

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 74

25th October 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, Schliesfach 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

SIXTH WORLD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

(FULL REPORT.)

Thirty-fourth Session.

(Continued.)

Moscow, 17th August, 1928 (morning)

Continuation of the Discussion on the Questions of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies.

Comrade FOKIN (Young Communist International):

Comrades, a few general remarks on the theses. First of all it ought to be said that these theses have been largely drawn up in an academic and schematic way and that the attempt to picture the revolutionary movement in the colonies in the shape of stages and phases has entirely miscarried. It was a dangerous attempt which would be likely to becloud the real nature of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, endeavouring to force the dialectics of the revolutionary struggle into artificial limits which would only be confusing and perplexing to our brother parties in the East.

Nevertheless we believe the chief defect of the theses to consist in the fact that the central problem of the revolutionary movement in the colonies in the present stage of development, the problem of the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic into the social revolution, as well as the question of the non-capitalist development in the colonies, has not been dealt with at all in the theses. We consider this problem to be the fundamental problem serving as the criterion for the tactical slogans and the tactical course of the Party and for judging the class forces in the respective colonial countries.

Just because this problem has not been tackled in its full scope as the central problem, the theses do not possess any militant character, and they are not going to help the Parties in working out their tactical slogans for the present period. Since this question has not been raised, we miss also a whole number of questions, e. g. the question of the soviets, of dual power, of the preparation of the armed forces of the revolution, etc. Yet these questions, like the problem itself, have been placed upon the order of the day by the development of the revolutionary movement in China.

Was the problem of the revolutionary transformation raised in China? It was. Was the problem of dual power raised? It was. Nevertheless the experiences of the Chinese Revolution in this respect have not been sufficiently taken into consideration. The question of dual power arose in China also in the shape of the March uprising, when the working class took up the task of organising the workers, the peasants and the urban petty-bourgeoisie against the national bourgeoisie which had deserted the revolution, trying to create a force controlled by the workers and peasants.

Comrades, we have not sufficiently studied this problem from this point of view, although it would be exceedingly im-

portant to enlarge upon these experiences. In this connection it is also necessary to consider the question of organisational centres of the struggle — soviets or meetings of people's delegates as in China, i. e. of creating such centres which should rally the masses for the revolution against the backsliding bourgeoisie, and thus solve the question of power.

Now as to the question of the petty-bourgeoisie. On this subject we read in the theses of Comrade Kuusinen:

"On the whole, the entire petty-bourgeoisie as a class during the first stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution of these countries may be considered next to the proletariat as a driving force of the revolution."

I believe this is not quite correct. Further down in the argument the petty-bourgeoisie is entirely identified with the conception of the peasantry. This is wrong again. We have to deal here with two classes, so to speak, or with two factions of one and the same petty-bourgeois class. Naturally, all these formulae have their relative value (with their different revolutionary grades). Relying upon the experiences of the Chinese Revolution, we can foretell also the attitude of the petty-bourgeoisie in other countries. Whilst the peasants will take the land and destroy the big landlords, the representatives of the old colonial apparatus, and the usurers; the urban petty-bourgeoisie, at best, will waver between the camp of the agrarian petty-bourgeois revolution and the camp of reaction. Another example was furnished by the revolutionary movement in India last year. Whilst the peasant movement was rising to an ever-higher level, the petty-bourgeoisie in the towns, as represented by Gandhi-ism, surrendered to imperialism. Therefore, it is altogether wrong to identify the peasantry with the petty-bourgeoisie, and this may also lead to extremely dangerous tactical mistakes for our fraternal parties.

The next question is that of the relations to the bourgeoisie. I believe the question of the desertion of the revolution by the bourgeoisie should be more enlarged upon. This desertion is to be observed today in most of the colonial countries, particularly in the capitalistically advanced, e. g., China and India, and partly also Indonesia, Egypt, and even Korea, where this desertion has been clearly manifested.

The characterisation of the national bourgeoisie as national reformism is substantially correct, although the characterisation of its oppositional or reformist role is true only in regard to the preparatory stage of the revolution. No sooner, however, do the large masses of the workers and peasants join the revolution, than the bourgeoisie throws itself into the arms of reaction. In the theses of Comrade Kuusinen it has been well put that this bourgeoisie is incapable of raising and solving the agrarian question. It was therefore wrong to say the opposite that

"it would be an ultra-Left mistake to start in the agitation of the Communist Party by simply identifying the national reformists (Swarajists, Wafdists, etc.), with the ruling counter-revolutionary bloc of the imperialists and the feudal elements".

During the period of preparation there should be no identification of this kind. However, it will be no Left Wing mistake to say in the theses that our Communist Parties should already today, from the very outset, wage a bitter fight against the bourgeoisie.

From whom shall we have to win away the masses? From the bourgeoisie. We must unmask them in connection with their attempts to lead the peasant movements, in connection with their attitude towards foreign capitalism. We must show up their inability to draw the masses into the revolutionary movement, their inability to solve the agrarian question. Once we have to wage a fight for the masses, for the working class which is still under their influence, for the petty bourgeoisie, whom we must equally endeavour to influence, we must carry on our exposing activity in this direction with the utmost energy and determination. It ought to be borne in mind that our Communist Parties have not yet everywhere decidedly separated themselves from the Left Wing of the national-revolutionary movement, that they have not yet distinctly crystallised themselves; therefore this thesis should serve as a warning.

In this connection the question arises as to the means and ways of the struggle.

It was said by Lenin about the first Russian revolution that it was bourgeois-democratic by its social content, nevertheless it was proletarian as regards the means and ways of the struggle. He went on to point out that the forces of the revolution were then determined by the combination of strikes and peasant movements, strikes, workers' insurrections and peasant revolts. Upon these grounds should the problem of the labour movement be tackled. This problem is connected with the strategy of the strike struggle, with the development of the political strike, and with the question of the general strike. All these questions must be tackled in their full scope, and only upon such conditions can the theses constitute a certain programme of action laying down the principal strategical line of the Comintern and furnishing the chief tactical slogans to our Parties. Without raising all these questions our Congress will not be in a position sufficiently to summarise the experiences of all the past revolutionary movements and to work out a firm method for the onward march of the revolutionary movements in the East. This is all the more necessary since we are on the threshold of tremendous upheavals in the colonies. If we fail to work out such militant methods, we shall find ourselves insufficiently prepared for the solving of a series of tactical questions which are going to arise in the very near future.

Comrade CHU CHO-MEI (China):

It is believed by many that the influence of our Party has waned since the Canton revolt, and that our movement has become stranded. In reality, however, such is not the case. The influence of the C. P. of China has increased among the masses since the Canton revolt, and this was demonstrated among other things by the influx of new members immediately after the Canton revolt. The membership of the Party has increased as compared with what it was immediately prior to the Canton revolt. Similarly, the labour movement has begun to revive. Proof of this is furnished by the unceasing strikes among the textile workers in Shanghai. This movement grows incessantly in spite of the unheard-of terrorism exercised by the Kuomintang authorities.

A growing activity is to be observed among the large masses of the petty-bourgeoisie. In recent weeks, an anti-imperialist movement emerged among the petty-bourgeoisie on the grounds of their discontent with the compromising policies of the Kuomintang. The illusions of the petty-bourgeoisie concerning the Kuomintang are dying out as a result of the open surrender of the latter to the imperialist Powers.

The fact that the Kuomintang and its Government are in need of large funds for the maintenance of their growing armies and bureaucratic apparatus, causes the generals to increase the burden of taxation. In this connection a movement has started among the urban petty-bourgeoisie against paying taxes. The financial crisis of the Kuomintang Government has been revealed in the fact that the troops have not been getting any pay for months, and in some cases for years. As you probably know, there were numerous mutinies of soldiers against their generals and officers upon these grounds. The struggle of the masses of the soldiers for payment of arrears of their pay is going to increase, for the generals are extorting the taxes not in order to pay the soldiers, but in order to fill their own pockets. On these grounds the disaffection of the soldiery will be found to grow apace. We also see how the mutinies of the soldiers extend from one company to another. There were also cases when soldiers brought out to crush a rising of the peasants had thrown in their lot with the latter. This movement of the soldiers will no doubt continue to develop, assuming more and more a class-conscious character.

