

The End of Mr. Roy

(The Ideological Metamorphosis of a Renegade)

By G. Safarov

I. A DISCREDITED SYMBOL.

AT the second congress of the Communist International Roy was welcomed as the representative of the Indian Revolution. It was clear to everybody that the Indian revolution must seek its road to Moscow, could not but seek it. Roy was not asked for his formal mandate. He came over to the Comintern from petty bourgeois nationalism. When in the Congress Colonial Commission Roy attacked Lenin from the "left," foaming at the throat and arguing that the sole revolutionary force in India could only be the proletariat, that India was on the threshold of a proletarian revolution, Vladimir Ilyitch showed him the greatest of forbearance, seeing in him the expression of the revolutionary mood of the Indian masses.

And now Roy is offering pages of his memoirs for sale. Lenin "valued" him and after Lenin the "Communist International was never able to value him at his true worth."

Roy was accepted into the ranks of the International Workers as a "mass-man," as the expression of the revolutionary protest of the Indian masses against imperialism. He was given a political baptism, and a name, a pseudonym, that he might stand for the masses which had still to grow up, to rise and develop, to mature into a conscious revolutionary force. He was told: "You have come to us in the name of the newborn Indian revolution. Study in the school of revolu-

tionary struggle, that you may not betray the trust of those who sent you, that you may not betray the trust of the international working class."

And so Roy was accepted in the Comintern. He has now been thrown out—not too soon. Never having succeeded in mastering Leninism—the revolutionary method of Marxism—he could never succeed in coming together with the mass revolutionary and proletarian movement in India. Moreover, he placed an infinite distance between himself and that movement. A revolutionary working class was born in India, but Roy, who had impotently called for its arrival, cannot now find a common language with it. Instead of the symbol which has not justified the trust in it, a new, young, militant class has arrived. And the symbol is tormented with impotent anger. And listen now to the bankrupt and renegade: he knows all the declensions of the "masses": For the masses, to the masses, by, with or from the masses. But it is all paper talk, paper sighs. The Chinese have a custom, when burying the dead, of throwing scraps of paper all along the road which the procession has to follow, these scraps of paper having to represent money. They bribe the evil spirits with money in order that they should not carry away the soul of the dead man on his way to the grave. Mr. Roy is burying himself with all the Chinese ceremonial, scattering Menshevik objurgations around in order to save his own "Communist" soul. An unmasked and discredited symbol is comical. Neither

the Indian workers nor the International proletariat will spare a sigh for him. The wave of revolution brought him for a time into the Comintern, but he has crawled back to the bourgeois-democratic conventionally Menshevik "thinkers." The heavy marches of the proletarian revolution were too much for his strength. He has become a renegade to both the Indian proletariat and the Indian national revolution.

On the question of the fate of the Indian revolution, Roy has for a number of years, beginning with the Second Congress of the Comintern, defended the viewpoint of "left-wing Communism," denying the independent revolutionary rôle of the peasantry in the colonial revolution and making it all a matter of a proletarian revolution. He did not see, he did not wish to see anyone else in the arena of struggle of social forces except the local bourgeoisie, always ready for a treacherous accommodation with imperialism, and the proletariat. Right down to the Fourth Congress he always adopted this attitude. He did not understand the basic feature in the Leninist view of the peasantry and its attitude to the proletariat. As soon as it appeared to him that the revolutionary flood had been replaced by an ebb he swung a complete 180 degrees in the opposite direction, putting all his hopes in bourgeois progress, in the Kuomintang road, and finally in the theory of decolonisation. His "left-wingism" was purely circumstantial and consequently a "left-wing" expression of a suburbanly restricted approach to the tasks of the colonial revolution. He carried the renegade in his "ultra-left" soul just as did the same Wijnkoop, who was his closest rival in the attack on Lenin at the Second Congress. The superficial and shop-window clothing dropped away when difficulties came.

