Bolsheviks out of a total of 1,800,000. Also, the 12,000 men of the Baltic fleet voted almost unanimously for the Bolsheviks.

LENIN'S DECREE.

The old army was rent by class division; it completely collapsed. In place of the old capitalist army, a new Worker's and Peasants' Army had to be formed. In February, 1918, Lenin signed a decree for raising a Red Army, the preamble of which declared:

"The Workers' and Peasants' Red Army will be formed from the more conscious and organised elements of the working class. This new army will be a pattern for the replacement of standing armies in the near future by popular armaments, which will defend the coming European social revolution.

Without experience, sabotaged on all sides, denied elementary equipment, the Bolsheviks created an army which threw back the highly trained armies of thirteen capitalist countries. They succeeded because of the revolutionary spirit of the Russian masses. The Red soldiers were half starved, poorly trained and badly armed, yet they possessed what the capitalist armies lacked—"morale". They knew they were defending a country they possessed.

"An army of tramps and vagabonds" was the contemptuous verdict of the Allied military experts. But they soon changed their tune. In 1919, Lloyd George was forced to admit:

By some miracle the Bolshheviks have continued to retain their influence over the masses of the Russian people, and what is still more remarkable they have succeeded in creating a large and evidently well-disciplined army, the majority of which is prepared to make great sacrifice for its ideas."

The triumph of the Red Army was an amazing achievement, but not a miracle. Without the energetic and thoroughly prepared efforts of the Communist Party, there would not have been a Red Army. The enthusiasm and spirit of the masses would never have been harnessed. If the Bolshheviks had not succeeded in organising the economic life of the country, and consolidating the confidence of the peasantry, the Army could not have been built up. The Red Army victories were the results of the economic and political successes.

In the autumn of 1918, when the counter revolutionary attacks increased, the voluntary system was changed to compulsory military service, and the Revolutionary Military Council was formed. This was only possible because the organisation of the new army was firmly rooted and the Soviet power in the provinces successfully grappling with the problems of transport and industry. The Red Army grew very rapidly, reaching its maximum in January, 1921, at a figure of 5,300,000. At that time two-thirds of the officers were of proletarian origin.

EDUCATION VERSES ARMAMENTS.

Since the close of the civil war in 1921, the Soviet Government has constantly reduced the size of the Army. The colossal force of 5,000,000 has now been reduced to one tenth of its previous size. AT PRESENT, THE TOTAL STRENGTH OF ALL FORCES (Land, Naval and Air) IS 562,000. WHICH IS LESS THAN HALF THE NUMBERS OF THE TSARIST ARMY AT ITS PEACE STRENGTH. No new capital ships have been built since the revolution.

Expenditure on the fighting forces in the current year is £ 69,250,000. Great Britain is spending £ 115,000,000. Soviet Russia is spending this year £ 96,500,000 on education, but Great Britain is only spending £ 46,498,000. In other words, Soviet Russia expends £ 27,250,000 more on *education* than on the *forces*, while Britain expends £ 68,000,000 more on the *forces* than on education. The Soviet Government has reduced the armed forces to the lowest possible level in order to ensure that every available penny shall be expended on the building of socialism, i. e., the development of industry and the social needs of the people.

In addition to the regular army, there exist a militia, which consists of workers and peasants who under go an annual six weeks' training. Thus, a rapid expansion from peace footing is possible. The aim is to re-organise the entire Army into a voluntary militia. The size of the Red Army is indeed very small when one remembers that it defends a population of 130,000,000 along land frontiers of 11,670 miles.

Soviet Russia is prepared to go still further, and willing to consider any genuine proposals for disarmament, as Stalin recently pointed out. But the proletarian fly is not going to fall a victim to the capitalist spider by taking risks, even though Mr. Mac-Donald fumes and rages against "red imperialism" and "red militarism". The Red Army is one of the strongest bulwarks of the revolution. Despite the smallness of its numbers it is trained and ready, and can be rapidly expanded should the necessity arise.

STRUCTURE OF RED ARMY.

Let us take a look at that amazing and unique system upon which the Workers' Army is based, and which is absolutely foreign to the system of capitalist armies. The fundamental conception on which the Army is built is that it is a workers' army for the defence of the revolution and the workers of the world. Consequently, every effort is made to see that each soldier plays his part in the political affairs of the Soviet Union, and that the Army is closely bound up with the life of the workers, trade unions and peasants. The capitalists dare not do this in their armies. Politics are prohibited, and the soldier is segregated from the working class. The officers come mainly from proletariat. In Britain, the rank of the officer is the exclusive privilege of the bourgeoisie. Of course there are few exceptions that prove the rule.

The fundamental strength of the Red Army lies in the sure and certain knowledge which every soldier possesses that he is pledged to defend the toiling masses the world over. In order to strengthen this conviction, the Party has sent the maximum of its best forces into the Army particularly from the ranks of the Young Communist League. Politics are not tabooed, but encouraged. The basis of the political work being the Communist nuclei within the Red Army units.

The permanent political staff of the Red Army consists of commissaries attached to the non-Party military experts; superintendents of political work in each company, and political sections which are staffs for conducting political work in the regiments, brigades, divisions and armies. In addition to these, there are political organs of the provincial and district military commissariats. At the head of all political work stands the political Board of the Revolutionary Military Council, an apparatus centralising the political supervision of cultural and educational work within the army, and of the political aspect of military operation. This staff

forms an indivisible whole within the Army, and it is in continuous and close contact with the Communist Party. The results of this system were obvious to the T.U.C. Delegation, who reported,

“Discipline is strict while on duty, but off duty all ranks, high and low, freely mix on an easy and equal footing. There is, in fact, no trace of that social gulf separating officer from man that is also carefully cultivated characteristic of some other European armies.”

The relations between the Army and the civilian population have been built up very carefully and systematically by the patronage method. Factories, trade unions, political organisations etc., adopt regiments & companies with which they maintain contact and render cultural and material aid. The regiments in their turn assume patronage of different villages. Communist Party of Great Britain and Young Communist League are patrons of regiments and exchange correspondence and material with them.

A CULTURAL FORCE.

Neither must the role of the Red Army as a powerful educational force to be overlooked. A cultural and educational programme of great magnitude is applied within the Red Army. The Tsarist Army had about 69 per cent of illiterates. Illiteracy is now eliminated. Young peasants come fresh and raw from the villages and return bringing new ideas. The Army thus becomes a centre of educational activity, combatting illiteracy and infusing wholesome habits.

Every regiment has a club provided with a library, a reading room, and frequently, with a stage and cinema. Excellent provision is made for political and general education. Each soldier gets two hours a day general education, and one hour political. In order to obtain vocational training, soldiers visit factories.

To quote the T.U.C. Delegation Report again:

“The members of the delegation visited various Red Army barracks and clubs. On the walls are the usual ‘wallpaper’ contributions of the soldiers themselves. Rooms are provided for reading, education recreation and lectures, all of which are organised by the men themselves. The social atmosphere in these clubs seems thoroughly healthy—the young soldiers and their girls friends freely using them for games, dancing and co-education. The soldiers run their own dramatic societies, and arrange their own entertainments. They may retain their friends in barracks.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, supported by the working class of the capitalist world, and defended by the invincible Red Army, will in the future, as in the past, triumphantly

repulse the armed attacks of the imperialist powers should they dare to launch another open military offensive. It should be the duty of every militant worker to see that the latter contingency is rendered impossible.

LITERATURE IN SOVIET RUSSIA.