There is also a growth of the peasant movement in North China. It is true, such primitive peasant movements like those of the "Red Spears", "Big Knives", etc., are insufficiently organised; nevertheless, by their ceaseless fight against the taxes, they are undermining the foundations of the capitalist domination. You know that in South China the guerilla warfare of the peasantry is still going on. It is becoming more and more transformed into organised movements led by the peasant unions, in the course of which the power of the gentry has been overthrown in some places and Soviets established. Notwithstanding the difficult conditions, there is already a whole

number of districts in South China which have established Soviet rule and which are extending their sphere of influence.

All these are tokens of the revival of the mass movement, indicating at the same time the steady growth of the influence wielded by the Communist Party. Although this does not yet show that we have to deal already with a new revolutionary tide — we have not yet progressed so far — nevertheless, this new tide is bound to rise, and precisely for the following reasons:

In the first place, the objective tasks of the revolution have not yet been solved. The unification of China now being carried out by the Kuomintang is a mere sham. In reality, the Kuomintang, in which the different groups of generals are represented, is not in a position to bring about the unification of China. Secondly, the Kuomintang is not in a position to solve the agrarian problem. Even such a modest demand of the peasants as a 25% reduction in the land rent could not be fulfilled by the Kuomintang. On the other hand, the bourgeoisie cannot solve the agrarian problem by means of reformism of the kind carried out by Stolypin in Tsarist Russia, because China has no extensive areas of unoccupied land as was the case in Tsarist Russia. At the same time, the peasant masses are allying themselves more and more with the urban proletariat whose representatives are leading their struggle and gaining their ever-increasing confidence. Thirdly, the Kuomintang regime represents nothing else but a dictatorship of the bloc formed by the gentry, the landlords, the feudal elements, and the bourgeoisie. Nevertheless the Kuomintang Government does not constitute a solid body. It is split, each group of generals has its own government and is anxious to become independent of the central government. This, I believe, renders the Kuomintang dictatorship different from the Fascist dictatorship in Europe. There can be no talk of stabilisation of the Kuomintang, since the inward strife is inevitably bound to grow among the component groups of the Kuomintang. These are the principal circumstances which will lead to an inevitable revival of the Chinese Revolution.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assume that there are no chances at all for reformism in China. On the contrary, just because there is as yet no resurgence of the revolutionary wave in China, there are still great possibilities for the development of a national reformism.

The imperialist powers, particularly the United States, are trying to support the national bourgeoisie by extending petty concessions in order to "pacify", and in reality to hoodwink the masses. The petty-bourgeois opposition to the Kuomintang Government is by no means imbued with a consistent revolutionary character. The anti-imperialist movement, the fight against exorbitant taxes, etc., — all these things are due to a certain discontent with the Kuomintang regime; nevertheless this movement is not sufficiently energetic and determined and can easily end in a compromise with the Kuomintang. This points to the absolute necessity for the working class to maintain a determined and independent tactical line in the actual struggle. The Party must develop the everyday struggles of the working masses, creating stronger trade unions and leading their struggle for emancipation, at the same time refraining from raising the slogan of "restoration of liberties" which would only serve the ends of the Kuomintang. The Party must stand at the head of the anti-imperialist movement and of the struggle of the petty-bourgeois masses against taxes, etc... It must also lead the mutinies in the army, endeavouring to develop them into a progressive economic movement, into an open alliance of the soldiers with the revolutionary workers and peasants. It should devote particular attention to the struggle of the peasants against the militarists, as well as to their struggle against excessive taxes, for the confiscation of the big estates, for the overthrow of the power of the gentry and the feudal elements. The Party must give more systematic assistance and leadership to the guerilla movement of the peasants, taking all steps to help in building up the existing Soviet districts. The Party must develop a wide agitation and propaganda for the armed insurrection as the only means towards the overthrow of the Kuomintang rule, i. e. the feudal elements and the bourgeoisie. It must carry on a campaign of exposing the national reformists, and also against the so-called Third Party. (This party is by no means a workers' and peasants' party, but rather the representative of the Left-wing of the Kuomintang whose spokesmen are Tyn Il-ta, Cheng Kun-Po and others.)

This party befuddles the revolutionary intelligence of the large masses and plays therefore a reactionary role. The Party will not be able to carry out its line of winning the large masses and preparing them for the organised armed insurrection unless it successfully carries out these slogans.

A few words about the role of the women in the revolutionary movement in China. There is no need for me to point out how considerable that role is. Our women in China are taking the most active part in the movement. The working women in Shanghai have taken a most active part in the three revolts of the Shanghai proletariat, whilst numerous women have stood in the ranks of the Workers' Guards who waged a bitter fight against the troops of Chang Kai-shek. In the strike movement of Shanghai, the working women frequently play a leading role. The same is true in regard to the rural districts. Not only do the peasant women take part in the struggle for the division of the land, but also in the active guerilla warfare. They are very valuable in the liaison, sentry, sanitation services, and so on. In the Kwantung Province, in the districts of Hailoyn, Hainam, Chenfa, where Soviets have been established, the peasant women participate in the various activities of the Soviets. This women's movement, unparalleled in Chinese history, has uprooted in the Sovietised districts all the old prejudices and traditions of the degradation and enslavement of the woman in the family. Nevertheless the Party should devote even greater attention than hitherto to the organisational and educational activities among the working women. The central slogan of the women's movement to-day should be: the participation of all the working women in the struggle for the overthrow of the power of the gentry, the feudal elements and the bourgeoisie; the participation of the women in the agrarian revolution. It should be observed that the working women, particularly the peasant women, are already fighting under this slogan. This activity of the women is essentially due to the measures which have been carried out in the Sovietised districts (the women's right to land tenure, participation in the Soviets, equal rights in the domain of popular education, the abolition of family subjugation traditions, etc.).

In conclusion, a few words on the inner Party situation. I believe that not only the C. P. of China, but the Communist Party of all the colonies generally are still too young. Frequently, the Communist Parties of the colonial and semi-colonial countries do not grasp the decisions of the C. I. and they fail to carry them out. The opportunistic tendencies in these countries are still great, and experience has shown that the opportunistic mistakes, say, of the Chinese Communist Party, have the same roots as the oppositional ideology in the C. P. S. U. I fully support the idea that this Congress should particularly emphasise the question of strengthening the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

Comrade FORD (Negro Comrade from the U. S. A.) in name of the Communist Fraction of the R. I. L. U.:

Comrades, permit me to speak first on the attitude of the Socialist Party, the II. International, to Negro and colonial peoples in general; secondly, on some theoretical points in connection with the Negro question in America; and thirdly, on some practical steps towards carrying out our general programme.

First, a protest was recently made by colonial guests at the Congress of the II. International at Brussels, the essence of which characterises the attitude of the II. International to oppressed peoples in general and also to the Negro peoples in particular. This protest reads as follows:

"Having examined the decisions of the colonial commission of the Socialist Labour International, we have arrived at the conclusion that these decisions, in their present form, are inconsistent with the equality of nations and with the principle of self-determination, and equality of peoples should be applied to all oppressed nations and subject races without any distinction whatever."

This protest brings out the basic principles of the II. International with regard to the oppressed peoples, and particularly to Negro peoples which is characterised by the following quotation:

"This point of view is held by such renegades as Kautsky, who maintains that the whole racial question amounts exclusively to the class struggle between the proletariat and

the bourgeoisie, and that there is no need for any struggle for the social equality of the oppressed races and that such a struggle is even harmful since it interferes with the fundamental struggle. Let the Negroes wait until the advent of socialism, then the emancipated proletariat will proceed to emancipate all the oppressed peoples including the Negro race in America."

