

INDIA IN 1930

BY M. ALI.

THE year 1930 in India was the period of a great rise of the national revolutionary movement. It was the year of Peshawar, Sholapur, Kishorigunj, Chittagong and other heroic battles fought by the Indian masses against the forces of robber imperialism. History will record how capitalist-imperialists in their insatiable greed for profit and plunder, massacred thousands of colonial slaves aroused to protest against the abject misery and degradation brought about by imperialist exploitation. It will record another important fact that in this period it was the "Socialists" of the Second International who, holding the reins of government in imperialist Britain, actually carried out this massacre. While MacDonald and Wedgwood Benn were butchering the Indian masses for their imperialist masters, Maxton and Brailsford, the left wing "Socialists", were applauding them.

ARMED INSURRECTION.

In the history of colonial revolutions, the year 1930 will constitute an important chapter in the struggle of the Indian masses against British imperialism. During this struggle, several theoretical questions relating to colonial revolutions were demonstrated in practice. It was shown first of all that even in the colonies where the people have been disarmed and prohibited to carry arms for centuries and are cowed down and demoralised by imperialist terror, armed insurrection is not only necessary, but entirely possible.

At least two large and important towns, Peshawar and Sholapur had to be evacuated by the British in the face of a mass attack of the Indian peoples who secured arms by overwhelming the police.

Sholapur is an important industrial town in the Bombay Province. Out of a population of

about 100,000, nearly 40,000 are workers employed in the cotton mills. At the beginning of May, a huge mass demonstration about 30,000 strong was held as in other towns, to protest against imperialist repression and the arrest of Gandhi. Police fired at the demonstration, killing 25 people and injuring 100. The crowd, including a great number of the workers who were all on strike, attacked the police, burst the police stations and other government buildings, seized arms and compelled the government authorities and armed forces to evacuate the city.

In Sholapur, the workers were the driving force of the revolutionary revolt. The movement went beyond the control of the treacherous national reformists under whose leadership the demonstration was held. According to the London "Times," the masses sought "to establish a regime of their own," and the "Daily Telegraph" actually called it a "sort of soviet." Detailed facts are not known. Anyhow, one thing is clear, that the Indian toiling masses can, in a revolutionary situation, take up arms with success and bravery in spite of all the teaching of non-violence, etc.

In Peshawar also, a mass demonstration was transformed into an armed fight. The situation was rendered more critical for the imperialists by a squadron of Indian troops not only refusing to shoot the people, but allowing themselves to be disarmed. Thus a rehearsal, on a small scale, of the real revolutionary drama which has to wipe away British imperialism from India for ever, was enacted, viz. : the mass armed insurrection and the going over of the Indian troops to the fighting masses. The town was evacuated by the armed forces of imperialism which re-occupied it ten days later.

The victory at Peshawar would have been impossible without the intensive struggle of the peas-

ant masses in the area around Peshawar. Pressed down by the heavy weight of land rents imposed by the imperialist feudal regime, enslaved by avaricious usurers, the peasants rose against imperialist authority. A partisan warfare was conducted by them. For them it is very easy to obtain arms from their kith and kin, the independent tribes living close by across the border. They were rapidly organised in the course of the struggle. The Red Shirts, originally an organisation of a few hundred persons, became 25,000 strong in the course of a few months. Then there were the trans-border tribes (Mohmands and Afridis) who, with their armed lashkars, threatened the British power. Hundreds of imperialist aeroplanes dropped thousands of tons of bombs on the villages, not only across the border, but within the frontier as well. The London "Times" proudly remarked that the average quantity of bombs dropped in a day on the frontier can be compared favourably with that thrown on the Western Front by the allied forces during the Great War.

Besides the armed struggle for power, Peshawar has laid down another issue as the order of the day, namely, revolutionary agitation among the Indian troops.

NATIONAL REFORMISM.