Has the Russian revolution produced a literature? This is a question of burning importance to all students of the Russian revolution as it is to all those lovers of literature who have known pre-revolutionary Russia through the works of Gorky, Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, and others of the "classics". Has the country that produced these literary giants in the past brought forth any great writers out of this heroic epoch of revolutionary struggle, and the period of socialist reconstruction? The answer would be yes, and no. Russian revolutionary literature, as a matter of fact is still in a stage of growth.

But if no outstanding figures have yet had time to emerge, there is already a great basis for the future literature of revolutionary socialism. This basis is the revolutionary collective literature of Soviet Russia that is a growing tower of creative strength. Written by hundreds of thousands of worker, peasant and Red Army correspondents, throughout the vast Soviet Union, it reflects accurately and realistically, the life and thought of the toiling millions who are building up socialism.

Before turning to the actual Soviet writers and their works, let us look for a moment at what the Communist Government of Russia has done for Soviet readers. The taking of power by the workers of Russia was followed by a thirst for knowledge on an unprecedented scale. As the period of civil war and military Communism ended, and the workers and peasants flocked back to the factories and fields to take part in the building of socialist economy, so the demand for books increased in leaps and bounds. Furthermore, the enormous headway in State educational measures, and the decreasing illiteracy of peasants, meant an increasing demand from all sections of the population.

INCREASED BOOK PRODUCTION.

The growth of book production in Soviet Russia is seen in the following figures. In 1925, 36,416 different books were published in Russia alone, not counting the rest of the Soviet Union. The total number of copies printed was 242,035,804 (as against 133,561,886 in 1912) of these books 60.2 per cent, were published by the State; 12.8 per cent by the Communist Party; 7.8 per cent. by the trade unions; 5.3 per cent by co-operatives, and 13.9 per cent. by private and miscellaneous publishers.

The subject matter of books published was:

Social sciences	42.2	per cent
Applied sciences	21.2	" "
Exact sciences	6.3	" "
Fiction, belles-letters, etc.			11.2	" "
Various	16.1	" "
			100	" "

A large proportion of books consist of special literature for children, and for peasants who have just learnt to read and write. The number of books published for peasant readers has increased by 115 per cent. since 1924. During 1925 (first nine months) 25, 403, 450 books, were published in the languages of the national minorities, against 8, 312,030 in 1923. During the first half of 1926, 1, 135 different books (9,636,000) were published in the Ukrainian language alone. A tremendous achievement since, under Tsarism, all non-Russian literature was suppressed.

The phenomenal development of newspapers since 1927 also shows how the revolution has raised the cultural standards of the masses. The newspapers have increased their class consciousness and activity. In 1913, 2½ million copies of newspapers were issued in Russia. To-day more than 8,000,000 copies are sold. This figure is remarkable for thousands of obscure villages can only be reached once per week, being miles from any railway. One paper often does for a whole household, or even village. Furthermore, there are hundreds of workers' village or Red Army clubs where one or two newspapers are read by thousands of people. The number of Soviet newspaper readers thus by far exceeds 8,000,000. Whereas in Tsarist days there was no such thing as a peasant newspaper, the *Krestanskaya Gazett* ("Peasant Newspaper") now has a circulation of nearly a million. And *Pravda* ("Truth") central organ of the Communist Party, has a circulation of 630,000.

WORKER JOURNALISTS.

Soviet newspapers play an important part in the development of a revolutionary literature, not only by the quantity of their circulation, but the number of their *contributors*. The newspapers are not run by a handful of intellectuals, Journalists of selfimportant "newspaper men". In Russia every paper has hundreds, even thousands of contributors. These are the regular worker and peasant correspondents. The stories they send in not only keep the papers closely bound up with the factories and fields: the correspondent do valuable work helping the Government to overcome difficulties, exposing cases of negligence, red tape or inefficiency. There are now over 250,000 of these correspondents. Even before the revolution, Lenin realised the value of enlisting the services of worker correspondents for obtaining a correct estimate of the moods of the working-

masses. "It is quite wrong," he wrote, "to think that only professional writers can work on a paper. On the contrary, the paper will only be live and vital, if for every five editors or journalists, there are 500, or even 5,000 non-literary workers". The workers correspondents also have literary clubs and circles where they read their compositions. This is the anvil upon which the new proletarian literature of revolutionary Russia is being forged.

We now come to the actual schools of literature produced by the revolution. The first literature was of a semi-heroic and even semi-romantic nature, reflecting the first pathos and triumph of the revolution; later developing into pure propaganda, helping to rally the workers in their life and death struggle against counter revolution intervention and famine. Writers and poets of all classes and schools were swept along in the tide of the revolution. The neo-symbolist, A. Blok, author of "The Twelve", was among these. Then came Mayakovsky and the futurists. Mayakovsky, a poet of great talent, though originally a Bohemian individualist became a Communist, and one of the most outstanding figures of revolutionary literature.

During the first days of the revolution the futurists, whose impressionists methods made them the most effective propagandists held sway in the literary field. Among those who gave allegiance to the Soviet regime were also some noted writers of the "old school". These included V. Bryusov, who joined the Communist Party, Vieressayev—while Gorky, of course, to this day remains faithful to the revolution.

"FELLOW TRAVELLERS"

As the country settled down to new forms after the civil war, and the New Economic Policy developed, the front rank in the literary field was held more by the "Poputchiki" or "fellow travellers." These include many talented writers either of bourgeois or peasant origin, who, though not being Communists, had thrown in their lot with the revolution or else had gone through the struggle together with the Communists. Of their number are Boris Pilnyak and the talented authoress, Seifulina, whose work "Virineya" is a most brilliant description of the metamorphosis of the Russian village during the revolution.

Other notable "fellow travellers" are Vsevolod Ivanov, who describes the life of the peoples of the Soviet Union, and Babel, a Jewish writer who served with the Red Cavalry in the Ukraine and has written a remarkable realistic-romantic novel around the civil war. All the "fellow travellers" are vividly realistic writers, and though sometimes still romanticists, have written invaluable description of episodes in the civil war, or later period. The "imagist" poet Sergel Yessenin, was perhaps the last of the old decadent lyrical "national" romantic schools. He tried to

reconcile the old fatalism with the revolution, but was broken by the surging dynamic breakers of the new society.

Another group in Soviet literature is the "Smiena Vyekh" (Change of Landmarks). It comprise writers like Alexei Tolstoy (son of L. Tolstoy), Ilya Ehrenburg and to an extent, Andre Biely. These are writers who have now returned to Russia, and accepted the new regime; although remaining intellectual individualists or "Russophiles.

PROLETARIAN AUTHORS.

Next we come to the proletarian writers. The most outstanding work in this category is the famous "Iron Stream," by the veteran proletarian writer, G. Serafimovich. It is a vivid story of the revolution and the civil war. There are several groups of young working class writers and poets such as the Forge," and October." They produced Libedinsky, whose novel "The Week" caused such a stir. They also include the Young Communist poet, Bezimensky, who owes a great deal to the influence of Mayakovsy.

Among the revolutionary schools there is also the "Proletcult" group, which may be said to lie half way between the working class writer and the Mayakovsky constructivists and futurists. Though Mayakovsky remains a vivid exponent of the revolutionary urge of the factories and towns, he is somewhat losing ground, now that the purely propaganda period is over.