Let me now examine the attitude of the II. International in regard to the Negroes in America. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a progressive Labour League made up of Negro workers recently called a conference to participate in the elections in Milwaukee. This conference, which included fraternal organisations, working class organisations, sent also an invitation to the Socialist Party of Milwaukee. The Socialist Party refused to participate in this conference upon the ground that the movement was essentially a race movement, and not a working class movement. In an article appearing in the "Ford", an organ of the Socialist Party of America, Mr. Bruce, in analysing the Negro situation in America, states the following:

"But it is true as the years pass, as more and more Negroes come to the North and become decent, self-respecting men and women, doing their work, exercising their citizenship like their fellow Americans, the Negro problem will tend more and more to be solved."

This also characterises the attitude of the Socialist Party in regard to the Negroes in America, which is entirely an un-socialist point of view.

The election platform of the Socialist Party in America at present says in regard to the Negro question:

"The Convention records its sympathy and support of the Negro workers to wipe out the discrimination against which they have unremittingly laboured since the end of the civil war. The Socialist Party favours the Federal Anti-Lynching Bill, and is against the continuance of Negro lynching in some of the States and the heartless policy of 'Jim Crowism'."

This policy represents the same standpoint as adopted by the two bourgeois parties of America, the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. It also supports, as it says in its platform, the Negro porters who have been organised to the extent of 12,000. But again in reference to the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, a Negro trade union organisation which is entirely under the influence of the Socialist Party, this organisation has been allowed to slip into the hands of the reactionary A. F. of L. and at the last moment of their strike, Mr. Green of the A. F. of L., was allowed to call this strike off in the name of "seeking justice before the American Public for this strike." In this case there is a complete betrayal of the interests of 12,000 Negro workers who are labouring under the worst conditions of exploitation by one of the richest corporations in America.

Recently in the United States, in the name of "fair play", "freedom of speech" and "freedom of the air", the Socialist Party of America allowed an agent of the American imperialists to broadcast over their radio station (a station which has been built in the memory of Eugene V. Debs) a defence of American imperialism's encroachment upon the defenceless Nicaraguan people.

The II. International has divided the colonial peoples into four categories according to their degree of development. It says in reference to the first group, while we will stand for a partial principle of self-determination, we will not stand for complete freedom. To the other three groups, well, we will not agree to any separation from the mother country, you are not quite fully developed and so forth, and so on. Finally, this characterisation of the attitude of this bunch of social imperialists towards oppressed peoples can be summarised in the following point of view of Kautsky:

"This problem of social inequality is reduced to the national and colonial peoples."

In this sense he speaks in his "Judaism and Race" when he refers to the great gulf between the civilised and backward races and that the only road for the workers is to go on driving for independence and to assimilate the achievements of civilisation of the white peoples.

However, comrades, in pointing out this fundamentally incorrect principle on the part of the II. International, and the So-

cialist Party, of downright collaboration with the imperialists, we must not overlook in our own ranks, certain deviations in regard to our attitude toward Negro peoples. In Milwaukee there was a slight deviation on the part of certain elements in our Party not to co-operate with the movement of the Negroes there. But this deviation will be eliminated.

But the attitude of the II. International is a matter of principle. The Negro peoples and colonial peoples cannot accept the policies of the II. International. The colonial peoples and Negro peoples can and must accept only the leadership of the Communist, the III. International as its leader against imperialism.

There is a considerable discussion going on in the Negro Commission regarding the slogan for a republic of the Negro peoples in America. The Congress must give this question very serious attention indeed. It is necessary to examine thoroughly some of the following points of view. 1. What are the economic roots of international antagonisms? 2. What are the class contradictions within the dominating nations? 3. What are the sources and character of national chauvinism? 4. What is the basis of the national ideology of an oppressed nation or group and the effect of class differentiations, as well as what is the course of national emancipation movements?

The economic roots of national antagonisms as applied to the Negroes in the United States rise from the following propositions: that the Negro is an economically backward national minority which has no territory.

Here the question is the extraction of not only colonial super-profits, but the extraction of super-profits of the colonial peoples outside the confines of the imperialist nations. In the budding or emerging stage of capitalism we can conceive that the interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie for self-determination are coinciding or moving along the same lines for political and economic independence and even for a time, further, for cultural and language freedom, etc. Yet there is the ever-growing antagonism between the oppressed proletariat and the bourgeoisie which causes the collapse of nationalist unity.

At this point of development of the proletariat the bourgeoisie begins first the disintegration of the proletariat by arousing national chauvinism and secondly, by bribing the upper strata of the proletariat and petty bourgeoisie. Therefore, there can be no common national ideology of the oppressed proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

The ideology of nationalism on the part of an oppressed group is based upon the national ideology of the oppressed nation as the ideology of all its classes. This ideology is developed by the fact that they constitute a nation, or that they are living in one territory, under the same conditions and the same economic development, using the same language, etc., and 2. by the fact that they are oppressed and exploited by another nation which is technically more developed and through which their economic development is artificially retarded, that they cannot attain political independence, etc. In all cases of national antagonism the basis is the difference of technical and economic development.

In the United States we find no economic system separating the two races. The interests of the Negro and white workers are the same. The Negro peasant and the white peasant interests are the same. But the bourgeoisie has set up a racial barrier, playing upon the differences of colour, of skin and so forth, in order to super-exploit the coloured workers, which has its effect, to a great extent, upon the white workers.

It seems that any nationalist movement on the part of the Negroes does nothing but play into the hands of the bourgeoisie by arresting the revolutionary class movement of the Negro masses and further widening the gulf between the white and similar oppressed groups.

The revolutionary movement of the Negroes can take three forms: 1. the Negro movement may manifest itself as a reformist movement, of the opportunistic, conciliatory upper strata of the Negro bourgeoisie; 2. the chauvinistic racial movement of those elements of the black bourgeoisie who are interested in the isolation of the Negro population in order to secure for themselves the unhindered exploitation of Negro labour; 3. the racial movement of the Negroes can be a movement of the Negro workers and urban poor of the North, who are considerably more exploited than the white workers and also of the Negro agricultural labourers and Negro peasants of the South who are exploited

by capitalist landlords. They are struggling for equal conditions of labour with the white brothers of their class, for full political and social equality between white and Negro workers. The class struggle is an attack upon imperialist super-profits. The racial movement is therefore a revolutionary anti-imperialist struggle, a struggle insolubly tied up with the revolutionary struggle of the poor peasantry and workers against capitalist exploitation.

This question is related to the general question of the Negroes throughout the world. In South Africa we have the question of a nationalist movement, the development of class contradictions between the middle and petty-bourgeois elements. In South Africa we have the question of whether we can lead the peasant revolution. In Haiti there is national aspiration. This question of nationalism needs the full attention of the Comintern in order that we can lay down a thorough theoretical basis for our future work in regard to the oppressed peoples and the Negro peoples in general.

Finally, we come to the third point and that is in reference to our practical programme in connection with our Negro work and our colonial work. I want to touch upon some aspects of the Negro question in regard to the approaching world war.

In the last war 2,290,000 Negroes were registered for military service by the United States, of whom 458,000 were examined for military service. Of this number 380,000 were inducted into full military service of the United States army. Of this number 200,000 served in France. At the present time the United States, in her feverish preparation for war, is not overlooking the Negro as a combatant troop as well as non-combatant soldiers. Two regiments of state militia have been federalised into the regular army and are being constantly trained. The National Defence Act of 1920 provided for the organisation of the Military Guards to train Negroes in peace times. This organisation is similar to The Minute Men, provided for by the same Act, an anti-labour organisation headed by General Dawes. Under the pressure of petty-bourgeois intellectual Negroes, Negro students are being sent to West Point, the military academy of the United States army.

France controls a colonial population of 60 million colonials in Africa. 845,000 colonials served in France in the last war; 535,000 were soldiers and 310,000 were labour contingents. The peace footing of the French army at the present time is 660,000, of whom 189,000 are colonial troops. In ten years time (estimated from 1924), France plans to have 400,000 trained colonial troops and 450,000 more ready to be trained.