2. A KUOMINTANG ESTIMATE OF THE INDIAN REVOLUTION.

Be realists! A sober call to self-knowledge! Com. Richard on the question of the crisis of International Communism! You see, dear reader, that Mr. Roy has entered society with a genuinely right-opportunist jazz-band. The more the better. How would

it be possible, without the aid of this deafening music to prove that in the first place the May Day dealings with the Berlin workers were the fault not of Zoergiebel, but the Comintern; that secondly the partisan struggle in China against the bloody executioner generals is in contradiction to Marxism; thirdly, that in India there is a failure to estimate the revolutionary talent of the bourgeoisie? It is the last point that touches Roy most to the quick, of course.

"The tactics in India also do not take into account the given reality. They are conditioned by a reaction to the defeat in China; the offensive shadow of Trotskyism has fallen upon them. We have burnt our fingers in China, and so we want to do without fire altogether in India. Only yesterday every Indian, no matter what his birth, was a revolutionary nationalist. Our objection that it was necessary to differentiate in our approach to the various masses of which the nationalist movement is composed, was rejected as a 'revision' of Leninism. But now to-day everybody except the proletariat and the peasantry is counter-revolutionary. The Communists must lead the working class against the united counter-revolutionary front, which, according to this theory, extends from the British Viceroy to the petty bourgeois nationalist who threw a bomb into the national Assembly as a sign of protest against oppression. The Swarajist bourgeoisie, only yesterday, still exalted by these same theoreticians for their revolutionary quality, are to-day flung into one heap together with imperialism as the enemy of the Indian masses. That is difficult to believe, but none the less it is true, unfortunately it is true. A continual modification of tactics is necessary in a revolutionary struggle. The rôle of a class which is not revolutionary by its nature must change in the course of development of a movement. But that change has not yet occurred in India. Yet our tactics have been radically modified. Errors were committed in China and never corrected, and in India new errors have been committed on the basis of the new tactics, which are based on the experience of the Chinese situation and are as applicable to the modern situation in India as is a bruise to an

eye." *Volksrecht*, No. 20, 17th May, 1929.

Mr. Roy is inexpressibly angry. He rends and tramples on the caricature he has himself created and pummels away at the stuffed dummy used to teach raw recruits bayonet exercise.

In his capacity as a learned expert on China, Mr. Roy examines the Indian revolution. This forces us to turn our attention to Mr. Roy's conduct in China. What lessons did he draw from the first phase of development of the Chinese revolution? They are printed in his collection of articles and materials which without any mock modesty he entitled *The Chinese Revolution and the Communist International*. But we will not stop to cavil at a man on such a point! Mock modesty is not part of his nature. Remember only how he despised it at the most tragic stage of the Chinese revolution! "The time has come to separate the sheep from the goats," he declared (15th June, 1927.) "We must know and we must act so that the masses should know who is against the national revolution and who for it. The programme of national revolution which I propose can serve as such a criterion. The classes, parties or individuals who do not accept that programme, who will not wage a revolutionary struggle on its basis, cannot longer regard themselves as adherents of the national revolution." (p. 181 of "*The Chinese Revolution . . .*," etc.)

How did Roy distort the Comintern line in China, apart from his distortion of that line through his attacks of megalomania?

"Although at the present stage the proletariat is directing the revolution in conjunction [!] with the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry, at the same time it provides a guarantee that the dictatorship will not lose its character. The proletariat is the kernel, the centre of this bloc, and the petty bourgeoisie and the peasantry are the two wings. The proletariat is the class exploited wholly and completely. Consequently it consciously and objectively [?] struggles for Socialism. But among the other two classes the rudiments [oh!] of private property still exist, *i.e.*, the rudiments of future capitalism. These two classes will only completely unite with the proletariat's struggle

for Socialism when these rudiments of private property are destroyed. The task of the dictatorship [this bourgeois-democratic one!] is to destroy these rudiments within the bloc." (*Ibid.* p. 82.)