One thing common to practically all Soviet literature is the triumph of realism over abstract romance and mysticism. The increased interest in science and thing material, created by the very revolution itself, has caused the new authors to seek the answer to the psychological drama of human relations, not fantasy and sentiment, but in a material and realistic analysis based on economic and social forces.

A typical example is the remarkable novel "Cement", by F. Gladkov. The book portrays the tremendous work of a group of enthusiasts who return home from the Red Army, and set going a giant cement works, which had been ruined by the war and revolution. The book is also a remarkable psychological study of the conflict between primitive passion and social duty. It shows the change that is taking place in the minds of the formerly ignorant peasants especially the women. We see them becoming intelligent co-operators in the common work, while the old social forms and family relations are gradually broken down under the onward surge of new ideas.

Finally, one cannot complete even a summary of Russian revolutionary literature without mentioning the inimitable Demian Biedny. A peasant by origin and old "fellow tramp" of Maxim

Gorky, Biedny is a poet of outstanding talent. He is truly the "bard" of the revolution. Reflecting the joys and sorrows of the workers and peasants and Red Army Men right through the civil war and revolution, in simple, popular, optimistic verse, Biedny stands out as a figure quite "on his own"—except that he personifies the masses.

CENSORSHIP MYTH EXPLODED.

In spite of the complex and multifarious nature of Soviet literature, the different social strata and schools of thought represented, all writers are knited in their enthusiastic support of the Soviet system. This is because neither the State nor the Communist Party interferes in the policy of activities of any particular literary group. The Party, of course, gives every support and encouragement to the proletarian writers, but all other literary trends have perfect freedom of expression. This gives the lie to a so called appeal to "writer of the world" protesting against the alleged suppression of the freedom of the press in Soviet Russia, published in the liberal organ, the "Manchester Guardian."

This "appeal" has been exposed by a striking manifesto which appeared in the Soviet press signed by leading writers of all schools of contemporary Soviet literature. The manifesto is collectively signed by the Federation of Associations of Soviet literature. This Federation includes the All-Russian Union of Authors the All-Russian Association of Proletarian Writers, the Society of Peasant Authors, the "Lef" Group (Mayakovsky Asseyev, Tretiakov), the "Forge," and other groups.

The manifesto declares that the Soviet Government collaborates with writers of all shades and tendencies in spreading culture among the workers and peasants. It ridicules the statements spread by malicious enemies of the U. S. S. R. such as the one in the "Guardian", to the effect that Kant and Plato are barred from public libraries. Indeed, the State Publishing House has done yeoman work in reprinting the classics in a cheap form accessible to the masses. Fortunately, they were a privilege of the rich. It is characteristic that while I could freely read Joyce's "Ulysses" in the Moscow Public Library, one has to smuggle this suppressed work into England.

Soviet workers of all groups and opinions have collaborated on a State Commission on Literature. They took direct part in formulating various measures of general benefit to authors, such as questions of copyright, legal rights, financial aid, censorship, etc. All Soviet literary groups unite in agreeing that Criticism of the Political Censorship only come from abroad and that in the present situation, where the U.S.S.R. is surrounded by hostile capitalist States who have secret ramifications inside Russia, the political censorship is an inevitable measure of self defence against counter,—revolution.

The harmonious and flexible relationship between the censorship authorities and Soviet writers ensures that all authors have the fullest scope for literary expression.

BIOGRAPHIES.

Kalinin, Mihael Ivanovich, was born in 1875 in the village and Upper Troitsa, in the province of Tver. He was self taught, and had to learn to read by his own efforts. Through a neighbouring landlord he got a place in a school run by a village official, and he came out top here. Afterwards he went into service with this landlord, and, in his library, read a heap of books. Soon the mistress of the house got him appreciated in a Petersburg factory, where he worked for two years. At sixteen he began to work in the great Putilov works, where he became acquainted with underground revolutionary literature, with the consequence that, in 1898, he joined the Social Democratic Party. Within a year he was arrested in connection with the affairs of the "Petersburg union for the fight for the liberation of the working class."

Having served for ten months he went to Tiflis, and there carried on revolutionary work, with the result that he was sent to Reval as a exile.

In 1903 he was sentenced for six months, and after a short period as a factory worker, in Reval was sent to Siberia as an exile, but owing to the out break of the Russo-Japanese War never got there and was freed by the revolution of 1905.

From 1905-08 comrade Kalinin worked in the Metal workers' Union, and was a member of the Petersburg District Committee of the Party and delegate to the National Conference in Stockholm.

In 1909 he went to Moscow, and began work on the tramways. Next year he was expelled from Moscow, and worked in the Petersburg "Aivaz" factory till 1916 when he was arrested and put in prison till the February revolution of 1917.

Comrade Kalinin took an active part in the October revolution, and, in 1919, was elected to the Central Committee of the Party. After the death of comrade Sverdlov, in February, 1919 he was elected at the proposal of Lenin, President of the Central Executive Committee of the Congress of Soviets, and, from 1921, has been president of the All Union Central Executive Committee, the highest post in the Soviet Republics.

Comrade Kalinin is a member of the Political Bureau of the Party, and is especially popular among the peasants, crowds of

whom visit his office each day, sure of his personal attention and sympathy towards all their problems.

Rykov, Alexei Ivanovich was born in Sartov in 1881, the son of a peasant. When only a school boy in the upper classes of the grammar school, comrade Rykov made the acquaintance of political exiles, began to work among the students and in working-class circles, and took part in discussions. On moving to Kazan he took an active part in the work of the Kazan district of the Social Democratic Party, carrying on propaganda directing circles of workers and playing an important part in the student movement.

Consequently young Rykov was not very long in falling into prison, and was then exiled to Saratov under police supervision. There he quickly joined the active Party workers, and joined Lenin in Geneva, where he soon became one of his closest pupils. Soon he returned to Russia with a mandate from Lenin to work in the industrial districts.

After working in Moscow he was a delegate to the Third Party Congress in 1905, where he was elected a member of the Central Committee.

He was quickly arrested, and freed by the revolution of 1905 when he was elected to the Petersburg Soviet as the representative of the Bolsheviks.

After the arrest of the Soviet he escaped in time to take part in the Moscow revolt in December. Then he worked in Odessa, where he came to grips with the Mensheviks. He was twice arrested and exiled, and in 1908 once more escaped abroad to Lenin. He came back soon, however, was caught and sent to Archangel, and, in 1910, escaped to Paris. Returning to Russia on an organisational mission for the E. C. of the Party, he was betrayed by the provocateur Bryandisky, and sent to prison till 1913.

He followed a succession of evile, escape, arrest and exile again till the February revolution in 1917, when he worked in the Moscow organisation of the Bolsheviks. Comrade Rykov was one of those who, in October, organised the seizure of power in Petrograd, and ever since has played a leading part in the Workers' and Peasants' Government, becoming after the death of Lenin in 1924 President of the Council of Peoples' Commissars the position still he holds.

Stalin, Joseph Vissarinnovich, was born in 1879. His father's name was Djugashvili, "Stalin" being a revolutionary name adopted later when he was forced to work illegally. Stalin's father was a peasant in the province of Tiflis, Georgia, who made his living by working as a cobbler. The son would have followed

in his fathers footsteps but for the chance of a school being established in the village by the Tsarist authorities. It was a "religious" school, which answered neither the demands nor the moods of young Stalin, and he stayed there only a short time before being expelled for "irreverence".

From 1896, when he was only 17 years old, comrade Stalin has been connect with the revolutionary movement. He joined the Social-Democratic Party, took a leading part in Marxist training groups, and then carried on agitation among the workers of Tiflish, Baku and Batum.