England did not have as many colonial troops in the last war as France, but the troops of West Africa conquered German West Africa for England and held the Turks in check. At the present time England offers her greatest object lesson in the field of black labour.

Anglo-American rivalry throws up the possibility of black troops of these two nations being thrown against each other in the defence of "their" country. But more than this; it is not unlikely that in the event of the next war the scene of battle will shift to different parts of the world and even centre in Africa.

There is another grouping: the imperialist world against the U. S. S. R. In this alignment the imperialists intend to use if possible, the Negro colonial troops as was done during the civil war in Russia in 1920, 21 and 22, in which France and England used black troops against the Red Army.

We must turn our faces to the colonies and prepare the colonial troops to turn their guns upon their oppressor, to fight for their liberation from imperialist exploitation and oppression. The various Parties, the French, British, American, Belgian, South African should now begin plans to turn the resentment of the Negro troops against their oppressors.

Now in regard to our practical work, we must begin to organise trade unions among the Negro peoples of the world. There has been set up at the Profintern an International Labour Bureau of Negro workers for the purpose of unifying the Negro workers and the white workers throughout the world. Where possible, to organise trade unions of white and coloured workers, and to organise coloured unions separately where this is not possible. This bureau will also issue bulletins, pamphlets and literature with the idea of centralising and consolidating and bringing together the proletariat of the whole world, against the imperialist oppression and against a world war against the U. S. S. R.

Comrade LACERDA (Brazil):

Comrades, the delegates from Brazil are in agreement with the theses and report made by Comrade Humbert-Droz, with the exception of a few points on which amendments are moved by the Latin-American Delegation.

Thus, several points concerning Brazil call for some explanations on our part.

First of all, the question of the support given by North-American imperialism to the revolutionary movement in San-Paolo. This movement was started by a section of the army, being the expression of a strong discontent among the urban petty-bourgeoisie; it was directed against the agrarian reaction which is raging in Brazil, and was at first supported also by the industrial bourgeoisie. This revolutionary movement started in San-Paolo and spread to the different States of Northern Brazil, going on until the end of 1925, in the shape of revolts and attempted revolts. It ended in the mutiny of two warships and with the retreat of the remnants of the revolutionary troops into the interior of Brazil. This movement, having even gained a temporary triumph in the Amazon State, exercised a tremendous effect in Brazil and threw the whole country into great turmoil. This caused the government to resort to reactionary and brutal measures, not only against the insurgent petty-bourgeoisie, but also against the proletariat and its vanguard.

It is wrong to assert that material support was extended to the revolutionaries by North-American imperialism. Had this movement been supported by imperialism, it would have gained tremendous advantages over the reactionary power of the agrarians. As a matter of fact, the imperialists of North America accorded only vague sympathy to the movement which was confined to the United Press telegrams about exaggerated successes of the revolutionary forces. The only intervention in the petty-bourgeois revolution in Brazil came from England, who sent warships to Rio de Janeiro to support the agrarian government of Arthur Bernardes, the then President of the Republic.

I must also make a few remarks concerning the semi-colonial character of Brazil. It was stated by Comrade Humbert-Droz that objections were raised by comrades from Latin-America to describing these countries as semi-colonies. I must say that we in Brazil, as well as the majority of the Latin-American Delegation, are convinced that Brazil and all the other Latin-American countries are semi-colonies. The formal independence which we enjoy in Brazil can deceive only the nationalist petty-bourgeoisie. Ever since we won our "independence" with the aid of Admiral Cochrane, the servant of His British Majesty, we have been transferred from the colonial domination of Portugal to the economic and political domination of England. Since that time the Rothschild Banks invested money in Brazil and the economic and political dependence of Brazil became ever-more pronounced. Some time ago the Brazilian Government invited English financial experts to take charge of the finances of the country.

After examining all the books of the State finances, these experts recommended a series of measures for the adjustment of the country's finances.

After the Arcos Raid in London a series of "terrible" documents were sent by Scotland Yard to the Brazilian Government through the British Embassy, dealing with alleged Communist propaganda in Brazil, supposedly carried on by the III. International, and urging the Government to take strict measures against this propaganda which is so dangerous to the tranquility of the British bankers. As the result of this intervention, a series of measures against the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat was carried by the Brazilian Parliament. Our newspaper "La Nacion" was compelled to suspend publication to avoid victimisation by the reactionary government, whilst our Party was finally driven to strict illegality.

On the other hand, American imperialism continues its penetration by means of capital investments, the purchase of railways, the purchase of large estates in the Amazon State by the Ford Co., and so on. It may even be said that the whole of the national industry is controlled by American capitalism. Thus, the American "Light and Power" Company has a monopoly of the supply of electricity. The headquarters of the Company are in Canada, but the major half of its stock comes from the United States.

American imperialism intervenes also through its military missions. Thus, it sent a naval mission to enforce the imperialist principles upon the Brazilian navy.

Therefore, in spite of our wealth and of the silly belief of our bourgeoisie as regards political independence, we cannot consider ourselves independent, and in fact, as properly pointed out by Comrade Humbert-Droz and by the theses, we have every token of being a semi-colonial country.

Now a few words about the Kuomintang idea which was properly criticised by Comrade Humbert-Droz. Our chief mistake was committed at the moment when the Kuomintang in China was in the period of fighting against the imperialist forces. Since at that time we had not yet gone through the subsequent painful experiences, it was but natural that we should try to form a similar organisation. But this mistake was limited to a mere organisational attempt, and "our Kuomintang" was not carried out in reality. But as Communists we must confess to this mistake before the Communist International, and we accept Comrade Humbert Droz' criticism as right and proper.

It is hardly necessary to say that we are fully in agreement with the course he has outlined, and that we shall do everything in our power to develop our Communist Party into a real mass Party in spite of the bitter persecution and all the difficulties of our daily activity in the most backward country of the American Continent.

We must succeed in overcoming these difficulties by being led by the experiences of the comrades in the Communist International, and by the teachings of Lenin whose spirit is alive in the mighty work of the revolutionary international proletariat which is so powerfully represented at this Congress.

Comrade SCHÜLLER (Young Communist International):

Comrades, the theses begin with a reference to the theses of the II. Congress. The VI. Congress of the Communist International declares that the theses on the national and colonial questions adopted by the II. Congress are still valid, etc. Comrades I do not think that it is expedient to proceed in this manner. This is of course in regard to the contents, but certain fundamental ideas of the theses of the II. Congress should certainly be repeated in these theses. Why? The Congress of the Second International has taken place recently in Brussels. It dealt with the colonial question, and its proceedings in this were a complete fiasco. The colonial peoples were interested in this Brussels Congress, they wanted to hear what the Second International has to say about their national aspirations, what it can promise them in regard to their independence, etc. It is precisely in this question that the Second International has demonstrated its treachery by refusing to stand up for the colonial peoples' demand for independence, etc.

Comrades, I do not think that all the workers in the colonies and semi-colonies are familiar with the decisions of the II. World Congress. Therefore they will be waiting for the slogans which our Congress will issue for their liberation struggle. Hence, we should support also by revolutionary means the fundamental slogans, the right to self-determination including complete separation and the clearly expressed independence of the colonies, the duty of the Communist Parties to support in the mother countries such a struggle for independence.

Generally speaking, these theses are certainly a very important and valuable document. But we think that the method used in the theses is somewhat schematic. Firstly, an attempt has been made to press the great diversity of the existing colonies and semi-colonies into different groups. But still more important is the attempt to determine and lay down schematically beforehand the future dialectical process of development in all its details and possible variants.

Comrades we think that this is fraught with danger because of the tendency which exists in our Party work to be schematic, to apply mere formulae and to ignore the live process.

We also think that the theses are not concrete enough, that they do not deal in sufficient detail with a series of colonial questions and do not define clearly enough the tasks of the Communist Party in the imperialist mother countries.

