

# **SPECIAL NUMBER**

**English Edition.**

**Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint**

# **- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE**

Vol. 8 No. 78

8<sup>th</sup> November 1928

**Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schliessfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.**

## **SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.**

(FULL REPORT.)

### **Thirty-eighth Session.**

Moscow, 20th August 1928.

## **Continuation of the Discussion, and Concluding Speeches on the Colonial Questions.**

**Comrade PADI (Chairman):**

Comrades, I now declare this session open and we will continue the discussion of the theses of Comrade Kuusinen.

**Comrade BUNTING (South Africa):**

Comrades, I should like to have spoken on colonial or at least on South African matters in general but must confine myself to a controversial matter seriously affecting our South African Party.

There is a proposal in the Negro Sub-Commission that the Party should put forward as its immediate political slogan "an independent native South African Republic, as a stage towards a workers' and peasants' republic with full safeguards and equal rights for all minorities"; that the country and land be returned to the black population; and that a native revolutionary movement be developed by the Party.

This formulation is opposed by the majority of our Party, mainly for practical reasons. But we may first consider the more theoretical basis of the formula. This is stated in a draft resolution submitted to the Sub-Commission as follows:

"The national question in South Africa, which is based upon the agrarian question, lies at the foundation of the revolution in South Africa."

According to our experience, it seems possible to harp too exclusively on the national chord in colonial matters. In an earlier debate, I ventured the opinion, that it might not be so universally true that the chief function of a colonial people was to engage in a national struggle (predominantly agrarian in character) against foreign imperialism and for independence; and that in South Africa, at any rate, the class struggle of the proletariat (chiefly native) appeared more capable of accomplishing the same task.

It is often said that the colonial thesis of the II. Congress is authority to the contrary, but I do not find anything to that effect in the thesis. It says, of course, that we should "support the revolutionary movement among the subject nations and in the colonies" — "the form of support to be determined by a study of existing conditions". And it also says

"there are to be found in the dependent countries two distinct movements, one is the bourgeois democratic nationalist movement with a programme of political independence under the Congress order, and the other is the mass action of the poor and ignorant peasants and workers for their liberation from all forms of exploitation. The former endeavours to control the latter, but the C. I. and the Parties affected must help to develop class consciousness

in the working masses of the colonies. For the overthrow of foreign capitalism, which is the first step towards revolution in the colonies, the co-operation of the bourgeois nationalist revolutionary elements is useful. But the first and most necessary task is the formation of Communist Parties which will organise the peasants and workers and lead them to the revolution and to the establishment of Soviet Republics . . ."

That is so even when there is a bourgeois democratic nationalist movement in existence, and bourgeois nationalist revolutionary elements to co-operate with. Until recently, nearly all subsequent Communist theory on colonial revolution has been based on the assumption that such a movement and such elements are in existence in every colony; the present draft colonial thesis is one of the first to deal on a different basis with colonies, like most African colonies, where such elements do not exist.

In African colonies there is as a rule no native bourgeoisie, and consequently no question of the "two distinct movements": there is only the question of "organising the peasants and workers and leading them to the revolution and to the establishment of Soviets".

Put in another way, the class struggle is here practically coincident and simultaneous with the national struggle. The object is the same in each case — the removal of all oppression and the gaining of liberation and power for workers and peasants; the parties are substantially the same, and the weapons and methods of the struggle also. Hence, there is no very great point or virtue, even where there is no exploited European class present (as there is in South Africa) in emphasising the national aspect of the struggle as more fundamental than the class aspect; rather the reverse is the case.

Now a further complication arises in South Africa from the presence of a white exploited working and peasants class as well as a black one — a small minority, but one which also rises against the bourgeoisie and imperialists, sometimes in a very spirited and revolutionary way, more so indeed than any modern native national movement hitherto, although it has no racial oppression to fight against.

The South African native masses, in their turn, are being rapidly proletarianised and organised as a working class. The native agrarian masses as such have not yet shown serious signs of revolt: indeed, as the theses say:

"In these countries the question of the agrarian revolution does not by far constitute the axis of the colonial revolution."

At any rate a live agrarian movement has still to be organised in South Africa.

The draft colonial theses in reference to South Africa and other colonies says: (paragraph 12)

"The most important task here consists in the joining of the forces of the revolutionary movement of the white workers with the class movement of the colonial workers, and the creation of a revolutionary united front with that part of the native national movement which really conducts a revolutionary liberation struggle against imperialism."

But this task is no longer so easy. It is no longer a mere case of the national and the class movements coinciding as it were automatically. Here the white exploited are of the very race against which the native exploited as nationalists, are fighting. It is almost inevitable therefore that the nationalist movement of the natives will clash with their class movement. Similarly the white exploited, finding their race being attacked as such by a native nationalist movement, are predisposed by their superior economic and political position to side with the masters nationally and forget their class struggle. Special tactics have to be adopted to prevent this and to harmonise the national and the class movements in this special case, devoted principally to neutralising and correcting white labour chauvinism.

Not only have we no native bourgeoisie or bourgeois nationalist movement, but we have in South Africa no really nationalist movement at all of the kind contemplated in the draft resolution of the Negro Sub-Commission; certainly no movement for a native republic as such has been observable. The African

National Congress, which the resolution wants us to boost up, is a moribund body, it has had its day. In any case its demands were not nationalist demands proper, but such as the following: removal of all special race oppression and discrimination, land and more land, equality with whites, equal votes, equal education, equal justice, equal treatment, rights and opportunities everywhere. It has usually sought redress for grievances by sending deputations to the King of England, which of course have resulted in nothing. We believe the class stimulus is a greater stimulus even to the native masses, it has actually stimulated greater sacrifices and devotion already, and it has the advantage of gaining, instead of perhaps forfeiting, the alliance of the white workers. The C. P. is itself the actual or potential leader of the native national movement; it makes all the national demands that the national body makes, and of course much more, and it can "control" nationalism with a view to developing its maximum fighting strength. It can and will respond to the entire struggle of all the oppressed of South Africa, natives in particular.

Some reference to the actual work of our Party seems necessary to explain the foregoing.

Our work among the native masses, our chief activity, conducted so far mainly as a working class movement (although an agrarian movement will be developed as far as we can get contact especially with the distant and not easily accessible native reserves) is limited only by ability to cope with it. We have 1,750 members of whom 1,600 are natives, as against 200 a year ago, and we are adding to that and also rapidly organising militant native trade unions which have learnt to conduct strikes. We are also combating and slowly overcoming white labour chauvinism, which we find yields when confronted face to face with organised masses of native fellow workers. We have carried through joint strikes of white and black workers which were victorious, also an amalgamation of white and black unions into one, an unprecedented thing in South Africa. As for the native nationalist movement, we pay it a good deal of attention and whenever we see any life in it we apply United Front tactics. Thus, after years of preparatory effort, we have recently begun to reap substantial success which will continue provided we can find the man power to garner the harvest. Native workers and some peasants are pouring into the Party in preference to joining the purely native bodies, which have let them down and fallen into the hands of the bourgeoisie. They see that the C. P. sincerely and unreservedly espouses their national cause as an oppressed race.

Such are the circumstances in which a native republic slogan would be launched, and we consider it would not in theory perhaps, but certainly in practice, arouse white workers' opposition as being unfair to the minority, and this would not only intensify the contradiction between national and class movement, but put the whole native movement unnecessarily at a great disadvantage. It would not avail, when such suspicions are aroused, to put them off with smooth, "empty liberal phrases", to the effect that "national minorities will be safeguarded", especially when no definition is given of these safeguards. Expressions like "South Africa is a black country", "the return of the country and land back to the black population", "South Africa belongs to the native population", etc., though correct as general statements, do invite criticism by the white working and peasant minority who will have to fight side by side with the black workers and peasants if the bourgeoisie is to be overthrown. They certainly seem to indicate a black race dictatorship: they either are an exaggeration or they are calculated to be generally understood as one. If the white working class feels, from the apparent exclusiveness of the phrase "native republic", that the intention is to ride roughshod over it, it will say, rightly or wrongly: "Under a native government built on a nationalist or racial foundation and thus biased against whites, any "safeguards of the white workers and peasants would go to the winds at the first clash." And as regards disposal of the land, the draft resolution does not even speak of safeguards. As the slogan will certainly be interpreted by the exploited whites, it means that the exploited whites are to become in their turn a subject race, that the native republic in spirit, if not in letter, will exclude all whites, and that the land without exception will belong to the natives. The slogan will have to be redrafted on less nationalist lines if it is to avoid giving that impression.

Of course, no one denies that the immense majority must and will exercise its power as such, from which it follows that

a minority of the exploited is also entitled to its proportionate voice and share in power and land. The "native republic" is defended, indeed, as a mere expression of majority rule, but it obviously goes beyond that, and the little difference makes all the difference, it handicaps propaganda, when it comes to combating white chauvinism.

It is certainly strange that we of the C. P. S. A., who are accustomed at home to work almost exclusively among and for the native masses, and who are always attacking white chauvinism, should find ourselves obliged here to take up unwonted cudgels for the white minority. But the reason is, first the need for labour solidarity, and secondly, a true valuation of the forces at our disposal. Our infant native movement lives and moves in a perpetual state bordering on illegality; on the slightest pretext it can be suppressed either by prosecution or legislation or by massacre or pogrom. We are therefore always looking for allies, or rather for shields and protections behind which to carry on; and even the bare neutrality, much more the occasional support, of the white trade unions, etc. is of incalculable value to us. It undoubtedly helps us to avoid being driven underground, which in a country like South Africa would make our work almost impossible, and besides, in a political agitation for liberation of the mass of the people publicity is a very valuable weapon. We have always instinctively felt this need of white labour support, but it is only when threatened by this slogan with the loss of it, that we realise how very useful it is to us, and how impossible it is to agree with the defenders of the slogan who say "To hell with white labour support, damn the white workers". We who have had all these years to work in both camps, black and white, who have learned the art of going it on uncompromising Marxian lines by long and hard experience of the enormous difficulties arising out of this very race question, the crucial question of South African labour — on a matter like this we must be heard. We say that the white workers are unquestionably going to be alienated by the present slogan and that instead of support from white labour we are thus quite likely going to get its hostility and Fascist alliance with the bourgeoisie. This in turn will also encourage the government to prosecute and the courts to convict everyone who preaches the slogan. Indeed a further sequel may be violent race hostilities, a bloody struggle for mutual extermination or subjection between whites and blacks as races, and what is worse, between the white exploited and the black exploited, a struggle in which the class struggle is completely obscured and forgotten, and in which the unarmed side courts defeat.

Our present policy is endorsed by good authority. The amendment of the C. P. S. U. to the E. C. C. I. theses of Comrade Bukharin for instance says:

"53. the Congress observes a growth of Communist influence in South Africa. The Congress imposes the obligation upon all Communists to take up as their central tasks the organisation of the toiling Negro masses, the strengthening of Negro trade unions and the fight against white chauvinism. The fight against foreign imperialism in all forms, the advocacy of complete and absolute equality, strenuous struggle against all exceptional laws against Negroes, determined support for the fight against driving the peasants from the land, to organise them for the struggle for the agrarian revolution, while at the same time strengthening the Communist groups and Parties — such must be the fundamental tasks of the Communists in these countries."

There is nothing here about a "native Republic".

In the draft C. I. Programme there is also nothing about a native republic. But a direction to imbue the colonial masses with the idea of the independence and hegemony of the working class and to advance and at the proper moment apply the slogans of Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Republics.

After long consideration and having heard all that is said for the draft resolution, and in view of the special complications conditioning Communist progress in South Africa, we are at present, while standing for proletarian equality and for the fullest majority rights, against the creation of any special nationalistic slogan for South Africa, except of course the liberation of the native people from all race oppression and discrimination, and separation from the British Empire.

### Comrade RAZA (India):

Comrades, the colonial world today cannot be classed as isolated from the rest of the world. These countries are drawn into closer touch with the rest of the civilised world thanks to the international character of capitalism.

Owing to their world-wide inter-relations and economic inter-dependence, all that could have been termed strictly as national some years back is today international. When discussing the international movements, we have to make this Universal Law of Independence our main starting point and lack of the spirit of this law is, unfortunately, a shortcoming of the theses.

The colonies cannot be an exception to this universal economic law. It is true that the economic development of the colonies is extremely slow and it has viciously been retarded by foreign domination. But still they are drawn into the present world economic system as an integral part of the international capitalist world, through its imperialist policy. The imperialists, while practically putting an end to the feudal system in the colonies, have been purposely supporting the few feudal remnants and the landed aristocracy, they have created a class of the native bourgeoisie, as without it it was impossible to hold sway over these colonies. But the native bourgeoisie have to be put under permanent control so that they should not grow into a rival power to the foreign intruder; hence the support of the feudal remnants and vice versa, such is the characteristic feature of imperialist colonial policy of "divide and rule". Nevertheless, the foreign exploiter has to surrender, and in fact, has done, a minor portion of the profits to the native exploiter for the joint exploitation of the colony.

The capitalist system demands state power, without which it cannot coerce the working masses, cannot guard its trade and trade routes, cannot capture fresh markets, etc. etc., and hence the evolution of imperialist forces as the vanguard of capital. Imperialism is the tool of oppression in the hands of the capitalists. Imperialism demands ever more fresh colonies, exploitation and subjugation of new peoples. Imperialism has to introduce the capitalist order of society among the colonial peoples. Simultaneously with this, the colonial policy of the imperialists has given rise to enormous social contradictions in the colonies; the rise of the working class, the pauperisation of the peasantry. These are the two main factors which today stand face to face against the imperialist forces. But this is not only true of India and the other colonies, but is true today all the world over. The unification of all these forces in the colonies along the lines adopted for the rest of the capitalist world is the task before the Communist International. Imperialism is the creator and chief-in-command of the capitalists; Communism is the creator and the advance-guard of the toiling masses. All the rest of the political parties fall into either of the two main categories.

Communism, as the diametrically opposite force to imperialism, has to adopt just the opposite tactics as the latter in the colonies. Communism has to utilise all mass forces which imperialism has created. Communism has to challenge the very order which imperialism stands for in the colonies. Communism cannot aim at bourgeois revolutions.

The Communist International, as the standard bearer of Communism, has to rely on the industrial proletariat for carrying out its revolutionary programme in the colonies, and to co-ordinate this struggle with the revolutionary struggle of the world proletariat. Imperialism owes its very life to the capture and exploitation of the colonies. The C. I. must capture the colonial revolutionary forces, the proletariat and the peasantry, the very germs created by the imperialist colonial policy and which will eventually destroy it.

The history of the Indian Nationalist movement is a history of the treacherous betrayal of the toiling masses by the national bourgeois leaders. Not only that. Those treacherous leaders took a definite stand against the masses, when the latter took to armed uprising on any occasion. Because they are class conscious. There may exist antagonism between the foreign and the native bourgeoisie, but this is a phenomenon all the world over. But it does not mean that the C. I. bases all its revolutionary programme on this antagonism alone. No, it must base its programme on the dynamic forces of revolution, that is, the proletarian movement in all the countries. It is quite a

different thing for the Communist International, for tactical reasons, to utilise those antagonisms for revolutionary purposes. But even this is problematic, owing to the fact that the capitalists are more cunning and politically conscious than we are.

Economic antagonism exists between a section of the native bourgeoisie and the foreign bourgeoisie; the former stands for an exclusive right of exploitation, but this is not the driving force of the revolution. The driving forces of the revolutionary movement are, as in every other capitalist country, the millions of homeless industrial proletariat, and also the pauperised peasantry, created by the capitalist exploitation in different colonies; and it is these rising forces that badly need the attention of the Communist International. Needless to say, we cannot depend, or rather, we must not attach any considerable importance to the so-called nationalist movements in the colonies, as the history of this movement is the history of servile capitulation before the imperialist forces on the one hand, and on the other, the treacherous betrayal of the masses by the so-called nationalist leaders just at the moment when an honest sincere lead was needed.

With reference to paragraph 8, in which the theses mention the decolonisation theory, Comrade Kuusinen is quite right in his condemnation of this false theory. No imperialist power whatsoever will ever agree to decolonise until and unless its very existence is threatened. Especially in India it is a life and death problem for British imperialism.

A few remarks about the industrialisation of India. The creation of the native bourgeoisie is a historical necessity for the British bourgeoisie, but at the same time, by such an action, the British bourgeoisie willfully creates a competitor and a rival. And it is here that the imperialist colonial policy asserts itself. India must be industrialised, but: 1. under the chief control of British capital; 2. Indian capital has to assume a junior partnership; and 3. the Indian industries have to play a secondary role so as never to be independent of the home industries, but, besides this, to be permanent consumers of the home manufacturers; 4. to help in the competition against Japan and the U. S. A., etc. and 5. to help in the production of war material.

This is, in short, the gist of the real imperialist policy of the British bourgeoisie with regard to the industrialisation of India. There is a group of comrades who really think that the industrialisation of India is developing quite independently, and that that is the real policy of the British bourgeoisie. Such an idea is absolutely erroneous and misleading. As long as the British rule in India, there can be no free development of the natural resources of India, much less of industry. Then again, a section of the theoreticians think that there has been no industrialisation whatsoever in India. Such an idea is just as wrong as the first one. If there has been no industrialisation, how will you account for the huge army of the industrial proletariat and the strikes in practically all the industrial centres of India. Whatever motive may be attributed to industrialisation, it has been developing; though it is quite correct to say that it has been retarded, and that it will never receive any independent headlong stimulus at the hands of the imperialists. Comrade Page Arnot should not have been so optimistic and enthusiastic about the industrialisation of India. Speaking the other day on the colonial theses, he went so far as to defend British imperialism in India, instead of ruthlessly condemning it.

Well, now, the so-called industrialisation of India has brought forth an army of factory proletariat — the vanguard of the Indian revolution. But it is obviously relatively weak to be capable of fulfilling its historic mission quite independently. The peasantry, comprising the greater part of the Indian population, the most down trodden, the landless and the homeless whose blood is sucked by the government, the landlord and the usurer jointly, is adopting a revolutionary movement.

The present economic analysis of the situation brings forth to the light that the vanguard and the rearguard — the factory proletariat and the peasantry — must co-operate to fulfil the tremendous task of the liberation of India from imperialist domination. It is quite clear and certain that in the struggle the factory proletariat, being better organised in the urban centres, will take the lead. The situation today, therefore, demands the organisation and centralisation of a strong class-conscious political party with a Marxist-Leninist programme and slogans; in other words, the Communist Party of India, to lead the revolutionary masses to its final and successful goal.

Some comrades may suggest that the Workers and Peasants Parties existing in the various provinces of the country are nothing less than a proletarian party, as suggested by me. Permit me to clear the situation. In the first place, these workers and Peasant Parties are not Communist groups. Secondly, their programme is an elastic one so as to include all those who are interested in the welfare of labour. And thirdly, they have no peasantry affiliated to them. They are, so to speak, mere union of workers.

At the same time we must criticise the policy of the Comintern in conducting the organisation of the Workers and Peasant Parties while altogether ignoring the organisation of the Communist Party of India. This is just as absurd as to put the cart before the horse. This policy must be revised.

In conclusion I request that all these points should be clearly dealt with in the theses and a definite line of action should be drafted for the future work in India.

#### Comrade SCHUBIN (Soviet Union):

Comrades, I would like to pick out two questions: the question of grouping colonies and semi-colonies and the question of the characteristic of the class forces in the national revolution. First of all I will say a few words concerning the standpoint represented here by Comrades Bennett and Rothstein. But is it necessary after Comrade Bennett's yesterday's explanation to speak about this question? I think that it is. For if one sees through what stages comrades have gone who — I do not want to say represented formerly the decolonisation theory — but have nevertheless used the same arguments in defence of this theory, if one examines the whole path which the comrades have traversed, one must say that it is a path of retreat in connection with which the fundamental errors of this theory have been retained. To what length have these comrades already gone? They have gone the length of Comrade Bennet — to emphasise his standpoint — quoting, under the unanimous applause of the whole audience, Comrade Bukharin's speech in which the latter declares that the process of the industrial development of India, the process of its industrialisation, has been interrupted by British imperialism, that what is going on there at present is not the industrialisation but the pauperisation of the country.

