

India

A Few Remarks on the Indian Communist Movement

By V. Basak

A number of facts bear witness to a new revival in the labour movement. The result of the class changes which have taken place in the past years is assuming a more clear and definite form. The bankruptcy of the policy of Gandhism and the policy of the National Congress has had its influence. The united joint national front advocated by Gandhi, Nehru, Karnik and Kandalkar with the millowners has suffered a breakdown. The bourgeois leaders of the National Congress, with the blessing of Gandhi, are hurriedly forming the **Swaraj Party** for participating in the legislative assembly. And in the towns and villages the workers and the peasants, driven off the land and thrown out of the mills and workshops, starving, fettered and betrayed by the leaders of the National Congress, are preparing and rising for further battles. Workers' strikes take place. Their number and size is growing. The proletariat is consolidating its ranks, the trade unions are growing and the united **Communist Party** has come out on the arena. These facts are of tremendous historical significance and they cannot be minimised by the fact that the Communist Party of India is still very weak and does not stand firmly on its feet.

(1) What Are the Next Steps in Building Up the Party?

The real and unconditional merging of all the Communist groups and individual Communists into a united monolithic Party, composed of **united**, consolidated local organisations, still remains the central, decisive task of the Indian revolution. In the present situation the **central link** which will decide the success of this task consists in giving support to the C.C. and consolidating all the groups and the individual Communists into a united Party organisation around the C.C. and under its leadership.

It would be a mistake if the comrades would concentrate now their attention on immediate convening of the All-India Party Conference. It is not from that end that the work now has to begin. The **most important** and the major organisational task of the Indian Communists at the present time is to **concentrate** their attention and energy upon the formation of local Party organisations and strengthening and consolidating the existing ones. This is the crux of the problem at present. The Communist Party of India has hardly any local Party organisations—it has very few cells, practically no section committees and city committees and very few normally functioning provincial committees. The local Party organisations have not yet taken definite organisational form; they usually represent small groups of active leaders of the workers' movement. In some places groups are created, but they represent nothing else but educational groups, who do not undertake the task of taking up all political problems and all tasks and questions concerning their particular mills, do not become the leading body of their mill. In these places, besides the above-mentioned educational groups, the whole membership is divided according to their trade. This is also not correct. Membership must be divided in mill groups and in some cases in chawls groups, and then combined in section organisations and then in city organisations. And in the trade union, Party fractions should be formed. The task at present is to reconstruct the ranks and to begin to establish groups (cells) in the mills and workshops and in chawls, form section committees, particularly in the large cities (Calcutta, Bombay, etc.), and also city and provincial committees.

It is necessary to commence to form a Party apparatus. At the same time it is necessary that the Party committees should direct and guide through nuclei in the mills and chawls and through Party fractions—in the mass organisations—all the mass work. The Party organisations in the mills or in new places must from the very beginning be formed secretly, and this must be **strictly observed** when sending Party comrades to work. The recruiting of members for the Party must be carried on through

the lower organisations (through the cells in the mills, with the further confirmation of the section or city committees). It is necessary to develop the leadership of Party units in mass struggles, strikes, etc. In the course of every strike Party units must **draw into the ranks of the Party the most active class-conscious workers and form factory cells from them**. In the course of preparing and carrying out strikes, thousands of workers must be recruited into the trade unions, and mill committees should be elected and set up. If the Communists had formed in the past mill Party groups (cells) then the factional struggle and the confusion would have never dragged out as long as it did in India. The lack of lower Party organisations also explains why the revolutionary trade unions and the leadership of strikes can so easily be broken up, thus depriving the workers of organisation and leadership, as has so often happened in Bombay, Sholapur, Calcutta, etc. Strikes and the mass struggles of the workers cannot seriously be developed and led if we keep on merely sending some leaders from the outside to lead the strike when the workers began the strike. The experience accumulated by the Indian comrades clearly shows that the way to preserve the leadership of strikes and keep up the ranks and morale of the workers is to send beforehand one or several active workers to the given place, locality or mill to carry on constant work, build and train in the mills groups of class-conscious workers, form Party organisations and organise open mass unions and mill committees.