Moreover, the questions of South America and the Negroes, as well as the tasks of the Parties in the "mother countries" are

inadequately dealt with in the theses. As to the division of the individual countries into different groups, we propose that the present division into four groups should be reduced to three. It would be expedient to do away with the second group because another criterion is applied there than in the three other groups of countries. In the three other groups economic and social maturity of the development is the criterion, whereas the point of departure in the second group is utterly different, namely, the question of the immigration of whites. It happens that countries are included in the second group which belong by rights to the first or third group. This is confusing, and it would therefore be better to do away with the second group.

In regard to the bourgeoisie, a new turn has been introduced here, namely, "national-reformist". I think that it is on the whole correct to discriminate between national revolutionary and national reformist, but by identifying national-reformist with bourgeois-democratic, and this is done in the theses, we create confusion.

Another important remark which I would like to make is as follows:

In Point 18 second par. of the draft the following thesis is brought forward:

"... the rest of the native bourgeoisie, especially the main section of the industrialists, stand by the national movement; and in the most important colonial countries they represent a vacillating compromising tendency of their own which may be designated as a **national-reformist or bourgeois-democratic tendency.**"

This tendency is more clearly defined lower down. It is said in point 20:

"Yet one cannot maintain with certainty that in all these countries it is altogether excluded that the reformist bourgeoisie, or a section of it, in an acute revolutionary situation, will at first join the nationalist-revolutionary camp and thereby for a time play an objectively revolutionary role."

The possibility of it being able to play an objectively revolutionary role is reiterated in several other points of the draft theses. I think that such an assertion can only be accepted with the greatest reserve. It is of course true that there is such a vacillating, opportunist tendency in the bourgeoisie, but I doubt if one can really say in general, that in most of the important colonies this vacillating bourgeois tendency can be expected to make common cause for a time with the national-revolutionary camp; among the most important colonies and semi-colonies are Egypt and Syria. In Egypt, for instance, we have a peculiar situation, conditions there are not mature. As to China, it is perfectly clear that what I have just said no longer applies to the Chinese bourgeoisie. Neither does this apply to India, because I think it is perfectly clear today that the Indian bourgeoisie — not the petty bourgeoisie but the bourgeoisie — is now merely a more or less loyal opposition and also that it can no longer be considered a component part of the national-revolutionary camp. For instance, if we say here "reformists" to the Social Democrats, do we mean by this that, in an acutely revolutionary situation, the Social Democrats might for a time join the revolutionary camp, that they might play for a time an objectively revolutionary role? Certainly not. We know that if in an acutely revolutionary situation the Social Democrats take up an outwardly pseudo-revolutionary position, this is neither objectively nor subjectively a revolutionary position, but will lead, objectively and subjectively, only to impeding and retarding the revolutionary wave. (This comparison does not of course mean that I ignore the difference between colonial and non-colonial countries.) Well, I think that the Indian bourgeoisie is already in such a position. At present it is only in the nature of a more or less loyal opposition, in the nature of reformism, and it is perfectly clear that it can no longer be expected to join the revolutionary camp. It can perhaps make a revolutionary gesture, but it can no longer join the revolutionary camp. As to the other colonies, it is just possible that the bourgeoisie there will join the revolutionary camp. This is correct and I do not contest it, but I think it exaggerated and even dangerous to make a general declaration that such an improbable possibility still exists in most of the important colonies. In this respect the draft must be amended.

It is argued in Point 25 that the first phase of the bourgeois-democratic revolution consists of two stages. In the first stage the feudal-imperialist bloc is in power. The national-bourgeoisie in the most important of these countries plays a preponderantly oppositional although a vacillating role. Its national-reformist parties exercise considerable influence over the masses, etc. In this stage it is incumbent on the Communist Party to win over and mobilise the workers and peasants for mass demonstrations against the ruling bloc and for organised struggle for their everyday demands, exposure of the national-reformist Party, etc.

In the second stage the bourgeois parties join in a very marked manner the imperialist-feudal ruling bloc, their opposition begins to play a very secondary role and their counter-revolutionary struggle against the workers and peasant movement becomes paramount. Finally, the bourgeois parties are drawn into participation in the highest government organs, etc.

In this stage it is incumbent on the Communist Party to win over and mobilise the workers and peasants under the slogan of the overthrow of the enlarged ruling bloc, not only the imperialist and feudal lords, but also the Parties of the national big bourgeoisie, and also to launch the general agrarian revolution and to steer the course towards the seizure of State power. But a very important point is the situation between the first and the second stage. Here it should be emphasised with the utmost energy that it is not necessary and even not permissible for the Communist Party to wait for the bourgeois parties to assume power before raising the question of the overthrow of the bourgeois government and of the agrarian revolution. The Communist Party should avoid, as far as this is possible, a development of the second stage in which it has to raise the question of the agrarian revolution too soon, in which it is compelled to bring forward the question of workers' and peasants' government at the turning point between the first and second stage. Let us take for instance the Wuhan period. The mistake of the Communist Party consisted in its inability to raise the question of the agrarian revolution and of the seizure of power by the workers and peasants soon enough, already before the beginning of the Wuhan period. If our Chinese Communist Party had raised at the right time the question of agrarian revolution and seizure of power, seizure of power by us would have been possible if not certain. We should have been working towards this possibility.

There is also a very long Point 26 in the Theses where the possibility of such a development is certainly mentioned. But in view of the schematic attitude of most of our parties and the serious errors of our Chinese Party, we cannot adopt a rigid division into two stages as given in the Theses.

I should like to say also a few words about a country which has been treated by the Comintern like a stepchild, namely, Ireland. I think that the time has come to deal seriously with Ireland. One could of course say Ireland is a free state, a Dominion, and rest content with this. But this would be a serious mistake. Ireland is a free state or a Dominion only in name. In reality Ireland is still in the position of a colony. What was given here as the characteristic of a Dominion? That the British white bourgeoisie pushes the natives into the background and creates a new white state which, economically and politically, is an agency of the mother country. Another comrade will deal in greater detail with the Dominion question. I think that this formula does not take into consideration the centrifugal tendencies. In Ireland the situation is utterly different. We witness there the oppression of a whole people by British imperialism. In Ireland the social policy of the conquerors aimed at depriving the native population of the land. We witness there the typical economic policy of imperialism towards a subject race. If it is true for a colony that the "mother country" impedes the productive forces, it is certainly true for Ireland where British imperialism is ruthlessly impeding the productive forces of the country. If Ireland bears formally the character of a Dominion, this is due to a revolution which had its course between 1916 and 1923. This revolution ended in a compromise between the national bourgeoisie and British imperialism. This revolution was brought to an end by a sanguinary civil war of the new ruling bloc of the imperialists and the national bourgeoisie against the petty bourgeoisie and the workers and peasants who wanted to continue the struggle for full independence. The revolution came to a standstill half way, but the Irish question is not yet solved. Ireland has not yet secured independence and national unity. On

the contrary, Great Britain has driven a wedge into the national unity. The agrarian question is not yet solved in Ireland, it is probably not known that peasant rebellions have taken place lately in Ireland. We witnessed in 1922—23 seizure of land on a large scale by poor and middle peasants, establishment of Soviets in rural districts, the unfurling of the Red Banner on the buildings of the big landlords.

Everyone knows about the miserable position of the agricultural labourers in Ireland, but the labour movement, too, is in a miserable position in Ireland. As to the Labour Party I agree with Comrade Carney that it is now nothing but an agency of British imperialism. If it is necessary for us to take up a very definite attitude towards the Labour Party in Britain, this is all the more necessary in Ireland. But the most important point is that in Ireland we have no revolutionary, no Communist Party. There is certainly the fact that the Irish Workers League has begun lately to be politically active, for instance, in the 1927 elections. But it is not yet a Party in the true sense of the word; it is not yet a Communist Party, and as long as we have no Communist Party in Ireland, we will not be able to make any headway. We witnessed in the last years a big political crisis in Ireland. We will continue to lag behind also in future if we do not establish in Ireland a genuine Communist Party capable of leading the national and social liberation struggle.

