

silk ribbon industry. As regards the Japanese textile industry which maintains offices in India, it is asserted by the Japanese Consul-General in Bombay, that they do not intend closing down the offices. The way in which the 20% import duty on Japanese goods is met is that the shipping companies **Nippon Yusen Kaisha** and **Osaka Shosen Kaisha**, have decided to cut the freight rates for cotton yarn and cotton goods to

Shanghai and **India** by one yen per ton, thus depriving **Lancashire** of the advantage that had been secured by forced preferential treatment.

The American bourgeoisie has declared its "sympathy for the Indian movement", while U. S. A. manufacturers have obtained a large number of orders from India for goods that hitherto been imported from **Great Britain**.

Problems of the Revolution in India.

By **Karl Radek**.

II. The National-Reformist and National-Revolutionary Camps in India.

During the first mass wave of the Indian revolution, in 1919 to 1922 the class division of forces was as follows: **English imperialism** was supported by the princes, the feudal landlords, the comprador bourgeoisie, the usurers, and the strata of the intellectuals belonging to these. In **opposition** to these were the industrial bourgeoisie, the handicrafts, the small tradespeople, the intellectuals belonging to these strata, the masses of the workers and peasants. The struggle carried on under the leadership of the nationalists, and especially of **Gandhi**, who advanced at that time for the first time into the arena of all India, was not a struggle for independence, but for the participation of the Indian bourgeoisie in the administration of the state, for its equal rights in competition with Englishmen for positions in the administration. In the sphere of economics, the movement was carried on under the slogan of a return to the past, to a primitive economy of commodities (Gandhi's propaganda for home weaving), but in reality the movement took the form of a struggle for the conditions under which Indian native industries were to develop. Socially, Gandhi's adherents advanced exceedingly indecisive demands for the improvement of the situation of the workers and peasants. They founded trade unions, in order to meet the growing demand for organisation among the masses, but attempted to impart to these unions the character of educational and philanthropic institutions, and to play the part of intermediary between the capitalists and the workers. When the masses of the workers and peasants began to refuse obedience, and to intensify the struggle against both English imperialism and against the Indian capitalists and landlords, the Gandhi party ceased its campaign, substantiating this step in very precise class terminology. In the resolution passed at **Bardoli** (January 1922) it confirmed its rejection of revolutionary force, and stated in so many words that the nationalist movement did not aim at destroying feudal exploitation, but at coming to a peaceful understanding with the feudal landowners in the question of lessening the burdens imposed on the peasantry.

Has the position thus adopted by national reformism changed in the period since the cessation of the struggle in 1922? No, as regards English imperialism it has not changed. The national reformists, who advanced in 1927 the slogan of independence, exchanged this in 1928 for the constitution proposed by the older Nehru, which retains India's dependence on England, and returned in 1929 once more to the slogan of independence. This change of slogans makes it apparent that for national reformism the slogan of independence is merely a trump in the struggle to gain concessions from English imperialism. And we see that Gandhi, after the slogan of independence had been accepted at the Congress at Lahore ("Young India", 30th January), supported, in the 14 conditions for the cessation of the struggle and the participation of the national reformists in the "Round Table Conference", among the political demands only the 50% reduction of the army and a like reduction of the salaries of the higher officials, the amnesty for political prisoners (with the exception of the terrorists), the cessation of political persecution, and the permission to carry weapons in self-defence.

Is there any change in the national reformist attitude toward the questions of the workers and peasants?

The growth of the peasant movement has forced national reformism to accord it more attention; whining articles appear in the press, describing the sorry situation of the peasantry; Gandhi's 14 demands include one for the 50% reduction of grounds rents, but as a rule the national reformists do not

go beyond the reformist demands for the alleviation of the position of the peasants. They regard the growing labour movement with ever increasing disapproval, at times take sides openly with the employers, and even support the measures taken by imperialism for the repression of the proletariat. The demands formulated in the programme of the younger Nehru, which demand "as far as possible" both the abolition of feudalism (compensation to be given) and the nationalisation of big industry accompanied by the eight hour day, are as characteristic of the real policy of the national reformists as Skobelyev's demand for a 100% confiscation of profits for the Mensheviks, and for the S.R. in the February revolution of 1917. With respect to fighting methods, the national reformists continue to oppose any revolutionary mass action, although Gandhi now speaks of **passive-aggressive** tactics. In his letter to Lord Irwin, the viceroy of India, a few days before the beginning of the salt campaign, Gandhi openly exposed his counter-revolutionary attitude:

"We all know" he declared, "that the influence of the party of violence is growing, even though at the moment it appears to be badly organised and insignificant. Its aims are the same as mine, but I am profoundly convinced that it is not in a position to bring help to the silent millions. I am more than ever filled with the consciousness that only the entire renunciation of the use of violence can overcome the organised force of the English government. My experience, limited as it is, has shown that the renunciation of the use of violence can be a great and active power. I am prepared to lead this power, both against the power of the British government and against the unorganised forces of the party of violence. To fold our hands would be tantamount to abandoning the field to these two powers."

We need not enter into Gandhi's declaration that his aims are identical with those of the "party of violence", for we do not know of what "party of violence" he speaks. What is important in his declaration is his announcement, **at the commencement of a fresh wave of revolutionary movement, of a fight on two fronts. We see that the fundamental political principles of national reformism have not changed since the day of betrayal at Bardoli. Every Indian communist must keep fresh in his memory the resolution of Bardoli, and Gandhi's declaration, based on the class situation of the industrial bourgeoisie and the well-to-do strata of the petty bourgeoisie. These are striving to lessen imperialist exploitation and the imperialist yoke, but they do not forget for a moment that they are living on the crater of the profoundest discontent of the workers and the pauperised peasant masses. When the earnest revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants begins, the national reformists will inevitably stand on the other side of the barricade, and not between imperialism and revolution. "You cannot quarrel with a communist any more than you can quarrel with a mad dog; therefore the Chinese government has resolved to exterminate them by thousands of executions"** — these words of the Indian industrialist Victor Sassun, an open adherent of imperialism, will be the programmatic slogan of the national reformists when the class war is in full swing. To have even the slightest doubt of this, after what we have seen in China, and to fail to prepare ourselves and the masses for this inevitable change of front on the part of the national reformists, would mean a frivolous and criminal abandonment to defeat of the workers and peasants. **The struggle against the national reformists, the struggle against Gandhism, is no less important a prerequisite for the victory of the Indian revolution than the struggle against English imperialism.**

(To be continued.)