Unless the C.P. of India forms in the mills Party cells and in the cities local Party organisations, it will not be able to attract thousands of active workers into its ranks, will not be able to conduct mass work and set up mass organisations (trade unions, mill committees, anti-imperialist league, etc.), will not be able to get the leadership of the masses, will not be able to wage successfully the struggle for partial demands, and, finally, will not be able to prepare the masses for the struggle for independence, for land, bread and power. It is also necessary to carry out the decisions of the Communist International on the formation of the Communist fractions in the management committees of the trade unions and other mass organisations, because without them the conduct of the correct policy, the harmonious, organised work of the Communists for winning over and strengthening the leadership in the hands of the Communist Party will not be attained.

It is just for that reason that the central task of the Communist Party and of all the Communists at the present time is to **concentrate** their efforts on the formation of new local organisations wherever these do not yet exist (and this is the case in a larger part of the country), and to strengthen and reconstruct the existing ones. This is the best and speediest way to create under the leadership of the C.C. a mass Communist Party.

(2) Mass Work, Strikes, the Peasant Movement and the Tactics of the United Front

The platform of action of the C.P. of India, the open letter of the three Communist Parties (1932) and the letter of the Chinese C.P. (1933) correctly formulated the need of everyday work among the workers and peasants. Persistent and energetic everyday work among the toiling masses, creation of mass organisations (trade unions, etc.), leadership in the anti-imperialist movement, leadership of partial strikes and peasant resistance to the oppression of landlords, moneylenders and government, the struggle for partial demands, are the **necessary conditions** for winning the **confidence** of the toiling masses and carrying out the preparation for a general strike and unmasking of the reformists. This is the path which helps to organise and mobilise the toiling masses for the struggle for power. Dissatisfaction with the National Congress and its reformist policy is spreading among

the workers and peasants. The National Congress is going through a crisis. The bourgeoisie again capitulated; it is actively disorganising the mass movement, is trying in every way to divert it into "parliamentary" channels and reformist activity. In this situation, when the revolutionary movement is growing and the bankruptcy of the policy of Gandhism became obvious, the task of the Communists consists of developing mass actions. The development of mass actions against the offensive of the employers and the imperialists will not only facilitate the growth of strength of the revolutionary movement, but will show the workers and toilers in general that there is a Party which fights for the interests of the toilers, fights not in words but in deeds, that there is a revolutionary way which will bring them to victory. The tactics of the reformists at the present time consist in restricting the struggle of the toiling masses. They try to explain their treacherous policy by putting blame upon the toiling masses, they claim the workers are not conscious, that they are passive. Talking in this way they at the same time try to concentrate the attention of the toilers to the parliamentary use of the slavish constitution.

The policy of the Communists is quite the opposite. The Communists put before themselves the task of developing the strike movement of the workers, organise and extend the peasant movement, of non-payment of taxes, rent and debts, and mobilise the toilers of town and country-side for the struggle against the constitution. While carrying out these struggles, the Communists will also propagate and mobilise masses to fight for the main slogans of the Platform of Actions. That is how the Communist Party will try to rouse the masses, lead them in struggle against the imperialists, crushing the influence of the reformists. Among the workers there is a desire to resist the attacks of the imperialists, there is a desire to organise and consolidate their ranks. The C.P. of India should take the initiative and develop mass actions, build up the Party and the mass organisations and in this way fight for the hegemony of the proletariat. The struggle for partial demands is an obligatory task for all times, whether that be during the period of reaction, or rise of the revolutionary movement. And it has to be connected with the work in the mills and formation of mass trade unions. So far it remains a weak spot in the Communist movement; for instance, the comrades in Bengal have not yet learned how to build mass organisations (trade unions, etc.), and how to combine the propaganda of our general slogans with the struggle for partial demands.

The C.P. of India in pursuing the course of developing mass actions (meetings, demonstrations, strikes, etc.) against the offensive of the millowners and the imperialists, acted correctly in putting forward the slogans for a general strike of the textile workers and a general strike of the railwaymen.

However, in conducting the preparations for these strikes and pursuing the line of converting them into political strikes, it would have been incorrect to counterpose them to the individual strikes in the individual mills or to renounce the latter under the pretext of the hopelessness of isolated actions. Such renunciation would only lead to passivity.