In 1902 Stalin was one of the organisers of the great demonstration of Batum workers. Consequently the end of that year, and all 1903, he spent in Kutaisk and Batum prisons, but in 1903 he was exiled to Eastern Siberia for a period of three years. In January, 1908 he is again arrested because of his work in Baku once again imprisoned and than exiled to the province of Vologda for three years.

In 1909 he managed to escape to Baku, where he continued his work till he was arrested and exiled once, more this time for six years. Within a year he had escaped to St. Petersburg, and with a few months was arrested as belonging to the Central Committee of the Party.

After a few months' imprisonment he has once more sent to Vologda, when he escaped to St Petersburg in December 1911. For the last time he was arrested in March, 1913, and exiled to farthest Turkestan where he stayed till the February revolution.

After the insurrection of February 1917, he worked as editor of many Communist papers, including "Pravda". Then, when the workers seized power, he became People's Commissar for workers' and Peasants' Inspection. From 1920 to 1923 he was a member of the Revolutionary War Council, and for his services received the decoration of the Red Banner.

Comrade Stalin is now General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, and a member of the Political Bureau.

Voroshilov, Clement Yephrenovich, was born in 1881 in the province of Yekaterinoslav, the son of an agricultural labourer. He began to work when he was six years old, and after only two years at an elementary school began work in the factory in 1896.

For revolutionary speeches he was several times gaoled and sacked from his factory in 1900. In 1904 he was elected to the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party, and in 1905, for organising a strike, sent to prison. On his release he took part in various party conferences, and was arrested again at Kiev and exiled to Archangel for three years. From there he escaped

to Baku. From 1912 to 1917 he was an active revolutionary and many times arrested.

He took an active part in the February revolution, after its victory was elected to the Petrograd Soviet. In 1918 and 1919 he was busy in the Ukraine as Commissar for Internal Affairs and Commander of Kharkov Red Army Division.

The 14th Army, on the Ukrainian front, claimed him next and simultaneously, he was elected to the Central committee of the Party, and shortly after a member of the Political Bureau of the Ukrainian C. P.

He was responsible for liquidating a serious White uprising in the Ukraine, the "Grigoreshina", and from, 1919, was a member of the Revolutionary War Council of the First Cavalry Army.

In May, 1921, comrade Voroshilov became Commander of the North Caussian Military District, and, in April 1924, began as Commander of the Moscow Military District. In 1921 he took part in the liquidation of the Kronstadt revolt, and, in the same year, became a member of the Central Executive Committee of the All-Union Congress of Soviets.

For his war services he twice earned the decoration of the Red Banner and was known as one of the finest soldiers of the workers' Red Army. It was no surprise when on the death of comrade Frunze, in 1925, Voroshilov became Commissar for War and Marine and President of the Revolutionary Military Council of the U. S. S. R., post which he still holds.

The Relation of the Workers' Party to Religion.

By N. Lenin.

(This article, which is here published for the first time in English, should be of especial interest in England, where the question of religion and the working-class movement has always been very loosely handled. It was originally published in the PROLETARI, No. 45, in May, 1909).

The speech of the deputy Surkov in the Duma debate on the budget of the Synod, and the discussion in our Duma fraction over the draft of his speech have raised an extremely important and at the present movement topical question. Interest in everything connected with religion has to-day undoubtedly taken hold of considerable sections of "society", and has also made its way into the ranks of the intellectuals who stand near to the Labour

Movement, and even into certain working-class circles. Social Democracy must definitely make clear its attitude to religion.

Social Democracy builds whole world conception on scientific Socialism—that is to say, on Marxism. The philosophic basis of Marxism is, as Marx and Engels have repeatedly pointed out, dialectical materialism, which has taken over the historical traditions of eighteenth-century French materialism and of the materialism of Feuerbach in the early nineteenth Century—that is, of materialism which is absolutely atheist and definitely hostile to all religion. We recall to mind that the whole of Engels' *Anti-Duhring* which was read in manuscript by Marx, accuses the materialist and atheist Dunning of the inconsistency of Materialism, because he leaves a backdoor open for religion and religious philosophy. We would further call to mind that Engels in his work on Feuerbach brings against the latter the reproach that he fought religion not in order to annihilate it, but in order to revive it, to discover a new "elevated" religion, &c. Religion is opium for the people—this Marxist fundamental principle is the pivot of the whole Marxist world conception in questions of religion, Marxism regards all present day religions and churches, each and every religious organisations without exception, as instruments of bourgeois reaction, which serves as shield for the exploitation and deception of the working-class.

At the same time, however, Engels repeatedly condemned the attempt of those who wished to be "more left" or "more revolutionary" than Social Democracy and to introduce into the programme of the workers' party a direct confession of atheism in the sense of a declaration of war on religion. In 1874, in the discussions famous manifesto to the Commune refugees, the Blanquists, then living in exile in London, Engels treats their noisy declaration of war on religion as folly, and expresses the view that such a call to war is the best means to revive interest in religion anew and hinder the actual dying out of religion. Engels blames the Blanquists for their inability to see that only the class struggle of the working masses, which draws the widest numbers of the proletariat into a conscious and revolutionary political activity, that only this is able really to free the oppressed masses from the yoke of religion, while the declaration of war on religion, as a political task of the working class is a piece of anarchist phrase-making. Also in 1877, in the *Anti-Duhring*, in which Engels flies without mercy the slightest concessions of the philosopher Duhring to idealism and religion, none the less he condemns the would be revolutionary idea of Duhring the religion should be forbidden in the Socialist society. Such a declaration of war on religion, he declares, is "to out-Bismarck Bismarck i.e. to repeat the folly of Bismarck's "Kulturkampf" against the clericals, the fight which Bismarck in the seventies waged against the German Catholic Party, the

"Centre", by means of police persecution of Catholicism. By this fight Bismarck only strengthened the militant clericalism of the Catholics, only injured the cause of real cultural advance, since he pushed into the foreground religious division in place of political divisions and drew away the attention of certain sections of the working class and of the democratic forces from the urgent tasks of the class struggle and revolutionary struggle into the direction of an entirely superficial and deceitful bourgeois anti-clericalism. Engels accused the would-be ultr-revolutionary Dühring of wishing to repeat Bismarck's folly in another form, and he demanded of the workers' party the capacity to work patiently at the organisation and enlightenment of the proletariat a work which leads to the dying-out of religion without throwing itself into the adventures of a political war on religion. This standpoint has entered into the very flesh and blood of German Social Democracy, which accordingly supported for example, the freedom of the Jesuits, their permission to stay in Germany, and the removal of all police measures against this or that religion. "Declaration of religion as a private affair"—this famous point of the Erfurt programme 1891 confirmed the above political tactics of social Democracy.

This tactic meanwhile has become a routine and has produced a new distortion of Marxism in the opposite direction, in the sense of opportunism. The statement of the Erfurt programme began to be interpreted in the sense that we Social Democrats and our party actually regard religion as a private affair, that for us as a party, for us as Social Democrats, religion is a private affair. Without entering into a direction polemic against this opportunist conception, Engels considered it necessary in the 'nineties to make a definite stand against it, not a polemic but in a positive form. He did this in the form of a declaration-- on which he deliberately laid stress-- that Social Democracy regards religion as private affair in relation to the State, but not at all in relation to the individual, not at all in relation to Marxism not at all in relation to the workers' party.