If this is how matters stand, i. e., if Comrade Bennett means by "control of British imperialism" opposition to the industrial development of the colonies or impeding this development, and if he means by "industrialisation" not the course of the production of means of production, but merely transference of capitalist production to the colonies, — is it then worth while to argue against this whole theory? But I reiterate, in the arguments of the comrades who have defended this theory, the fundamental mistakes of the decolonisation theory, i. e., of the obliteration of the difference between the colonies and the imperialist countries, have remained intact. Let us consider the path traversed by the overt and covert adherents of "decolonisation". The first stage: decolonisation without inverted commas. It was already formulated in Roy's book "The Future of the British Policy" a book which was written, as everyone knows in 1926. Roy said then:

"What are the main demands of the nationalist bourgeoisie? They consist of three fundamental demands: industrialisation of the country, fiscal autonomy, and protective tariffs. All these demands were satisfied because British imperialism endeavoured to overcome the post-war crisis through the reorganisation of the foundation of the Empire.... Experience has shown that the economic programme of the nationalists can be carried out even if the imperialists do not introduce the drastic political reforms demanded by the petty bourgeoisie. In other words the big bourgeoisie has come to the conclusion that its economic development is possible within the framework of the imperialist policy", (retranslated from the German).

This is fundamentally all that is wanted for a decolonisation theory! Certainly, someone in the commission designated Comrade Luhani quite wrongly as the father of this theory. Perhaps Comrade Luhani was the first to coin the name for this theory, but in that case he is only the "sponsor" of the theory whereas its father is Comrade Roy.

Let us take the second stage of the development of this theory. The slogan "Industrialisation of India under British

Control" is brought forward. But what arguments are used for this? The argument was that imperialism means export of capital. This is correct. **Moreover**, imperialism is export of capital in spite of what Sultan Zade has to say. But what for does capitalism go to the colonies, in what manner does it go there and what is it doing in the colonies? According to Bennett's and Rothstein's standpoint, capitalism goes to the colonies to give them more independence. This is supposed to be its immediate aim. But the result?

(Interjection by Bennett: Quite so, it develops, industry.)

But it certainly goes there to enslave the colonies. **And it does it:** The dependence of the colonies does not decrease, on the contrary it increases as a result of the penetration of finance capital. This is certainly an elementary truth. If we say that a free Poland becomes dependent owing to the penetration of finance capital, why then is colonial India pursuing the path of freedom?

This was the second stage. Then came a third stage which we have in Comrade Arnot's speech. Here the decolonisation theory is almost scattered to the four winds. But unfortunately the whole argumentation has remained the same, and finally we had comrade Bennett's explanation.

This is already the fourth stage. Comrade Bennett associates himself, as I have already said, with Comrade Bukharin who describes a spasmodic development inevitable in a colonial country, a development with breaks and interruptions, accentuation of antagonisms and capitalist oppression. Why do I say that the same errors have remained intact in this explanation? Bennett quotes Lenin. He quotes the place where it is said that the development of the colonies has assumed a capitalist form.

(Bennett: Definitely!)

Of course, definitely. Very good.

(Bennett: But why don't the theses say anything about this?)

Lenin says in the same article: "Better Little But Good" that the collision between the counter-revolutionary imperialist West and the revolutionary nationalist East, between the civilised countries and the backward countries of the East is inevitable. (I quote from memory because I do not have the volume by me.) If one takes these two quotations, one gets a complete picture.

On the strength of these two quotations the development of the colonies has definitely assumed a capitalist form, but only just "assumed". This is only a process, it is only the beginning of this process and the main difference between the civilised bandits and the backward oppressed peoples has remained the same.

Lenin gives us a picture of reality. We have the beginning of a development which does not alter the main difference between two worlds, the oppressors and the oppressed.

(Bennett: But why not obliterate it?)

The obliteration consists in the fact that you secretly dispute the main difference between imperialism and the colonies, i. e., the difference which makes an industrialisation of the colonies impossible. I certainly agree with Comrade Bennett that one cannot, for this reason, give every comrade a special label. I am the last person in the world to do so. But when he asks: Why not obliterate?, I say: If you take the resolution of the Autumn Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U. in 1927 you would find in the part which deals with the Chinese Revolution, that this obliteration is designated there as a danger but not as an ultra-Left danger, as Comrade Bennett believes when he declares that he would gladly shoulder the accusation of an ultra-Left deviation, but a Social Democratic one. This is what this resolution says and I think that all those present here will agree that this is correct.

(Bennett: But this has nothing to do with what I have said.)

(Lominadze: You are making rather free with the distribution of Social Democratic labels. Take care that you do not get caught by this danger.)

Nothing of the kind. I do not think that I have the right to do so. But in answer to Comrade Bennett's question I quoted the characteristic of a certain line from the resolution of the Plenum of the C. C. of the C. P. S. U.

(Bennett: a line with which I have nothing to do.)

It is a line which consists mainly in underestimating the enslaving role of the export of capital to the colonies.

I am coming now to the question of the division of the Colonies, to the question how this has been carried out in the Theses. After all, is such a division necessary? Doubts in regard to this have been expressed here. I think that these doubts are unjustified. One must of course lay down the main types of Colonies because this sums up the experience and makes it general. Therefore it facilitates the elaboration of a tactical line.

We know that the first attempt was made by Comrade Stalin in 1925. Comrades who deal in some form or other with colonial questions frequently refer to this speech. Why are they doing so? Because the main types are laid down there according to their most important characteristics. One of the most important characteristics is the development of the productive forces in the Colonies and the development of the proletariat, — a matter which has not been sufficiently considered in the Theses. On the strength of this characteristic practical conclusions are drawn for three types of countries. I will quote here what Comrade Stalin said about India although this quotation refers to a question with which I will deal later. It seems to me that in this quotation the correct line in this question is pointed out which is not given either by comrade Bennett or the Theses. What does Comrade Stalin say about India? This is not the main subject of his speech but he mentions India and says: "In some of these countries (he means countries which develop under the yoke of imperialism), for instance in India capitalism grows at a rapid rate...."

(Bennett: One should immediately declare Comrade Stalin a social-democrat, for he was of the opinion....")

This is not necessary because the increase of capitalist production in the Colonies is an indisputable fact....

However, as a consequence of this phenomenon enslavement grows and dependence upon finance capital increases. This is also an indisputable fact.

(Bennett: An indisputable fact! special stress is laid on this in our Theses.)

Comrade Bennett, I do not know in which of your Theses you have laid special stress on this, but I do know that Comrade Bennett has mentioned in his speech an "industrialisation under the control of Great Britain". This has an utterly different meaning. This amounts to a diminution, to a weakening of the economic dependence on Great Britain.

(Bennett: Not a bit of it! My Theses contained the sentence that for India gold is converted into iron fetters.)

Gold is converted into iron fetters in all capitalist countries.

(Bennett: But in the colonies this fetter is much stronger.)

Capitalist accumulation does not lead anywhere to direct emancipation. Comrade Bennett did not say so and therefore he does not see the specifically new and fundamental question for the colonies.

(Bennett: financial strangulation.)

Why was this correct when comrade Stalin said it about India in 1925? Why does not this clash with the fact that the growth of capitalism in India was interrupted, that the revolution in this sphere leads in India to an ever increasing pauperisation of the peasantry? Because the chief process now in the colonies is increased control by monopolist capital and not something else, which does not exclude the possibility of the advent of a new period of increased development of capitalism in India, but which entirely excludes the possibility of this development leading to de-colonisation without a revolution.

What Comrade Bukharin said in his concluding speech coincides completely with the formulation given by Comrade Stalin and which I find particularly in comrade Kuusinen's Theses.

Well, I would like to draw attention to this quotation from comrade Stalin's speech and especially the attention of the "anti-industrialists" — even this variety made its appearance in the discussion — who are of the opinion that the recognition of the fact that capitalist production is developing in the colonies constitutes already a concession to the de-colonisation theory

and that by laying stress on the role of the proletariat in the colonial revolution "we get nearer to the second International". (This shade of opinion was, I believe, noticeable in Comrade Remmele's speech.) You must read this particular passage in order to realise that your standpoint is wrong. At the same time this passage should also be read by those comrades who talk about the liberating role of capitalism in the colonies.

(Bennett: Comrade Roy.)

I am coming now to the question of the individual types of colonies and semi-colonies. What about this classification in the Theses? Comrades, you know that it is impossible to elaborate a tactical line on the strength of the classification contained in the Theses. Why? Because on the strength of secondary characteristics countries are jumbled up in our Theses, countries which are standing at the extreme wing. If we wanted to elucidate on this basis the peculiarities of the tactical line for the respective group, we would find this impossible.

I consider it therefore correct to revert from the draft Theses to the classification given by Comrade Stalin. This does not mean that we must not supplement and amend this formulation on the strength of the development and experience of the last three years. Addenda to this formulation are necessary, firstly because the development of the productive forces in the colonies is taking place very unevenly, by fits and starts, for these functions the law of the unevenness of development in the artificial situation of colonial dependence; secondly, because we go on increasing our influence over new countries; thirdly, because we are all the time adding to our experiences in all dependent countries, not to mention the fact that the development of the revolution in China is placing this law outside all former categories. In my opinion we must base ourselves on the facts as outlined by Comrade Stalin. The principles which must constitute the foundation of our addenda re-grouping of countries must be the same principles because they have been borne out by practical work.

I am coming now to the characteristic of the class forces in the national revolution. If one reads the Theses not in parts but as a whole, one is struck by the following: the role of the revolution is described on page 9 from § 16 to § 24.

Then on page 3 up to the points where the analysis of the individual stages begins, the petty bourgeoisie, especially the petty bourgeois intelligentsia is dealt with in considerable detail. Then begin the "stages". If one asks oneself where the peasantry and the proletariat are, one can certainly find the peasantry by going back to the third chapter but if one wants to find the points which deal specially with the position of the proletariat in the colonies....

(Bennett: but we have no proletariat there.)

I would not like to say so. We have a proletariat there because it is said at the beginning of the Theses: "Consolidation of the capitalist and especially the industrial development, growth of the proletariat..." It is therefore wrong to assert that the proletariat is not mentioned in the Theses. But, comrades, it has not a place of its own in the Theses. It has been dissolved. Therefore many points are incomprehensible. Incomprehensible is — how proletarian hegemony can be guaranteed in the national-revolutionary struggle, how the leadership of the proletariat in the workers and peasants bloc can be brought about if no characteristic of the proletariat in the colonies has been given. I think that this is one of the main lacunae in these Theses. Perhaps the super-abundance of criticism which we heard here is a reaction to these defects. These lacunae must be filled up. A description must be given of the position of the proletariat in the colonies and semi-colonies. Then one will be able to speak about non-capitalist development. Otherwise this is incomprehensible.

I will deal now with the form given to the Theses. I am afraid that this form is much too complicated, that trifles and exceptions overshadow the main things. I must associate myself with comrade Bennett in regard to his criticism of that part of § 21 which deals with the possibility or impossibility for the reformist bourgeoisie which has already deserted the revolution to come back to it or, to use the language of the Theses: to join the camp of the revolution at the moment of a revolutionary situation. In the Theses this possibility is admitted as an exception, but 100 lines are devoted to this exceptional case. This is the proportion which creates the impression

that this exception is treated as something real which in view of our tactic must be considered immediately. This lack of proportion is the worst in the Form which has been adopted for the Theses. To criticise this point is not a very easy matter. Why?

(Bennett: what a lot of reservations you are making!)

Quite so! Because here every possible objection has been anticipated. Therefore it is extremely difficult to get at the Theses, it is really awfully difficult to grasp their inner meaning. I have tried this with the part which in this respect seems to me the most important.

Here it is said:

"One cannot however assert with any certainty..."

With any certainty — this is reservation number one "... that in all countries..." All — this is reservation number two "... it is quite out of the question..." Quite — this is reservation number three. "... that the reformist bourgeoisie and a section..." A section — this is reservation number four "... will join in an acute-revolutionary situation at the beginning..." In the beginning — this is reservation number five "... the national-revolutionary camp and will thereby for a time..." For a time — this is reservation number six "... play an objectively revolutionary role..." Objectively — this is reservation number seven, "but this must be considered as an exceptional case". Exceptional case — this is reservation number eight, "... moreover in this case there is almost always behind it this or that imperialist State..." Almost always — this is reservation number nine.

Thus if one wants to make objections to this point, here all objections are anticipated by reservations. One feels nevertheless that the whole position of the question is wrong. One endeavours to get through this whole network of reservations; one asks oneself how can the bourgeoisie come back to the revolution in a revolutionary situation when we know that it is said in the Theses that a revolutionary situation means action by the workers and peasants, and that action of the workers and peasants repels the bourgeoisie. But wait a minute, there is a reservation even against this objection. It is also said in the Theses:

"It goes without saying that this is possible only in a period when the independent revolution of the workers and peasants has not yet become a real, actual danger..." "Real and actual..." — this is reservation number ten.

In this manner this objection is also anticipated.

Comrades the form of the Theses is very heavy. But if we take into consideration that these Theses will be translated into all the Eastern languages, what will become of them then? The reservations might become obliterated and then the idea remains that the bourgeoisie which has betrayed the national-revolutionary struggle can again join the national-revolutionary camp just at the decisive moment. Can such an idea determine our fundamental policy? I think that the main idea of § 20 is wrong and can only lead to confusion.

(Bennett: or we get nothing but reservations.)

Comrades, let us take the paragraphs which deal with our tactic towards the bourgeoisie. If it were only said in the Theses what is said at the end of point 21, namely:

"Where the objective conditions for a serious political crisis exist, even the actions of the national-reformist opposition, even their insignificant conflict with imperialism, which are hardly at all connected with the real hearth of the revolution, can assume considerable importance."

Then comes a reference to Lenin. If this fundamental idea had been given a concrete form for the various types of the national-revolutionary struggle, for the various stages of the struggle, I think that then we would have got a clear line. It would have been said that we must support the national bourgeoisie in as far as its struggles against imperialism, in as far as it does not hinder us to organise the workers and peasants for the revolutionary struggle. But instead of this we have a whole point in which it is said "that one must not criticise the bourgeoisie for future errors, that one can only criticise it for the past and for its present errors." But how is this to be done?

Just picture the concrete situation in India. What is most important and decisive for the labour movement in India, for

our Party? Is it not most important to take into consideration the experience with the treachery of the bourgeoisie in 1921 and 1922? Is not the most important for the masses to understand the lessons of this treachery? What is now the chief danger in India? To put it in a few words — and my time is nearly up — the most important is that an **ultra left deviation** exists there. Does not the danger consist in the fact that there are communists who are also members of the Swaraj Party? Or that there are communists who belong to the Republican Neru League, that there is a legal party which calls itself Communist whose activity or rather inactivity is permeated with petty bourgeois influence? That the Left Wing in the trade unions is beginning its career under colossal difficulties being compelled to make tremendous efforts in order to shake off the influence of Djaman Lal and Josse. If in some colonial countries the situation is better it is not very much better (of course excepting China), and this is the case when the revolutionary crisis is extended, when a spontaneous unorganised movement is springing up in town and country, when the proletariat is exhibiting remarkable firmness and a spirit of self sacrifice in all strikes, when its ranks produce hundreds of fighters and organisers. When in such a situation Theses are drawn up which say that one must not speak of the future treachery of the bourgeoisie, then I must declare that we cannot arrive at a correct line; but you just try to criticise this formulation in the theses and you will find that it is not an easy matter because it is not said here that one must limit criticism in regard to the bourgeoisie. Something else is said here. But comrades, I am afraid that in reality we get precisely this.

We must also draw attention to a part of the Theses which deals with the development of the revolution, the part where dual power is discussed. In Russia dual power was a characteristic feature of the period of the transition of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the socialist revolution. This was in the summer of 1917. But in the Theses the dual power of the transition period is added to the first bourgeois-democratic stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. I emphasise, not to the second stage but to the first, the change being described here as the coming into being of independent workers and peasants organs owing to the consolidation of the position of the Communist Party and the revolutionary trade unions". According to the Theses it might seem as if the organs of the workers and peasants power have already come into being in their primary form but that the revolution had not even reached the second stage of the bourgeois-democratic phase. Is not this antedating of the dual power linked up with the danger of missing the moment of the real change in the revolution?

In spite of the defects and ambiguities in the Theses I must reiterate what I already said at the beginning, namely, that in regard to the gulf which separates the imperialists from the oppressed the Theses pursue the line of the Second Congress, which unfortunately cannot be said of the comrades who spoke here on behalf of the British Delegation.

To decide the question of the development of capitalist production in the Colonies and its influence on colonial dependence, it seems to me that the indication given by Comrade Lenin in the article "Results of the Discussion on Self Determination" is very important:

"The economic difference between the colonies and the European peoples, at least the majority of these peoples, consisted above all in the fact that the Colonies were drawn into the exchange of commodities but not yet into capitalist production. Imperialism is moreover export of capital. Capitalist production is being transferred to the Colonies with ever increasing rapidity." (Lenin, volume XIX, page 196.)

I must say that the rapid transference of capitalist production to the Colonies is not mentioned in the Theses. If the Theses would declare that in spite of the development of capitalism the Colonies remain an agrarian appendage of the imperialist countries because the level of this development is very low in spite of the possibility of a temporarily increased rate; if the Theses were to declare this there would have been fewer misunderstandings in the discussion. But they declare much more. They declare that the Colonies are developing more and more into an agrarian appendage of the imperialist countries.

More and more (i. e. in most cases) — but this does not fit in with a process of "transference of capitalist production to the Colonies".

But what is Lenin's conclusion from this? He declared:

"They (i. e. the Colonies to which capital is exported) cannot be freed from dependence on European finance capital. From the military standpoint as well as from the standpoint of expansion the separation of the Colonies in general is only possible under Socialism, and under capitalism only in exceptional cases or at the price of a series of revolutions and insurrections in the Colonies and Mother countries."

Comrades, I am not quite sure that also in the last declaration of the British Delegation the idea is emphasised that de-colonisation can be effected not only through an insurrection in the Colonies but also through a revolution in the Mother Country.

Comrade **Bennett** who is interrupting me all the time, asserts that they say the same. But I would like him to explain the following: one of the most important lacunae in the Theses consists in their not saying anything about the tasks of the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries in regard to the Colonies. This is of course an involuntary lacuna and is probably due to the fact that the Theses were drawn up by Comrade Kuusinen whereas the tasks of the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries are dealt with in another report by Comrade Ercoli. I think that the British Delegation would have done right if instead of its amendment concerning the industrialisation it had brought forward an addendum to this question. Of course this addendum will be made anyhow. But the British Delegation would have done right if it had formulated this addendum, if it had taken the initiative in this question.

If the British Delegation will bring forward addenda concerning the duties and tasks of the Communist Party, it will mitigate to a great extent the misunderstandings which it called forth in the discussion in connection with Comrades **Bennett's** and **Rothstein's** position. In regard to this dispute the fundamental lines of the Theses are certainly correct. They are the continuation of the Theses of the Second Congress. (Applause.)

#### Comrade CARDENAS (Colombia):

Comrades, in a general way, I express the agreement of the Colombian delegation on the report presented here, except where it deals with the classification of the semi-colonial countries. This could be made more in agreement with the situation. For instance, Argentina, which is a semi-colonial country, is more free to dispose of herself than certain Balkan countries that are classified in the theses as independents.

The Colombian Delegation is also in agreement in general with what was expressed before the Congress by Comrade **Humbert Droz** with regard to Latin America. What Comrade **Humbert-Droz** said about Latin-America is only one step forward in the direction of the study of these Latin-American questions. Comrade **Humbert Droz** has certain ideas about Pan-Latin Americanism with which we do not agree, at least, not altogether.

I have the impression that the character of the coming revolution in the Latin American countries has not been clearly expressed here. It appears to me that there has been an over-estimation of the role of the petty-bourgeoisie in the revolution. Owing to the extent of imperialist penetration on the part of the United States in some of the Latin American countries, the petty-bourgeoisie has become weaker, and the proletariat has arisen which, although it has no tradition as a proletariat, no clear Marxist understanding, has a very developed class-consciousness. There has been formed in Colombia a **Revolutionary Socialist Party**, which has shown considerable class-consciousness, and which has been able to deal a formidable blow to imperialism.

I therefore hope that the Latin American revolution will become a revolution somewhat between a proletarian and a pettybourgeois revolution.

I also wish to express here the satisfaction with which I listened to the speech of Comrade **Wolfe**. This speech indicates that the North American Party now realises the enormous

revolutionary force that Latin America represents at the present time, and that the Party will now pay more attention to the tasks in connection with the Latin American movement. I think that no other Party in the Comintern should pay as much attention to our Latin American problems as the American Party.

Speaking of the characteristics of the coming revolution in Latin America, I refer to the statements of Comrade Travin, who asserts that it is not possible for a single country in Latin America to achieve a bourgeois-democratic revolution because of the dependence of these countries upon the U. S. We have a good example that repudiates this point of view. We have already seen that Sandino, in a little insignificant country like Nicaragua, has been able to fight against American imperialism for more than a year and a half.

If Comrade Travin would say that the possibilities of a victorious petty-bourgeois revolution in Latin America are greater if it will take place in several countries, I would be in full agreement with him. Precisely the cohesion and organization of the different movements of Latin America is the task of the Comintern.