At the same time, the struggle for the masses and for consolidating the ranks of the proletariat under the banner of the Communist Party very sharply places now the question of the application of the tactic of the united front in the labour movement.

We must acknowledge the obvious fact that the agents of the bourgeoisie (Kandalkar, Ruikar, Karnik, Mehta, and others) and of the imperialists (Giri, Joshi, etc.) succeeded in splitting the labour movement. The struggle at the Nagpur and Calcutta congresses of the trade unions, the struggle in the Girni-Kamgar Union and the great India Peninsular Railwaymen Union undoubtedly took place on questions of principle, and the efforts of the followers of Roy to gloss over these facts are vain. However, in explaining these facts to the workers, we must acknowledge that the reformists had no great difficulty in carrying out their intentions to split the trade unions, and this fact undoubtedly shows that a number of tactical weaknesses and mistakes on the part of the revolutionary trade union movement was committed. This split was carried through by the liberal and national reformists in the interest of imperialism and the bourgeoisie. The workers are now spontaneously striving to consolidate their ranks in order to beat back the offensive of the exploiters. It is the duty of the Communists to take the lead and head the movement for consolidating the ranks of the workers and to point out to

them that real class unity of the proletariat is only possible on the platform of the class struggle. This has to be done while exposing the truly harmful policy of reformism. It is not so easy to prove this, because the reformists cover up their disruptive, treacherous activity by pseudo-revolutionary phraseology. In order to expose them the Communists must pursue a correct policy, carry on energetic day to day work among the masses, develop a genuine struggle for the interests of the workers, and also apply the tactic of the united front. The essence of the tactic of the united front consists precisely in this, that the Communists propose to carry on joint mass actions, **put in the forefront the development of mass actions.** Only while carrying on mass actions do the Communists make it possible and easier for the workers to see and to recognise in the practice of the class struggle that the Communists fight for the interests of the workers and that the reformists break up the defence of the workers' interests.

For this reason it is permissible and expedient for the class trade unions, particularly in the present situation, to come forward and propose to the reformist and national-reformist trade unions (only those which have masses) joint mass actions (strikes, etc.) against the offensive of the employers and imperialists. Still more, it is even permissible to address the National Reformist All-Indian Trade Union Congress, in the name of the Executive Committee of the Red Trade Union Congress, with proposals for joint mass actions on concrete issues. Such proposals should not be converted into negotiations of the leaders from above, but, on the contrary, should lead to the united front from below and facilitate the consolidation of the ranks of the workers around the programme of concrete actions: for instance, the preparation and actual realisation of the general textile strike. The tactics of the united front should not be confused with the question of trade union unity. The tactics of the united front means that mass organisations which are led or are under the influence of the C.P., appeal to the other mass organisations (led by the reformists, the national-reformists, or wavering elements) with the proposal for joint actions in a particular concrete situation.

The All-India Textile Conference which took place recently in Bombay showed that the national-reformists, under the pressure of the workers, were compelled to talk about strikes and unity. They tried to eliminate the workers from the leadership of strikes and artificially maintain control in the hands of a small group of self-styled "leaders." Demonstrating in that way their anti-proletarian essence. The class trade unions acted correctly in taking part in the conference and placing sharply the question of **electing** the central strike committee and in setting up **elected** strike committees in every mill and in every town. That is one of the concrete methods to help the workers to understand the harmful policy of the Left national-reformists and how it differs from a proletarian policy which aims to develop the initiative of the rank and file and the formation of mass organisations rooted in the masses.

The tactic of the united front does not mean peace or armistice with the reformist leaders, does not mean conciliation with reformism, but, **on the contrary**, it should lead to a more persistent and concrete exposure of the harmful essence of national reformism. If, during the period of a joint strike, the class trade unions took upon themselves the obligation to cease the attacks against the leadership of the reformist trade unions which participate in the strike, it does not mean that the class-conscious workers should for a moment cease their struggle against reformism and refrain from defending the revolutionary policy, or refrain to put forward and explain to the workers their suggestions how to carry on strikes, or refrain in case some suggestions of the reformists are wrong to explain to the workers why it is wrong and how it differs from the suggestions of revolutionary workers and why and how the workers should give support to the suggestions of the revolutionary workers. This still more applies to the C.P. of India, which did not even formally participate in this agreement and did not take any obligations upon itself. The duty of the C.P. of India precisely is this: clearly and concretely explain the harmful essence of national-reformism and at the same time carry on the defence of the interests of the workers.