This is the outward history of the views of Marx and Engels on the question of religion. For people who handle Marxism carelessly, who cannot and will not take the trouble to think, the history is a tangle of senseless contradictions and vacillations of Marxism: a mess of "consistent" atheism and "indulgence" towards religion, an "unprincipled" vacillating between the r-r-revolutionary war on God and the cowardly wish to suit one's words to the believing workers, the fear of frightening them away, &c. In the literature of the anarchist phrase-makers many attacks on Marxism after this fashion are to be found.

But whoever is even in the least able to take Marxism seriously, and to go more deeply into its philosophical foundations and the experiences of international Social Democracy, will easily see that the tactics of Marxism in relation to religion are completely

consistent and fully thought out by Marx and Engels and that what the dilettantes and ignoramuses consider to be vacillations are a direct and necessary conclusion of dialectical materialism. It would be a great error to believe that the apparent "moderation" of Marxism in relation to religion finds its explanation in so-called "tactical" considerations, in the sense of the wish "not to frighten away", &c. On the contrary, the political line of Marxism in this question is inseparably bound up with its philosophical foundations.

Marxism is materialism. As such it is no less hostile to religion than the materialism of the eighteenth century Encyclopaedists or of Feuerbach. This is certain. But the dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels goes further than that of the Encyclopaedists and Feuerbach, in that it applies the materialist philosophy to history and to the social science. We must fight religion. That is the A. B. C. of all materialism, consequently also of Marxism. But Marxism is not materialism that remains at its A. B. C. Marxism goes further. It says: we must know how to fight religion, and for this purpose we must explain on materialistic lines the origin of faith and religion to the masses. The fight against religion must not be narrowed down to an abstract ideological preaching; the question must not be brought down to the level of preaching of this character; the fight must be brought into close connection with the concrete tasks and activity of the class struggle, which is directed to the elimination of the social roots of religion. Why does religion maintain its hold in the backward strata of the town proletariat, in the strata of the semi-proletariat, and in the mass of the peasants? Because of the ignorance of the people, answers the bourgeois progressive, the radical or bourgeois materialist. So: down with religion; long live atheism; the spreading atheistic views is our principal task! The Marxist says: Wrong! Such a conception is a superficial, narrow bourgeois view of "spreading light and culture to the people". Such a conception does not explain deeply enough the roots of religion, does not explain it materialistically, but idealistically. In the modern capitalist countries these roots are above all social. The social oppression of the working masses, their apparent absolute importance before the blind forces of capitalism, which daily and hourly inflict upon ordinary working men and women sufferings and atrocious tortures a thousand times more frightful than all the extraordinary happenings, such as war, earthquakes, &c—here is to be sought the deep present day roots of religion. "Fear has created the gods". The fear before the blind power of capital—blind because its action cannot be foreseen by the mass of the people—the fear that hangs like a menace over every step of the proletariat and the small owner, and can, "suddenly", "unexpectedly", by "accident" inflict upon him poverty, downfall, to be turned into a beggar, a pauper, a prostitute, hand him over to death by hunger—here is the root of present day religion, which the materialist must before all & above all hold before his eyes, if he is not to

remain stuck in the children's shoes of materialism. No mere books of propaganda are going to drive out religion from the masses who are ground down by the convict system of capitalist forced labour, who are at the mercy of the blind destructive forces of capitalism, so long as these masses have not themselves learnt, as a united, organised, systematic, conscious force, to fight against this root of religion—the domination of capital in all its forms.

But does it follow from this that a book of propaganda against religion is harmful, or superfluous? Not at all. Something quite different follows. What follows is that the atheistic propaganda of social Democracy must be subordinated to its principal task—that is, to the carrying forward of the class struggle of the exploited masses against the exploiters.

Whoever has not thought out fully the fundamental principles of dialectical materialism—that is, of the philosophy of Marx and Engels—can misunderstand this basic principles or at least not understand it at once. How is this? Shall the propaganda of the spirit, the propaganda of certain ideas, the fight against the thousands-of-years-old enemy of culture and progress—that is, the fight against religion—be subordinated to the class struggle—that is, to the fight for definite practical aims in economics and politics?

An objection of this character belongs to those customary objections to Marxism which arise from a complete ignorance of Marxist dialectic. The contradiction which troubles those who argue thus is the living contradiction of living life, i. e. a dialectical not a verbal or artificial contradiction. To place an absolute unbridgable barrier between the theoretical propaganda of atheism—that is the annihilation of religious belief in certain sections of the proletariat—and the success, progress and conditions of the class struggle of these elements means not to argue dialectically, but to turn what is a movable relative barrier into an absolute barrier, to separate forcibly what in living reality is inseparably bound. Let us take an example. The proletariat of a given place and industry is divided, let us suppose, into the progressive section of conscious Social Democrats, who are naturally atheists, and backward workers who are still bound to the village and peasant traditions, who believe in God, go to church or are at any rate still under the influence of the local priest, who has let us suppose, formed a Christian trade union. Suppose further that the economic struggle has given rise to a strike. The Marxist movement, must unconditionally place in the foreground the success of the strike movement, most resolutely in this struggle work against any division of the workers into atheists and Christians actively oppose any such division. In such circumstances atheist propaganda can be seen to be both superfluous and harmful, not from the point of view of the philistine

who does not want to frighten off the back ward sections, or to forfeit an electoral seat, but from the standpoint of the real progress of the class struggle, which under the conditions of modern capitalist society will bring the Christian workers over to Social Democracy and atheism a hundred times better than bare atheist propaganda. The preacher of atheism would at such a moment and in such conditions only be playing into the hands of the priests, who would wish nothing better than a division of the workers, not exceeding to their participation in the strike, but according to their belief in God. The Anarchist, who preaches war on God at any price, would in reality only be helping the priests and bourgeoisie (just as the Anarchists in their action already help the bourgeoisie). The Marxist must be a materialist—that is, an enemy of religion—but a dialectical materialist—that is, one who takes up the fight against religion not abstractly, not on the basis of an abstract, purely theoretical, unchangeable preaching, but correctly, on the basis of class struggle, who practically accomplishes his object and teaches the masses most widely and best. The Marxist must be able to take into consideration the whole concrete situation, must know how to find the border line between anarchism and opportunism (this border line is relative, movable; changeable nevertheless it exists); he must neither fall into an abstract phrase-making empty “revolutionarism” of the Anarchist nor into the philistinism and opportunism of the small bourgeois or liberal intellectual, who shrinks from the fight against religion, forgets his task of his, reconciles himself with the belief in God, and lets himself be led, not by the interests of the class struggle, but by petty, miserable considerations—to cause pain to no one, to drive away no one, to frighten no one—who guides himself by the wise rule, “Live and let live,” etc.