A bourgeois-democratic revolution in Colombia, for example, would only be seriously menaced by Yankee imperialist intervention in the coastal districts, but in the interior of the country the United States would not be able to make great headway.

Until a short time ago Colombia was the country in Latin America which was able to stand outside the imperialist movement in Latin America. In fact, with the exception of the banana region, which is on the Atlantic Coast; and the platinum region on the Pacific Coast, the interior of Colombia has resisted imperialist penetration. But previously Colombia was subjected to the holy "imperialism" of the Roman Pontiff carried on through the priests and other kinds of the religious hierarchy who turned Colombia into a feudal territory of the Pope.

In a short time Yankee imperialism has rooted itself in Colombia. Its economic positions there are very solid. Its bankers have loaned, without any specific guarantee, more than 2 million dollars. At the present moment negotiations are being conducted to put through a loan of 100 million dollars.

To the U. S. we export 80% of our products and import 58% of our own total import trade. In 1913 the imports from the U. S. amounted to \$ 7,647,164 and in 1924, to \$ 25,671,858.

The banana exploitation and the extraction of the platinum yield a profit to Yankee imperialism of more than ten million dollars.

The oil zone, has a territorial extension of 88,000 sq. kilometres.

The best located section of this zone is already in the hands of American oil companies.

The only company, the Tropical Oil Company-, has in Colombia 400,000 hectares of rich oil land, and it carries its oil to the sea through 800 kilometres of pipeline which cost \$ 40,000,000. At the present moment negotiations are being carried on by the British oil companies, as a result of which the antagonism between these rivals is developing. In the course of a few years Colombia fell definitely under the influence of American capital and of American imperialism.

The bourgeoisie of Colombia has surrendered deliberately, it has joined hands with imperialism and has become a definite agent of it.

The Colombian proletariat has formed a party, a working class party, called "The Socialist Revolutionary Party", which, if it has not a solid Marxist ideology, nevertheless has a class-consciousness quite sufficient to play an important role in the coming bourgeois democratic revolution in Colombia.

Imperialist penetration has not only called forth a vigorous opposition of the proletariat, but has aroused large sections of the petty-bourgeoisie. The intellectual and commercial bourgeoisie and even the petty-peasant proprietors find themselves in a certain dilemma — whether they should go to the revolution with us or whether they should support imperialism. They do not like the idea to follow us, but imperialism is also repugnant to them. The definite ruin of agriculture which is its basis of living and the competition of industry from the United States undoubtedly tends to drive it into our camp.

This petty-bourgeoisie will not be able to keep away from, or to stand aside from carrying through its historical role which in Colombia is very great indeed, i. e. the struggle against feudalism. The petty-bourgeoisie will not play the same role that it did in Mexico because we have a Labour Party in Colombia. Naturally, the petty-bourgeoisie will have at the start the hegemony in the campaign, but it will have to reckon with us also.

In the centres of oil production, in railroad construction, in transport in general, which in Colombia has become great now, there are proletarian zones and this proletariat has formed the Socialist Revolutionary Party. And we are just at the beginning, in fact, of imperialist penetration. This developing proletariat will become more and more strong every day. The Communists will have to take advantage of the revolutionary situation which exists in Latin America and the Communist International will have to co-ordinate these movements, so that when they are in a united front against international imperialism, real results will be achieved. If a united front of the countries facing imperialist penetration in Brazil, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, etc., is made, a great number of markets will be withdrawn from American imperialist domination and this will greatly affect American industry, and above all, will weaken the moral prestige of American Imperialism at home.

#### Comrade LOMINADZE (Soviet Union):

Comrades, I think that Comrade Kuusinen's theses and report are a big stride in regard to the study of the colonial problem by the Communist International. I consider correct the most important part of the theses, the part which deals with tactics. If Comrade Kuusinen's theses are nevertheless contentious, this is due to the newness and complicated nature of the problem which is confronting us. We are face to face for the first time with a whole series of important questions.

I will deal with the most important questions which, in my opinion, are either not definitely enough formulated or are not correctly raised in the theses.

The first question is that of the role of imperialism in the development of productive forces in the colonies. Does the capitalist rule of the mother countries over the colonies impede the development of productive forces there? Yes, it does. But to limit ourselves to this answer, would be only a common place: the concrete dialectical picture of the development of the colonies becomes obliterated, the multi-coloured reality assumes a uniform colour and the historical delimitations which separate various epochs of development disappear. The error of non-dialectical treatment of the question was committed here by comrades who were too ardent in their attack on the British Delegation and particularly on Comrade Bennett. What is the real state of affairs? To answer this question, it will be best to take those parts of the theses which are contentious. I will read the parts which I do not consider quite correct. Here is the first of them. We read on page 4:

"The devastating effects revealed by capitalist development everywhere, especially in its first phase, are produced in an accelerated tempo and in a tremendously enlarged degree by the penetration of foreign capital in the colonies, whereas for the most part little or nothing is to be seen of the progressive results of capitalism. Where in times past a relatively well-off people, or an old culture was to be found, this has now been ruined by the imperialist colonial regime, and the mass of the toiling population has been flung into the deepest material and cultural poverty".

The first part of the extract I have just read is perfectly correct. But objection can be taken to the too categorical and onesided assertions in the second part.

It contains a somewhat idyllic description of the situation which capitalism found in the colonial countries. Some comrades assert that these words about the well-being of the people, the old national culture — we must not forget that the words, "national culture" are frequently taken to mean that in this culture the whole people participated as the subject — are Marx' words. I do not know, but I can say that I have not found such words in Marx. But I found something else on this subject. In his letters on India Marx declares point blank



that he does not share the views of those who believe in the existence of the golden age of Hindustan.

Marx was probably the first who gave prominence to the question of the misery caused by the penetration of European capitalism in the colonies. But Marx did not give an idyllic description of the state of affairs found there by contemporary capitalism. Marx said that "the idyllic communal basis was the basis of despotism", that it set narrow limits to reasoning, subordinated it to traditional rules and deprived it of any greatness, any energy for historical action.

Marx declared that the life led by the primitive commune was a miserable life without progress, that it was in fact vegetation, a passive form of existence. Marx pointed out that the Commune was degraded by caste distinctions, by man's subordination to circumstances instead of raising man to the position of master over these outward circumstances. This is how Marx appreciated the beginnings of the penetration of British capitalism in Hindustan: "It is true that in effecting the social revolution in Hindustan, Great Britain was guided by the grossest interests and was by no means clever in its methods, but this is immaterial. The question is — can mankind fulfil its mission without an ultimate revolution in the social position of the East. If not, Great Britain was, in spite of all its crimes, the unconscious tool of history in the achievement of this revolution." (Translated from the Russian. Tr.)

It seems to me that if an attempt is made in the theses to estimate the importance of the penetration of capitalism in the colonies, this side of the question should also be pointed out. This would not of course imply kow-towing before imperialism and capitalism, just as it is not implied in Marx' words. (Martynov: Did Marx write this before or after the October Revolution?)

Comrade Martynov, if you like I will answer this question at once. I had occasion myself — and this is a truth not discovered by me — at the VII. Plenum to say that capitalism has ceased to be a progressive phenomenon after the victory of the October Revolution in our country, that even in regard to colonial countries one can no longer speak of the progressive role of capitalist development because history has already given another, a higher, type of social development. But this does not mean that also from the historical viewpoint, when estimating the historical past, we must deny the progressive role of capitalism. Marx ascribed to the penetration of capitalism in the Eastern countries the importance of a revolutionary change, in spite of the monstrous crimes perpetrated by Britain in India. Neither can one deny from the historical viewpoint the progressive role of imperialism compared with pre-monopolist capitalism. This, too, is not my idea, it is Lenin's idea. You will find this idea expressed in Lenin's article against Piatakoff.

I will deal now with the second question about which there was so much divergence of opinion here. It is not true that the theses do not differentiate between two diverse epochs in the colonial policy of capitalism; the epoch of pre-monopolist capitalism and the epoch of finance capital.

How did Lenin deal with this question? Martynov had much to say about the anti-Leninist views of those with whom he argued, but he himself did by no means defend Leninist views. I will read you a quotation from Lenin. Comrade Shubin has already given this quotation, but I will repeat it because it is of enormous importance. Comrade Shubin holds such eclectic views that this quotation does not justify his position in the least. This is what Lenin said in 1916:

"The economic difference between colonies and European peoples — at least the majority of the latter — consisted (this refers to the past, V. L.) mainly in the fact that the colonies were drawn into the exchange of goods, but not into capitalist production. Imperialism has changed this. Imperialism is, among other things, export of capital. Capitalist production is being rapidly transferred to the colonies".

At this juncture I will dispose beforehand of an argument which most of the comrades have been using rather indiscriminately. These comrades say: If one admits that industry is developing in colonies, one comes to the theory of decolonisation. This was the argument used by most of the comrades in reply to the British Delegation. However, imperialism is

export of capital from the mother countries to the colonies. This is an incontrovertible fact. If one admits that the capital of the mother countries initiates and creates a basis for the development of industry in the colonies in which process foreign capital plays a decisive, commanding role in industry, this by no means leads to any decolonisation theory. Why? Because development of industry at the expense of foreign capital does not increase the well-being of the colonial country, it does not increase its economic independence and does not lead to decolonisation, but to even greater oppression and enslavement of the colonies by the imperialist mother countries. The viewpoint which leads to the decolonisation theory is that which wants to describe the whole process of development as if the entire industrial development in the colonies takes place in spite of the finance capital of the mother country, a viewpoint which describes the state of affairs as if the internal forces of the colonial countries are the only foundation for the development of their industry in spite of the policy and actual activity of the finance capital of the mother countries. This of course leads to the decolonisation theory because if, for instance, China and India have succeeded — in spite of the policy of imperialism — to make such a gigantic stride in regard to industrial development in the last 30 years, this must be a guarantee that the colonies will be able to achieve without great upheavals their economic emancipation from the mother countries.

This is the error into which are falling those who want to obliterate the importance of industrial development in the colonies by means of foreign capital.

I will read you another quotation from Lenin. I take it from his book on "Imperialism" to which Comrade Martynov referred.

"The export of capital influences the development of capitalism in countries to which it is directed, and accelerates it enormously. If therefore, this export can impede to a certain extent development in the exporting countries, this can only take place at the price of extension and intensification of the further development of capitalism throughout the world."

Thus, according to Lenin, the development of capitalism extends and intensifies in countries to which capital is exported, and such countries are also the colonies. One cannot deny that the export of capital to non-colonial backward countries is in any case not bigger than to the colonies.

What is incorrect in Comrade Kuusinen's theses? The assertion that colonial countries are becoming more and more an agrarian appendage of capitalism, and also the assertion that raw material is exported only to the industrial mother countries. This was correct formerly, in the epoch of pre-monopolist capitalism, but it is not correct now.

The inherent law, the tendency of economic development in the colonies under imperialism does not consist in their gradual transformation into an agrarian appendage of the mother countries, but in their transformation from an agrarian appendage into a sphere where productive capital is functioning and to which the centre of gravity of the production of the mother countries is transferred.

I reiterate, this is only the general tendency of the economic development of the colonies under imperialism, a tendency which is not yet realised and which will not be realised, in as far as proletarian revolutions and the colonial revolutionary movement will interrupt this process. But we cannot deny this law. This would mean putting upside down Lenin's whole teaching, which some comrades attempted to do here in an indirect manner.

Yesterday Comrade Bennett read here a quotation from an article by Lenin (Bennett: I did not read it, I merely referred to it), an article written in March 1923, one of Lenin's last articles in which he says:

"At the same time a whole series of countries: The East, India and China, etc., got out of their depth as a consequence of the recent capitalist war. Their development assumed definitely the form of the general European capitalist development. A general European movement was initiated there. It is clear now to the whole world that they

were drawn into a development which is bound to lead to a crisis of the entire world capitalism."

The same assertion was made by Lenin in 1912 in an article on China, but I will not read this quotation here. He also said this in 1916, in his pamphlet on imperialism, in the discussion on the national question, and in 1923, in one of his last articles. Lenin has always emphasised that imperialism stimulates the industrial development of the colonies, that it creates a basis for industrial development in the colonies, and that in this not native but foreign capital is playing the chief role. But Lenin does not say that this leads to decolonisation. On the contrary, Lenin asserts that the stronger the industrial development in the colonies, the more acute the struggle between the colonies and imperialism, the more it assumes a contemporary European character, i. e. the more the proletariat become the driving force of the colonial revolutions. But without revolution the colonies cannot shake off the yoke of finance capital. Only as an exceptional case is "peaceful" separation of the colonies possible; only revolution in the mother countries and colonies will enable the latter to separate from the former.

This is what Lenin said. Does all this mean that imperialism is developing the productive forces? Certainly not. By establishing big industry in the colonies, imperialism impedes the general development of the productive forces of the colonies. Precisely this side of imperialist policy is not sufficiently emphasised in Comrade Kuusinen's theses. What is the character of the imperialist policy in the colonies? First of all it impedes development, or rather it interferes with the development of agriculture in the colonies. This is a general truth accepted by all. This fact is mentioned in Comrade Kuusinen's theses, but not in the part which deals with the economic role of imperialism in the colonies.

What form does this imperialist interference with the development of the productive forces of agriculture in the colonies take? Finance capital in the colonies has first and foremost the support of the most reactionary pre-capitalist classes, big landowners, feudal lords, gentry, etc. Imperialism, by strengthening these classes through political alliance with them, impedes the agrarian revolution without which the further development of agriculture in the colonies is impossible. By resting politically on the most reactionary social circles in the colonies, imperialism makes even a gradual reform of agrarian relations impossible.

In some colonies we witness the development of capitalist plantations created by foreign capital. From the viewpoint of technique and the organic composition of the capital, these plantations represent a step forward compared with colonial agriculture. But plantations do not exist everywhere, and the price of their establishment is wholesale ruin of the peasant farming which is excluded from the process of development of the productive forces. Moreover, finance capital has in colonial agriculture the function of trade and usurious capital; it stoops to this form only in regard to agriculture. While trade-usurious capital destroys old forms of production, it does not create new ones. By destroying agriculture in the colonies, imperialism narrows down their internal market and consequently the base for the further development of industry. This fundamental feature of imperialist policy should be emphasised in the theses.

In regard to the question of industrialisation in the narrow sense of this word, one cannot of course say that industrialisation of the type at which we are aiming here in the Soviet Union is taking place now in the colonies. Competition and the tariff policy of the industrial mother countries impede and distort the direction of industrial development in the colonies. Light industry develops first of all, production of means of production lags behind compared with other branches. But it seems to me that it is impossible to prove that this is the inherent law of the development of capitalism. The question of the export of capital, into what sphere of production this capital flows, is determined by the rate of profit, and nothing else. Nevertheless, one cannot deny that in the last 25—30 years a gigantic industrial development has taken place in countries such as China, India, Egypt and others. But one should not confound industrial development with the general development of the productive forces of these countries. That is why I consider incorrect a whole series of assertions in Comrade Kuusinen's theses.

I am coming now to the question of the division of colonies into four groups: I will deal briefly with this question. It seems to me that it would be better to replace this division by definitely laying down four groups, pointing out in the theses that colonial and semi-colonial countries are on diverse planes of economic and social-political development. It is essential to give examples of countries on the lowest plans of social-economic development, of others which are on the highest plane and also of those which are on an intermediate plane, instead of squeezing all the colonial countries into firmly defined four groups and then attempting to subdivide these groups according to their specific character.

I will deal now with the role of the bourgeoisie. This subject as it appears in Comrade Kuusinen's theses, has been already subjected here to very correct criticism. I want to make a few additional remarks.

It seems to me first of all that Comrade Kuusinen does not lay enough stress on the fact that the industrial bourgeoisie in the colonies is very weak, that it constitutes only an insignificant part of the whole bourgeoisie, that trade and usurious capital and compradordom are much more powerful in the colonies. This error is particularly noticeable in paragraph 18 of Kuusinen's theses. However, I think that the most glaring and dangerous error is that which appears in paragraph 20 and the following paragraphs in which Kuusinen gives prominence to the idea that cooperation of the national bourgeoisie with the revolutionary camp for a certain period, is not out of the question. Comrades, it is true that this possibility is not out of the question. But in Kuusinen's theses maximum stress is laid in regard to the role of the bourgeoisie on proving this possibility, whereas no account is taken of the fact that this historical possibility has already existed, but can hardly be said to exist any longer.

Comrade Kuusinen transfers the historical possibility which really existed in the past, to the future without explaining that this is an already accomplished phase of development. There can of course be isolated exceptions. But one cannot make a rule out of exceptions for this would be a serious mistake, the mistake becomes more serious because maximum efforts are made to prove a truth which was true in the past period. I also consider incorrect the tactical deduction which Comrade Kuusinen makes from this analysis.

Comrade Kuusinen thinks that failure to distinguish between the national reformists and the ruling counter-revolutionary bloc of imperialists and feudal lords, is an ultra-left error. This is true, and I am prepared to say that even after the national bourgeoisie goes over definitely into the counter-revolutionary camp, as this was in China, one must distinguish between it and the feudal lords and imperialists. But the further deduction made by Kuusinen is not correct. This is what he says:

"It is not true that Swarajests and Wafdists and others have already exposed themselves in the eyes of the masses as allies of imperialism and counter-revolutionary traitors to the national movement. To expose their true character in the eyes of the masses, much educational work and a much greater political experience of these masses themselves are needed. In a word, a whole preparatory phase is necessary, and we cannot skip over the difficulties of this phase, we cannot treat lightly its tasks. Swarajists, Wafdists, etc., have not yet betrayed the national-liberation struggle as the Kuomintang has done in China."

I think that we must argue with the utmost energy against this historical assertion. Facts were mentioned here concerning India and Egypt which show that the bourgeoisie of these countries is already struggling against the revolutionary movement of the masses. This applies to a considerable extent also to the petty-bourgeois party "Sarekat Islam" in Indonesia. Its treachery is already confirmed by history, and one cannot bring forward in the theses of the VI World Congress of the Communist International the assertion that the Swarajists and Wafdists have not yet betrayed the national-liberation struggle, and that they will still vacillate between this and that camp.

Another wrong deduction is — that it is essential "at this stage to concentrate the main fire not against them, not against the national bourgeoisie, but against the present direct chief enemy — the ruling imperialist-feudal bloc."

Comrades, when in 1905 our Party was struggling against absolutism the chief enemy who had to be overthrown, was absolutism; in our agitation and propaganda the firing was pre-eminently directed against the cadet party. In 1917 our criticism was pre-eminently directed against the Mensheviks because the bourgeoisie in 1905 and the Mensheviks in 1917 were the chief bulwark of the social order which we wanted to overthrow. In order to develop the national-liberation movement in the colonies, Communists must struggle energetically against their bourgeoisie, making this struggle the most important part of their activity. The tactical deduction in the theses is wrong from any viewpoint, and requires radical correction.

I will deal very briefly with the question of the petty bourgeoisie. It seems to me that Comrade Kuusinen is wrong when in point 24 he considers indiscriminately the entire petty bourgeoisie as a driving force in the revolution.

This is not correct. We should emphasise from the beginning the special role of the urban petty bourgeoisie, which we cannot consider as a driving force of the revolution without a series of reservations. We must strictly distinguish between it and the peasantry which is a real driving force of the revolution in the colonies. There is finally the question of division into stages. In the theses the stages are again divided into certain phases.

Comrades, it seems to me that such division is too schematic. First of all it is difficult to understand. I must say, that I read a certain statement four times without understanding it, and yet theses are written for people who know much less than we, delegates to this Congress.

But the main error of such division is — that the movement in the colonies will certainly not follow these stages and phases. We have seen in what a peculiar manner the Chinese revolution developed. Can we say with certainty that revolutionary development in other countries will follow the path of the Chinese revolution? Kuusinen's theses are a slavish copy of the Chinese revolution. I think that the revolutionary development will be necessarily different in other countries from that in China. Lenin has pointed out repeatedly that revolutions will assume in the various countries a peculiar original character, and in regard to the East, he pointed out to **Sukhanov** that the revolution will assume forms which contemporary social democratic philistines cannot even imagine. Lenin was against all general schemes for the revolutionary movement of the various countries. We can see that revolutionary development varies in the various countries — in Egypt, India, China, etc.

I also think that the political error of such division is as follows: the first and second phase in the first stage are described in the following manner: in the first phase the bourgeoisie still forms part of the national-revolutionary movement; in the second phase the big national bourgeoisie has already allied itself so firmly with the feudal-imperialist bloc "that its oppositional character is overshadowed by its counter-revolutionary brutal war against the revolutionary workers' and peasants' movement".