The events in Sholapur, Peshawar and other towns showed that the movement had grown beyond the limits fixed by the National Congress, the political organ of the Indian bourgeoisie. Gandhi, who was given dictatorial powers by the Congress in regard to the civil disobedience movement, had a definite programme aimed at promoting the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie. He wanted to make a show of fight with the British Government by means of which he could gain the support of the masses ready to fight against imperialism and put pressure on the British Government to come to favourable terms with the Indian bourgeoisie on such questions as tariffs, exchange, bankings, transport, and political concessions. His notorious eleven points, which need not be repeated here, show exactly his programme in regard to these issues. After the first violence which broke out in Calcutta, Karachi and Chittagong, Gandhi wrote :—

"At the very outset of the campaign I declared that there was every probability of some violence breaking out

on the part of the people. It seems now to have broken out and it hurts me because it hurts the cause I hold as dear as my life. . . I have therefore still every hope that at the end of the struggle it will be possible to say that even though regrettable acts of violence now and then broke out, it remained predominantly and overwhelmingly non-violent. *Not what happens in the cities, but what happens in the villages will this time decide the fate of India.*"

Besides his propaganda for non-violence which leads to crippling the resistance of the masses to imperialist terrorism, what he said about the villages is very important. Gandhi, as the representative of the Indian bourgeoisie, dreading revolution, understands the great importance of the peasantry in the Indian revolution. At the beginning of the present movement, the peasantry had not stirred on a great scale. The agrarian revolts of Kishorigunj Burma and Berar were events of a later stage. Therefore Gandhi, with a sigh of relief, said "not what happens in the cities but what happens in the villages will this time decide the fate of India."

By saying that, he had another point in view. He seemed to believe that his salt campaign, and later on his campaign of non-payment of land revenue in Bardoli district, would be a sufficient dose to the Indian peasants to keep them away from the thought of an agrarian revolution.

Starting a movement of non-payment of land revenue in the Bardoli district is a pet scheme of Gandhi and his followers. He did the same thing in 1919-1921. Why? Bardoli has a predominating population of kulaks who lease land from the Government. Through constant agitation Gandhi's influence there is strong. It is easy, therefore, for Gandhi to make these kulaks refuse to pay land revenue taxes which, as in other parts of India, are very heavy. The advantage is that they will not go beyond the limits imposed by Gandhi. Such a movement serves to put pressure on the Government without leading to an agrarian revolutionary movement. That is why the Gandhites, closely allied with landlordism and usurers' capital, try their best not to allow the movement of non-payment of rents in districts where landlordism prevails, or even in those places where the poor peasants dominate. In Bengal, Behar, and the United Provinces for instance, the Congress did not sanction anything beyond the non-payment of chaukidari (police) taxes. And when, in spite of their efforts to check the

agrarian movement, the Kishorigunj revolt took place, the national bourgeoisie appealed to the imperialists to suppress it without mercy.

Gandhism is the national reformism of the Indian bourgeoisie. It represents and safeguards the interests of the Indian capitalists and landlords. Standing between the masses and the revolution it tries to extend its influence among the masses by such slogans as national independence, united national front, removal of poverty and misery of the people, etc. It does so in order to strike a favourable bargain with British imperialism. In a revolutionary situation Gandhism frightens imperialism with the "horrors of revolution," and appeals for co-operation. Thus, for instance, said the "Hindustan Times," an organ of the Congress :

"Let England understand that if Mahatma Gandhi's movement fails, the situation in India would change for the worse as far as the British are concerned and even the present ray of hope of an honourable settlement would vanish into the darkness of a chaotic future.

"What has happened at Chittagong and what occurred at Karachi and Calcutta are indications of the coming whirlwind if British statesmen fail to be impressed by the sincerity of the Satyagraha movement. Let British statesmen co-operate with the Mahatma in avoiding that whirlwind, or else India will become not only another Ireland, but probably, what is worse, another Russia."

It is clear from this quotation for what Gandhism stands, viz., for preventing revolution, for betrayal of the masses and for compromise with imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie have taken the lessons of the Russian and Chinese revolutions to heart. Hence their warning to British imperialism, hence their attempts to disorganise the revolutionary revolt of the Indian workers and peasants.

The Indian capitalists love Gandhi as their own man. Of the several mass meetings organised by Indian capitalists in support of Gandhi, one was held in Bombay just after his arrest. The meeting protested against the arrest and demanded that the British Government come to terms with Gandhi as "the only man who represents the whole of India." The resolution passed by the meeting further said :

(By the arrest of Gandhi). "The Government have not only effectually destroyed the country's strongest guarantee for non-violent political agitation, but have also most effectively removed the one supreme check in the tendencies towards revolution which have already begun to be alarmingly noticeable in the country."