We should not be confused and mix up the reformist leaders and the reformist organisations. We must win over the rank and file of the reformist trade unions. Our task is to defeat the disruptive policy of the reformists and to point out its bourgeois essence. The application of the tactic of the united front helps to achieve this. Still more in the course of the mass actions

(strikes, for instance), it is permissible to raise the question of uniting some of our parallel trade unions and the reformist trade unions into joint trade unions, under the condition that this unification shall take place from below, that the election of the management committee of the trade union shall be made by the workers—delegates from the mills—and that the advanced workers shall have the right to bring forward before the workers their proposals and defend them.

The C.P. of India, the relentless and uncompromising enemy of national reformism in all its shades, is not afraid of the unification of some parallel trade unions, and is convinced that by its policy and daily work it will succeed in winning over the workers for the revolutionary class policy, for the programme of action of the C.P. of India. The unification of parallel trade unions does not mean at all that Communism is making peace with national reformism, with the Roy group, etc.; it only facilitates for the workers understanding the difference between Communist policy and reformist policy.

At the same time, the exposure of the harmful essence of the Ruikar-Roy-Karnik-Mehta and others should be done by explaining both their general wrong political views and the true character of their practical everyday activity. For here, in the struggle for the daily interests of the workers, the only correct policy and the only force which is capable of safeguarding the interests of the workers is the Communist Party and the class trade unions. It is necessary to smash the lying propaganda of Karnik-Roy-Kandalkar, etc., when they say that the Communists do not carry on a day-to-day struggle. We must explain to the workers that this lying accusation that the Communists are sectarians is only a trick of the Roy group which aims to cover up their policy of economism, which is exactly the essence of Karnik-Roy-Kandalkar Menshevik policy.

(III.) The Alliance of the Working Class and the Peasantry, the Hegemony of the Proletariat and Anti-Imperialist League

The questions pertaining to the character and the main tasks of the Indian revolution—the hegemony of the proletariat, the alliance of the working class and the peasantry, and the working-class leadership of the anti-imperialist movement, are extensively discussed in the revolutionary movement.

In India there are three camps; first, the camp of imperialism, which consists of the imperialists, feudal princes, landlords, usurers, and the compradores; second, national reformism, which consists of the national bourgeoisie, the liberal landlords, and the upper stratum of the petty bourgeoisie; third, the camp of the revolution, which consists of the proletariat and the peasantry, and which can draw to its side broad masses of the urban petty bourgeoisie in the struggle against imperialism.

The reformist policy of the bourgeoisie is explained not only by its connections with the landlords and the usurers and the interests of Indian capital, but also by its fear of the approaching people's revolution and the growing strength of the proletariat. It is incorrect to say that in the critical moment the bourgeoisie only withdrew from the leadership and in that passive way betrayed the movement, because the bourgeoisie, as a matter of fact, not passively but actively helped to smash the actions of the people. All recent facts show that the national bourgeoisie, capitulating to imperialism, refused to conduct a revolutionary struggle against it. The Indian bourgeoisie opposes a genuine struggle for independence, for clearing away all the feudal debris and developing the productive forces of the country. It is only the proletariat in alliance with the peasantry that can do this, and this ought to be explained to the toilers and the petty bourgeoisie. We must acknowledge that Gandhism is a bourgeois ideology, notwithstanding a number of statements about charka, etc. It would be incorrect to say that Gandhism is the ideology of reactionary feudalism or that Gandhism is the ideology of the petty bourgeoisie. Gandhism was always for "Swadeshi" and for all kinds of small democratic reforms. The practice of Gandhism still more sharply emphasises the bourgeois character of its "philosophy" and its policy. A correct analysis of Gandhism is necessary in order to expose the policy of the National Congress, the Left wing of the Congress—Nehru, Bose, and their agents, Kandalkar, Roy, Karnik, and Co.—who try to hide the bourgeois character of Gandhism. The Left national-reformists, Nehru, Bose, etc., represent the interest of the bourgeoisie and of the capitalist development. They use the upper stratum of the petty bourgeoisie to penetrate and spread their influence among the toiling masses. Representing the sentiments of the most determined sections of