Thus, the role of the bourgeoisie has changed to the extent that from a temporary unreliable alliance with the national-revolutionary camp it has gone over to brutal suppression and fierce struggle against the workers' and peasants' movement. At the same time the forces of the workers' and peasants' revolution are considered inadequate for seizure of power in the first as well as in the second phase. Communists are not in power even in the second phase, they are only beginning to consider the question of power. Thus the defeat of the workers' and peasants' camp seems to be pre-determined in the first phase. It seems to me that this is a rather non-critical copy of the trend of the revolution in China. Such a development did of course take place in China. At first the bourgeoisie was even at the head of the national-revolutionary camp; subsequently it joined the reactionary camp and was able to smash the camp of the workers and peasants. But this was by no means pre-determined objectively. If it had not been for the opportunist errors of the Chinese Party, Communists could have converted this second stage or transition from one stage to another into victory over the bourgeoisie, into a state of affairs when instead of the bourgeoisie "brutally suppressing the workers and peasants, the workers and peasants would have suppressed the big landowners and the bourgeoisie."

It seems to me that this is a too fatalistic and slavish copy of the trend of the Chinese revolution which was to a considerable extent determined by the errors of the opportunist executive of the Communist Party of China. It must be our foremost task to prevent a repetition in other countries of this second stage with its brutal suppression of the workers and peasants, and to endeavour to wring the neck of the bourgeoisie and other reactionary classes in the first stage.

I want to read only one statement which requires no comment from an article published in the "C. I." and signed by **Lin Ho-yuan**. This is what he says:

"The revolutionary path of the development of agriculture which is connected with the destruction of the monopoly of big landownership and the transference of all the land to the peasantry for free usufruct, is under the peculiar forms of agriculture which have developed in China in the course of history, the farmer-capitalist ('American') path of development".

This monstrous twaddle which requires no comment is presented to us in the "Communist International" as a new revelation on the Chinese question. It is true that Lin Ho-yuan accompanies his thesis with a whole series of reservations. But the analogy itself between the capitalist development of agriculture and the development of agriculture in China, the analogy which seeks justification in what Lenin said in an utterly different situation about the development of Russian agriculture, remains nevertheless. We must declare ruthless war on such glorification of capitalism for contemporary China.

I am coming to the end of my speech and would like to say in conclusion a few words to Comrade **Pepper**, who in his speech here devoted much time to me. I do not raise the Pepper question because I consider myself insulted by the polemics and personal attacks on me by Comrade Pepper.

Nevertheless if I am compelled to devote a few words to Pepper, although this is highly unpleasant to me as well as to the Congress, I do so for the following reasons: Firstly, the struggle at the Congress against Pepper, not only on my part but also on the part of tens of delegates who spoke against Pepper for various reasons quite as emphatically as I did, is not a personal intrigue against Pepper. Personally I have not and cannot have anything against Pepper; my attitude is merely a perfectly justifiable, healthy, revolutionary protest against the opportunism, lack of principle and narrow political sectarianism which Comrade Pepper personifies. If it were only a question of Pepper's personal qualities, he could be left to himself. But Pepper makes use of these qualities very extensively in politics. No wonder that on the part of an enormous majority of the Congress if not on the part of the Congress as a whole, these political qualities of Comrade Pepper are very much resented. This alone justifies such a very unpleasant occupation as polemics with Pepper.

Secondly, Pepper allowed himself today a political declaration which I cannot leave unanswered. Pepper declared that Comrade **Bukharin's** arguments against comrades who underestimate the war danger, minimise the importance of international antagonisms and give an eclectic interpretation to the correlation of international and internal differences in the capitalist world, were aimed at me. What justification could Pepper have for such a statement? Pepper's only motive in this could be petty resentment of an offended person. In my speech at the Congress I said very emphatically that war danger is in the present period the central point in the international situation. I have never and nowhere brought forward the eclectic theory against which Comrade **Bukharin** argued. Neither in these, nor in any other questions, in which principle is involved, have I ever disagreed or disagree now with the policy and the decisions adopted by our Party delegation to the VI. Congress.

Thirdly, I cannot leave unanswered Pepper's persistent insinuations for already six months in regard to my disagreements with the Executive Committee of the Comintern and my errors in regard to the Chinese question before the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. During preparations for the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. and in the discussion of the Chinese question in the E. C. C. I. I defended in connection with a series of questions (about the character of the present stage of the Chinese revolution, about current events in China, etc.) a viewpoint which

differed considerably from the subsequent decisions of the Polit. Bureau of the C. C. of our Party and of the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. From the moment that these decisions were adopted by the Central Committee of our Party and the Comintern I submitted to them completely and made a declaration to this effect already at the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. Events in China after the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. convinced me of the erroneousness of my views in regard to a series of Chinese questions, and I made a statement to this effect to the C. C. of our Party and also to the Congress. But as Pepper is still trying to get some satisfaction for himself in connection with this question, I must make the following statement:

As long as I was convinced of the correctness of my views and as long as no authoritative decisions were made in regard to the contentious questions, I defended in free discussion my viewpoint to the best of my ability and irrespective of persons; unlike Pepper, I am not accustomed to change my views in the course of a day or an hour in accordance with what some authoritative comrade might say in connection with the contentious question. No one has ever seen or will see Pepper contending with any of the leading comrades. This is with him evidently a matter of inadequate firmness of principle and backbone. He always agrees with those who are his seniors even if a minute ago he defended an utterly different viewpoint. This was the case in regard to the character of the Chinese revolution. In the discussion in the Chinese conferences in the E. C. C. I. Pepper endeavoured to prove at first that the Canton insurrection was the beginning of the socialist stage of the Chinese revolution. As soon as he noticed that this view was not shared by the leaders of the E. C. C. I., he changed his position in the course of 40 minutes. No efforts of Pepper will obliterate the disgraceful fact that he considered the Canton insurrection as an adventure, that in regard to Canton he reproduced Plekhanov's argument against the Moscow armed insurrection. I do not think it necessary to deal in detail with such "trifles" as the demand to replace for the Chinese rural districts the Soviet slogan by the slogan of rural self-governments, as the proposal to bring forward the slogan of a legal Communist Party in China, etc. Pepper renounced these Menshevik proposals in the course of 24 hours with the same ease as he renounces his ultra-radical proposals. And this person dares to criticise from the platform of the Congress other people's mistakes and errors in regard to the Chinese question!

I would like to say in conclusion:

The foolish and unfounded accusations made against me by Pepper (accusations of under-estimating war danger, imperialism, and the colonial character of the Chinese revolution and even — how very like Pepper — the accusation of Right deviation) can only rouse a smile among those who have followed our discussion. By such tactics Pepper has shown once more that he fully deserves the position which he has created for himself in the Communist International. (Applause.)

#### Comrade RAVETTO (Argentina):

Comrades, the Argentine Delegation feels that it must join in the discussion of the colonial theses in order to point out certain characteristics of imperialist penetration in Argentine and steps taken by the Communist Party.

It is well known that a ferocious struggle is going on between British and North American imperialism for the economic and political domination of Argentine. The consequences of this struggle have taken the form of a growing dependence of our country upon financial powers. These powers determine the development of its economic life and, through exploitation and pillaging the wealth of the country they are making the conditions of the proletariat and workers worse from day to day. They are accelerating the process of proletarianisation of vast sections of the peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie and are binding more closely the bourgeois classes who are struggling for power to the interests and policies of the two imperialisms.

British imperialism, which gets its support from the big landed proprietors, looks upon Argentine as a source for war materials. The railroads, the monopoly of which is held by the big landholders, enables them to pillage the wealth of the country at a faster pace. Economic progress is checked and the an-

cient inefficient forms of labour are maintained. The big agrarian bourgeoisie, influenced by British imperialism, has issued the slogan: "Buy from those why buy from us".

North American imperialism on the other hand, which during the past years has penetrated all spheres of the economic life of the country and which is carrying on a ferocious struggle against British imperialism for absolute domination, gets its support from the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and is developing chiefly the industry of extraction and transformation of the wealth of the country (monopoly of réfrigé-ration concerns, etc...). The industrial bourgeoisie is becoming more and more identified with the interests of Yankee finance capital which favours primarily the industries which are not opposed to the expansion and export of their own products and which enable it to control the economic life of the country. It is in the course of this penetration and of the struggle between these two imperialisms that the process takes place of the differentiation of classes in Argentine and the struggle for power.

The traditional agrarian class which ruled the country continuously during the war is gradually losing the dominant positions which it occupied. The victory of the radical Irigoyenist party in the last elections marked the downfall of the industrial bourgeoisie and the beginning of more and more effective and open domination of Yankee imperialism, which has got control of all the vital resources of the country. Our delegation is in agreement with the characterisation of the Latin American countries as semi-colonial, this characterisation is absolutely correct for Argentina, in spite of the formal independence which it enjoys. The power and domination of imperialism in Argentina are extending further and further, corrupting ever-greater sections of the classes in power and imposing upon the Communist Party the struggle against imperialism as an essential task.

The Argentine delegation considers it necessary to carry on a bitter struggle against the Apra, which is a sort of Kuomintang of Latin America, as well as against all attempts which under various forms, seek to prevent the hegemony of the proletariat in the struggle against imperialism, and to transform this struggle by means of the predominating influence of the petty bourgeoisie objectively into a counter-revolutionary struggle. The struggle against imperialism is only possible to the extent that a struggle is carried on against the native bourgeoisie which has sold itself and become an accomplice of imperialism and against the petty bourgeois opportunist deviations — a struggle which must have for its aim a true mass movement which will carry on the fight until the establishment of a workers' and peasants' government. Our task is to gather together the working and peasant masses, and to influence and bring with us the petty bourgeois masses which are becoming more and more proletarianised. The slogans of a workers' and peasants' bloc, organisation and consolidation of the anti-imperialist league and trade union movement and, most important of all, unity, according to the instruction of the Red International of Labour Unions, are slogans which are perfectly adapted to our country. It is the task of the Communist Party to coordinate and direct all these movements. For this purpose, it is indispensable to reinforce it and give it a good organisation, to transform it into a mass party.

Originating as a small group in the capital city and having passed through a crisis, the Party has spread into the interior of the country and has firmly established itself in the provinces of Cordova and Santa Fe. Our Party has maintained and increased this influence by spreading among the working masses the slogan of the workers' and peasants' bloc in order to rally around it the exploited workers and peasants and lead them to the struggle for the defence of their immediate interests.

In the struggle against imperialism and the bourgeoisie, we must not lose sight of the important role played by their agents, — the defenders of Pan-Americanism, the American Federation of Labour, which, by opportunist phraseology and in the name of democracy supports objectively and deliberately the penetration of Yankee imperialism — and lastly, the socialists who have split the trade union movement and who are now following the instructions of the Amsterdam Trade Union International; since the establishment of its office in Buenos Ayres, this international has been attempting to influence the trade union movement of Latin America. It has been opposing the American Federation of Labour and placing itself at the service of English imperialism. Social Democracy and the Amsterdam Trade Union International

constitute an effective force in Argentina which they utilise as a starting point for penetration throughout Latin America. It is the duty of our Party to struggle most vigorously against the corruption of a section of the working class, against the conquest of the labour movement by the imperialists, through the intermediary of their agents, whether these be from the American Federation of Labour or from the Amsterdam International; our fundamental task is to get on a true class basis to struggle against all imperialists, against the bourgeoisie as allies of imperialism, and against their agents, the socialists, petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals who ignore the role of the proletariat and against all forms of labour demagoguery.

The struggle of the workers and peasants of our country must be joined and bound up with the struggle of all the countries of South America, which are also the prey of imperialism, which is oppressing us cynically and openly, which is utilising all methods for its penetration, which is splitting the nations and inciting them against each other, in order to weaken them and take control of them more easily. The revolutionary and anti-imperialist movements in South America have common aims, they must therefore form a united front which in alliance with the proletariat of the ruling countries, can break down the oppressive power of imperialism. The Communist Party of Argentina is faced with formidable and multiple tasks. In the course of the past years we have had favourable conditions but we have not known how to become a real Party which could lead the masses in the fight. We have yielded on many points of our position. We have been torn by internal crises. Nevertheless, the Party has acquired broad experience and, at the present time, it is busy with the work of uniting its forces, analysing its mistakes and take advantage of the experiences of these past years. It is changing its methods of work and organisation. It is raising the level of its members, and with the support and direction of the Communist International it will transform itself into a great mass Party and will be in a position to accomplish its task of leading the proletariat to victory against imperialism.

#### Comrade WURM (E. C. C. I.):

Comrades, I believe that one of the essential questions on which there was a controversy during the discussion of the Colonial question was also somewhat brushed aside in the discussion. In the speeches of some of the comrades a certain schematism was to be observed which rendered it impossible to ascertain the proper points of difference.

I should like to deal with some details of the essential question of the so-called "decolonisation". This "decolonisation" involves everywhere such different things that it is possible only to establish here the general features of this development. The general feature consists in securing the bases of raw materials and selling markets. Comrade Arnot stated in his speech that the first period of capitalist colonial policy was expressed in the exporting of commodities, whilst the second period was expressed in the exporting of capital. He also complained that the question of colonial policies was being considered too schematically. Nevertheless he himself promptly fell into a kind of schematism, for even in the second period of capitalist colonisation the export of commodities cannot be separated from the export of capital. We find these two forms intermingling and interlocking, whilst the deciding role belongs to the export of capital.

Is it possible to judge of the development of the forces of production in a given country by the size of its capital export? Already here we encounter some difficulties. For we have to consider not only the amounts of money that flow into the colonial countries, but also the concrete application which is made of them. If we observe the export of capital to the colonial countries from this standpoint, we find a great variety of purposes for which this money is employed. Almost invariably the building of ways of communication constitutes the first purpose. Thus, in India, the transport was developed by means of capital export. But does this development of the transport constitute an unquestionable proof of the development of the productive forces in India? Not at all. In the whole of England's railway policies in India or in Africa, or in other colonies, the question of revenues from the railways does not play any role from the standpoint of economics. The railways were con-

venient source of tremendous profits, and the capitalists were only interested in making sure of the interest on their investments, for which purpose the revenue of the country, etc. was practically mortgaged. This constitutes the only concern of the imperialist country which makes colonial investments.

It should be generally observed that the industrial development of the colonies, apart from the colonies for land settlers, did not go any further than the creation of a certain raw material industry, or at most, certain industry of semi-manufactures. This is the general course of development to be observed in every colony.

There was a good deal spoken here about industrialisation. I believe that this term, if taken in the Marxian sense, implies something different from what was put into it by some comrades here. As a matter of fact, this term implies not only the development of an industry of raw materials and semi-manufactures, but the concept of industrialisation implies also the development of the manufacturing industries. It is only in this manner that the term acquires the importance which it has for capitalist production.

Comrade Bennett said that the whole question was not dealt with in a Marxian way by those comrades who deny the process of decolonisation. But he did not take the trouble to adduce any proof that this was a Marxian definition, but he simply went on to quote Marx on India. The fault with his argument here was that in the very passage quoted it was said by Marx that a certain capitalist development in colonial countries is possible only after the importation of machinery. Nothing at all is proved by the quotations from Comrade Dutt. If British capitalism deliberately pursues this new development, the question may just as well be asked whether it possesses definite ways and means to hinder this development. I believe British imperialism in India has these means at its disposal. England possesses sufficient means to prevent the penetration of foreign capital into India, or to turn it into such channels as would serve the interests of British imperialism.

Comrade Bennett went on to say that the British imperialists were no doctrinaires, that they were clever enough to adjust themselves to the eventual developments. But I believe this also to be a mistake. We have to deal here with certain tendencies of development in which imperialism, or capitalism, becomes involved and from which it cannot escape even by means of the cleverest policies.

However, the most important point is that it was declared by Comrade Bennet that the question of decolonisation was a bogey. Is this question considered a bogey by those comrades who expound this theory? Anyone who lately followed the discussion on this question has observed the contrary, namely, that we have to deal here with a very serious conception on the part of individual comrades which harbours a big danger. Of the articles written by the Comrades Rathboun, Roy and Luhan, I am going to quote from one by Luhan. He writes on the question of decolonisation:

"The process whereby India ceases to be a colony was stimulated by the weakness of British imperialism and not by the strength of the Indian bourgeoisie".

Thus, Comrade Luhan speaks in his report about a process now going on in the course of which India ceases to be a colony. Does not this constitute a complete denial of the facts? But he goes even further. In the same report we find the following sentence:

"Outwardly India represents today a modern bourgeois State which is rapidly doing away with the social survivals of feudalism."

Now, comrades, I believe that these statements contain a very great danger. And how does Luhan picture the extent of India's economic development? He writes:

"The International Labour Office of the League of Nations considers India as one of the world's eight big industrial countries. As regards the textile industry — the oldest industry in the country — India occupies fifth place in the world. The steel industry, which recently sprang up in India, is beginning to compete with European and American steel in the Indian market. On the other hand,

the capital accumulated by Indian capitalists is looking for opportunities of investment, even outside of India. Last year it was reported by the 'Times' that Indian capital was already available for investment abroad, whilst Indian manufactured goods were already gaining their way to the less developed Eastern markets. Indian mercantile capital was being invested in South Africa, in Kenya. Quite lately an Indian shipping company with Indian capital began to compete in the coastwise shipping in the Indian Ocean and was building a fleet of vessels to get into business for greater distances also."

This constitutes already a panegyric which we are not used to hearing in Communist circles. Now Comrades, I believe these few quotations will suffice to show that the Communist International ought to devote the greatest attention to these conceptions. The point of the controversy certainly does not relate to the fact that anyone might deny the existence of a certain industry. But the question is to ascertain the specific importance of this industry in relation to the whole economy of the country. And what do we find? Comrade Remmele was sharply attacked by Comrade Arnot for having designated the consumption of coal as the criterion of the extent of industrial development in a given country. If there is a deliberate industrialisation policy on the part of British imperialism, one should presume that at least the consumption of coal would directly increase to the same extent as the production within the country. Yet we find, for instance, that 1.2 million tons of coal were exported in 1925 and 2.6 million in 1926, which shows a growing export of coal with a relatively slight increase in the consumption of coal.

It was further stated by Comrade Arnot that there was a tremendous increase in the output of steel. This is unquestionably true. But is this an argument for industrialisation? Not at all. We have to deal here with an industry of raw material and semi-manufactures, and not an industry for the manufacturing of the means of production. The Indian steel output in late years was approximately 600,000 tons, whilst more than a million tons was imported. As regards pig-iron, over one-third was imported in late years. Thus here again we find no argument pointing to growing industrialisation. It is certainly more important to observe how the proper industry of the means of the production has developed in India. In this respect we can observe a complete stagnation on the basis of the figures relating to the imports of machinery. What do we find in the textile industry? This particular industry was mentioned a good deal by the comrades. Yet what kind of production is encouraged by the Indian Government? Does it encourage production in the modern capitalist sense or something else? In late years it encouraged handicraft production, and it notably encouraged the purchasing of hand-weaving looms. This is certainly no indication of growing industrialisation.

What development was encouraged by England? No doubt, the production of raw materials. For instance, we find considerable progress in the cultivation of cotton, a 30% increase in the output of short fibres since 1915, and an 85% increase in long fibre. Yet nearly the whole output of long fibre cotton goes to Lancashire. Thus we see that England pursues a systematic policy of developing the production of raw materials in India, but does not do anything to encourage the further development of the only manufacturing industry which might stimulate the development of capitalist economy in India.

Let us take a glance at the trade balance of India in late years. On examining the trade balance of a capitalist country or of a country going in a capitalist direction, one finds invariably a continuous growth in both imports and exports. But what do we find in India? If we take the figures since 1924, we find stagnation as regards imports, and retrogression as regards exports. This is certainly no sign of a process of industrialisation going on in India.

One more example. Let us see the emission of capital. Capital has the knack of going in the direction where it can make the highest profits. But how was the development of capital emission in India in late years? There were emitted:

In 1913 . . . . .	56 million rupees
" 1920 . . . . .	122 " "
" 1923 . . . . .	21 " "
" 1924 . . . . .	19 " "
" 1926 . . . . .	16 " "

The same picture we find in examining the comparative index of industrial shares.

Thus we find that we cannot assert that a process of industrialisation is now going on in India and that this process of industrialisation is encouraged and furthered by England. I believe, one of the most important arguments against those comrades who expound the theory of industrialisation is to quote from the *Balfour Report* on India in which we find, after a description of the general difficulties of British industry, the following statement:

"After several years of protectionist agitation in India they will have to arrive at the conclusion that it is more to India's economic interest to intensify the agriculture than to artificially stimulate the industry."