Now it is clear. The rudiments of private property are to be destroyed within the Kuomintang, in the process of realising a bourgeois-democratic dictatorship. Roy did not understand the class struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat in the Chinese revolution, he did not understand the class struggle within and around the Kuomintang. He did not understand because he has no general understanding of what such a class struggle is and whence it arises. In another part of the same book in which he analyses, in the words of the unfortunate manifesto of the Chinese C.P.s Fifth Congress, how the "gigantic wave of the movement drew the bourgeoisie also after it," he adds that "given such a social basis to the national movement the class antagonisms could not disappear (?) in their entirety." (*Ibid.* p. 123.) To Roy "classes" are not social economic conceptions, are not economic realities, but political conceptions, or to put it better, one-sidedly opportunist political fictions. They are not linked up with one another through class antagonisms and the class struggle.

Such an emasculation of the objective economic basis of the class struggle is characteristic of the bourgeois democrats. They can operate and juggle with Marxist terminology. They cannot exploit the Marxist methodology in the interests of the proletariat's class struggle. The "coalition" speeches of the Tseretellis and Martovs in Marxist "style" in 1917, following on the exercises of the Kautskys and Bauers, were entirely constructed on an emasculation of the objective content of the class concept and the class struggle concept. In order to reconcile the classes one must "trim the rough edges" of class disintegration and the class struggle. That is their logic.

And for Roy the idea of proletarian hegemony has remained a book sealed with seven seals, and will so remain to the end of his days.

In vain does he upbraid the Comintern with Trotskyism. For the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution, to which he paid unconscious tribute in his dispute with Lenin at the Second Congress, is based on just this very failure to understand the idea of the proletarian hegemony in the revolution. All the course of the Chinese revolution from 1925 to 1927 is a refutation of it in the same measure as it is a refutation of the right-opportunist attempts to transform the Chinese C.P. into the tail of the Kuomintang.

Roy offers a truly idealist estimate of the Indian revolution on the basis that there class antagonisms mature more swiftly, develop more severely than one is accustomed to think in a "good" Brandlerite society, in which the third period of the historical crisis of capitalism is in general regarded as an abominable invention, dictated by an ebullient phantasy. In specifying his proofs of the "Comintern crisis," the renegade Roy has by no means accidentally come to defend the most miserable of all the attacks on the Chinese C.P. "The Communist Party, which in the revolutionary years of 1925/27 were completely masters of the situation, are incapable of organising even the smallest mass demonstration against the anti-Russian activities of the national bourgeoisie acting as the direct instrument of imperialism. Certainly that is not to the great honour of a party which two years ago was the chosen leader of two-and-a-half million organised workers and almost nine million organised peasants. (*Gegen den Strom*, No. 39, 28th Sept., 1929.) The counter-revolutionary liberal cannot see the growth of an illegal and hunted Communist Party, carrying on a struggle under most difficult conditions with its own Roys. The counter-revolutionary liberal prefers a bloc with the counter-revolution at Chang-Sha, with the machinations of Tang-Shen-She, etc., to the Canton Commune, the heroic struggle of Pang-Bai, the underground struggle and revolutionary demonstrations. And he would like the Indian revolution to take the same road. For the Indian bourgeoisie have "not yet matured" for the counter-revolution, yet there is already great haste to "accuse" it of having done so. So

Roy judges, slavishly imitating the Tseretellis and Dans of 1917, who sought for the truth somewhere between the Kornilovs and Tereshchenkos. "It's only a baby yet"! None the less this "baby" has long since taken the road of accommodations with the "Labour Government" under the old "dominion" firm, and only the further growth of a revolutionary mass, and first and foremost of a workers' movement can smash this accommodation. Roy weeps over the "miscalculation" of the Swarajists, and lauds their left-wing gestures against the persecution of Communists, the Meerut trial, and so on as noble outbursts of soul. On the basis of the Comintern tactics, Roy snivels, "we must revile the revolutionary ally as a provocateur." (*Volksrecht*, No. 24, June, 1929.)