From this standpoint also must be determined the special questions which bear on the attitude of Social Democracy to religion. The question is, for example, asked whether a minister of religion can be a member of the Social Democratic Party, and this question is commonly answered, without any reserve, in the affirmative, by a reference to the experience of the West European Social Democratic Parties. The experience, however, is not a simple product of the application of Marxist doctrine to the Labour Movement, but is a consequence of particular historical conditions in West Europe, which are absent in Russia, so that an unconditional affirmative answer to this question is here incorrect. One cannot say absolutely, and for all conditions that ministers of religion cannot be members of the Social Democratic Party, but neither can the opposite rule be laid down. If the minister comes to us to do common political work, and fulfils his party work with understanding without bringing himself into opposition to the party programme, then we can receive him in the ranks of Social Democracy, since the opposition between the spirit and fundamental principles of our programme and his religious convictions can only concern him and

remain his personal contradiction; a political organisation cannot examine its members as to whether there is not a contradiction between their conceptions and the programme of the party. But an instance of this type could naturally only be a rare exception, even in Western Europe and in Russia it is still more improbable. If a minister should enter into a Social Democratic Party and then wish to take up as his principal and almost his only work an active religious propaganda in the party, the party would undoubtedly have to expel him. With regard to groups of workers who have still retained their belief in God, we must not only admit them into the party, but should energetically draw them in; we are absolutely against the slightest injuring of their religious feelings, but we win them in order to be trained in the spirit of our programme and not in order to take up an active fight against it and not in order to take up an active fight against it. We allow inside the party freedom of opinion, but only within certain limits, which are determined by the freedom of the formation of groups; we are not obliged to go hand in hand with those who actively propagate points of view which are rejected by the majority of the party.

Another example. Should one under all circumstances condemn a member of the Social Democratic Party for the declaration, "Socialism is my religion", as one would for the propagation of points of view which corresponds to that declaration? Oh, no. A deviation from Marxism, and therefore from Socialism, is very definitely here, but the meaning of this deviation, its specific gravity as it were, can vary in different situations. It is one thing when an agitator or someone coming before the masses speaks in this way, in order to be better understood, to draw interest into his subject matter, to express his point of view more vividly in forms which are more accessible to the undeveloped mass; it is quite another thing when a writer begins to propagate some God-construction or "God-constructing" Socialism (for example, in the spirit of our Lunacharsky and his associates). Just as in the first case censure would only be captious cavilling or an uncalled for limitation of the freedom of the agitator, the freedom of the teachers' methods of work, so in the second case censure by the party is necessary and obligatory. The maxim, "Socialism is my religion", is for the one a form of transition from religion to Socialism, but for the other—from Socialism to religion.

Let us now consider the conditions which in Western Europe have produced an opportunist interpretation of the thesis "Proclamation of religion to as a private affair". Certainly there are also general causes here in play which at all times lead to opportunism, as the surrender of the permanent interests of the working class for the sake of the temporary advantages. The Party of the proletariat demands from the State the proclamation of religion as a private

affair, but does not regard as a private affair the question of the fight against the opinion of the people the fight against religious superstitions, &c. The opportunists distort the question so as to make it as if the Social Democratic Party actually regarded religion as a private affair.

But in addition to the vicious opportunist distortion (which in the debates of our Duma fraction on the treatment of the question of the religion was not all made clear) there are also certain historical conditions which have produced the present, so to speak, excessive indifference of the Western European Social Democratic in questions of religion. These are conditions of two kinds. First the task of the fight against religion is an historical task of revolutionary bourgeoisie, and in the West this task has to an important extent, or at least partially, been fulfilled by the bourgeois democracy in the epoch of its revolutions against feudalism and mediaevalism. Both in France and in Germany there is a tradition of the bourgeois fight against religion, which was begun long before Socialism, (the Encyclopaedists and Feuerbach). In Russia, in accordance with the conditions of our bourgeois democratic revolution this task also falls almost entirely on the shoulders of the working class.

On the other hand, the tradition of the bourgeois war against religion in Europe has produced a specific bourgeois distortion of this war in the hands of Anarchism, which, as the Marxists have long ago and repeatedly shown, stands on the basis of a bourgeois world conception, despite all the "vehemence", of its attacks on the bourgeoisie. The Anarchists and Blanquists in the Latin countries, Most (who was pupil of Duhring) and his associates in Germany and the Anarchists of the 'eighties in Austria raised the revolutionary phase in the war against religion to the highest pinnacle. What wonder that the European Social Democrats to-day fall into the other extreme.' This is comprehensible and even in a certain measure justified, but we Russian Social Democrats must not forget the special historical conditions of the West.

Secondly, in the West, after the conclusion of the national bourgeois revolutions, after the introduction of more or less complete freedom of religion, the question of the democratic fight against religion was already to such an extent historically overborne by the fight of bourgeois democracy against Socialism, that the bourgeois Government consciously attempted to draw the masses away from Socialism by sham-liberal crusades against clericalism. Such was the character of the Kulturkampf" in Germany, as also of the fight of the bourgeois republicans in France against clericalism. Bourgeois anti-clericalism as a means to draw the attention of the masses away from Socialism in the West is what preceded the present "indifference" among Social Democrats towards the fight with religion. This is also comprehensible and justified, since the bourgeois and Bismarck-

kian anticlericalism must be held in check by the Social Democrats on the ground that the fight against religion must be subordinated to the fight for Socialism.

In Russia the conditions are quite different. The proletariat is the leader of our bourgeois democratic revolution. Its party must be the spiritual leader in the fight against all remains of mediaevalism, including the old official religion, as also against all attempts to renovate it or reconstruct it either on a reformed basis or on a completely new one. If Engels corrected with comparative mildness the opportunism of the German Social Democrats—who in place of the demand of the workers' party that the State should declare religion a private affair, put forward the proclamation of religion as a private affair for Social Democrats themselves and the Social Democratic Party—it can be imagined how a taking over of the German distortion by the Russian opportunists would have earned a hundred times sharper criticism from Engels.

Our Duma fraction, in declaring that religion is opium for the people, acted entirely, and has in this way established a precedent which must serve as the basis of all future acts of the Russian Social Democrats in questions of religion. Should one have gone further and set out in full detail all the atheist conclusions? We think not. This might have called forth an exaggeration of the fight against religion of the part of the political party of the proletariat, and have led to a blurring of the boundary between the bourgeois and Socialist fight against religion. The first task which the Social Democratic fraction could do in the Black-Hundreds Duma has been honourably accomplished.

The second, almost the most important task of Social Democracy—the exposure of the class role of the church and the clergy in the support of the Black-Hundreds Government and of the bourgeoisie in their fight against the working class has also been splendidly fulfilled. Certainly, there is still much to be said on this theme, and the Social Democrats will on further occasions know how to amplify the speech of Comrade Surkov; but his speech was nevertheless excellent, and it is the duty of our party to spread it among all party organisations.

Thirdly, the right sense of the thesis which is so often distorted by the German opportunists—the “proclamation of religion as a private affair”,—should be explicitly made clear. This unfortunately, Comrade Surkov did not do. This is the more to be regretted, as the fraction had already committed an oversight in this question, which the Proletarii at the time nailed to the counter, namely, the error of Comrade Belousov. The debates in the fraction show that the discussion on atheism concealed the question of the right interpretation of the demand for the proclamation of religion as a private affair. We shall not lay the blame on

Comrade Surkov alone for this error of the whole fraction. More, we state openly that it is the fault of the whole party, which has not sufficiently cleared up this question and has not sufficiently made Social Democrats aware of the meaning of Engels' comment concerning the German opportunists. The fraction debates show that there was an unclear approach to the question, not a deviation from Marxism, and we are convinced that this error will be put right at a later meeting of the fraction.

In broad outline the speech of Comrade Surkov is, as said, of outstanding excellence and should be circulated by all our organisations. In the handling of this speech the fraction has shown a conscientious fulfilment of its Social Democratic duty. It only remain to wish that correspondence concerning the debates in the fraction should appear more frequently in the party Press, and so build up a close ideological unity in the activity of the party and of the fraction,

British War Preparations in India.