If such are the conclusions made by the leading elements of the English bourgeoisie concerning India, we have to conclude also that there is no British policy of industrialisation in India. But we also must reject the contrary opinion of some comrades because they approach the Social Democratic views on colonial policies. If we assume that India is going through an economic process which leads to the decolonisation of the country and its emancipation from England, then we cannot conceive the whole struggle against British imperialism which is going on in India, nor the social roots of that struggle. Yet an understanding and a clear appreciation of these circumstances is essential to our tactics in regard to the revolutionary emancipation struggle in India. Only in this manner will it be possible to create the postulates for the victory of the oppressed masses of India against British imperialism, and to properly choose the weapons of this struggle.

#### Comrade MAZUT (Young Com. International):

I was charged by the delegations of the Y. C. I. to make a few remarks on a question which aroused here a big discussion — the question of industrialisation. There is no difference of opinion as to the point that in colonies like India for instance a certain growth of industry, especially of the light industry, a certain growth of capitalism takes place.

I believe that what arouses differences and discussion is the question of the economic policy of British imperialism and of the role which this imperialism might play in the colonies. Is capitalism able to develop an industry in the colonies, is imperialism able to lead the industrialisation of the colonies? Can this capitalism transform the colonies into developed industrial countries? Can it develop there an industry of means of production? I think, comrades, that we do have differences on this question and that it is a question which is worth while discussing.

I think that the formulation accepted by the Second Congress on the colonial question was a correct one, and that it is in its main points correctly indicated by Kuusinen in his thesis. I think that the point in the colonial theses that imperialism aims to maintain the colonies as an agrarian appendage to the motherland is absolutely true. Imperialism at the present epoch of existence of the U. S. S. R. has become reactionary! and the attempts to present it now as a progressive form are wrong. And though Comrade Lominadse tried to prove the contrary, all his conclusions are wrong. If we take the concrete state of affairs in the colonies, analyse the events of the last years, we should find, that the policy of imperialism is directed towards arresting the industrial development, that in the colonies we have a struggle on the part of the new-born and growing native capitalism against imperialism. He who does not see this fundamental contradiction confuses the basis of the struggle between imperialism and colonies, he confuses and does not understand the characteristics of the "world village and the world city".

I shall quote here the characteristics given by an Indian professor Sapre, on the British economic policy.

"The development of the banking system in India is not only insufficient but also one-sided. The banks supported the home trade only to the point where it could thereby support the export trade. The banks did not consider the industry at all, neither in the field of agriculture nor of textiles". Further: "The railroads not only did not help

directly the industrialisation of the country but on account of their petty policy of railroad tariffs decidedly harmed and almost entirely annihilated even the little industry which existed in the country". Still further: "The majority of the Fiscal Commission declared the following in a recent report: 'Taken as a whole the accusation consists in that the railroad tariffs are drawn up so as to simplify and cut down the costs of transport from and to the ports at the expense of the inner goods traffic. This means a support of export of raw materials and import of foreign goods to the disadvantage of the Indian industry, which often has to pay unfair tariffs for raw materials exported from other parts of India, also for its own goods shipped to the local markets.'"

The same policy of undermining the inner markets of the native industry and of the industry itself is adopted in other branches of India's national economy. For instance, England holds up through different means the development of river and coastal-transport which is of great importance in the development of home trade.

These characteristics of the British policy by an Indian professor correspond to reality and underline the reactionary character of the economic policy of British imperialism.

During these last years we had some concessions on the side of England. They are to be explained firstly, by the military considerations of British imperialism; in the approaching world war in which the Pacific will probably play a great role, India — especially on the background of developments in China — gains an enormous significance. This is the reason why British imperialism is forced here to make certain concessions, for instance to develop the ways of communication, to develop auxiliary branches of the war industry. But this is of secondary importance and remains in the limits of war tasks.

The second factor is the pressure on the side of the national bourgeoisie. This pressure connected with the growth of mass movements had a certain influence on England, and England made concessions, before all in the field of light industry, mainly textile which did not contradict its fundamental interests. The point is that the Indian textile industry produces goods of a cheap kind while the English textile industry produces finer goods, so that there is no deep contradiction of interests between English and Indian industry. In this case England gave in for the simple reason that this did not affect her interests, while on the whole she continued her old imperialistic policy in India — to keep India as an agrarian appendage to the motherland.

Where does the export of capital invested in India go? It goes for loans, to keep up the army, to support the state-apparatus, for war-industry, etc. It goes also to those branches of industry which maintain the agrarian character of the country, for instance, to agriculture, agricultural industry, building in cities, banks serving credit, export and import operations, but in no way is this capital being used to help the development of production of means of production, or to help India to become an industrial country, as comrade Lominadse put it.

I consider that all these facts prove that British policy, just as imperialist policy in general, is directed towards maintaining the agrarian character of India. It is true that English imperialism aims to raise to a higher level agriculture which is extremely backward, that it favours the growth of technical cultures, etc., but all these measures are on the lines of preserving India as an agrarian appendage to the motherland. He who does not see it, describes the role of British imperialism in a progressive light and does not notice those fundamental contradictions which only a revolution and the working class and peasantry of India can solve.

The adherents of this point of view, do not see that by this they create a favourable basis for those comrades who represent the theory of "decolonisation". Comrades from this tribune have mentioned that there are adherents of this theory even in our ranks. I think that the fundamental line of the theses of Comrade Kuusinen is correct. The comrades who think that we diminish the role of the proletariat are wrong. On the contrary, the role of the proletariat as the protector, the

banner-bearer of the interests of the whole Indian national economy as a whole, of the Indian people, — grows, and out of this the objective role of the hegemony of the proletariat grows enormously, and there is no underestimation of the role of the proletariat here.

Out of the treason of the national bourgeoisie, of the fact that it can not even protect those economic interests of the country, which correspond to its fundamental interests, it follows that the role of the proletariat as the only leader of the masses, objectively grows enormously. This is a factor which will expedite its capture of the leadership of the movement. The attempts of the adherents of the point of view of the English delegation are certainly wrong in that they impute us as underestimating the role of the proletariat. (Bennet: The industry does not develop but the proletariat grows?)

I said, comrade Bennet, that the British policy is directed to keep the country as an agricultural appendage. The development of India comes into contradiction to British imperialism. The policy of British imperialism is directed towards arresting the capitalist development, and though the national bourgeoisie after all supports and will support British imperialism — this by no means changes our estimation of the role of British imperialism. The Indian Bourgeoisie will betray the interests of the industrial development and capitalism in India itself. What we have in China, we also have in India. And only the revolution under the leadership of the working class is able to solve this contradiction.

I consider that this point in comrade Kuusinen's theses is correct, it demands only a more detailed formulation, an explanation. And in this sense it can be accepted. (Applause.)

#### Comrade RAMIREZ (Mexico):

Comrade Kuusinen, although his thesis does not speak of or refer directly to our Latin American countries, advances observations and instructions that are of the greatest value. For example, in referring to the characteristics of the bourgeois democratic revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, Comrade Kuusinen has reflected very faithfully the situation of the major part of our Latin American countries. Notwithstanding this, it seems to me that the differentiation made between the countries of Latin America in relation to the degree of political and economic development and their dependence on the imperialism of England and the United States are incomplete. On this matter there should be a more detailed study in order to establish the logical and correct sub-division in each one of these countries. In this way, the correct tactics can be best applied.

The penetration of Yankee imperialism, always more and more aggressive, helps us and makes it necessary for us to revise our conclusions in regard to the present situation. The judgement of Comrade Codovilla, written less than two years ago, must be totally changed for the more correct one which is now expressed in the thesis without direct reference to Mexico by Comrade Kuusinen.

As follows: "Since the petty bourgeois national reformists are incapable of opposing the advance of imperialism, but are obliged to give way, trying to satisfy the masses with nationalist phrases which are wholly lacking in principle", on the one hand, while on the other they try to convince themselves again of the possibility of arriving at a peaceful agreement.

On another plane, the same mystification, the same deceit of the II. International, when in another form it says to the colonial peoples:

"Socialism repudiates in principle political domination of the colonial peoples and desires to abolish the colonial relation as a premise for the international community of colonial peoples."

That is to say, the Social Democracy, just as the petty bourgeoisie in power in our Latin American countries, repudiate in principle colonialism, but at the same time desire "a relation or a peaceful agreement between the two historically antagonistic forces: colonising imperialism and the colonial slaves".

This is the present tragedy of the petty bourgeoisie in Mexico. Certainly in the period of two years it resisted tenaciously Yankee imperialism, exerting all possible forces to keep alive and create in fact a national movement of its own. But imperialism was stronger than it; it was ravaged by hunger, blockaded economically, and the government had to give in on the petroleum question and it is already beginning to talk of reforming the agrarian laws, something which should not surprise us if we understand the teachings of **Marx and Lenin**; we know that it is its role to betray the masses. But this treason has its consequences, the masses begin to understand always more and more clearly the deception and this leads them finally to abandon their illusions in the promises of the petty bourgeoisie and to trust only their own forces for their emancipation.

Much has been said and written on the character of Mexican revolution. Here, from this platform, this question has already been analysed. Comrade Codovilla said in an article in the organ of the Communist International some two years ago, after making a classification of four groups of Latin America, in which he places Mexico in the fourth category i. e. "Countries where democratic revolutionary governments exist, that have tended to construct a national economy", he said the following:

"the petty bourgeois government strives toward the economic and political independence of the country on a basis which contains certain Socialist elements... In a certain sense we can compare the present situation in Mexico with the Russian situation under the regime of Kerensky."

Another comrade wrote recently

"The Mexican Revolution of 1910—17 can be characterised as a democratic bourgeois revolution which at the same time has the character of peasant insurrection and presents tendencies of its own as a colony to pursue the path of national liberation."

Comrade **Travin** says "that the revolutionary movement of Mexico and Latin America is of a revolutionary type". Comrade **Humbert-Droz** on the other hand maintains:

"the revolution of Latin America as well as the Mexican revolution are bourgeois democratic of the colonial type which have as a consequence a well pronounced anti-imperialist character."

I believe none of these definitions has described with exactitude the Mexican revolution.

The revolution in Mexico of 1910, led by **Madero**, was a typical bourgeois-democratic revolution. In order to justify certain statements, we have been presented with all sorts of explanations, but I will show here what **Madero** said in his speech of 1911:

"It is necessary to help the proletariat to progress but this progress must be slow, for in this manner capitalism will also progress."

This was the programme of the petty bourgeoisie against the feudal agrarian bourgeoisie. But this declaration found its acute repercussion amongst the masses of workers and peasants, who had to take up arms in order to better their conditions, without giving the least attention to the progress of capitalism.

**Madero** was killed by a coup d'état of the reaction and of the great agrarian bourgeoisie supported by English imperialism and personified in the assassin of **Madero**, General **Huerta**. **Carranza** entered into an uprising supported by Yankee imperialism and with the collaboration of the labour movement on the basis of a contract signed by anarchist and reformist leaders — which was the beginning of the collaboration of the reformist labour movement with the petty bourgeois governments of Mexico —, overthrow the government of **Huerta** and continued the struggle against **Billa** and **Zapata** who represent in the first case, nationalism against the alliance of **Carranza** with American capitalism and in the second, the rebellion of the peasants to obtain land.

The working class pressure compelled **Carranza** to issue the decree on the right to strike, recognition of the trade unions, 8-hour day of labour, etc. etc. The pressure of the peasant masses who had risen in arms under **Zapata** and who partially expropriated the land compelled **Carranza** to issue his

decree of the 6th January 1915 in which Article 27 deals with the division of the land among the poor peasants.

Under the most intense pressure of the masses of workers and peasants, the Congress of Queretaro met and established the Constitution of 1917, which favours in Articles 123 and 27 the workers and peasants. The whole revolutionary period of 1910—17 is very acute. But the revolution did not end then. Strikes of a social character were so intense that it was sufficient to know this fact to see clearly what was the situation up till 1921. The number of strikes in 1911 were only 6 and included 19,000 strikers. In 1921 the number of strikes reached 89 and included 106,000 workers; almost one-fifth of the industrial proletariat of Mexico.

The coup d'état of **Obregon** swept away **Carranza** in 1920; but it was a military struggle; the proletarian masses did not participate in it at all. Undoubtedly, the conditions were not the same as in 1910. The class-consciousness of the workers and peasants began to develop and a clarification was brought about in spite of the attempts of the reformist leaders of the C. R. O. M. with **Morones** at the head, who signed an agreement with **Obregon** offering him support that no one had authorised him to give and which **Obregon** did not need, and which he would not have been able to obtain very easily from the organised working class.

It is true that our Party did not exist organisationally yet, but it did exercise some influence already by means of various groups, in the organisations. The revolution of 1923, which was nothing more than the last organised effort of the remnants of feudalism allied with the church and British imperialism, which wanted to take the power from the petty-bourgeoisie, was met with a stubborn resistance on the part of the peasant and working class masses to which our Party had helped by its political and education work.

The rebellion of **Gomez** and **Serrano** in October of 1927, is well known to us. The opinion of the working and peasant masses was so clear, that without their intervention, only with the strength of their full conviction that it was just another reactionary uprising, it took the government only three days to smash this uprising.

It has been said that our tactics have been defective and erroneous, and as a consequence, our perspectives have had to be so. We do not say that no errors have been made. But the political line of the Party has been, in general, correct.

What has the revolution given to the workers? A few small reforms and a good-looking constitution and nothing else. The revolution has given the power to the bourgeoisie and with it the power to exploit the workers and poor peasants. In 1922 our Party said in its pamphlet:

"The Communist Party of Mexico recommends to the workers that they do not take part in the riots that are being prepared by various politicians because the participation of the workers in these riots will only weaken the forces of the Mexican proletariat and these must be safeguarded for the social revolution. The Communist Party of Mexico will tell the workers when the moment is opportune to take advantage of the political riots and transform it into the social revolution."

In 1923 we had the directives which came to us in a letter from the E. C. C. I. to the Mexican proletariat. In one of the paragraphs it reads as follows:

"Calles will be obliged to yield to imperialism. It is evident he represents for the masses of workers and peasants the struggle against the bourgeoisie and the clericals, and consequently will be supported by them. It is the task of the Communist Party to destroy the illusions of the masses in the government of Calles. The policy of the Calles government will open the eyes of the Mexican proletariat — and the workers and peasants of Mexico will understand that there are only two policies: either the dictatorship of the proletariat under the slogan of all power to the workers and peasants, or the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie."

Finally, in August 1927, our Party submitted to the workers of Mexico its attitude with respect to the situation by means of its August resolution in which it said, among other things,



the following: We can affirm that the alliance between the bourgeoisie and the petty-bourgeoisie and the proletariat constitutes a pre-dominant force in the country sufficient to smother any attempt at reactionary dictatorship. However, this does not mean that the interests of the national bourgeoisie and the working class are the same. On the contrary, the proletariat has interests essentially opposite to those of the bourgeoisie, and its temporary alliance can only be justified by the fact that the power is still in the hands of reaction. The working class of Mexico, divided and decentralised like the territory of Mexico itself, has not been able to create a strong organisation and a national proletarian direction. Having neither the necessary cohesion, nor direction, the worker and peasant masses cannot initiate an independent struggle for the conquest of power. But confronted with the efforts of the clergy and reaction for the overthrow of the government of the petty-bourgeoisie, it is the duty of the proletariat to support the candidate of the petty-bourgeoisie. It was not a secret for anybody that against the candidacy of General Obregon, the Generals Gomez and Serrano represent the interests of reaction, and of the conservative classes. In view of the above, the Communist Party does not expect from General Obregon the solution of the fundamental problems of the proletariat. The Communist Party supports the candidacy of Obregon without any agreements or compromises, but only as a defensive measure against the common enemy, against the clerical reaction. General Obregon belongs to the Right wing of the national bourgeoisie, that is to say, he is the representative of those elements who aspire to the national reconstruction and industrialisation of the country on the basis of the creation of a national capitalism, of a strong national bourgeoisie showing an independence from the foreign influence.

The policy of Obregon, openly capitalist, even though it aspires to reconstruct the country on a higher level of living conditions, undoubtedly will diminish the public influence and the prestige of such "Labour leaders" whose activity must lead to the exposure in the eyes of the masses of the real role of the opportunist leaders of the C. R. O. M. We believe that it is clear enough what has been the policy of our Party in this connection. How then can we admit the charge that our Party has not showed its face enough and has not spoken enough about the hegemony of the proletariat? I believe that the comrades who say that have not read enough our Party organ, manifestoes, declarations, etc., etc., on this matter. If you judge our Party activities through, for example, the "Daily Worker", of the American Party, the Mexican delegation declares that at the present moment this paper does not correctly interpret the situation in Mexico, nor the attitude of our Party. Why? Simply because it treats these problems superficially, being problems which require a much better understanding of the situation to reach the right conclusions. Our Party has not said a word in defence of Morones and his reformist group. Nevertheless, anyone who has read the opinions expressed in the "Daily Worker" with respect to Mexico recently, will get the impression that our Party believes that Morones is a victim of the clergy and the agrarian reaction. The truth is that the only thing our Party has done in this connection is to place before the workers the following demands:

"For the complete distribution of all the land and for the disarming of the white guards, for the effective nationalisation of the mineral wealth, and workers control over production and consumption, for the extermination of the clerical reaction, and the arming of the workers and peasants; for the effective introduction of working class insurance, and the application of the few proletarian conquests of the constitution in the interests of the workers which up to now have been a dead letter, and for the international workers and peasants bloc in the countries of the three Americas against imperialist oppression!"

Comrade Humbert Droz stated in his thesis that comrades of the Mexican Party have declared that the Calles Government is socialist. I must say that if any comrades have expressed such an opinion, this does not mean that this is the opinion of the Party. Furthermore, I do not know any Mexican comrade who has such an opinion.

The Mexican bourgeois democratic agrarian revolution has assumed a form which is not like that of revolutions in other countries of Latin America, which in many cases are mere military riots. The Mexican revolution cannot be placed in the

same line of development. It has followed a zig-zag line, sometimes high, sometimes low. It has followed the natural course of all revolutionary processes. This process has not been completed, and after 18 years of struggle it has to its credit a number of achievements, that cannot be called socialist, but from which you cannot detract its proletarian character. What shall we call it? How shall we define the exact nature of the Mexican revolution? The organising of peasant unions in Mexico, the arming of thousands of peasants and so forth, are conquests which the proletariat of Mexico will not give up. On the contrary, it is trying to enlarge them.

The Mexican bourgeois-democratic revolution in its second stage undoubtedly contains certain elements in the course of its growth that in other countries will appear and become real in the initiation of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat: peculiar transitional forms of the semi-colonial countries, to which Lenin already refers in his book on Imperialism.

Some comrades have overestimated the character of the Mexican revolution, others have underestimated it. Calles, not even to a certain extent, will be the last Kerensky of the Mexican revolution. Neither does the Mexican revolution decrease, because the petty-bourgeoisie in power abdicates, because the workers and peasant masses gain in proletarian consciousness.

Therefore we believe that the estimation of those comrades who have tried to analyse the question have not taken into account a number of indispensable factors.

As for the carrying through of the tasks of our Party, I believe that, in spite of our inexperience and organisational and ideological weaknesses, we have, in general, a correct political line. Notwithstanding the errors which have been committed, and the errors which have not been committed and which have been ascribed to us, there is one eloquent fact which stands out — that our membership has been more than doubled during the last year, and our influence among the working and peasant masses, organised and unorganised, has increased considerably. If the results have been good, then it must be admitted that the policy and tactics of our Party have been more or less correct.

The Communist literature in the Spanish language is still very poor. This must be remedied; the more than 100 million of human beings who speak Spanish demand it. The period before us is of fundamental importance to the world proletariat, and our Parties will not carry through their mission in the proper way if they do not play the role corresponding to the struggle against imperialism. If they are sufficiently prepared, so much the better will they be able to carry through the struggle united under the banner of the Communist International.

#### Comrade BEN SAID (Algeria):

To give a good idea of the question of the colonial workers in France, one must get at the root of it.

The problem of colonial workers in France has already received the attention of our Party.

This labour power played a very important role during the war. Recruited by force for starvation pay it was used for the manufacture of war material and for military work. Only an infinitesimal section was specialised and received equal wages with French workers. This encouraged clandestine embarkations which assumed enormous proportions. In 1920 imperialism, seeing that it could not put a stop to them, gave freedom of passage.

But the main factor which determined imperialism to make this concession was the lack of labour power in the colonies.

Before the war French capitalism suffered from lack of labour power. The war aggravated this deficit and brought confusion into the economy of the country. In the post-war period the problem of the reconstruction of the devastated regions, the trend towards industrialisation stimulated by the annexation of Alsace Lorraine, compelled French capitalism to introduce foreign and colonial labour power.