But just one moment, beloved! You have noticed the suspicious-looking "League of Independence," you have observed its indelicate treatment of the bourgeoisie, but you don't trouble to note that the working class of India, in the persons of the Bombay, Jamshedpur, and Calcutta strikers, in the persons of the Girni Kamgar, and so on, are reacting on the whole political situation in the country, are accelerating the differentiation of all the warring forces. You have not observed that at the present stage, the struggle for proletarian leadership of the developing revolutionary rise is concentrated on the unmasking of the "left-wing" disguise of the Indian National Congress. With the aid of this "left-wing" disguise the bourgeoisie is trying to keep the revolutionising stratum of the petty bourgeoisie, the students, the urban population, the peasantry under its own influence. The chief struggle is being waged on this section of the battle-field. But what is the use of explaining this to Roy when with all the obstinacy of a mule he brays that "The various social classes, taken together, constitute the strength of the bourgeois democratic revolution. The alliance of these classes is consequently necessary to the development of the revolution." (*Ibid.*) With the aid of the coalition ideas of Menshevism, it is impossible to understand the tasks of proletarian hegemony in a bourgeois-democratic revolution.

3. A COMINTERN CRISIS OR A CRISIS OF A MENSHEVIK PHILISTINE?

The proletariat underestimates its enemies, not only in regard to their strength, but in regard to their benevolent deeds, and overestimates its own possibilities. Hence we have a crisis in the Comintern. That is, truthfully speaking, the matter has gone much farther. "The First International went to pieces over the conflict between Marxism and anarchism. We have just heard the echo of that conflict inside the Communist International. The policy of the present Comintern leadership is a reverberation from anarchism." (*Gegen den Strom*, 28th Sept.) It is not Paul Axelrod or the emigrant blackguard Stanislav Ivanovitch, but M. N. Roy, who is still indisposed to declare himself what he really is. The Mensheviks, "departing" from anarchism, which breaks up all the basis of Statism and civilisation, very quickly arrived at intervention. Roy appeals for self-knowledge in a spirit of advertisement. But you cannot separate the words from the music; in his view the Comintern are behaving like anarchists in regard to Zoergiebel, and in regard to Gandhi, and in regard to the Kuomintang. Worse than that, by attacking MacDonald and dear Miss Bondfield, they do not take the will of the masses into account. The present Comintern leadership is sticking to their erroneous conviction that the success of the revolution does not depend on the will of the masses, but on the determination of a small minority, welded by political backwardness and mechanical discipline. (*Ibid.*)

The late Martov wrote of these matters much more interestingly from the literary point of view. Mr. Roy is wearing out cast-off clothing. He is a Philistine to such an extent that he cannot remain even at the position of conventional "leftism" adopted by the heroes of the utterly forgotten 2½ International. "But it is a very unpleasant fact," he writes, "that the masses are still living under illusions concerning the nature of the Labour Government. The Communist Party ought to explain its real essence in their propaganda. But the injurious illusions will be overcome only through bitter experience. . . Consequently the party (the British party) has gone against the will of the masses in adopt-

ing a view that practically involves hostility to the Labour Government." (*Gegen den Strom*, No. 23, for 8th June, 1929.)

The "democrat" Roy justifies his dragging at the tail by references to the will of the masses, which you cannot deny voted for the Labour Government. Roy covers his renegadism by frenzied attacks on "ebullient" tactics. But he will not delude anyone as to the real nature of his intentions. In his own miserable person, which has lost all equilibrium, he demonstrates the very elementary truth that when social-democracy is transformed into social-fascism and its "left flank" into the most miserable section of that social-fascism, then the "right-wing" deserters from the ranks of International Communism inevitably become the hirelings and agents of social-fascism. This happens with all deserters, whether right or left-wing, of the type of Urbans, Trotsky, etc.

Roy is so confident of the social-democratic schoolboy crib, and that not even in the old-fashioned edition of Martov, but in the modern edition by Zoergiebel, that he follows up his accusations of anarchism and anti-democratism against the Comintern with accusations of terrorism and blind subjection to Moscow. It is amazing to see how much this man, who has received lessons even from the greatest leader of the working class, from Lenin, has remained organically inimical to the proletarian revolution. As soon as a new wave of revolution began to rise, as soon as he was given to understand that he must speed up his steps in order to keep pace with international Communism, all the superficial verbal trimmings dropped from him and he began to talk in the language of a mortal suburban terrified by revolution. "If the internal terror," Mr. Roy vociferates on the Brandlerite platform, "is injurious to a party which has found itself in power in conditions of an economic backwardness, where the dictatorship of the proletariat has to hold on through a long period of post-revolutionary (!) struggle of classes, it is still more dangerous to a party only now called to mobilise the masses for the forthcoming struggle. Despite all this all sections of the Comintern are internally dominated by a régime of real terror. Terror is a permissible instrument in the