Gandhi not only attempts to save the Indian capitalists from revolution, but helps them in improving the conditions of the native textile

industry by leading a campaign of boycott of foreign cloth, demanding tariffs for the Indian industry and a favourable exchange rate of the rupee, etc. Boycott of foreign cloth is still the chief plank of the Congress programme. Congress volunteers are stationed to picket the shops dealing in foreign cloth. These pickets come into collision with the police as the British capitalists do not want to tolerate further blows to their already declining trade in India. Thus, Indian jails are filling with Congressmen who show themselves martyrs to the cause of Indian national freedom.

In consequence of the tremendous growth of the working-class movement during 1928-29, the Indian proletariat has travelled a long way on its road of development as an independent political force, as the prospective leader of all the anti-imperialist forces in the country. The Indian bourgeoisie were determined to fight with this new political force on the issue of hegemony in the national revolutionary movement. Therefore, they fought against the revolutionary vanguard of the Bombay proletariat, the Girni Kamgar Union. During the general strike of the Bombay workers in 1929, the National Congress made a united front with the imperialists and social reformists to break the strike and to smash the Girni Kamgar Union. Although the strike ended in defeat they could not break the union.

Later on, in 1930, when the full force of the economic crisis was felt in India and in virtue of the fact that 60-70,000 workers were thrown on the streets as unemployed in Bombay, the Congress bourgeoisie made another effort to disorganise and disrupt the Girni Kamgar Union. This time circumstances were favourable for them. The failure of the general strike had weakened the union. Unemployment had thrown many of its active members out of action. Imperialist repression had taken away its best leaders. Gandhi had launched his salt crusade and was making a show of a national revolutionary fight against imperialism, which had attracted the masses to the movement in which Gandhi and company held the hegemony. Instead of attacking the Red Flag Union as a whole, the Gandhists began to attack the Communist leadership with a view to isolating it from the rank and file. They organised a "labour week" in Bombay during which they

organised numerous meetings of workers, calling upon them to join the Congress in its alleged fight for national freedom. They spoke of the coming swaraj in which there would be no unemployment and no hunger as now. They condemned the Communist leaders as traitors to the cause of national freedom, as disrupters of the united national front, etc. They took the workers in lorries around the town and gave them good lunches.

By these tactics they succeeded in splitting the Girni Kamgar Union into two parts, one of which went over to them.

In its struggle for hegemony, the Indian bourgeoisie very profitably utilises the services of its pseudo-left-wing led by Jawaharlal Nehru, Bose, and others. These Gandhists appear among the workers, peasants and the revolutionary sections of the city petty bourgeoisie with their cleverly arranged masks of Socialism, revolutionary nationalism, etc. Jawaharlal, the "Socialist" (not hiding his hatred of Communists for their "evil deeds" in the Chinese revolution), would put forward a programme of qualified abolition of landlordism, abolition of peasant debts by partial compensation and improvement of the conditions of the working-class. Bose would even go so far as to agree to a plan of a national general strike "in order to frustrate the manoeuvres of the nationalist bourgeoisie to betray the cause of Indian independence by striking a bargain with British imperialism." (From the resolution adopted by the Executive Council of the All-India Trade Union Congress at Calcutta on November 18th, 1930).

A similar attempt may be recorded recently in the organisation of a "Punjab Socialist Party" by the national reformists under the auspices of the British Independent Labour Party. The "Socialist" Party was organised at the end of November, 1930, in Lahore, under the patronage of Brailsford. It has put forward the slogan of "Nationalisation of land" for which Brailsford was careful to point out the Party "would have to carry the fight to the councils and Legislative Assembly." Thus, "Socialism" and "nationalisation of land" are to be ushered in in India by the order of Lord Irwin or one of his successors and at the demand of the Indian bourgeois-landlords who dominate the councils and assemblies!

National reformism does its best to disorganise the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants and the city petty bourgeoisie with a view to put off the evil day (for it) of Indian revolution. But the revolution develops on the basis of the acute economic crisis. Gandhism is exposing itself and the treacherous masks of Nehru and Bose are being torn off in Kishorigunj and during other revolutionary campaigns of the workers and peasants.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS.