Colonial labour power (unskilled workers) and foreign labour power (skilled) workers, introduced in France after the war by French capitalism made the law of supply and demand function in its favour. From its exploitation it derived a great deal of prosperity; moreover it enabled it to constitute its industrial reserve army.

The revolutionary situation which arose after the war brought capitalism face to face with a series of problems, among others the introduction on a large scale of labour power from technically backward countries which are under its yoke.

French capitalism imagined that this labour power would be in its hands a weapon which would crush all eventual movements of the working class for better conditions. It also hoped that the very low wages paid to the workers would create between it and the French workers continuous friction and antagonism and would be a means to reduce the wages of the latter.

Thus there were in France in 1924 about 300,000 North Africans including 70,000 in the Paris region. This number has been reduced to 100,000 including 40,000 in the Paris region. They are employed by various industries especially by the metallurgical industry. Their average pay is 20 francs. These workers returned and are still returning to France by various means — clandestine embarkments, industrial or collective contracts.

The objective and subjective reasons which are at the root of this exodus are the pauperisation of the peasantry, the accentuation of the process of the proletarianisation of the petty bourgeoisie and the artisans, the terrorist regime which has become the normal regime, the "high wages" earned by their compatriots who have already gone to France.

Collective recruitment through agencies has also played a certain role. Recruiters invaded the regions and dangled before the eyes of the natives enticing wages and wonderful conditions of labour. They frequently succeeded in making many recruits especially among the Khammes (landless peasants) who were atrociously duped in this manner. For when they arrived in France they found that their wages were 25 to 40% smaller than those paid to French workers; moreover travelling expenses were deducted from their wages although they had been told that they get a free passage. They are also made to pay for their lodgings (in insanitary barracks).

In 1926 a terrible tragedy took place in connection with clandestine embarkations. On a boat travelling from Algiers to Marseilles 25 natives were found dead in the ships hold, two years after the promulgation of the Chautemps-decree which suppressed freedom of passage.

In spite of the suppression of the freedom of passage the number of colonial workers did not decrease till the economic crisis of 1926—27. They were the first to be dismissed. By roundabout methods used in certain regions they were compelled to go back to their country, whereas in the Lyons region they were repatriated by force.

Did our Party work among these workers? The answer must be in the affirmative although the work was not very adequate. Nevertheless the organisation of many recruiting and agitational campaigns, especially in the Paris region, can be reckoned among the real successes of the Party.

The organisation of Congresses of North African workers in Paris, Douai, and Marseilles were the culminating point of the great work in these regions. The Congresses, which were attended by many delegates from these regions, discussed political and trade union Theses and adopted two resolutions dealing with their immediate political and trade union demands. One must admit that it was a great error not to keep up the connection with these delegates which would have enabled us to group them in trade unions and to form among them regional cadres.

During the Riff war work among these workers was utterly neglected. Instead of taking advantage of the presence of these elements in France in order to explain to them the position of the Party and to help to develop their class consciousness which they were beginning to acquire under the influence of the economic conditions, they were utterly neglected. During the general strike declared by the Committee of Action against the war in Morocco these workers did not respond to this slogan as was expected of them. The blame for this rests with the regions and districts which did not do their duty in this sphere.

This defect was remedied to a certain extent by the creation of the post of colonial organiser which was very serviceable

in the Paris region but had to be suppressed subsequently for certain reason.

Our comrades in the C. G. T. U. realised the importance of this question only much later. Till 1925 the Party alone carried on recruiting campaigns for the trade unions. At that date a part-time organiser was appointed but this did not have the desired results owing to the inertia of the Executive.

It was only in 1926 that the Colonial Bureau was reorganised and a permanent organiser was appointed.

We must admit that although at first this colonial bureau was fairly active and succeeded in grouping around itself energetic bona fide workers, this is no longer the case at present. The energy displayed at first has made room for complete inertia. For instance no preparatory work was done in this sphere for the last May Day. A few feeble efforts were made by the C. G. T. U. in regard to the colonial workers.

It should also be pointed out that even militant colonial workers are showing signs of inertia because they do not get the necessary encouragement and direction from the leading cadres of the Party. No work has been done at all among the Negroes and Indo-Chinese of whom there are 10,000 in France.

When the Party and the C. G. T. U. were embarking on energetic work among the colonial workers the C. G. T., through its Secretary **Jouhaux**, was demanding the complete repatriation of these workers on the plea "that these 300,000 colonial workers who have acquired certain professional skill can provide the technical cadres required for the further development of the French Colonies...."

Soon after Jouhaux brought forward another very edifying proposal in the National Labour Sub-Commission to the following effect:

"Considering that the requirements of the natives are very modest and that their production is one quarter of that of the French worker, their wages must be established on this basis...."

This slogan issued by Jouhaux from the platform of the National Labour Commission where he collaborates with the big industrialists is taken over from an Algerian deputy. This representative of the colonies, who is himself a colonist and a mine-owner, formulated his proposals as follows:

"In Algeria shortage of labour power is the most serious problem confronting the colonisers. It is absolutely necessary that North African workers who are in France should not get such high wages. Taking into consideration this smaller productivity they must receive the same pay as workers in Algeria."

Community of viewpoints between Jouhaux, the spokesman of the C. G. T., and the representative of the colonisers reveals the path traversed by the reformist organisation which has fallen into downright racial hostility and shows to these workers that it is the best supporter of the employers and colonisers.

It will be no news to you that the colonial workers will have nothing to do with it and that any attempt to form a reformist organisation is bound to fail ignominiously.

In this connection it should be pointed out that two police bureaux have been established in France, one in Paris for the Algerians and the other in Marseilles for the Indo-Chinese. These bureaux are above all to watch over revolutionary workers and to terrorise colonial workers who follow us.

By such means natives who are known to be active trade unionists or active Party members are dismissed from certain factories while others, in order to get employment, must produce a green card signed by this bureau to which employers apply for information about the workers they engage.

Our Party carried on an energetic campaign against the establishment of that detective institution which demonstrates the determination of French imperialism to apply to colonial workers the denizenship regime even in France. But this demonstrates also that imperialism is alarmed by the increasing sympathy of these masses for our Party.

It should also be stated that the desire to be organised is very strong among these masses. Thus many organisations have sprung up on the platform of national independence which advocate uncompromising direct struggle against imperialism.

The most characteristic of these organisations is certainly "L'Etoile Nord African" (the North African Star). This Association established by the North African workers in Paris is rather influential in North Africa. At one time it had as many as 2,000 members in the Paris region alone. But the economic crisis in 1926 reduced its membership considerably. This did not however prevent it taking up a definite attitude to the political, economic and social problems which arose in North Africa. Thus it published its programme for the three North African countries in its organ "Ikdam" which is very popular and has a big circulation among the populations of North Africa and was several times suppressed by the Minister of the Interior. The programme demands complete independence without neglecting at the same time to bring forward a programme of immediate demands for each of these countries concerning the peasantry, the working class, civil liberties, women, a programme from the cultural and constitutional viewpoint: demands against feudalism, big landowners and all the profiteers of the colonisation system.

"L'Etoile" denounces energetically the opportunist bourgeoisie, combats tendencies towards assimilation and exposes the attitude of the social-democrats which is described as follows in an article published in the "Ikdam":

"Its collaboration in the new military law and its adherence to the plan for the development of the colonies make this party one of the worst enemies of the colonial peoples, a particularly dangerous enemy because of its insinuating and perfidious policy."

This Association is by no means sectarian; its statutes show that it is open to all North Africans whatever be their creed as long as they accept its programme, defend it everywhere and at all times and submit to its discipline.

This Association carried on a big agitation in the Paris region: it held at one time 4 to 5 agitational meetings per week. But one must say that it has not yet extended in the Colonies proper where it has good connections, nor to regions in France where more African workers reside.

There are also three groups of Indo-Chinese workers in France (in Paris, Havre and Marseilles). These Associations embrace all the Indo-Chinese workers of these localities but they do not have any official and organisational connection between each other which would have enabled them to carry on a more effective struggle against imperialism. Nearly all the members of these Associations are seamen and foodworkers.

There are also Students Associations in every French university town, but they are merely mutual aid associations. There is also for instance, the Independence Party which has branches in Toulouse, Havre and Bordeaux. This Party and its organ "L'Avenir de L'Annam" (Annam's Future) advocate the independence of Indo-China but have no political platform.

There are many Negroes in Marseilles, Bordeaux and Paris. They have three organisations. One is a freemason organisation and the other two go by the name of "Defence Committee of the Negro Race". The two latter constituted at first one group which was founded by our much lamented comrade Sengnor Lamine.

I would like to say a few words on the North African Students Association which was founded a few months ago. This group seems to be a purely mutual aid and philanthropic society. It consists of young native bourgeois elements with a sprinkling of poor students who profess their national sentiment behind the scenes but are too timid to profess it publicly. Through their silence and political inertia they are objectively supporting the imperialist policy of expropriation, exploitation and terror of imperialism.

These students should learn a lesson from the native manual workers in the Paris region who, in spite of the obscurantism to which Imperialism condemns them, have been able to find the right path: the path of organisation which alone will lead to liberation.

The French proletariat is the only proletariat of the imperialist countries which has the great advantage of the presence of colonial elements in the mother country. This creates important duties for the French Party because these workers stay generally only one or two years in France. Therefore we must concentrate our efforts on these immigration channels and stations where the natives merge together from various North African regions and can be developed into future cadres for their own class organisations.

One must of course admit that progress has been made in this domain since the V. Congress, but one must also admit that the work done is inadequate. Among these elements we must not work sporadically but systematically and continuously, through our basic organisations which unfortunately do not yet fully realise the importance of this question.

Formation of militant colonial cadres, efforts on our part to group them in trade union organisations, developing their class consciousness and recruiting them for the Party, — such must be our tasks in France.

It is only by tackling these tasks resolutely, by establishing a united front of the oppressed of the colonies and the exploited of the mother countries, that we will be able to make a stride towards the preparation of the revolution.

#### Comrade SHAGRI (Persia):

Comrades, as pointed out in the theses, the immediate task of the Comintern after the Congress is — establishment of Communist Parties in countries where none as yet exist, and the consolidation of those which already exist.

But the question arises, what our Communist Parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries should be like. It is said in the theses that Communist Parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries must be genuine proletarian parties not only in regard to their aims and programmes but also in regard to their social composition. This is correct, but are our Parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries really genuine proletarian parties? I can boldly say, in regard to many parties, that they are not. Our colonial parties have been crowded with opportunist and petty-bourgeois elements. For instance, our Persian Party had in 1922 several thousand members, half of them being petty-bourgeois and opportunist elements. This applies also to other parties, for instance, the Turkish Party where a similar state of affairs prevails.

The experience of the colonial parties shows that parties must not aim at quantity but rather at the quality of their membership.

Colonial Communist Parties are confronted with three main tasks: 1. leadership in the class struggle, in the struggle of the working class of the respective country; 2. Development of the peasant struggle and the agrarian revolution; 3. Struggle against imperialism.

In regard to the first question, the Communist Party must of course come forward independently and with its own programme, it must not co-operate with other classes. But in regard to the second and third question, the Communist Party must of course make full use of the masses of these countries. To solve these tasks, the Communist Party must co-operate with and utilise the small and middle peasantry, the intelligentsia and small and middle traders.

Comrades, in many Eastern countries these classes (intelligentsia, small traders, merchants) have not yet fulfilled their historical role and have still a great deal to do in the struggle against imperialism and for liberation from the imperialist yoke. We must organise now these masses for the struggle against imperialism. I think that in colonial and semi-colonial countries where the peasant movement already exists and develops rapidly from year to year, the organisation of labour-peasant parties, as auxiliary organisations for the Communist Parties, is necessary. For instance, in India. These labour-peasant parties must control the struggle of the peasantry, must place themselves at the head of this struggle. I therefore disagree with that part of the theses where the necessity of organising labour-peasant parties is denied. It goes without saying that the or-

organisation of a labour-peasant party where a strong Communist Party already exists, enables us to prevent by correct leadership the transformation or degeneration of the labour-peasant party into a bourgeois counter-revolutionary party. A labour-peasant party was organised in Persia in 1924. But as at that time there was no strongly developed peasant movement in Persia, the organisation of such a special labour-peasant party seemed superfluous. But in the country like India, it has every justification.

I will deal now with national-revolutionary parties. As I have already said, we must make use of several classes, for instance, the peasantry, small and middle traders in the struggle against imperialism. But these classes by themselves are unable to organise the struggle, and the Communist Party must assume control over them. We are therefore confronted with the question of creating such parties in countries such as Persia. We know, of course, that in China, this party, i. e. the Kuomintang, has turned reactionary. On the other hand, in Mongolia, such a party has produced brilliant results. A national-revolutionary party could co-ordinate elements capable of playing today a progressive role. Therefore, I personally, consider imperative the organisation of national-revolutionary parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries, but of course only when a strong Communist Party has been established there.

Unfortunately, we find the following statement in the theses of the Comintern Congress:

"When Great Britain noticed that the national elements had become strong in Persia, it organised in 1924 the insurrection of Mohammed Haisal, on whose territory the enterprises of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company were situated. This insurrection ended ignominiously."

This statement is not correct. The Sheik Haisal did not combat the national forces in Persia. This was only a struggle within the feudal-landlord class, within the reactionary strata. There was no consolidation of national forces in Persia. On the contrary, there was a consolidation of reactionary forces. **Reza Shah** is the representative of the Persian reaction, and not the representative of Persian nationalism and progress. Such formulae should have no room in the theses of the VI. Congress of the Comintern. I therefore strongly object to that part of the theses which mentions some sort of national forces which are supposed to be grouped around Reza Shah.

Comrades, there is another question with which I would like to deal — the importance of **Pan Islamism**. Nothing is said about this question in the theses, and yet it is of enormous importance for colonial and semi-colonial countries, above all, for the Moslem world. Imperialism made an extremely clever use of the slogan of Pan Islamism for the achievement of its aims. Just during the imperialist war of 1914 Pan Islamism was the main tactical slogan of the imperialists by which they utilised Moslem, Mohammedan countries and peoples for their own purposes. This is a very acute and important question which we cannot ignore. I think therefore that Pan Islamism should be mentioned in the theses; it should be pointed out the harm it does to us and that the Communist Parties of countries such as India, Persia, Turkey, Syria, in fact all Moslem countries must act energetically against Pan-Islamism and expose the manoeuvres and intrigues of the imperialists

Comrade **CHEN KWANG** (China):

The question that requires our closest attention in the nationalist movements in the colonial countries is that of the participation of the bourgeoisie in the revolution. The experience of the rise and the failure of the Chinese Revolution prove that at a certain stage of the development of the revolution the bourgeoisie can play a revolutionary role. At the same time it is inevitable that the bourgeoisie in the colonial countries will ultimately pursue a counter-revolutionary path, but during the process of the transformation of the bourgeoisie in the revolution, partly because objectively the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution have not yet been completed, and partly because the bourgeoisie, in its attempt to hold political power, makes radical gestures such as putting forward the slogan for the unity of the country, the demobilisation of

the soldiers and the demand for tariff autonomy, there are comrades who fail to understand the real situation and who raise the question of the possibility of a further revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie. After the occupation of Peking by the Kuomintang forces some Chinese as well as foreign comrades raised the following questions;

1. Whether the Kuomintang can still play a considerable revolutionary role in the anti-imperialist movement in China.

2. Whether there is a possibility for the Kuomintang power to consolidate itself and to carry out a reformist programme.

3. Whether there is under the Kuomintang regime a possibility for the development not only of a "third party", but even a possibility for the Communist Party and the revolutionary workers' and peasants' organisations to carry on their activities legally.

In answering these questions we cannot consider the nationalist movements in the colonies apart from the world revolutionary movement, nor can we consider a counter-revolutionary national bourgeoisie in the colonies apart from the imperialists. After the betrayal of the revolution by the national bourgeoisie in the colonies, the tasks of the bourgeois democratic revolution will inevitably fall upon the shoulders of the worker and peasant masses who are under the leadership of the proletariat. The revolutionary tasks consist in driving away the imperialists, in carrying out the agrarian revolution, in bringing about the 8-hour day, establishing Soviet political power and in completing the national independence of the colonies. In the carrying out of these tasks the proletariat cannot for one moment neglect its class struggle. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that there are still contradictions between the national bourgeoisie and the imperialists, between the national bourgeoisie and the feudal forces and new militarists; that the national bourgeoisie objectively still demands national independence — the national bourgeoisie will inevitably adopt the policy of suppressing the workers' movement and capitulation to the imperialists. This is because the national bourgeoisie in the colonies is weak, and in the face of either the bribery or the pressure of the imperialists and the developing class struggle of the proletariat, it will inevitably turn to the side of counter-revolution. Not only the Indian national bourgeoisie which is dominated by one imperialist country is acting this way, but the Chinese national bourgeoisie, which is controlled by many imperialist countries, also acts this way in the face of the policy of Japan's threats and the policy of bribery of the United States of America.

Therefore, I think to say that the national bourgeoisie which has already betrayed the revolution can still play an anti-imperialist role, is to show a lack of understanding of the transition and the progress of revolutionary stages in the colonies and the role which the imperialists play in the revolutionary movement in the colonies. This mistake is the result of a mechanical understanding of the revolutionary role which the different classes play in the revolution.

The second and the third questions should be answered together. If we admit that there is a possibility for the stabilisation of the Kuomintang political power, then 1. Either the imperialist policy of the division of China has been successful and has completely turned China into a colony. In this event the Kuomintang would be simply a tool of the imperialist rule in China; 2. or the strength of the Chinese national bourgeoisie is great enough to maintain its independent political power; 3. or the Chinese workers' and peasants' revolution has completely failed and there is no possibility of any development in the near future.

But facts tell us that first of all the world revolution has already reached its third period, that capitalism has its own new internal contradictions, that imperialism is confronted with new conflicts for the re-division of the colonies, and that a new world war, especially a Pacific War, is imminent. There is a Leftward movement of the working class of the world and a forward development of national revolutionary movements in the colonies. If we cannot disprove these facts, then there is no reason to believe that the imperialists can safely turn China into a complete colony. And further, the conflicts between Japan and the United States of America, in China as well as in the Pacific area, are becoming more and more

serious every day. The conflict between the Right wing and the Left wing at the V Plenum of the Kuomintang which recently met in Nanking reflect this very clearly. The Left wing is pro-American and maintains that the boycott movement against Japanese goods should be encouraged. The Right wing and the Centrist are compromising with Japanese and British imperialism, and they are in favour of suppressing the popular-anti-Japanese movement. This conflict is a symptom of the coming war between the new Chinese militarists which will be instigated and utilised by the imperialists. Secondly, the semi-colonial status of China, the fact that the Chinese Kuomintang represents the political power of the landed gentry and bourgeoisie under the shelter of the imperialists, and the fact that the Chinese national bourgeoisie is not yet fully developed and is infected with provincialism, all prove that the Chinese national bourgeoisie has absolutely no possibility of independently maintaining its political power. Thirdly, not only is the world revolutionary movement developing rapidly, the Chinese revolution is still progressing in spite of the tremendous defeat it suffered. The agrarian revolution is developing rapidly in the villages. The revolutionary movement among the soldiers is progressing. The internal conflicts and the struggles in the army are assuming a revolutionary character. The city poor are gradually adopting an anti-Kuomintang position because of their experience in the anti-Japanese movement. In spite of the capitalist offensive and the reign of white terror, the working class is again consolidating its forces and is preparing for the coming new revolutionary wave. Under the banner of the Soviet revolution which the Canton uprising has hoisted, the Chinese proletariat is developing its leading role in the revolution. These facts may not yet be sufficiently clear to the comrades of our brother Parties who live far away from China, but if we open even imperialist newspapers we will find much news about peasant uprisings, the revolt of soldiers, and the slaughter of city workers. All these facts prove that the Chinese revolution has not yet been completely defeated, that it is still undermining the political power of the Kuomintang, of the Chinese landed gentry and the bourgeoisie. All these facts prove that there is no possibility for the Kuomintang to carry out a reformist programme. The conditions in China are such that not only the living conditions of the workers are getting worse every day, that the workers enjoy absolutely no freedom in political and trade union activities and that the struggles between the peasants and the landlords are becoming sharper and sharper, but even the anti-imperialist movements are prohibited by the Kuomintang government. This shows that there is not the slightest sign of reformism in the Kuomintang rule.

Precisely at this moment the II International has invited the Kuomintang to take part in its Congress. The II International is evidently carrying out the diplomacy of the imperialists by drawing the hangmen of the Chinese and workers and peasants into the ranks of the II International. By doing this the II International is recognising the activities of the Kuomintang in helping the imperialists in the exploitation of China, the results of which are, of course, shared by the labour aristocrats.