hands of a revolutionary class in power. The fact that one of the sections of the Comintern has come to power has created a ludicrous psychology throughout the International. The present leaders of the Comintern and of all its sections act as if they were in power and bask in the sunlight of the Russian party." (*Gegen den Strom*, No. 46, for 16th Nov., 1929.) Martov, grieving at the success of world Bolshevism, did at least endeavour to explain the extension of Bolshevik methods to the West as being *inter alia* the result of an intensification of the ruthlessness of the class struggle. We recall this not in order to "speak fair" of this mischievously impotent leader of Menshevism, but in order to reveal the extent of the fall of the renegade Roy. He wants Martov to take an encore. The ideological irreconcilability of Bolshevism is for him not in the least an indispensable and obligatory consequence of the great intensification of the class struggle in our present epoch, it is not a demand for an iron leadership of the mass struggle on a world-historical scale. He compares this ideological irreconcilability to terror applied against enemies of the proletarian dictatorship and Socialistic construction, he flings down the party and State in one heap. Psychologically he is right: he has so completely broken with the Comintern and the October revolution that to the land of proletarian dictatorship he is a white emigré, together with the *Socialistic Courier*, together with the successors of Martov. How does Roy justify his rejection of ideological irreconcilability and party discipline? "By its nature," he writes, "the proletariat is the most homogeneous social class. The disagreements which break out inside the party from time to time in the course of the struggle for power or in order to maintain power, are consequently not irreconcilable disagreements, as they would be in other classes. These classes grow into one another and so create the possibility of the representatives of the interests of one class acting inside the party of another class. But the proletariat is so cleanly divided from all other classes that there is no place in its party for representatives of other classes, with the exception of isolated adventurers or provocateurs. Consequently, disagreements inside

the Communist Party do not represent clashes of hostile class interests. In the very worst case, if the party is in power in such a backward country as Russia, it indirectly reflects the post-revolutionary struggle of classes in the conditions under which the dictatorship of the proletariat is maintained." (*Ibid.*)

Mr. Roy is fond of throwing the jibe of Trotskyism at his opponents. Mr. Roy may be a complete ignoramus, but none the less he must know that the views of the party which he expounds are a free rendering of Mr. Trotsky's work, *Our Political Disagreements*, which appeared a quarter of a century ago in the capacity of an ideological manifesto of Russian Menshevism. Menshevism invariably preached the homogeneity of the working class, together with a defence of a broad Labour Party on British lines, with attacks on the party as an advance guard ideologically monolithic and organisationally consolidated. Mr. Roy is once more wearing cast-off clothing and is so illiterate that he does not even ask himself where social-democracy, with its Zoergiebls, its MacDonalds, its Boncours and Vanderveldes, have come from in face of this absolute homogeneity of the working class. Mr. Roy is a complete, self-confessed Menshevik. That is the essence of the matter. That is why he has such a tender regard for the British Labour Party. To him it is just as equally a creation of the working class as is the C.P.S.U. It has even more right to be representative of the workers than has the C.P.S.U. Let Roy not pretend he has been deprived of the party ticket illegally. Of course there can be no arena for a class struggle inside the Communist Party. But why not? Because the Communist Party is a party of the leading representatives of the proletariat, fused together by ideological irreconcilability in regard to all opportunism; because the party will not allow deviations reflecting bourgeois or petty bourgeois influence on the proletariat to develop in its ranks; because the party—the International Communist Party—throws out the Levis, the Frossards, the Brandlers and Roys in good time. It is by this very quality of irreconcilability that it attracts the working masses to itself. The extrusion of the opportunists serves as a means of getting closer to

the masses. The party as an advance guard is necessary for the realisation of the proletarian hegemony in pre-revolutionary battles and the proletarian dictatorship and Socialist construction in the subsequent period.