(By A. N. Bhaduri)

India has always been the strongest base for British imperialist wars during the last hundred years of world history. To mention only a few, the three Afghan wars, the Boer war the Boxer uprising in China, the two Burmese wars and the last world war, were waged with Indian men and money. In Mesopotamia, Palestine, Persia, Turkey, Africa, Egypt, Nepal, Tibet. Indian mercenaries and resources were used for the imperialist expansion of Great Britain. Hong Kong was wrested from the Chinese with the help of Indian soldiers; opium was thrust down their throats with the help of the Indian police, and even in revolutionary China of to-day, Indian soldiers are mobilised in order to drown in blood the Chinese struggle for freedom. India has only too often stood in the way of human freedom, though generally against her own will. The vast reserve of Indian men and money and the strategic value of the occupation of this continent, largely helped the British capitalist class to win its dominant position in the world, to maintain which another war, more sinister than ever, is again being organised.

This "war of civilisation" against Soviet Russia is a question of life and death for the cause of, Indian freedom. The declaration of war against Soviet Russia, who makes no secret of her moral and material support for the struggle for freedom of the Asiatic nations from the yoke of the international Imperialism headed by Great Britain, is a matter of sheer logic; a declaration of war against revolutionary Asia. India forged in 1914 more strongly on her own

neck the chains of political and economic slavery by strengthening with life and money an arch-reactionary force in the world, British imperialism—the most perfected stage of world capitalism. Indian middle class nationalism, by supporting a decadent culture of vested interests and by assisting British militarism, which is the mainstay of the huge irresponsible bureaucratic machine in India, is bound sooner or later to drag the Indian people into a criminal war against the aspirations of Asia and against the exploited workers of the world. Indians who have nothing in common with the interests of the imperialists must work to prevent this crime of declaring war against their own interests, a war for swelling the pockets of their own oppressors, a war that is prepared to lower their already miserable standard of living.

But the murderous war plans in India are organised on the certain support of the privileged ruling class of India. The Conservative Government of England is feverishly seeking to foment a war against Soviet Russia, after being sure of the help of the Indian bourgeoisie in her military operations in India. The buying up of the Indian bourgeoisie for the stabilisation of British capitalism and the winning of them over to her sinister war plans is an important chapter of Indian history of recent years. It is worth while studying the history of the bourgeoisie in a fairly industrialised Asiatic country like India, where the interests of this class are interwoven with the interests of the British imperialists.

The world war, which revolutionised Britain's economic relation with India, brought the Indian people almost to the brink of a social revolution. The new imperial policy after the suppression of this mass discontent, is a policy of "economic concession and political repression." The new phase is marked by the growth of Indian industries and by a new agricultural policy (the new Viceroy being an agricultural expert and ironically called a peasant viceroy) and the export of British capital with increasing rapidity in order to industrialise India with the help of Anglo Indian capital and thus to restore with the help of Indian cheap labour, raw materials and the Indian market, Great Britain's badly shaken industrial monopoly in the East. The removal of duties on imported machinery, the removal of the cotton excise duty of $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and the raising of the duty on imported cotton goods from 7 to 11 per cent; the enormous bounty from the Government to the iron and steel industry, political pseudo-reform, the recognition of the Government prize boys in the League of Nations, in short a junior partnership in the exploitation of the masses, and lastly the fear of a social revolution, all these causes have driven the nationalist leaders (since they come from the land-owning or industrialist class) to the side of the Government and have led them to carry out the British imperialist policy both inside and outside India with little or no resistance. The following opinion of one of the most prominent spokesmen of the bourgeois

nationalists, Mr. B.C. Pal (once in the camp of the Bengal revolutionaries), will clearly expose the betrayal of the nationalists and the trend of events in India:—

Economically, Britain's possession of India is also a very great asset to herself and her overseas empire. India's raw material, cheap labour and huge unprotected markets offer almost incalculable opportunities of exploitation to British imperial industries, trade and commerce.

The attainment of a national government in India by timely and friendly compromise with the representatives of British imperial interests will alone provide for the adequate protection of these very large interests which the British have acquired in this country.

A possible revolution will be the greatest conceivable menace to those interests, and British statesmanship, therefore, must put forth its best efforts to secure the timely and friendly compromise, but before this compromise can be effected the British will naturally want reasonable guarantees for peace and good government in India which is so essential for the protection and promotion of their special interests.

This speech is addressed to the "representatives of British imperial interests" showing the advantages of a timely and friendly compromise" with the Indian bourgeoisie for the united exploitation of the "unprotected market, cheap labour and vast resources" of India. This classical, frank and conscious statement from one of the prominent mouthpieces of the Indian upper class, proves most conclusively an open betrayal of the nationalist movement. With this certain and important support, the British imperialists can afford to prepare another bold crusade against Soviet Russia. It is worth while also noting the statement from the report of the Fiscal Commission, consisting largely of a radical section of the Indian bourgeoisie, which was appointed in October, 1921, with the object of examining the tariff question:—

It is mere common place to say that a rich India is a tower of strength to the Empire, while an economically weak India is a source of weakness....India would have been of far greater help to England during the war if the policy of protection had been adopted at least a generation ago.....This (revision of the tariff policy would have been to her great advantage and would have been beneficial to the Empire.....

No further comment is necessary to prove the object of the era of Protectionism in India. In order to realise England's further war preparations in India it is necessary fully to understand its economic basis. That there is a systematic preparation for war is self evident in view of the fact that more than one third of the

Indian revenues are still used for the military budget. The war preparations in India are of various kinds and have recently grown rapidly in size and intensity. They can be divided into several categories.

POLITICAL PREPARATION FOR WAR.

The main political object of the British Government is to buy up the Indian leaders in time, in order to be sure of their help with men and money, when declaring war against Russia. After the Indian revolutionary movement had some attempts to create revolutionary risings in 1915, the Home Rule movement was organised throughout the country and the British-Government promised the leaders constitutional reforms in August 1917, in order to secure Indian men and money and support in the war against "barbaric Germany." To-day after the mass movement of 1921 and the Chinese revolution, Britain again finds it essential to buy up the upper class by two arguments:—

(a) The argument of offering a substantial share in the government of the country, that is to say, a share in the exploitation of the people.

(b) The argument that the upper class must be protected against Bolshevik Russia which threatens private property.

Since all the Indian leaders come from the landowning or industrialist class, it is not surprising that they are ready to use these arguments for their own political benefits. All the Indian leaders are, in one form or another, negotiating with the British government and some of them are even now (June-July) in London in order to fix the terms of the betrayal. The coming reforms of 1929 are a very important step in the war preparations of England just as the 1917 reforms substantially helped England in the war against Germany.

It must be remembered that it is only British India that will get reforms, and that it is the policy of the British Government to divide India into two parts, viz. (a) the so-called Swaraj-India, and (b) the India of the Princes. A study of the negotiations of the government with the Council of Princes shows that it is the intention of the government to make the Princes responsible to the Government of Great Britain and not to the Swaraj Government of India, so that if Swaraj India were to go against England in her war plans, the Princes' India may be used for the purpose of supplying troops and money not only against Russia, but also to crush any attempt at revolution in India. The facts regarding the Anglicisation of the armies of the Indian States, the increase in the number of troops in the States, the more effective control of the armies, the occupation of the posts of military ministers and the training of the sons of the Princes in England under the control of the English

agents, all point to the conclusion that the States are being specially and rapidly prepared for rendering services to Great Britain in the coming war.