The economic starvation of the colonies is not a new thing. It is more or less a constant phenomenon (with certain exceptional periods) brought about by the contradictions between growing productive forces and imperialist policy of obstructing them. Whatever industry exists in the colonies (mostly textile) has to struggle against the tariff, exchange, banking and transport policy of imperialism which holds all the key positions in regard to these. Thus, we had an economic crisis in India long before the world economic crisis set in. It was on the basis of this crisis that the great working-class movement of 1928-29 developed.

The economic crisis in the capitalist countries gave an additional heavy blow to Indian economy. The colonies are linked up economically with capitalist imperialist countries as suppliers of raw material and as markets for manufactured goods. As a result of the crisis, prices of the primary raw products in the colonies fall, the purchasing capacity of the masses further decreases. An agrarian crisis sets in. The native industry suffers as in capitalist countries. The whole crisis is intensified and made more complicated by the imperialist policy of checking the growth of the productive forces.

Already in 1929, prices of the chief Indian products (jute, cotton, wheat and rice, etc.) had fallen on an average from 20% to 30%. The price of silver had also declined by 20% to 30%. Thus the peasantry was hit hard. But during 1930 the crisis went still deeper. Comparison of the figures for November, 1929, and July, 1930, shows that jute prices had fallen during this time (eight months) by 30%, wheat by 38%, cotton by 40% and rice and ground nuts by 14% and 20% respectively.

Jute, cotton, rice and wheat fell below the cost of production. To make matters worse, there have been abundant crops of these products this year. The price of jute, for instance, which plays a great role in Indian economy (the jute industry is the largest industry employing 360,000 workers) has declined to two-and-a-half to three-and-a-half rupees a maund (about 40 kilos), the cost price being six rupees per maund (that is about half as much as the cost price).

"Only about one-fourth of this year's production has been marketed so far at the price mentioned, and even if the ryot is fortunate enough to sell the whole of his crops at this price, the total loss to the jute cultivators will be about two hundred million rupees, which means the worst possible calamity to the peasant." (Bengali, 18/9/30.)

A severe fall has also occurred in the prices of manufactured jute goods. Bengal, which has the monopoly of jute production in India, exports annually about nine hundred million rupees' worth of jute and jute manufactures, "and if the same quantity is exported this year—a big assumption when there is a general trade depression throughout the world—Bengal stands to lose to the extent of about four hundred million rupees." (Bengali, 18/9/30.)

India produced in 1930 a bumper crop of wheat amounting to about ten-and-a-half million tons. The pre-war average was 9.58 million tons. During the four years, 1925-1929, India produced on an average only 8.72 million tons and was obliged to import wheat from outside as production was not sufficient for internal consumption. But the irony of the situation is that India imported wheat even in 1930 to the extent of about 100,000 tons, mostly from Australia, although she was at a loss to find a market for her own surplus wheat. Thanks to the imperialist tariff policy, Australian wheat sells cheaper in Calcutta than wheat from the Punjab. This is explained by the simple fact that freight rates from Punjab to Calcutta for a maund of wheat (19 annas) are much higher than freight rates for a corresponding weight of wheat from Australia to Calcutta (only 6 annas).

The crisis has also hit Indian industry badly. In Bombay, 60,000 to 70,000 workers are unemployed on account of many cotton mills having ceased to work. Some cotton and woollen mills in the North have also stopped

working, throwing several thousand workers on the streets. The jute mills work for three weeks in a month and five days in a week. Unemployment in the industry is growing. The tin-plate workshop in Golmuri (near the Tata Iron Works) has been closed down.

Trade has considerably declined. The returns of Indian sea-borne trade for the first six months of the year 1930-31 show a fall of 28% in the value of imports and 21% in exports compared with the corresponding period of the previous year. The share of Great Britain in the import trade fell during three months, April-June, 1930, to 41.6% from 44% in the same period the previous year.

The gross revenue receipts of the Indian railways fell from 1,046 million rupees in 1929 to 1,024 millions in 1930, and net revenue receipts fell from 375.1 million rupees in 1929 to 335.2 million rupees in 1930. A deficit of seventy million rupees is expected in the railway budget in the present year.