Roy is calling together the Lovestones, the Kilboms and the other opportunist refuse. But where are they to meet if not on the platform of Menshevism? Historically, it is impossible to think out an original platform outside those which have been worked out by the class struggle. Mr. Roy proves that every time he puts pen to paper, for all his writings are littered with the lumber of decaying Menshevik ideas.

4. A JOURNEY FROM MOSCOW TO LONDON

“Without in the least depreciating the brilliant achievements of the Bolshevik party [you observe the funereal tone Mr. Roy adopts] we must none the less keep in view the fact that the Russian revolution is to be explained by the confluence of a whole series of favourable circumstances. The bourgeoisie was weak, the State machinery was absolutely broken, the ruling class was demoralised by the catastrophic liquidation of the front, the complete disintegration and demoralisation of the army and fleet supplied the revolution with considerable armed forces, and finally the foreign capitalist States were in no state to intervene successfully at once.”

You read these lines and your imagination conjures up some emigré grand dame of the ancient régime, putting her handkerchief to her eyes and sobbing: “Ah, poor Russia! Everybody has forgotten her, although they could have saved her.”

But no—this is Mr. Roy writing. And so to this hysterical description of the conditions governing the October revolution he hastens to attach a pseudo-Communist tail, which even so Roy does not start to wave at once. “If an experienced, clear-sighted, resolute and intelligently-led party had not appeared on the scene, then despite all the favourable conjuncture of objective circumstances the proletariat would not have succeeded in winning power. But [Ah, that “but.” He’s not to be caught napping!] it still remains an open question whether the Bolsheviks

would have succeeded in winning power without these favourable conditions. The present leadership of the Comintern underestimates the confluence of circumstances as an indispensable prerequisite of the success of the revolution.” (*Gegen den Strom*, No. 41, for 12th Oct., 1929.) Mr. Roy is somewhat inarticulate in explaining what he means, but one can see that by this mysterious “confluence of circumstances” he means famine, plague, the demoralisation of whole peoples, races, in a word: “Ah, poor Russia!”

Mr. Roy took part in the Comintern Second Congress. He will not have forgotten how Lenin replied to one Mr. Crispian, who had indicated that such a revolution as that of October could be accomplished only from despair, whereas the German workers could not renounce the comforts they had already achieved. Lenin said: “If you wish to prepare the workers for dictatorship and talk to them of a ‘not too great a worsening’ of conditions, you are forgetting the main thing. And that namely, that the Labour aristocracy arose by assisting ‘their’ bourgeoisie to conquer the whole world by imperialist methods and to strangle that world, so as to guarantee themselves a better wage.” (*Second Congress of Comintern, Shorthand Report*.) Even in his capacity as an ideological bourgeois nationalist Mr. Roy should remember that. For that matter the theory of decolonisation has probably put even hatred for great-power imperialism out of his head.

In this case let him remember what Lenin said in 1920, in reference to the Italian reformists’ attempts to frighten the workers with blockade in the event of a proletarian victory. “The reformists point out the possibility of a blockade in order to sabotage the revolution, in order to frighten the workers from the revolution, in order to pass on their own panicky, fearsome, irresolute, vacillating, wavering mood to the masses. The revolutionaries and Communists must not deny the dangers and difficulties of the struggle, so as to inspire the masses with greater firmness, so as to cleanse the party of the weak, the vacillating, the wavering.” (*Lenin: Hypocritical Speeches on Freedom*, 1920.)

But Mr. Roy doesn’t want to know anything about Leninism, which is the mortal

enemy of renegadism. And on his road from Moscow to London, *via* Berlin, he reveals a new Russian defect in the Comintern: "In the exact sense of the word there were 'no Trade Unions' whatever in Tsarist Russia. So long as 'competent' people were at the head of the Comintern, men who had come into contact with the West, the Russian on-sidedness was not fatal. But without these men everything has been turned upside down. Since these old, experienced leaders have departed, either by death or by exclusion from leadership, the view of the Russian party on the Trade Union question has become muddled, and that as the direct result of the difference in character and functions of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union and those of the West. Hence the theory has been built up that the Trade Unions gradually become a part of the capitalist State machinery. They have not noticed that the functions of Trade Unions under capitalism are quite different from those appertaining to a dictatorship of the proletariat.