Next, let us come to the question of the "third party". This organisation is the inevitable consequence of the polarisation of the forces of revolution and counter-revolution in China. Since the Kuomintang Government is becoming more and more reactionary and the Soviet revolution is developing rapidly, and since there is a pause between the two revolutionary waves, it is inevitable that a portion of the petty bourgeoisie should come out to organise a "third party". But since its policy is to prevent the Soviet revolution, it cannot have any real revolutionary policy. It refuses to stand for the agrarian revolution, but advocates local self-government for the villages (our comrade Pepper once also advocated such a policy). In spite of preparing the workers for the armed uprising, it only asks for the reinstatement of the mass movement and hopes for the realisation of a reformist programme. If the "third party" will be able to carry on its activities openly, its policy of compromise will objectively make it a Left wing of the Kuomintang. The results of this policy have already been revealed by the recent activities of the Left wing of the Kuomintang. Let us suppose that the "third party" refused to become the Left wing of the Kuomintang, then it must oppose the Kuomintang. Considered from this standpoint the prospects of the "third party" are also very bad. Because when a new revolutionary wave rises a por-

tion of the petty bourgeoisie will naturally come under the leadership of the proletariat, and the possibilities of the development of the "third party" will be reduced to a minimum.

Having shown the impossibility of the imperialists to turn China into a complete colony, having proved the impossibility for the national bourgeoisie to stabilise itself, and having shown the bad prospects of the "third party", I think we can safely say that there is no possibility for the Communist Party and the revolutionary workers' and peasants' organisations to carry out a legal movement. Only opportunists can draw an opposite conclusion.

Basing our observations on the fact that the world revolution has already reached its third stage and that the Chinese Revolution is still progressing, we can clearly see that there is no other way for the Chinese Communist Party but to organise hundreds and millions of Chinese toilers, preparing them for the coming revolutionary wave, carrying out the armed uprising, overthrowing the rule of the Kuomintang of the landed gentry and bourgeoisie, and establishing the political power of the Soviets.

The world proletariat and our brother parties must recognise the fact that the reactionary role which the Kuomintang plays in the colonies is similar to the role of the Fascists in Europe. 310,000 of the Chinese workers and peasant masses, of whom 6,000 were Communists, fell as victims of the Kuomintang. Its brutality excels the record of all the Fascists in the world. The Kuomintang not only governs China on behalf of its imperialist masters, but its counter-revolutionary position is affecting the bourgeoisie of other colonial countries in the East, and is influencing them in the same direction of counter-revolution. Therefore, one of the important tasks of the Communists is not only to fight against the fascists in the West, but also to fight against the Fascists in the East — the Kuomintang!

#### Declaration of Comrade ROTHSTEIN (Great Britain):

In the course of Comrade Schubin's speech this morning the question arose of a certain position which the British delegation was supposed to hold. The British delegation has commissioned me to make the following statement here.

In the first place, the amendments that we proposed in our speeches in this discussion were intended for one main purpose — to correct a series of errors within the chief theoretical part of the thesis. We wished to oppose the theory of "village continents", in which strikes embracing tens and hundreds of thousands of workers take place. Secondly, we wished to criticise the theory of transformation, I underline this because some comrades have spoken as though it were only a question of the maintenance of the colonies into "agrarian hinterlands" and "appendages" of the imperialist countries. We wished to oppose this because we could not understand how, in a country which is being transformed more and more into an "agrarian hinterland", suddenly a bourgeoisie and a proletariat could make their appearance, and conduct a struggle for the hegemony of the national revolutionary movement. Thirdly, we wished to oppose the conception that the policy of finance-capital represents a "deviation" from the supposed general policy of capitalism. Fourthly, we wished to criticise the theory that the colonies were being adapted to the requirements of the industries in the chief imperialist countries, when in actual fact, as we see from the example of Great Britain, the industries of imperialism are gradually stagnating, and the place of the basic industries is being gradually taken by parasitic industries.

Finally, we wished to criticise the theory of the revolutionary bourgeoisie in the colonies which, in the present epoch, "pendulates" between counter-revolution and the support of the revolution.

These were our criticisms, this was the prime reason why we took the floor, and by these criticisms we stand. We have formulated these criticisms in an amendment, which we are circulating among the delegations of the Congress today, but naturally we did not consider that this exhausted the list of our amendments.

In the second place, I want to refer to a few things that we have been accused of, and which we are not advancing. We are not advancing, first and foremost, the absurd and un-Marxist

theory that a colony can be "decolonised" except through revolution, except through insurrection and revolutionary separation from the imperialist country. On this question we stand where Lenin stood, and we shall take an occasion further on in the Congress to deal with this at greater length. Secondly, we are not saying that the colonies have already become advanced industrial countries, in which the consumption of coal per head is equivalent to the consumption of coal in countries like Germany or the United States, or even in secondary industrial countries in Europe. Thirdly, we are not subscribing to the inference made, particularly by Comrade Schubin, that imperialism is "interested" in transforming the colonies into advanced industrial countries, nor are we alleging that imperialism is softening the contradictions within the colonies, and between the colonies on the one hand and the imperialist world on the other.

None of these things we are alleging, and therefore, all the accusations, which unfortunately are becoming almost a sort of mechanical reaction against those who dare to criticise a thesis put forward in the name of the E. C. C. I., — all the accusations of being Social Democrats, about our being Amsterdamites, about our qualifying for leadership of the British Labour Party, and many other things of this kind — have no effect upon us whatsoever. We are not children. We knew what we were under taking when we criticised the thesis, and it is not by such arguments that the British Delegation, or the other Delegations of this Congress can be persuaded.

Therefore, I want to say, we wanted to put forward this criticism as our main amendment because we considered that the errors which were made in the section of the thesis that we were dealing with, were fundamental errors, which initiated all the rest of the thesis. It stands to reason that we are prepared to draft amendments to the rest of the thesis, and that should be clearly understood.

We are prepared, we are willing, we will gladly assume the obligation suggested by Comrade Schubin that we should correct the glaring defect in the thesis, that there is no clear statement of the vital tasks facing the Parties in the imperialist countries in connection with the struggle against colonial exploitation, and particularly the utmost assistance to the national revolutionary movement in the colonies. We accept that obligation, we shall draft such a resolution, and we shall present it to this Congress.

Therefore all the more we feel that we are entitled to say that we reject with contempt the insinuations and suggestions made on several occasions that our criticism is based on the desire to soften the criticism of the role of imperialism in the colonies. We reject with contempt the insinuations that when we give our criticism we are endeavouring to suggest that imperialism plays a progressive role in the colonies. On the contrary, our opinion is that imperialism heightens the class contradictions and class oppression. What we do suggest is that the thesis in its criticism glosses over the actual facts that

are taking place in the colonies, thus opening the way for the Communist Parties in the colonial countries to drag in the wake of the bourgeoisie and to condemn the revolutionary movement to defeat. This is what we stand by. We repudiate the suggestion made by Schubin and others, and we shall take an early opportunity to develop this before this discussion closes.

#### Declaration of Comrade LUHANI (India):

I consider it necessary to declare that I have nothing whatever to do with the so-called "de-colonisation of India" theory which Comrade Kuusinen described in his speech introducing the draft theses on the Revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies. What he, and some other comrades taking part in the discussion, said in this connection is a complete travesty and misrepresentation of what some of us wanted to convey in the provisional use of the term "de-colonisation". I emphasise that our use of the term was provisional; we always put the term in quotation marks. I repudiate entirely the interpretation which Comrade Kuusinen has given to our use of the term.

In order to dissipate the confusion which has been created with regard to the genesis of this point of view, I think a certain *mise en point* is called for. About a year ago at a meeting of the Political Secretariat of the E. C. C. I., an Indian comrade made a report on the situation in India. In the report no mention was made either of the colonisation or de-colonisation of India. As a result of the discussion of the report, a special commission was, however, appointed to study, among other aspects of the Indian situation, the question of decolonisation. The terms "decolonisation" was included in what I may call the terms of reference of the commission. So far as I am aware, it was the first occasion of the use of the term "decolonisation" with reference to India.

The special commission occupied itself with the questions as formulated. Materials were submitted to the commission embodying a certain point of view. There were several discussions held and I remember no serious divergence of opinion inside the commission, and, if I am not mistaken the point of view was accepted as general groundwork. The materials of the commission, either in a manuscript of printed form, have been available for the last nine months. They contain the subject matter of the greater part of the present discussion on India — I have not the possibility here of raising the question whether the point of view is right or wrong, or whether it is Right or Left, and of formulating my response to the somewhat one-sided discussion. However, I want you to take note of the fact that the point of view has been presented to you, not in its original, but in its travestied form. Thus, our own formulation of the point of view in question is not before you. I must register my energetic protest against this method of controversy as, to put it mildly, unfair both to the delegates of the Congress and those whose point of view is being criticised.

### Thirty-ninth Session.

Moscow, 21st August, 1928.

## Concluding Speech by Comrade Sikandar Sur (India):

Comrades, Cent per cent. of the speeches of the advocates of the theory of decolonisation were of an academic nature. They had no bearing whatsoever on the existing circumstances in India. The theoretical basis for the majority of the British Delegation in advocating this theory is that imperialism means the export of capital to the colonies and to India. And that the export of capital means development of industries, that is, industrialisation, and finally culminating in the development of India as an independent economic unit depending on imperialism mainly for its financial resources.

Comrades, the development of capitalism brings into existence a native capitalist class. Now, the interests of this new-born class collide with those of the metropolis.

This theory of decolonisation seems to me to be a mechanical application and distortion of Marxian theory in the colonial countries. The comrades who advocate it seem to neglect the actual state of affairs and jump headlong into a wide ocean of metaphysics. We are here not to discuss metaphysics but we are here to analyse the actual state of affairs in the colonial countries. It is not so automatic as Comrade Page Arnot, the glorious theoretician of the British delegation who pretends to be an authority on colonial and Indian questions, asks us to believe. Let us peep a little deeper.

The chief imperialist interest in India is its monopolist character and the preservation of this position in India at all costs.

The second interest is the trade. India is the biggest single market of Britain. India is also the biggest field for services of the youths of the British governing class. This is evident by many commissions that had been appointed and by the many Britishers found serving in the I. C. S. (Indian Civil Service). India is also the biggest reservoir of raw materials. Then it is the investment field of British export capital. And last but not least there comes the tribute from India in the shape of Home charges for pensions of retired service men and certain military expenses. This tribute amounts to 40 million pounds sterling a year. Britain will not lose its grip on India as easily as some of the comrades indicate!

England needs agricultural products. To get these raw materials and products also for military strategic purposes it is necessary to develop the railways there — which ultimately means the investment of capital exported from England. In the capitalist countries, corollary to the development of the railways is the development of the key industries. But here in India, the building of railways and the extension of rail lines is made for strategic purposes and for the export of iron and finished goods from England into India. Hence this means the widening of the market for England; it does not mean the industrialisation of India.

So you see this capitalist development and investment of capital from England is not industrialisation in the sense that India could develop into an independent economic unit, but that it is the tightening of the grip and strengthening of the imperialist monopoly over India.

So far as this analysis is concerned, the theses is correct.

Comrade **Page Arnot** was all along trying to seek shelter under the cloak of his phraseology, but we find he was actually and insistently supporting the decolonisation theory.

Comrades, besides the agricultural products, British imperialism needs industrial raw materials as iron ore, petroleum, etc. India is developing very big petroleum wells at present. But all this is not in the hands of Indian capitalists. It is done exclusively by means of British capital, British management and British clerical and technical staff. Plantations also are being carried on under direct supervision of imperialist agents. The petroleum industry and plantations are expanding and naturally need subsidies, but the direct Indian share is scanty. Here is one of the main reservoirs where British capital flows in, but this form of industrial development does not industrialise the country to her own interest.

So it is clear that the export of capital and its investment is not synonymous with the development of India as an independent economic unit. It is not industrialisation. The industrialisation theory therefore falls to the ground.

We also see a developing coal mining industry. Comrade **Remmele** cited figures relating to coal consumption showing how the country is not being industrialised. When the consumption of coal per head is stationary, how could one say that the country is being industrialised? Comrade **Page Arnot**, to contradict this statement, brought forward no other facts than a morsel of 'cow dung' theory. Let Comrade Arnot throw his cow dung on Buckingham Palace, but let him not entertain the delegates with it.

I will say in conclusion that the protagonists of industrialisation are confusing investment with industrialisation. Investment is not the same as industrialisation of a country. The general capitalist development in India has brought into existence the native bourgeois class. Indian capitalist investment, but not industrialisation, which dates from the middle of the last century has considerably increased during recent years. The war situation promoted this trend of development in the key industries. But when Britain was no longer interested in having her factories turned into war factories and when she once more began peacetime productions, then the break up of Indian industries commenced. Since the war, India has been striving to become economically independent, and the slogans of the Indian bourgeoisie are: development of key industries, development of export capital, and political independence.

This trend and these slogans directly challenge the monopolist position of imperialism in India. The imperialist slogan is, unity with the landlords and feudal elements, split between

the upper and lower bourgeoisie, a definite check to the development of key industries and a brake to the political aspirations of the bourgeoisie.

This is the driving forces of the bourgeois opposition and of the outburst of protest against the Simon Commission.

But comrades, let us have no false illusions regarding the bourgeoisie. They are not revolutionaries, but decidedly counter-revolutionary because they betray even the political independence movement. They betray the revolution at every footstep by compromising with imperialism.

Comrades, to think the Indian bourgeoisie have not yet betrayed the national liberation struggle in the same way as the Kuomintang has done in China is not correct. In 1918, when the working class resorted to street barricades fighting and when, in the beginning of 1922, the fury of the masses released with vengeance on the agencies of British imperialism, when the Police Station at Chauri Charra was set on fire, the national bourgeoisie relapsed. Gandhi played a definite role as agent of imperialism. There after came the Bardoli resolution which liquidated this movement.

Let us not over-estimate the role of the bourgeoisie. I am not a theoretician but I am speaking from experience. The development of Kuomintang is a warning example for us. It is the duty of the Communists not to let the power fall into the hands of the Nationalists, however radical they may be. To base our policy on the oppositional attitude of the bourgeoisie against imperialism is to put ourselves on the wrong track. At the time of a political crisis or during a war, when England will be involved in this war with some other powers, there will be a decided split in the bourgeois camp. The upper layer will side with the governing class, while the lower strata, — might struggle to seize the reins of the Government, utilising the workers, and peasantry, as cannon-fodder. We must be prepared for this most critical period in the history of the working-class movement in India. It may be that the seizure of power by the bourgeoisie will deliver a blow to British imperialism; it may be that they will be friendly towards the Soviet Union for a time, but they will prove a definite brake to the Indian proletarian revolution. For that day we must be prepared. We must have our own machinery and, while using the radical bourgeoisie so far as they facilitate our work, we must see that the actual power does not fall into their hands and thus prevent a repetition of what we have experienced.

No one denies that the lower strata of the bourgeoisie have got influence over the masses. To wrest the masses from the influence of this strata is our main task. We can do this by discrediting and exposing them. At every demonstration which these bourgeois organise against imperialism we should bring forward more radical demands. Here we should work out the programme for the proletarian revolution. The bourgeoisie would then automatically be unmasked.

In this respect the theses need changes which will be proposed in the form of amendments.

As to the existence of workers and peasants parties, I agree with the thesis where it says:

"Special workers and peasants parties no matter how revolutionary they be, can all too easily be transformed into ordinary bourgeois parties; therefore the organising of these parties is inadvisable."

The workers and peasants parties exist owing to the wrong tactics and instructions of the Comintern. The last report of the Annual Conference of Bengal Peasants and Workers Parties shows that the party is falling into the hands of philanthropic petty bourgeoisie. Our comrades do not hold any office there.

Comrade **Shubin** is absolutely wrong when he talks of the inadvisability of forming a Communist Party on account of objective difficulties. But should we surrender to obstacles or should we overcome them?

The organisation of a strong Communist Party in India is an urgent necessity so that when the long-anticipated political crisis overtakes Britain the political power does not pass into the hands of the petty bourgeoisie.

I come once more to the topic of industrialisation. The belief in the industrialisation policy of imperialism is synonymous with the belief that imperialism has a progressive character. While we, Marxists, say, that imperialism is the last stage of capitalist development and it is in its decaying stage. MacDonald and the II. International cry themselves hoarse to prove the progressive character of imperialism on account of the industrialisation of colonial countries. And this is the theory which these people put forward in support of colonial domination. It is strange to see so many comrades putting on these

garments of MacDonald and Co. by supporting this theory of industrialisation and decolonisation of India.

Comrade Arnot surpassed all when he brought quotations that in such and such a report, imperialism has promised the industrialisation of India. In support of his absurd assertion he vehemently asked: Do these governments tell lies? Yes, comrades, the imperialist governments tell lies — thousands of times more than we can dream of. In conclusion I would say that these arguments of Comrade Arnot and of other comrades are nothing more than a open defence of imperialism!

## Concluding Speech by Comrade Strakhov (China):

Comrades, I began my report with a description of Asiatic methods of production, and I will begin my concluding speech with a description of Asiatic methods of terrorism. The white terror which broke out after the defeat of the Chinese revolution, must teach us something. We know that in no other country has there been such brutal terrorism and such cruel dictatorship. And yet, when we discussed the colonial question, we paid very little attention to the lessons of the Chinese revolution. I therefore want to divide my speech into three parts: 1. lessons of the Chinese revolution; 2. a short announcement which I have to make on behalf of the Chinese delegation and 3. a few general points in the colonial question with which I would like to deal.

One of the discussion speakers pointed out that we do not pay sufficient attention to the defeats of the Chinese Communist Party in regard to the organisational question. This is based on a misunderstanding. We know very well our errors and defects. I did not touch upon them in my oral report, considering that I had presented a corresponding written report. These defects and errors are also mentioned in my pamphlet "Contentious Questions of the Chinese Revolution". But as this material has not yet been published in the foreign languages, I will fill in this gap now.

We know that opportunism and putschism are rife in our Party. The main defect of our organisational work was — that we did not approach the masses as well as the petty-bourgeoisie did, that we approached them in the gentry-Kuomintang style. Owing to opportunist leadership, we ordered the workers not to strike and to disarm the pickets; we ordered them to come to an agreement with Van Tsin-vei, so as not to disturb him. During the putschist period, the same methods were used. We wanted to strike and played the role of the magnanimous lord who wants to make a revolution and thinks that one can go on strike any day. Orders were issued wholesale to instigate "insurrections" and declare strikes. By approaching the masses, and the working class in this manner, we dissociated the Party from the masses. As a result of this, we witness now in the Chinese Communist Party — in spite of the growth and extension of its political influence on the masses — a certain organisational isolation from the masses. As to the composition of the Communist Party of China, it is true that we have a too big percentage of peasants in its ranks. But this does not mean that we must give up admitting peasants to the Party. On the contrary, we must do our utmost to draw the peasant masses into peasant organisations, peasants unions, soviets etc., extending of course at the same time the labour organisations. Only by such means will we be able to guarantee the proletarian composition of our Party.

Such are the main defects which I can point out. I think that this is useful and instructive for the other Parties because we know that excessive bureaucratic centralism exists also in other Parties, which develops in the Party the tendency to take the place of mass organisations. But one cannot of course say that everything is bad in our Party, that formerly we had Sun-Yat-Senism and that we are having Trotskyism now, that Bolshevism is conspicuous by its absence.

On the instructions of the Chinese delegation, I want to make the following statement: Pepper says that formerly we had Sun-Yat-Senism and that now we are having Trotskyism in our Party. This is slanderous and not correct. Why? Be-

cause, don't you see, if we speak of Trotskyism and if Pepper even says that after the Wuhan Coup d'Etat we committed the error of permanent revolution, what does this mean? Did we rouse the Canton Insurrection a la Trotsky? Trotsky is saying now: what happened in Canton was nothing but an adventure, a putsch. But he says nevertheless that this putsch, this adventure took, according to him, "immediately the form of proletarian dictatorship". If Comrade Pepper thinks that we were carrying on a permanent revolution in Canton, he is himself a Trotskyist. We know that Pepper accuses us of not having paid attention to the anti-imperialist movement. What does this mean? What is the anti-imperialist movement? True, in the past period the Chinese Party was weak organisationally and could not pay sufficient attention to the development and guidance of the anti-imperialist movement among the masses. But if this question is raised as Pepper does it, it appears that we paid too much attention to the agrarian revolution and that one should pay more attention to the anti-imperialist movement.