THE PEASANT MOVEMENT.

The peasants, already ground down in poverty by high rents and heavy indebtedness, have been reduced to utter misery on account of the catastrophic fall of prices of their products. They are unable to pay rents to the moneylenders. They starve. Hence the agrarian revolts developing all over the country.

In the middle of July, 1930, a widespread agrarian revolt occurred in Bengal, which was mainly directed against the moneylenders. (The total indebtedness of the cultivators in Bengal amounts to 1,000 million rupees. The official Bengal Provincial Banking Enquiry Committee gave some examples in their report of exorbitant rates of interest. For instance, for a loan of 1,000 rupees, a decree of 18,000 was issued. Interest on a loan of fifteen rupees made in 1923 came to 9,450 rupees in 1929.)

The revolt extended over an area of 200 to 500 square miles covering Kishorigunj and some other districts. The peasants attacked the moneylenders (who in some cases are also landlords), burnt their houses, destroyed the debt bonds and in case of resistance killed the moneylenders and their relatives. Police and military forces were sent, who fired at the peasants on several occasions. In some cases the police were obliged to retreat before the peasants.

Some of the government offices in the districts were looted by the peasants. The Indian bourgeoisie of the Congress demanded that the Governor of Bengal crush the revolt, and even criticised the Government for not taking sufficiently severe measures.

According to the latest news, the movement there has not stopped, but has been going on ever since. The "Bengali" (17/12/30) announces that though more than 6,000 peasants have been sent to prison, "in connection with the last disturbance, further molestation of the Hindus (landlords and moneylenders), up to murder and grievous assaults, are still going on. The Mahomedan tenants of their locality refused in a body to pay any rent to the Hindus (landlords). When this state of affairs was brought to the notice of the district magistrate, he at once started with the special police for the affected area and visited almost all the villages. Everywhere he assured the Hindus that they need not apprehend any further molestations and any such occurrence would be dealt with very strongly and warned the Mahomedan leaders of the consequences of not paying rent due to the Hindus."

Not only this particular paper, but all the Nationalist Press of the Congress describes the conflict as between Hindus and Mussalmans and not between landlords and moneylenders and the peasants. The fact is that in Bengal nearly all the landlords and moneylenders are Hindus and the peasants Muslims. In July even some of the Muslim landlords were killed and their property looted. But still the national reformists, dreading an agrarian revolution, preferred to call it a Hindu-Muslim conflict. They invite imperialism to come to their aid and save them from the agrarian revolution. The prospects are gloomy for them, as can be seen from the following quotation from "Liberty," the Congress organ of Calcutta :

"The price of jute will go on falling, the commodity will soon be had free for its removal. The ruin of the ryot will be complete. . . The tragedy of Kishorigunj will be enacted in every district of Bengal and neither Lord Irwin nor Gandhi will be able to prevent the wholesale non-payment of taxes and revenues brought about by sheer want, starvation and sickness."

"Ah ! If only Gandhi would save us for ever from the agrarian revolution ! But he cannot. Not only he, but the great Viceroy of mighty Great Britain cannot do that. How dreadful,

how wicked ! Soviet agents have brought Bolshevism to India." Thus cry the Indian bourgeoisie. Even Gandhi cannot deceive the masses forever.

The agrarian riots in Bengal are the results of the fall in jute prices. Similar riots are taking place in Burma on account of the decline in rice prices, in Berar on account of the fall of cotton prices.

In Burma a fierce armed struggle is going on between the peasants and the armed forces of imperialism. "The peasants are conducting a partisan guerilla warfare, and take refuge in the thick forests. Since the movement started about ten days ago, three hundred peasants have been killed, two hundred wounded and three hundred taken prisoners." (London "Times," 5/1/31.)

In Berar and Sind moneylenders were attacked and killed as in Kishorigunj. In the United Provinces, the Punjab and Behar, the agrarian movement is spreading. Peasants refuse to pay rents to landlords and the Government. Clashes between armed police and peasants are frequent. The Government is distributing leaflets among the peasants explaining that it was no fault of theirs that prices had fallen, it was the world crisis and the Congressmen who were to be blamed for this state of things.