the industrial bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia, insisting upon more serious concessions from the imperialists, Left national reformism fulfils now on the side of the bourgeoisie the most important function, because, covering itself with pseudo-radical phraseology and pseudo-socialist demands, it serves the cause of subjecting the toiling masses to the leadership of the bourgeoisie and disorganises the development and the preparation of the anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution. Therefore the task of exposing Left national reformism assumes a great importance. Together with it a struggle against Roy's conception of the proletariat must be carried out in a sharpest form. According to the views of Karnik, Roy, and Co., the working class of India has not sufficiently developed to understand the big political tasks and cannot wage the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat. Karnik, Roy, Shetty, and Co. assert that in India, China and other colonial countries the proletariat has not reached the level of development attained in the capitalist countries, and with this is connected their policy of subordinating the working class to the leadership of the bourgeoisie. This assertion of Karnik and his followers is a slander against the proletariat.

It is sufficient to recall the experience of China, the proletariat of which is showing an example to the workers in the advanced capitalist countries, in order to understand that the theory of Roy does not correspond with reality.

According to Roy, Karnik, etc., the development of the proletariat depends only upon how many years of capitalist development have gone on in the country and how the productive forces have developed. Such an approach is entirely wrong and harmful. In order to get a correct idea about the level of class consciousness of the proletariat we must take into account the history and the experiences of the class struggle. The Indian proletariat, mercilessly oppressed by the imperialists, the landlords, and the Indian capitalists, has for many years been conducting a desperate struggle. The Indian proletariat was in the front ranks in the anti-imperialist movement. The Indian proletariat has gone through the great school of the class struggle (strikes, economic and political as well) and verified the position of the various classes and their political organisations from its experiences. Facts show that the level of class consciousness of the Indian proletariat is not low and that there are all the prerequisites for rapid creation of a mass Communist Party, that there are objective conditions to carry the struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat.

The Karnik-Roy-Shetty group denies the hegemony of the proletariat. Roy has always in the past and now as well continues to replace the hegemony of the proletariat with the hegemony of the three classes—the urban petty bourgeoisie, the peasantry, and the proletariat—which in reality means the hegemony of the bourgeoisie. He pursued this line in China. In his book on China he openly wrote about the Chinese revolution as follows: "Inasmuch as the revolution still relies upon a coalition of classes and has not got a pure proletarian character, the proletariat cannot become the sole leader of the revolution." History laughed at the renegade. The Roy group is conducting the same policy in India, and in doing so covers up and strengthens the position of the bourgeoisie. Based on this conception and spreading disbelief in the strength of the proletariat, Karnik, Shetty, Kandalkar, Roy, and Co. systematically carry out the line of forming a Left national party inside or alongside of the National Congress.

Roy, Karnik, and their followers claim that the working class cannot and should not try to take upon itself the leadership of the masses of the people, the leadership of the anti-imperialist struggle, etc.—for this purpose—they say—a Left national party should be formed to lead the people, and the proletariat should be the Left wing of this party.

The C.P. of India must fight against such ideas and expose the bourgeois character of this group.

The struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat is now the basic question; however, one should not understand it in a mechanical or simplified manner.

Hegemony—that is the leadership by the proletariat of the peasantry and the toiling masses as a whole—can be achieved only in the course and as a result of the class struggle. The Communist Party can establish the hegemony of the proletariat when it shows in practice that it deserves to be the leader of the toiling masses and when the masses recognise it as such. It is necessary to agitate not only in words and slogans, but above all by mass actions, which will serve as examples of the proletarian

forms of struggle (strikes, etc.). The hegemony of the proletariat can be won only when there is a mass Communist Party. Without a mass Communist Party which actively and openly (leaflets, mass actions, etc.) comes out before the masses, the leadership over the people's movement cannot be won.