Hegemony has already been in the hands of the labour movement in Ireland, namely, in the revolutionary years 1916—1918, in the Easter insurrection and also later. At that time the Irish labour movement committed a big mistake; it gave up hegemony and independence and became only an appendage of the petty bourgeois republican movement. The result was — a break up of the revolutionary labour movement and a reinforcement of the reformist labour organisations. In this respect a change has taken place lately, and we are progressing. This year the Irish Workers League has begun to act as a kind of political organisation. But we must demand more. We must demand that this organisation be transformed into a political organisation, into a Communist Party. We have Communist Parties in China and India, which work even under the pressure of white terror and in very complicated situations, why should not we have a Communist Party in Ireland? Are we to rest content there with diverse labour organisations and keep silent on the fact that we stand in need of a Communist Party? We must not do so. It is high time to take a step forward, all the more so as there are good elements in Ireland which we can use, and not only in the political groups of the workers, but also in trade unions. There are also many honest revolutionary elements among the Republicans whom we can win over to our side. Such a Party would give an impetus to the labour movement and could also carry out the alliance policy with the peasantry which is one of the main problems in Ireland. With the support of the C. I. and the British Party, such a Party could achieve considerable results in the Irish revolutionary movement.

Comrade PAREDES (Ecuador):

Comrades, on the whole the colonial theses are quite acceptable. Nevertheless I should like to pass some critical remarks on a few points.

The classification of the different countries in these theses is better than in the Draft Programme. Nevertheless I believe that there should be a different sub-division as regards the economic and political situation of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. In the discussion on the Programme I pointed out the necessity of introducing a new group of countries to be described as "dependent countries". This question is of importance in working out the proper tactics for these countries. I am not going to dwell upon this question, nor upon a number of other points which I have raised in the discussion on the Programme. Nevertheless, I should like to urge the need of a thorough study of the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries.

On the question of the bourgeois, democratic and agrarian revolution, stress ought to be laid upon four chief points: 1. the economy of the country; 2. the degree of economic penetration by imperialism; 3) the political strength of the country, and 4. the political sway of imperialism. In connection with the first point it is essential to make an attentive study of the

correlation of the classes. Yet this question has not so far been sufficiently cleared up, hence our Parties and the proletariat at large receive wrong tactical directives.

Must the proletariat accomplish the bourgeois-democratic revolution? Must it accomplish a revolution from which the advantages will be reaped by the bourgeoisie? I believe this question ought to be answered in the negative.

From the point of view of economic development the situation in the individual dependent colonial and semi-colonial countries varies, particularly as regards the degree of their industrialisation. In this respect the following four groups of countries should be distinguished:

1. The first group is made up of those countries which are also classed in the theses among the first group (although this does not relate to some countries). These countries have a growing industry and also important sources of raw material which industry requires (for instance, the countries of Latin America which are rich in various minerals and fuels, chiefly in petroleum, as well as in agricultural raw material). They have the possibility for Socialist construction in the not far distant future. The group of countries with possibilities for Socialist construction is larger than is indicated in the programme. It ought to be mentioned further that the existence of Soviet Russia constitutes an important support for the creation of new proletarian States. In some of these countries, particularly in the dependent countries, concentration has far advanced and property is concentrated in the hands of a small group. Another favourable factor to the realisation of Socialism is contained in the fact that in the domain of agriculture the soil is but little divided (tremendous estates, sometimes strongly industrialised). For political reasons it would be advisable to divide the first group of countries into two sub-groups: a) dependent countries (Argentina, Brazil, Uruguay, Mexico, Ecuador), and b) colonial and semi-colonial countries, in which the problem of national emancipation stands in the foreground.

2. To the second group belong all the countries with a low level of economic development, with small numbers of proletarians, who cannot become the driving force of the revolution notwithstanding the support of the peasantry. As regards this group of countries, the bourgeois-democratic revolution should be designated as the immediate task.

3. The third group comprises exceedingly backward countries with either very little or an entire absence of large industries. In such countries the proletariat forms quite a weak element. Owing to the exceedingly slight class differentiation, the class relations are as yet very vague. In such countries our first task is the revolution for the national emancipation of the population.

In the second and third group it is the task of the Communist Parties to develop the nascent proletariat, to promote the growth of the forces of production in the country, and to win the maximum of political freedom and economic advantages for the poor strata of the population.

The role of the national bourgeoisie in the different movements of the proletariat and the peasantry differs in the individual countries. In the dependent countries, where the national-bourgeoisie constitutes already a definite political force, it does not apply its force against the imperialists, but against the proletariat that is fighting for its class demands. Therefore in these countries our chief struggle is against the national-bourgeoisie, the ally of the imperialists. In Mexico the problem is somewhat different, in view of the profound economic penetration of imperialism and the deep-rooted historic hatred of the Mexican people against the imperialists of North-America. In all these countries the fight against imperialism will constitute one of the chief problems of the proletarian revolution. I believe the force of the national-bourgeoisie has been underestimated in the theses. Hence comes the mistake that the problem of the struggle against imperialism takes up almost the whole attention, whilst the struggle against the national-bourgeoisie has been consigned to oblivion, so to speak.

The force of the proletariat in the dependent, colonial and semi-colonial countries of the first group is not only a numerical force, because it has already fought with the greatest courage and self-sacrifice against the bourgeoisie (China, Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Ecuador). In the theses the role of the proletariat is under-estimated. Moreover, the attitude towards the peasantry is not properly stated. It is said in the

theses that the peasants are the most numerous class; this does not correspond to the facts. In a great number of these countries the rural proletariat is far more numerous than the peasantry. Naturally, the industrial proletariat and the rural proletariat cannot be placed on the same level, nevertheless the concentration of a large number of wage-earners upon the agricultural estates constitutes an important factor. Owing to the under-estimation of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the over-estimation of the peasantry, the problems of these countries are tackled exclusively from the standpoint of the division of the land and the struggle against imperialism.

Having regard to all these elements, I now proceed to the question of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in these countries. Above all, what are the elements likely to take part in the bourgeois-democratic and agrarian revolution, in the revolution against imperialism? Let us first of all consider the possibility of the participation of the big bourgeoisie. Referring to my statements in the discussion on the Programme, I should like to add here only that in these countries the big bourgeoisie forms part of the Government and is allied to imperialism (the participation of the big bourgeoisie in the Government has reached a different degree in the different countries). As regards the dependent countries, the big bourgeoisie will always be against the revolution, because the latter will eventually be turned against it. Also in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, where the question of the hegemony of the proletariat and the peasantry is coming clearly into view, the big bourgeoisie will be opposed to the proletariat and the peasantry.

In the theses the role of the national bourgeoisie, as regards this economic power, which is tremendous in some of the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries, has been rather under-estimated. On the other hand I believe their role in the anti-imperialist struggle has been over-estimated. The national bourgeoisie of nearly all these countries is most intimately allied to imperialism, and not only economically, but also by a certain sharing of political power with it.

As regards the petty-bourgeoisie, we believe it will play a very big role in nearly all these countries. In some countries of Latin-America, e. g. Venezuela, Peru, Brazil, Chile, Bolivia, Colombia, etc., the petty-bourgeois revolution is already upon the order of the day. In Venezuela and in Peru, where there is no Communist Party and no trade-union movement of any importance, the petty-bourgeoisie will consequently play a predominant role in a coming revolution. Nevertheless the petty-bourgeoisie is a wavering class which will betray the revolutionary movement, if the proletariat and the peasantry will not make the proper use of it.

In those countries where the petty-bourgeoisie already possesses political power (Mexico, Ecuador) it may happen that the petty-bourgeois governments will temporarily play a revolutionary role, that in some cases, e. g. in the case of a world war, they will turn against imperialism.