Besides these agrarian riots which began recently and are developing more and more, there had been riots in the early part of the year in connection with the movement of "Forest Satyagraha" (so-called by the Congress). The peasants in tens of thousands went into the forests, let their cattle graze there, and cut down timber. The forests are Government monopoly and people are not allowed to graze cattle or cut wood without paying for it. The Congress inaugurated this movement of breaking forest laws in their own manner, that is, by non-violent means, but many conflicts, in some cases even armed clashes, took place between the police and the peasants.

At the beginning of the Gandhi movement, the Secretary of State for India declared to the satisfaction of the House of Commons, that "rural India was quiet." Even imperialism understands that Indian revolution will not come unless the peasant masses revolt. To-day they are revolting and as neither imperialism nor

national reformism can solve the agrarian crisis the revolt will go on spreading and developing. To quote again from "Liberty" of Calcutta (5/12/30):

"Hunger, the creator of revolutions, is abroad and stalking over the land with gigantic strides . . . In Bengal the peasantry and the labourers are on the verge of starvation. The same story of distress comes from the Punjab and the United Provinces. Bombay is on the crater of a volcano and look where we will, the same sinister signs of the coming storm stare us in the face."

Let the imperialists and bourgeois-landlords tremble before the coming revolution.

THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT.

By their heroic struggles fought in 1928-29 extending to the first part of 1930, the Indian workers gave a new orientation to the national revolutionary movement in general. It put an anti-imperialist stamp on the movement. The slogans "Down with Imperialism," "Long live revolution," etc., not only became common in the city, but penetrated to the villages as well. The peasants in many parts of the country also became acquainted with the working-class slogans "Long live Soviet India" and "Land to the peasants." This was clearly seen in the big peasant conferences held in the Punjab, the United Provinces and elsewhere. It was under the influence of the working-class revolutionary movement that the Red Shirts organisation with its slogans "Workers and Peasants of the World, Unite," and its symbol of the hammer and sickle was formed. It was the same influence which helped to crystallise the revolutionary wave of the petty bourgeois youth movement. Certain organisations such as Naujawan Bharat Sabha in the Punjab and the Nagpur Youth League, stood very close to the revolutionary proletariat.

The Congress national reformists observed the change. They were feeling it in the shape of merciless criticism directed against them by the Youth Leagues, peasants' conferences, etc., After the Delhi manifesto, they were condemned as agents of imperialism, traitors and so on. They had, therefore, to change their tactics. First of all, they passed the resolution of complete independence at Lahore and then the Gandhi crusade began.

The anti-imperialist movement of the masses spread very rapidly. It went beyond the control of the Gandhists, but they were clever

enough to stick on to it and not relinquish their hold. Gandhi said after Chittagong and Calcutta that "there was no going back this time." By their cleverness, combined with the strength of their organisation and the weakness of the political organisation of the working-class, they maintained their hegemony in the movement.

The working-class organisations were weak. The revolutionary trade unions were much reduced in strength. The Communist Party was still in the process of creation. The working-class set the ball (of the anti-imperialist movement) rolling, but it travelled at such a fast speed that they could not keep pace with it, and Gandhi was able to play with it.

The working-class did take active part in the movement, but under the hegemony of the Gandhists. They swelled Gandhi's demonstrations in Bombay, Karachi, Calcutta and other towns. They fought bravely with arms in their hands as in Sholapur, but still not as an independent political force. No doubt there were independent demonstrations led by Communists on Lenin Day, May Day, the Unemployed Day, Independence Day, etc., but these demonstrations did not play the leading role, they were eclipsed by the huge demonstrations organised by the National Congress.

The strength of the trade unions as a whole fell heavily during 1930. The figures for the total membership of the trade unions in the Bombay Presidency in March, 1930, were 144,409 as compared with 196,748 in December, 1929, and 200,325 in March, 1929. In March, 1930, the Girni Kamgar Union had only 800 paying members, while in 1929 its strength had risen to 80,000. We have already seen how the Gandhists attacked the union and disrupted it.

The strike figures show the same picture. In 1928, 506,851 workers were on strike, in 1929 531,059, and in 1930 there will be not more than 150,000.