By its programme, by its slogans, the C.P. of India consolidates the struggle of the workers and the peasants. By its daily work among the workers and peasants, by its initiative and its practical organisational activity among the workers, the peasants and other toilers, by its ability to lead the battles of the workers and peasants against the imperialists, the landlords, the mill-owners, by its ability to lead the masses during an offensive and during a retreat, by its ability to change the slogans and forms of struggle in accordance with the changed concrete situation, by its ability to evolve proletarian forms of struggle (for instance, strikes, political strikes, general strikes, etc.), the C.P. of India will be able to win, to establish its leadership. Only in this way will the C.P. of India be able to give leadership to the peasant masses, be able to establish the hegemony of the proletariat. In brief, the setting up of hegemony, i.e., the leadership of the proletariat through the Communist Party, can only be done when the Communists and the Party will be in the forefront of all actions, of all movements, and will not entrust this to other organisations, and will not think that the solution of this task is to find out some open organisation which will substitute the Party in the given field of mass activity. For the development of mass struggles the Communist Party must create mass organisations (trade unions, peasant committees, the anti-imperialist league, committees of action, etc.). The C.P. must develop the most varied forms of activities and organisations and be able to change some of them when conditions are changed. The C.P. must always utilise the legal forms of organisation and activity, and all the time the Party should not hide its face. During strikes, besides the trade union leaflets, the C.P. should get out leaflets in the name of the Party committees and organisations. The winning of the hegemony of the proletariat, the development of the anti-imperialist struggle and the formation of a bloc of anti-imperialist forces should not be regarded as something which amounts only to the formation of an anti-imperialist league to which the Communist Party would entrust the struggle for independence. It cannot be achieved by means of organisational schemes, regarding them as the means to get out from isolation from the masses. The correct approach consists in practical everyday activity and in the development of mass struggles and the creation of Party and various mass organisations. For instance, it would have been correct to take the initiative in organising a mass protest movement against the draft constitution. If the C.P.I., through the revolutionary trade unions, would have appealed to the other trade unions with the proposal to join and organise mass protest actions against the constitution, would have set up committees of action applying the tactics of the united front and through the committees of action would have appealed to the peasant, youth and other organisations, calling upon them and Congress rank and file to join the movement and to send their delegates to the committees of action and in that way develop a mass movement (conferences, meetings, demonstrations, strikes, etc.), right up to the general political strike, linking up this movement with the struggle of the textile workers, **then this would have been a real way to fight for the hegemony of the proletariat**, to build a bloc of anti-imperialist forces, create open platforms, to demonstrate the role of the Communists and leading role of the proletariat and build a mass Communist Party. This example clearly explains the correct idea how to approach correctly the problem of winning the leadership in the anti-imperialist movement. The formation of an anti-imperialist league is not in contradiction to this and it is advisable that it should be organised as one of the forms of the mass movement. However, it would be incorrect if, in the opinion of the Communists, the league should claim to have the monopoly of the organisational expression of the bloc of anti-imperialist forces. It would also be incorrect if the league were to supplant the Communist Party, and be a replica of a Communist Party and would have commenced to form its league fractions in the mass organisations. Such an idea of an anti-imperialist league would not only hold back the development of the Communist Party, but would also develop a sectarian line in the anti-imperialist movement. The task of the Communists is to take upon themselves the initiative in converting the league into a broad, mass organisation, and at the same time increase their

work for the formation of a mass Communist Party and for the formation of Communist fractions in all the organisations of the toilers, both of the permanent (like the league) as well as of the temporary (like committees of action) type.

It is also advisable to form local legal workers' parties or workers' leagues. These organisations, being one of the forms of the legal mass workers' movement, can play a useful role for the defence of the interests of the proletariat, for the dissemination of revolutionary Marxism, the development of the Communist Party and the widening of a mass movement. However, this will depend on the class content which will be put into them, i.e., it will depend upon Communists alone. If they (the Communists) would succeed to pass a class programme, give them (the workers' parties) a genuine mass character, draw them in active participation in the mass movement, if the Communists would form fractions inside and get the leadership and spread their influence—then it could be useful. In brief, the useful role of the local workers' parties entirely depend upon the work of the Communists.