What is the anti-imperialist movement? It is boycott, demonstration, meeting and then strike. We had a strike in Hong-kong which lasted nearly 2 years. We had a series of demonstrations etc. But this did not put an end to imperialism, and we cannot say that we will overthrow imperialist rule in China if we continue to fight only by such methods. Imperialism can be really overthrown only if the proletariat can rouse the millions strong peasantry under the slogan of agrarian revolution.

Comrade Pepper is quoting Comrade Stalin. Comrade Stalin said that the peculiarity of the Chinese revolution consists in it being an anti-imperialist and a bourgeois-democratic revolution: its main substance is — agrarian revolution, an agrarian coup d'Etat. But Comrade Pepper does not go on quoting. And yet Comrade Stalin repeatedly said that struggle against imperialist rule cannot be separated from struggle for land.

Comrade Pepper does not want to say this. Why? He himself proposed to state in the programme of the Comintern that in China or in the East in general, we have only relics of Asiatic methods of production and not feudalism. If this is his view he should be more consistent following Plekhanov's example, who justified his opposition to the nationalisation of land by saying that in Russia land relations were not unlike those in ancient China, i. e. land was already nationalised, why then nationalise it once more? Pepper should have come forward as frankly as an opponent of land nationalisation and agrarian revolution in China. He sets agrarian revolution against the imperialist movement. He also quoted Comrade Bukharin, where Bukharin praises him. But the showed no inclination to give another quotation which says:

"One cannot say: either armed insurrection or trade union work and struggle against putschism."

"Thus, energetic struggle against all who reject the insurrection slogan or have even the least inclination to reject it."

Another saying is:

"What are the mistakes in Comrade Pepper's estimate? — They are as follows: 1. one cannot clearly understand what is, in his opinion, the extension of the peasant movement (or rather what is the role of the peasant struggle in the anti-imperialist revolution); 2. his attempts to bring



forward the artificial watchwords and slogans of the minimum programme in regard to governmental power.

"Namely, Pepper proposes: to elect local self-government organs in the ruling districts on a democratic basis" etc.

According to Bukharin, this

"can be interpreted as annulment of the slogan of Soviets."

This shows you how consistent **Pepper** is, more consistent than **Trotsky** because Trotsky says that we have now in China the period of counter-revolution, that in China "revolution is on the downward grade" etc., but he does not want to make the deduction in regard to the constitution. Such is Trotsky by nature, but Comrade **Pepper** is by nature different. He arrives at a political deduction: since agrarian revolution cannot give anything in China, let us have a "constitution", let us elect democratic self-government organs for the peasants.

Given a correct understanding and a decision of the colonial question, the lessons of the Chinese revolution play an important role. Owing to this experience, we learn to understand the Chinese revolution and the revolution in India and other colonial countries. This revolution is bourgeois-democratic only because the tasks of overthrowing imperialism are closely connected with the tasks of destroying feudal land relations. This revolution cannot be carried to a conclusion except under the hegemony of the proletariat, only by the establishment of proletarian and peasant dictatorship.

The experience of the Chinese revolution shows us that when the revolution in the colonies reaches a decisive moment, the question takes the following form: either landlord and bourgeois dictatorship or proletarian and peasant dictatorship. There can be no constitutional, no rural self-government way (hear, hear).

In the rural districts of China landlords and peasants flay each other, cut each others' throats, — how could one introduce their self-government together with the gentry? How is this possible?

I think therefore that, for the discussion of the colonial question, we must take into account — more than we have hitherto done — the lessons of the Chinese revolution. The main question is; what is our attitude and tactic in regard to the national bourgeoisie and the peasantry.

If we allow ourselves to be carried away by the oppositional attitude of the national and petty-bourgeoisie, by the so-called anti-imperialist movement instead of turning our attention to the revolution, the struggle, we will naturally be unable to establish such relations with the peasantry as we need.

We must make this also the starting point for the question of industrialisation and decolonisation. Why do we raise this question? To determine to what extent the national bourgeoisie is revolutionary, oppositional or venal. During the European war industry developed in India and China owing to that trade capital the development of which was promoted by imperialism. But at the end of the war, when imperialism increased its pressure on China and India, a terrible crisis set in in agriculture, a terrible pauperisation fostered also by the internecine wars which have been going on in our country for decades. Even if we put up one or two new factories in Shanghai while at the same time war is raging within the country, millions of people are dying, trade comes to a standstill and railways are destroyed, what chance is there for industrialisation? Therefore, the phenomenon we witness after the Chinese wars and revolution is — the "denationalisation" of the Chinese national bourgeoisie. A section of the national bourgeoisie has already given up its factories, being unable to stand the competition, and has become again comprador. Our comrades can give many examples of this. Another section of the national bourgeoisie has given itself up to political speculation, i. e. political usury. It gives big loans to the provincial governments because it cannot derive any profits from industry. Yet another section of the national bourgeoisie has gone to the country, i. e. has begun to buy up land in provinces where no insurrections have taken place. This develops feudal methods of exploitation, feudal dependence, on the one hand, and dependence of the national bourgeoisie itself on imperialism, on the other hand.

There is also the interesting fact that in Shanghai several former manufacturers have secretly sold their factories to foreigners. The national question plays an important role in China; articles which are called national articles are in great demand. But in reality they are no longer national articles, because these factories are no longer national. The management of the factories is no longer in the hands of the national bourgeoisie but in the hands of foreigners. We know ourselves that, in this state of affairs not only the political but also the economic treachery of the national bourgeoisie is historically inevitable, in as far as this bourgeoisie has deteriorated economically after the wars and the revolution.

It is said in the theses that such and such conditions are necessary for the participation of the national bourgeoisie in the revolution. This is correct. But one should show at first what economic causes, for instance, development of some branches of industry in China and India after the war, create the possibility of a certain degree of revolutionary spirit in the national bourgeoisie.

Another period is beginning now. We have entered upon the period when the national bourgeoisie is deteriorating, when it is inevitably veering towards treachery, and has already betrayed the national revolution in China. It is said now that probably the national bourgeoisie has already established its reign in China. But this is not so, because it is so weak that even when it engages in counter-revolution, it does so **with the help of the gentry** and all sorts of other riff raff and — what is the main thing — **under the leadership of the imperialists**. This is particularly important. We have therefore in Nanking the Chang-Kai-Shek government. We read in today's papers that this government cannot do anything with the militarists. Feng-Yu-Hsiang did not go the Plenum, he did not want to compromise, which means that Chang-Kai-Shek will have to compromise with him, the gentry and the landlords. What does this mean? It means that in regard to the leadership, the hegemony of the bourgeoisie, one can see that it is, so to speak, "like a man kept by a woman".

You will understand then with such a state of affairs, one cannot speak of a revolutionary attitude of the national bourgeoisie. We have here material according to which the Chinese bourgeoisie recently called a conference and placed the demands before the national government, the chief demand being restitution of the sums taken from them by the militarists. None of the demands was of a national character, no Customs autonomy, no unification. If there were some national demands, they were only for show. This is what the "revolutionary spirit" and oppositional nature of the national bourgeoisie comes to.

I say that this applies not only to China but also to India. The entire colonial bourgeoisie acts in this manner. In as far as the masses have already risen, it wants to get something out of the imperialists. But when the masses begin to move too quickly, its interests urge it to go over to the side of the imperialists and to support them. Even if the demands of the present Chinese bourgeoisie be directed against the imperialists, they are after all demands such as the social democrats address today to the European bourgeoisie. The Chinese bourgeoisie says now to the imperialists and landlords that, if they do not make concessions, do not reduce their armies and do not give them a certain share of the Customs revenue, it will not be able to cope with the Bolsheviks, to suppress the insurrection and to solve this problem, and that then the rebellious workers and peasants will throw out the landlords and imperialists. Therefore, the bourgeoisie advises the latter to make a few concessions. Is this a revolutionary role? It is a counter-revolutionary role. We therefore witness a similar state of affairs also in the campaign against the Simon Commission in India. This must be verified by facts. I therefore think that the foremost question is that of **national reformism**. It has its roots in the economic development of the colonies. This national reformism has a tendency of developing into **national fascism**. We must take up a definite attitude to this tendency.

We must struggle against national fascism not only because it leads to the suppression of the most elementary class struggle in the name of the nation, but because it has also another side. National fascism will always declare that it is

for reforms, for the improvement of the international position of China, the colonies etc. By this it wants to deceive the petty-bourgeois masses which it wants to utilise so as to prevent revolution.

Therefore the next important question is our attitude to the petty-bourgeois parties. We can lead the petty-bourgeois masses in the struggle against imperialism as long as it keeps within the primary limits of such anti-imperialist struggle: demonstrations, meetings etc. We can shout with them "down with imperialism", what Chang-Kai-Shek and Li-Ti-Sin are always shouting. We must lead the petty-bourgeois masses in this movement, but we must not have the stupidity of rousing the mass of the poorest urban and rural population only for demonstrations, — we must rouse them for something more serious. Although we begin with elementary methods and actions, we must not stop short at them. Therefore, as long as it is a question of demonstrations, meetings etc., we can always depend on the petty-bourgeoisie, but when it comes really to an insurrection, an agrarian revolution, we must take care that our Communist Party does not succumb to the influence of the petty-bourgeois parties. We must have independent organisations and an independent policy; we must freely criticise not only the national-fascist bourgeoisie, we must also criticise and expose the illusions of the petty-bourgeoisie and its parties. All these are definite and important matters. In this connection, it should be also pointed out that in eastern countries where the petty-bourgeois masses are very strong, we must turn our attention to struggle against ideologies such as Gandhism, Confucionism, the golden mean, non-resistance to violence etc. All this, together with nationalism, plays an important role and has at times considerable influence even among the workers.

Therefore struggle against the national bourgeoisie, against petty-bourgeois illusions must be our foremost task in the colonies.

I think that we must make the following conclusion:

1. where the national bourgeoisie has not yet seized power, we must initiate the struggle against its influence, we must paralyse it. Where the national bourgeoisie is already participating in the government, our only task is — overthrow of this government. No support whatever.

2. We must have an independent organisation, an independent proletarian policy to counterbalance the petty-bourgeoisie. All ideas of "constitution", co-operation with bourgeois national reformism are inadmissible.

3. We must impress all Communist Parties with the necessity of giving real support to the Chinese revolution and all Chinese insurrections. We must support not only in the I. R. A. way, **not only** by struggling against the white terror. We must strengthen our real work. We must study all questions as they affect individual countries: Pacific questions, the question of coordinating actions in the West and in the East, of linking up our work, so that the European proletariat should simultaneously support insurrections in the colonies against the imperialists and carry on the struggle against the national reformists and the national-fascist bourgeoisie.

The revolutionary workers in the West should be told definitely that they must be against the Kuomintang, — we want to know that this is the case. This is not sufficiently clear at present. Is Kuomintang terrorism less violent than fascist terrorism? Is Kuomintang terrorism any better than lynch law against Negroes? The national-fascist nature of the national bourgeoisie must be shown up.

4. I think after all that the problem of the national revolution consists in the fact that the colonies are the world rural district. If one takes into consideration that, on the whole, all these colonies are agrarian and peasant countries, we must realise that a definite tactic in regard to the colonial peasantry as a whole is necessary. It is only from this view point that we can elaborate proper tactics for the revolutionary movement in the East. We are of course against the national bourgeoisie, against national-reformism, but this does not mean that we are against national liberation, that we have gone to the other extreme — denial of the nation and of national liberation. Most decidedly not. Now is the time to say that the pro-

letariat and the peasantry and the working masses in general are the bearers of the national revolution in the colonies. On this basis we will support the movement and insurrections against the national bourgeoisie, the native ruling classes of landlords, gentry etc. I think that this is the only right way of putting the question. The national programme of the Marxists consists in standing up for:

1. "Equality of national and language rights, no privileges whatever in regard to this (also right to national self-determination).

2. The principle of **Internationalism and relentless struggle against the infection of the proletariat by bourgeois nationalism, even if it be the most refined nationalism.**" (Lenin.)

"To imagine that social revolution is possible without insurrections of small nations in the colonies, without revolutionary outbursts in Europe of a section of the petty-bourgeoisie **with all its prejudices**, without movements of the unconscious proletariat and semi-proletarian masses against the landlord, clerical, monarchist, national etc. yoke, — to imagine this, is tantamount to revoking the socialist revolution... Only from such a pedantically ludicrous view point was it possible to call the Irish insurrection a "putsch". Those who wait for the "pure" social revolution, will wait for it in vain. They are people who do lip service to the revolution without understanding real revolution." (Lenin.)

Marx said that in Germany everything will depend on the possibility of support for the proletarian revolution by some sort of second edition of the peasant war. Marx's idea has now become a reality, and even on an international scale. At present we have or will have a second edition of the German peasant war in China, India and in all Eastern countries. This was Marx' attitude to peasant wars. I think that he indicated thereby what the attitude of the international proletariat should be to the Chinese revolution. The VI. Congress of the Communist International has already expressed its attitude to the Canton Insurrection and to the Chinese revolution. With your permission, I will close my speech thus:

The Canton Insurrection has impressed itself on the mind of the masses as a sample of maximum heroism on the part of the Chinese workers. Let the future insurrection of the mass of the workers and peasants, organised on the basis of the sound and tested principles of Leninism, supported by the international proletariat, be a victorious October for China.

Long live the independent federated Chinese Soviet Republic!

Long live the victorious insurrection of the oppressed peoples!

Long live the world proletarian revolution!

**Chairman Comrade Remmele:**

**Declaration of Comrade PEPPER.**

Comrades, I would like to make the following short remarks:

Comrade Lominadze has here made an unusual accusation against me. He said that I never dared to polemise against any leading comrade in the Comintern. I would like to reply as follows to this quite remarkable accusation:

Firstly, the fact is I polemised quite energetically against leading comrades, and indeed such leading comrades of the Comintern as Lenin and Trotsky (Trotsky was then on the side of Lenin) at the Third World Congress, on the question of the offensive theory, on the defence of the mistakes of the March uprising in Germany, as well as on the question of judging the world situation. In my opinion I made quite great mistakes at that time by these polemics, and I can tell you that I am not at all proud of the fact that I polemised against Lenin, against "a leading comrade of the Comintern". That is the difference between Lominadze and me in judging "bravery" within the Comintern.

Secondly, since when is it a criterion of a good revolutionary communist, that he should fight against leading comrades of the Comintern. According to my knowledge we until now considered those comrades to be good Communist revolutionaries who have fought against the Social Democracy, against opportunism and against the bourgeoisie. At any rate it would be quite a new and completely strange criterion of a revolutionary that he "dared" to come forward against "leading comrades" of the Comintern. That is the second difference between Lominadze and myself in judging leaders of the Comintern. At any rate, this can lead to quite extraordinary deviations, if one puts the relation between individual Parties or delegates of the Comintern to the leaders of the Comintern in such a way as has been done in these peculiar remarks of Comrade Lominadze.

Then the second short remark. I would here like to establish emphatically, that not I but Comrade Lominadze began the polemic about the judging of the uprising in Canton here before the World Congress, and he did it in his first speech upon the theses of Comrade Bukharin. Not I but he brought forward here the question of Canton with big gestures, and warmed up his old stale views. Not I but he dragged into the discussion here before the World Congress the question of the "putch". I had to refer to the question of the uprising in Canton and to Lominadze's conception of the permanent revolution a la Trotsky, because he and those who share his opinions tried to twist and obscure the decisions of the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I.

The Chinese Resolution of the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I., with complete correctness, designated Canton as one of the most important military deeds of the Chinese proletariat. But at the same time the 9th Plenum also criticised those mistakes, which were made by the leadership of the uprising in connection with the Canton uprising. The resolution of the 9th Plenum stressed the following critical points:

1. Insufficient preparation among the workers before the uprising.
2. Insufficient preparatory work among the peasants.
3. Insufficient preparatory work among the enemies' army.
4. False methods of approach to the membership of the yellow unions.
5. Insufficient preparation of the uprising in the Party and in the Youth.
6. The C. C. of the Party was not in the least informed about the uprising.
7. The weakness of the political mobilisation of the masses.
8. Lack of broad political strikes.
9. Lack of elected Soviets.
10. The general political responsibility of the leadership of the uprising for the mistakes before the Communist International.

No less than ten quite weighty critical remarks are therefore contained in the theses of the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. on the Canton uprising. It would of course be ridiculous to say that these critical remarks mean so much as to say that the uprising in Canton was a putsch. The theses about the world situation which have already been adopted by the VI. Congress confirmed the correct conception of the Resolution of the 9th Plenum in the question of the Canton uprising. The theses state that Canton was an heroic struggle of the proletariat, a rear-guard fight and the leadership of the uprising made great mistakes, and condemn the leadership of the Chinese Party because in the past — the old leadership — made opportunistic mistakes. The theses confirmed the fact that the new leadership then fell into the other extreme (Interruption: That is discussion, not a declaration). Comrades, I shall now quote only the theses accepted by the VI. World Congress. It is to be hoped that nobody will here come forward against the assertion of these theses. The theses maintain that the new leadership has not made sufficient resistance to adventurous, to putschistic views. (Interruption: That is no declaration.) Yes, that is a declaration, because some speakers attempted to obscure the facts here, to change the position of the 9th Plenum and the VI. World Congress into an opposite one.

In conclusion, I would like to add that it is incorrect, and Comrade Strakhov also used this incorrect method, if one first

of all identifies the great historical fight of the Chinese workers with the mistakes of the leadership, and secondly, if one attempts to obscure the great historical significance of the uprising in Canton by keeping silent about the mistakes which were made on the part of the leadership in connection with the uprising. If in the future we wish to organise and carry through new uprisings and, indeed, successful ones in China, we must learn not only from the historical facts of the fight of the workers, but also from the mistakes which the leadership made.

Comrade REMMELE (Chairman):

We now come to a greeting by the communication workers, that is the post and telegraph workers in Moscow. On this matter Comrade Salnikov has the floor.

Comrade SALNIKOV:

The proletariat of the Moscow post and telegraph service sends its fraternal greetings to the leaders of the World Revolution — to the VI. World Congress of the Comintern. The proletariat of the Moscow post and telegraph service follows with eager attention the work of the Congress of the Comintern, and emphasises with the deepest satisfaction the fact that the defence of the first Socialist country in the world — this shield of the World Revolution — stands in the centre of the work of the Congress.

Comrades, in fulfilling the trust bequeathed us by Lenin, and with the deepest faith in the triumph of the Revolution, the proletariat of the Moscow post and telegraph service, together with the international proletariat, will fight for the creation of a proletarian dictatorship in the entire world, for the erection of a Soviet Power throughout the world. (Applause.) The proletariat of the post and telegraph workers will march forward at the first appeal of the leaders of the Revolution to the last and decisive fight against the bourgeoisie and world capitalism.

Long live the world revolution!

Long live the international proletariat!

Our greetings to the VI. World Congress of the Comintern!

(Applause.)

Comrade REMMELE:

I believe we must give our special thanks to the workers and employees of the post and telegraph service in the First Workers' State. If it was possible in Red October to lead the revolutionary troops, the advance guard of the world proletariat into the fight for the Soviet State, to hold them together in the fight and to lead them through to a successful victory, then it was the special service of these same communication workers, to link together the various regiments of troops of the Red Army, the various general staffs, and so made it possible to carry through the victory of the Red Guards. But not only in the famous days of the first proletarian revolution, but also at our Congress the transportation workers of the Soviet Union, and especially the workers of the Commissariat for Communication prepared for us a special gift: the excellent connections which we have in our translations here are the work of the communication workers from the telegraph service. Here also the communication workers showed that their technique, their experience, their scientific studies are of the first order even in comparison with the capitalist world. For this reason we give our communication workers again the heartiest thanks of the VI. World Congress.

\* \* \*

Comrades, the Chairman of the Red Front Fighters' League of Germany, Comrade Ernst Thälmann, has received a telegram of fraternal greetings from the Central-German meeting of the Red Front Fighters at Leiszig:

"Assure the soldiers, workers and peasants of the proletarian fatherland, of our invincible solidarity and of the faith of the German workers in the Russian proletariat. The Red Front Fighters League...

Red Front — Leo Hoffmann."

(Lively Applause.)

Close of the Session.

---

---

TO OUR READERS!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England . . . . .	2 sh.
Germany . . . . .	1.50 marks
Austria . . . . .	2 sh.
Norway . . . . .	1.50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. R. . . . .	1 rouble

For other countries the subscription rate is six dollars for one year.

Readers in the United States will please note that the sole agents for the "Inprecorr" in the U. S. A. are the Workers Library Publishers, 39, East 125th Street, New York, N. Y., to whom all subscriptions should be sent. The subscription rates in the U. S. A. are, \$ 2 for three months, \$ 3.50 for six months and \$ 6 for one year.

The Business Manager.