We are, however, on the eve of a new general upheaval of the working-class of India. This time the growth of the proletarian movement promises to be on a higher level organisationally and politically.

The Communist Party of India at least seems to have emerged into existence. The programme of action which it has issued is a document of the highest importance for the coming Indian revolution. The Communist Party is

making it known without any ambiguity to the toiling masses that the leader of revolution is already there to guide the further course of the Indian revolution without allowing it to be betrayed by the national reformists. The Party is showing the workers, peasants, city petty bourgeoisie and semi-proletariat the correct way to reach their goal of destroying the imperialist feudal regime.

The working-class is again gathering strength to renew its class war against imperialism and Indian capitalism. New strikes are taking place in Bombay, Ahmedabad and Calcutta. The Executive Committee of the All-Indian Trade Union Congress which met at Calcutta on November 17th to 18th, passed a resolution in favour of a general strike all over India. Concrete tasks have been fixed to be carried out in the way of preparing for the general strike. The resolution passed by the Executive Committee further demands "the establishment of a workers' and peasants' republic" "land for those who till it" and condemns the Indian bourgeoisie for their policy of compromise with imperialism. All these demands, in spite of the serious fault in the resolution of not attacking the landlords in connection with the demands of the peasants, must have been very unpalatable for S. Bose (the bourgeois Congress leader who is also the President of the All-India T.U.C.) and his reformist friends. The fact that they were obliged to swallow it shows that the militant spirit of the working-class is at work. The resolution of the general strike was moved by Comrade Deshpande, the leader of the Girni Kamgar Union.

With the rising of the new tide of the workers' movement, the Indian proletariat will conquer not only the influence lost to the national reformists, but, under the leadership of its Party, will win the hegemony of the national revolutionary movement as well.

THE TERRORISTS.

The programme published by the Communist Party of India will help it to draw also to its ranks and round its banner that revolutionary stratum of the city petty bourgeoisie, which, finding that Gandhism leads to nothing but treachery and compromise, are engaged in terrorist attempts. The terrorists activities of these revolutionary youths have increased very

much during the year. Several police officers have been killed and others attacked, even the Viceroy was attacked and the Governor of the Punjab wounded. Many "conspiracy cases" have been and are continually being heard all over India. Extreme penalties of death, transportation for life and long years of imprisonment have been inflicted on revolutionary terrorists. There is also a panic among the police and government officials.

Besides this, discontent in the Indian troops is increasing. Several British officers were killed recently.

The forces of revolution are thus ripening. Peasants, workers, revolutionary petty bourgeoisie are all fighting and their fight is developing more and more.

THE ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE.

Imperialism and its allies are not blind to this fact. British imperialists, Indian feudal princes, landlords, representatives of the Indian Liberal bourgeoisie, "responsive co-operators" (the Right wing Gandhists) have been deliberating in London, sitting at a Round Table. They have been conspiring against the Indian toiling masses, against the Indian revolution.

It has been decided in the first place to create a Federative States of India in which the Indian princes will have their due share while preserving autonomy in their internal affairs. It is proposed to have a "Federal Assembly" at Delhi and an "Upper House" as well, and the "princes and people" to sit together in these "Houses" to decide the fate of the Indian masses. So under MacDonald's presidency, British imperialism is organising in India a centralised imperialist feudal regime on a scale never thought of before.

The National Congress outwardly mocked at the Round Table Conference. The Gandhists want to show that they have nothing to do with this unholy conspiracy. But in fact their hearts were there. Their unofficial spokesmen, who continued negotiations between Gandhi and the British Government took an active part in the whole affair.

Gandhi and the Nehrus are clever. They are playing a double game, namely, of compromise with imperialism, through their friends and a show of fight to deceive the masses. The more the proceedings of the conference come to light,

the more it becomes clear that a compromise between MacDonal and Gandhi is being arrived at. A compromise between the Nehru Constitution and the Simon scheme is being worked out in London.

CONCLUSION.

The Indian bourgeoisie will compromise and

their real physiognomy will be exposed to the masses. The anti-imperialist struggle of the masses will be continued on a higher plane under the revolutionary leadership of the vanguard of the proletariat. All the conspiracies of imperialism and bourgeois-landlords will be smashed by the coming Indian revolution.