What has been said with regard to the anti-imperialist bloc and the role of the anti-imperialist league is also correct with regard to the alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

Apart from the Communist cells in the mills and chawls, the C.P. of India should form in the villages Party groups and build mass peasant organisations, peasant committees, etc., and also work in the existing peasant organisations, vigorously advocating the tactics of the united front. The alliance of the proletariat and the peasantry and the hegemony of the proletariat can be won only on condition that the Communists conduct vigorous work in the villages, wage a persistent struggle for the everyday interests of the peasantry as well as agitate for the fundamental slogans of the agrarian revolution.

Thus proletarian hegemony can be won only when the Communists learn to make use of and to combine the various forms of the movement, quickly react on all facts of oppression and all manifestations of the class struggle, will learn to organise and lead the mass struggles, correctly combining open and underground forms of organisation, fighting against sectarianism as well as against opportunism.

While considering the question of the hegemony of the proletariat the Indian Communists correctly take into account the difference between the bourgeois-democratic and the proletarian revolution and correctly state that in order to solve the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution it is necessary to approach them from the point of view of the future struggle for socialism. The future struggle for a socialist path of development in India will be accompanied by a most severe class struggle, not only against the counter-revolutionary attacks of the imperialists, but also in the struggle against the bourgeoisie and kulaks, and can be successfully carried out only when the dictatorship of the proletariat is established.

The Roy group shows its anti-revolutionary, anti-socialist character on the question of the character of the revolution and its perspectives as well. In his book on China Roy clearly described his conception of the tasks of the Chinese revolution, which he and his followers now repeat with regard to India:—

"The immediate perspectives of the Chinese revolution are not in socialism, but in non-capitalist development, and this means that the economic development which prepares the transition to socialism can take place in China with the **help of capitalist methods**. . . . The perspectives of the Chinese revolution do not deny the necessity of **economic development which will be more or less similar to the development of other countries in the capitalist system**. In China there must be attained a certain level of economic development in which all the methods of production existing in the capitalist system will be applied."

This whole conception signifies nothing but the perspectives of capitalist development, the struggle for the interests of Indian capitalism. Roy, Karnik and Co. propose for India as well a path of peculiar capitalist development, saying that it will go without capitalist exploitation (?), advocating a transitional stage of the capitalist development of the productive forces before the struggle for socialism could be started. Without this stage of development of the productive forces, the working class, according to the opinion of the Roy group, is not in a position to attain hegemony at present because it has not yet matured to the understanding of the big political tasks, and for this reason Roy recommends that the workers should submit to the leadership of the Left

national party. Roy and his followers strive in every way to subordinate the proletariat to the leadership of the bourgeoisie.

The Communist Party must expose all the national reformist groups which conceal their bourgeois and petty bourgeois essence behind pseudo-socialist phraseology and point out that they are anti-revolutionary and anti-proletarian, not only because they fight against socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also because they disrupt and disorganise (and **this is the most important thing to be explained in our mass agitation at the present time**), the struggle of the toiling masses for independence, land, bread, and power. The reformists disorganise the strikes and the development of mass revolutionary of the working class and the peasantry against imperialism and the landlords and strive to preserve and to fortify the positions of the bourgeois National Congress. The Communists must point this out to the masses, not only taking up the questions of general principles, slogans, and theory, but especially analysing and explaining their practice in the everyday struggles.

CONCLUSION

The perspectives of the future revolutionary struggle are inseparably linked up with the obligatory tasks of persistent, everyday preparing, educating and mobilising the masses at the present time. And this means that at the present time the task of developing everyday struggles, the resistance of the workers against the attacks of the employers, the protest movement of the masses of the people against the constitution, the peasant movement against pressure and ruination at the hands of the imperialists, the landlords, and usurers must be pushed into the foreground. This also means that at the present time it is necessary to concentrate our attention upon strengthening and building up the Communist Party, and creating mass organisations—factory committees, trade unions, peasant committees, etc.

The persistent mobilisation of the masses, the creation of proletarian organisations, the combination of partial struggles with agitation for the general demands in the programme of action of the C.P.I., and popularising all this as widely as possible among the workers and peasants—this is the only serious way to prepare for the direct struggle for power. And this must not be forgotten. This must be placed in the forefront of all Party work.