The peasantry will play a foremost role in the revolutionary struggle. Yet when I speak about the peasantry I have in mind also the agricultural labourers who in nearly all the Latin-American countries formed the most important part of the toiling section of the rural population. It is possible that the revolutionary struggle will be started by a revolt of the agricultural labourers and peasants against the big landowners and the government. Nevertheless the proletariat, which in some Latin American countries has already acquired revolutionary traditions in the courageous fight against the employers will quickly intervene and place itself at the head of the movement.

It is the tendency in the theses to consider all the problems of our countries from the agricultural standpoint, chiefly as peasant problems. It is quite right that in some of the greatly backward colonial and semi-colonial countries where there is almost no proletariat or where it exists only in its embryonic stage (some of the nomadic peoples, some African colonies), the problem is essentially a peasant problem, a problem of the national independence and the establishment of a democratic government in which the largest number of workers and peasants shall participate.

The question of sub-dividing the countries of imperialist economic penetration into two groups — semi-colonial and dependent countries — is important from the standpoint of the

beginning of the struggle which is going to be different in the two categories of countries, whereas the ultimate problem will be identical and will be determined by the respective degree of economic development.

In the theses the fact is overlooked that in some of the dependent countries there has been already in existence for some time a bourgeois-democratic regime (Argentina, Uruguay), as well as a petty-bourgeois order, against which the proletariat will have to fight in order to overthrow imperialism and establish the hegemony of the proletariat and the peasantry.

The proper estimation of the role of the petty-bourgeois revolution, which is going to be accomplished in some of the Latin-American countries, is necessary for us for the establishment of the hegemony of the proletariat and the peasantry. The outcome of this revolutionary movement will be extremely varied, depending on whether a Communist Party exists or does not exist in a given country. The proletariat will be able to win the hegemony with the aid of the peasantry only if it has a Communist Party.

The petty-bourgeois revolutions, which have lately occurred in the Latin-American countries, should be studied by us with attention. Comrade Lacerda has already spoken about the petty-bourgeois Revolution in Brazil. The Mexican comrades will have to tell the same story about their own country, and I should like to say here a few words about Chile and Ecuador. The second coup d'état in Chile in 1925 was a petty-bourgeois movement in which the peasantry and the organised working class took an active part. This movement had some progressive features. However, the third coup d'état of Ibanez was out and out reactionary and was distinctly of a Fascist character. The Mexican revolution of 1910—17 was directed against the power of the big landowners, the national big bourgeoisie, the church, and imperialism. The movement of the toiling rural population had an aspect of its own and constituted a big driving force in the revolution. Nevertheless this revolution, in spite of the participation and the big role played by the organised workers, is of a typical petty-bourgeois character.

In Ecuador there was since 1895 a bourgeois-democratic revolution which was accomplished by the nascent national-bourgeoisie and was directed against the power of the landlords and the church. On the other hand, the 1925 revolution was directed against the power of the national big bourgeoisie, the big landlords, and partly also against imperialism, chiefly against banking capital which had held political sway over the country for a period of 15 years. Politically the leadership of the revolution was in the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie which was fighting against the monopoly of the big bourgeoisie (some of its monopoly rights were actually abolished). A considerable role in this revolution was played by the organised working class. A peasant movement developed independently of the revolution, being the consequence of the revolutionary ferment among the rural population which was the after-effect of the revolution of 1925. Thus, the 1925 revolution was not caused by the movement of the agricultural labourers and peasants, as was stated by Comrade Humbert-Droz in his excellent report. The Governments of Mexico and Ecuador are losing day by day their revolutionary force, surrendering more and more to imperialism. Into these Governments, there have gradually crept big bourgeois elements, the new estate owners, and even some of the old estate owners (this however does not mean that the Mexican government is a government of liberal landowners, as was opined by Comrade Travin). Some Mexican comrades believe that the Mexican Revolution is continuing to develop. I do not believe this is the case. It is true, the situation in Mexico is a revolutionary one, but it is not the revolution itself. The proletariat and the peasantry are driving forward, the Government is pulling backward, and a new revolution is imminent. Nevertheless, we should not exaggerate to the extent of saying that the Governments of Mexico and Ecuador are already reactionary. For the time being they are still progressive forces.

As regards the perspective of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, it ought to be said that in some countries, e. g. in Argentina, the revolution may be of a proletarian character from the start. Furthermore, a series of revolutions will ensue in which the leadership will be in the hands of the petty-bourgeoisie, but the proletariat and the peasantry will take a more or less active part. These revolutions will in the different coun-

tries pass through a number of various stages, depending upon the correlation of the class forces in the movement and upon the respective strength of imperialism. Nevertheless, the moment that we shall achieve the hegemony in the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the moment the proletariat and the peasantry will be able to establish their dictatorship, the big bourgeoisie in each of those countries will deliberately turn against us. The big bourgeoisie will play a counter-revolutionary role, and in some countries we shall have to fight it from the very first. In all countries it will be counter-revolutionary towards the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. In this respect the tasks of our Parties are stated quite incompletely in the theses. It would be a great danger to the Revolution if we were to leave our enemy, the big bourgeoisie, in possession of the economic power. I am firmly convinced that once we have been able to establish the proletarian-peasant dictatorship, we shall be able also to expropriate the big bourgeoisie.

As regards the division of the expropriated land, I believe this should be carried out more or less in the following manner: the land leased to the peasants must be left to them upon the terms of collective tillage, while the rest of the soil ought to be used for the purpose of establishing big estates owned by the State. If we should directly divide the land among the peasants, it would mean the rise of a large number of small-holders, of a rural petty-bourgeoisie, which would considerably jeopardize the power of the proletariat, because the rural workers would be turned into small-holders. This, in its turn, would constitute a great hindrance to socialist construction. On the other hand, the existence of large estates, largely run on more or less industrialised lines, will afford the opportunity of concentrating a considerable portion of the land in the hands of the State.

On these grounds I am opposed to the formulae contained in the theses concerning the tasks of the agrarian revolution in those cases where a proletarian-peasant dictatorship is established. If we let these formulae stand as they are, we shall inevitably arrive at a wrong conclusion. We shall then consider those governments which have already accomplished some of the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic agrarian revolution (the Mexican Government, and partly also the Ecuador Government) capable of carrying out the agrarian revolution to the end. On all these grounds I believe that the theses must be altered in the sense indicated above.

Comrade MARTYNOV:

I have taken the floor to speak against Comrade Heller's and Bennet's arguments. Comrade Heller brought forward a whole series of critical remarks or addenda to the colonial resolution.

Comrade Heller says that he has the impression as if the resolution looks upon the export of capital and the role of finance capital as something abnormal, as something casual. He emphasises that the export of capital is the specific characteristic of imperialism. Is Comrade Heller right in saying so? Of course he is right in this. The export of capital is a specific characteristic of imperialism.

He also says that the peasants of the colonies and semi-colonies are drawn now not only into the world market. Is Comrade Heller right in saying so? Of course he is right. He also says that the native Indian production is developing. This is also correct.

He says furthermore, that factories in China and India are equipped according to the latest American technique. Is Comrade Heller right in saying so? Of course he is right. Shanghai which is not imported from America but is manufactured in Shanghai itself. Is Comrade Heller right in saying so. Yes, he is right.

Furthermore he says: there is modern textile machinery in Finally, he says that in the Congo the number of industrial workers has considerably increased between 1916 and 1924. Is Comrade Heller right? Of course he is right.

But if one considers the facts and explanations of Comrade Heller altogether, one gets a quite false and distorted picture of imperialism. According to Heller the situation is as if all these facts are due to imperialism as such, as if imperialism does not impede the development but, on the con-

trary, calls forth a very rapid industrial development. And this is precisely the effect of the export of capital which is characteristic of imperialism.