The ideological propaganda which is being conducted by the Press agencies, by the information departments of the British Government in India and by members of the British Labour Party, is clearly directed against Russia. By continual reiteration of the Russian menace to the safety of the Indian people, England is creating a fear of Sviet Russia. The propertied class is to be frightened into helping Britain against the U. S. S. R. by being told that the Bolshevik movement intends to seize their estates. The Hindus, especially in the Punjab, are being told that Soviet Russia is helping Afghanistan in order to set up Islamic rule in India. The Mohammedans are being told that Bolshevik Russia is an enemy of the Islamic religion and of all religions. In this manner the help of all groups is being secured.

WAR PREPARATION IN INDUSTRY.

The establishment of the Tariff Board, besides having the object of buying the nationalist leaders as has been already mentioned, is intended to facilitate the production and storing of war materials in India. The industries which were practically called into being and enormously developed during the war for the supply of war materials, especially the iron and steel industry, are now technically well equipped through "subsidies" and "protection" and in the event of war, will represent an important technical basis for British militarism in India.

This is remarkably confirmed by the evidence given before an official commission last year, when a representative of one of the Indian steel producing firms said that his firm received "from time to time" orders from the ordnance Department of the Government of India "for various parts of gun mountings and other munitions" as their plant was "particularly well-adapted for the manufacture of a large variety of castings for munition purposes". The same firm was also asked to under take the "manufacture of aerial bombs weighing respectively 5 cwts; 1 cwts; and 20 lb." The probable number required was stated to be 5,000 or more per month. The representative of the firm further said that "in the event of war, a vast quantity of special steel for manufacture of high explosives and sharpnel shells, gun tubes and jackets, ribs, barrels, &c., were certain to be required at a very short notice. Their works could be turned to this class with little or no delay". This vast storing of war materials in India, which is surely also going on from many other sources unknown to us, most conclusively proves that the British Government intends to wage a war in which India will play an important part.

Among other industrial war preparations may be mentioned the following:—

(a) The participation of Indian capitalists in the building up of Indian industries and protection given to steel, paper, cement, mining and other industries; whose products, though alleged to be Indian, are used largely for the manufacture of munitions and war material and will be used in future solely for war purposes.

(b) Freedom from customs duty for motor lorries. The importance of this will be seen from the fact that special motorlorry transport service is being arranged between Karachi and Peshawar. In the last war the motor lorry (armed cars) transport was a very important factor in the military success of the French and British armies. It must be remembered that a railway strike would endanger the transport of munitions and therefore the importance of motor lorries is increased. Military motor transport roads are also being made in the Burmese frontier region.

(c) The monopoly and the use of the entire rubber industry for war purposes.

(d) The new agricultural policy is clearly intended to win over the peasantry under the small landholders. The biggest zemindars enjoying an artificially prolonged life, are already slaves of the Government. The establishment of co-operative banks under Government control will assist in solving the problem of food supplying in times of crisis.

MILITARY WAR PREPARATIONS.

It is impossible to enumerate all the military preparations for war that are now being undertaken. The following are only some of the most important of these measures:—

(a) The Singapore base which serves the following purposes. It controls the Pacific and China, keeps Holland at least neutral, threatens French possessions in the East and makes it difficult for France to go to war against England, threatens the Japanese Navy, and enables the landing of Australian troops quickly in India in the event of a revolution.

(b) The secret naval base in Trincomally.

(c) The construction of the air base at Karachi.

(d) The concentration of the air fleet in the North West frontier provinces—the probable Verdun of the coming war. This air-craft base in one of the best technically equipped in the world; one of the finest duties which the present Viceroy, Lord Irwin, performed on his arrival in India, was a extended tour of this frontier.

(e) The already mentioned motor lorry transport between Karachi and Peshawar.

(f) The very costly Khyber Pass railway and the new strategic railways on the Afghan frontier now under construction.

(g) The projected railway to connect Bengal with Burma and the one between Burma and Siam.

(h) The Royal Indian Navy, whose sole function is to co-ordinate the action of the Indian Fleet with the British Fleet in the Persian Gulf, which dominates Mesopotamia.

(i) Lord Haldane's proposal to transfer the British expeditionary force to India for the purpose of being used in Asia. i. e. against Russia and China. This remarkable proposal for concentrating the British Expeditionary Force in India has been discussed in a leading article, in the Calcutta Statesman, which is usually very well informed about official intentions and a strong hint is given that this plan is under consideration by the Government of India and Imperial Government, and that it is strongly supported by the military authorities. Before the war, it was pointed out the Expeditionary Force was kept in England because "it was known that it might have to be landed on the continent of Europe". The question, says the Statesman, arises "whether England is any longer the most suitable place for the whole striking force, where exactly the danger centres are".

where exactly the danger centres are". It should also be remembered that the growing consciousness of the British working class as witnessed during the last General Strike might endanger the transport of troops in times of crisis. The Statesman dwells further on "danger centres" which leaves no shade of doubt about England's sinister preparations of war against Soviet Russia and Asia. It is stated that-

The Likelihood of necessity of shipping the force across the Channel is clearly a good deal less than before the war, whereas prospects that it may have to be employed in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Black Sea or the Far East are greater than of old. The last case has in fact arisen and we have now 25,000 troops in China. Of these India has supplied two battalions from her own army and two battalions from the British garrison in India. The bulk has had to be drawn from the expeditionary troops retained at home, and clearly had they been in India they could have been dispatched to China more quickly and more economically.

The journal further gives financial reasons and adds with naive hypocrisy, that this step will release the serious strain of the military budget on the country.

(j) The modernisation and control of the armies of the Indian native states, as already mentioned.

(k) The establishment of new munition factories in India

(1) On the pretext of liberating slaves and stopping human sacrifices in the wild jungle regions of North Burma, the Government of India is making a military inspection of the frontier between Burma and China. So long as Southern China was a helpless victim of Great Britain's opium policy and military aggression, the military authorities who are responsible for the "Safety of India" concentrated their sole attention on the North West Frontier. But now that China has resorted to armed resistance to British imperialism it has been suddenly discovered that the wild tribes in the North of Burma were practising human sacrifice (although apparently on a very much smaller scale than the British Empire) and a Captain of the British Army was sent out to bring the tribe to feason. Last winter the Commander-in-Chief of the Indian Army travelled to Bhamo on the Irrawady, and from there he proceeded, mainly on foot, down the Burmo-Chinese frontier, in order to make an inspection of that imperfectly known region. "We have got the North West frontier-always before us", said Sir William Birdwood on March 5, 1927, and I may say we have to keep stricts watch on the North East frontier also. We know what Bolshevik propaganda is doing not only in Afghsnistsn, but also in China." Commenting on this warning the Englishman of Calcutta, a semi-official organ of the Government of India, wrote :-

If India is to be confronted permanently with a hostile China as well as a hostile Russia, additional precautions on the Burma frontier will be essential.

The Calcutta Forward, the organ of the Indian Swarj Party published an article recently in which it warned the people of India that "the British government was preparing to advance towards China on land". For this article the Government of Burma has prohibited the Forward to enter Burma, a prohibition that caused great indignation in India.

(m) The increased expenditure on political Secret Service in Afghanistan, Russia, Persia, Turkey and China.

One need not be a Communist to realise the conclusive significance of these facts as revealing a systematic preparation for war against Soviet Russia. A politically and economically enslaved India is the strongest base for British military operations. The subjection of India has kept humanity in poverty, and perpetually on the brink of imperialist wars. We are faced with a situation to-day when we have to decide again whether we can permit this crime against humanity for the sake of imperialist profits.