"It is quite clear: in Russia the Trade Unions are semi-Statized, and so the Bolsheviks think that the same applies in the West, not understanding that under capitalism Trade Unions are free." (*Gegen den Strom*, No. 41.)

Mr. Roy has slipped into such a Menshevik morass that a quite insufferable odour arises from every word he writes. Of course, he does not see the State arbitration, the alliance between the trade union upper groups, the bourgeois State and the entrepreneurs. After all, that is part of his direct obligation as a renegade learning to be a lackey. He reminds one of the notorious judge in one of Shchedrin's stories, who had two eyes, one asleep and the other awake. With the one he saw nothing, but with the other he saw only trifles.

Roy's sleeping eye is turned towards social-fascism. His vindictively unsleeping eye towards the U.S.S.R. And this second eye sees only Menshevik trivialities.

But we will let Roy speak for himself. No one can compromise him more than he himself does. Roy floridly considers the present situation in the U.S.S.R. and points to the necessity of passing from NEP to something

which has never been before. He lays it down without right of appeal that "in fact the capitalist element in agriculture has of recent years already shaken the foundations of the dictatorship of the proletariat." Capitalism is advancing, and the workers' government is completely non-plussed. This optimist where the Kuomintang and the Indian National Congress are concerned doesn't think our Five-Year Plan is worth a brass farthing. Listen to his profoundly thoughtful explanation. "Whilst agreeing with the principle [!] of the Five-Year Plan and knowing that its achievement demands stern resolution, at the same time one may not underestimate the difficulties standing in the road. For instance, there is a danger of a serious financial crisis, which may develop out of the attempts to establish collective agriculture too fast. Hitherto a very large proportion of the State finances has come from the peasantry, *i.e.*, accumulation has largely taken place in the agricultural sector of national economy. Now the process will be the converse. A very considerable part of the new capital has to be invested in agriculture, if it is indispensable to achieve the swift success of the great agricultural collective farms." (*Ibid.*) Mr. Roy has just as brilliant an understanding of the tasks and conditions of Socialist reconstruction as he has of the nature of the Kuomintang, of the proletariat in the middle and the "rudiments of private property" on each side. His argument against the Five-Year Plan may be compared with the Philistine argument against Socialism that if nobody has his own pocket no one will accumulate and so naturally society will perish.

Mr. Roy has arrived at the Berlin of Zoergiebel and the *Socialistic Courier*. His further route has its destination in London.

It may seem strange that in summarising Mr. Roy's political balance we have ignored his theory of decolonisation, which announces the arrival of a new era in the development of imperialism, an era of voluntary and intensified industrialisation of the colonies. Mr. Roy strove to put an industrial basis under the compromise between the bourgeois leaders of India and British imperialism. In its developed form this theory inevitably led to the renunciation of a revolutionary struggle for

proletarian hegemony in the Indian revolution. But this theory is only one of the metamorphoses of the renegade. He has now so completely defined his own position that the theory of decolonisation has ceased to be the most characteristic vestment of the chameleon.

In his renegadism Roy has discovered himself, has found his real nature, which hitherto he had to hide and suppress, squeezing it into Communist bounds. This is why all his present protest against an enforced past is so strongly marked with calls for "freedom of thought and judgment."

It is difficult for a man of the colonial East to pass straightway to the social-imperialist second international. And that is why Manabendra Nath Roy has so long hidden in the shadow of the Comintern. But the rise of a new wave of colonial revolution in connection with the lessons of China has forced him to say who he is. He has forgotten the road by which he arrived at Moscow, and now, become a renegade of the Comintern, he has become also a renegade of the Indian revolution. Mr. Roy has nothing to do either in Moscow or in India. His place is in London.