At the end of his speech Comrade Heller says that he is nevertheless against the decolonisation theory. But why is he against it? Because he does not understand what colonisation or decolonisation means; because according to him, the only feature of the reactionary side of the colonial policy of imperialism is — that cheap labour power is brutally exploited in the colonies. But we had this kind of thing also in the epoch of the original accumulation of capital, nevertheless it was not imperialism. Exploitation of cheap labour power is not an adequate definition of imperialism. The specific character of the colonial policy of imperialism consists in the fact that the powerful monopolist capitalism creates in the colonies capitalist monopolies for their thorough exploitation, which rests "not only on economic pressure, but at the same time on non-economic coercion," and that it therefore strongly impedes the capitalist development of the colonies which it has called forth, although this development takes place to a certain extent in spite of this. From Comrade Heller's argument it follows that imperialism is playing an economically progressive role in the colonies, just as industrial capital played a progressive role in the independent countries, as mentioned already by Marx in the "Communist Manifesto". If we consider matters from this viewpoint, then the social democrats are right when they say that although the workers in the colonies are greatly exploited, culture is spreading there thanks to the Mother countries. This is a social democratic and not a Leninist estimate.

Comrade Bennet represents the same standpoint by left arguments. It frequently happens that the Right and ultra-Left conception coincide. He defends very cautiously the theory of the British comrades re decolonisation. At what conclusion does he arrive? He says: industrialisation in India and in the colonies is going full steam ahead. He refers to Marx. (Interjection by Bennet: You must quote!) Marx said where capitalism has once penetrated, it goes on developing. This is true. But how does this proceed, against imperialism or by means of imperialism. This is the question. Comrade Bennet said: "The difference between us is: that while the social reformists are anxious to glorify imperialism, our aim is to ensure the new forces and new ways of development of the national revolutionary movement in India which makes for the transformation of the bourgeois democratic revolution into the social revolution".

On the eve of what stage are we then in India according to Bennet? (Bennet: On the eve of the stage of the democratic revolution!) No, we are on the eve of the stage of the transformation of the democratic revolution into the socialist revolution — so said Comrade Bennet in the quotations which were brought forward. But this is precisely what Radek said about China. Where is here the struggle against imperialism, the struggle for national liberation, the stage of the anti-imperialist democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants? It has disappeared. Why? This is clear. If through the influence of imperialism industrialisation in this country is going full speed ahead, if imperialism is developing the productive forces of the colonies to this extent, India will be very soon the most developed, "the true capitalist world power". Then we are on the eve of the social revolution. Even the question of the national liberation struggle against imperialism disappears.

On what theoretical error is this based? Comrade Heller says: Kuusinen has forgotten the main thing — the export of capital; but this is the characteristic feature of imperialism. (Bennet: Hear, hear!) Comrade Bennet says hear, hear, but wait and hear what I will say next. (Bennet: But in the meantime it is so.) (Manuilsky: It is better to say yes than no later on!) You do not agree with my argumentation, Comrade Bennet. I will answer you with the proverb that a girl always says no at first and ends by saying yes.

What about the export of capital? Of course export of capital is one of the most important characteristics of imperialism. But there is export of capital to backward but not colonial countries.

We had in the eighties and nineties of the last century a big export of capital to Russia. What was then the negative side of the foreign capital for Russia? Only that the profits flowed away from Russia to the creditor countries. But in all other respects foreign capital produced a colossal development

of capitalism in Russia. The same applies to the recent export of capital from the United States of America to Germany, which has called forth there a remarkably rapid reconstruction of capitalism. Is this the same as in the colonies? What about export of capital to the colonies? It creates there monopolies which rest not only on economic, but on military pressure. It creates there a privileged power which endeavours to suck up all the means of the country in the interests of the Mother country. What do we see for instance in China? What is imperialism doing there. We witness there that the import of coal to China is in a state of stagnation. In 1920 there was an import of 1,338,000 tons, in 1921 — 1,361,000, in 1922 — 1,151,000, in 1923 — 1,336,000, in 1924 — 1,610,000. But export is continually increasing. It has increased from 1,970,000 tons in 1920 to 3,202,000 tons in 1924. What about iron there? The production of iron in China is very small. Moreover import is continually decreasing whereas export is increasing. Import amounted in 1919 to 37,152, in 1920 — 20,102, in 1921 — 5,992, in 1922 — 1,366, in 1923 — 3,084, in 1924 — 1,575 tons. Just the export amounted in 1919 to 640,159, in 1920 — 682,660, in 1921 — 514,888, in 1922 — 670,220, in 1923 — 727,683, and in 1924 — 846,333 tons.

How is the country "industrialised" there? Perhaps by the export of iron and coal? How can one industrialise a country if one takes away its iron and coal? The same tendency is shown by the fact that in the colonies imperialism tries to produce mainly semi-manufactured goods or raw material or rough products of the light industry which also requires export of capital.

I will deal now with the agrarian question. When the bourgeoisie came into power in the independent countries it attempted either a revolutionary (in France in the eighteenth century) or a reformist solution of the agrarian question. But the capital which penetrated into the colonies has not attempted either the one or the other. In the "epoch of the export of capital" the so-called "Torrence" system spreads in the colonies. This system is: that old feudal titles remain and are entered in a land-register; but the right is given to purchase the feudal titles by voluntary agreement. A feudal lord can sell his feudal right to a capitalist. The feudal rights themselves are not destroyed, the whole feudal humbug remains. Only the bearers of the rights change; the rights are concentrated in the hands of the capitalists. The second "agrarian reform" introduced by imperialism, is legal encouragement to the development of kulakdom (the homestead law in Egypt and India), — a kind of imitation of the Stolypin agrarian reform. But the chief effect of imperialism on agrarian conditions in the colonies is that the home industry is being destroyed through the import of cheap commodities free duty. The peasants are pauperised thereby and must produce agricultural products for export at a very low price. This destroys the internal market and the industrialisation of the country is undermined. The comrades see the big fine factories with the newest technique, but these new factories work for Great Britain, America and Japan. One sees these factories but one does not see that in spite of them the ground for the industrialisation of the country is being undermined.

What was Lenin's standpoint to this question? In his speech Comrade Kuusinen quoted already the theses of the Second World Congress on the colonial question which were drawn up by Roy and edited by Lenin. These theses contain the following statement:

"The foreign imperialism forced on the Eastern peoples has no doubt impeded their social and economic development (Comrade Heller and Bennet!) and has deprived them of the possibility to reach the stage of development which has been reached in Europe and America. Owing to the imperialist policy which endeavours to retard industrial development in the colonies, the native proletariat has only lately begun to exist."

There is not a word about export of capital in this resolution. Was there no export of capital then, or did Lenin know nothing about it? Lenin wrote a book: "Imperialism, the last stage of capitalism." The resolution on the colonial question was drawn up in 1920 and Lenin's book on imperialism was written already in 1916. What did Lenin say in this book: It contains the following statement:

"Export of commodities was typical of the old capitalism when free competition predominated, whereas export of capital is typical of the new capitalism when monopoly predominates..."

Thus Lenin knew very well that export of capital existed. Why did he write about it in his book and why is there not a word about it in the resolution edited by him? Lenin was certainly not so thoughtless to forget such an enormously important phenomenon!

Well, I think he had a very good reason for this. What is the difference between the book and the colonial resolution? The resolution speaks **only** about the position in the colonies, whereas the book deals about conditions in the colonies and mother countries, that is to say, about the role of imperialism in general. Why was the role of the export of capital emphasised in the book on imperialism? Lenin wanted to show that the export of capital leads to the parasitical degeneration of the Mother countries. He has always emphasised the reactionary side of imperialism. Therefore he dealt in the book with the export of capital in connection with what is going on in the mother countries. **Because there**, for instance in Great Britain, it leads to the parasitical degeneration of capitalism. Therefore he wrote in detail in his book about the export of capital. But when he wrote about the colonies there was no need for him to speak about it; but for Comrade Heller, who is fascinated by the "grandiose" development of capitalism in the colonies, there is need to speak of it. (Interjection: Heller and Marx!) Heller and Marx — they are two quite different persons. What was Lenin's main idea when he was editing the resolution on the colonial question? He said this in his speech at the Second Congress. He declared: "What is the main, the most important fundamental idea of our Party? It is the difference between the oppressed peoples and the oppressors. This is the foremost and most important idea. Then there is the antagonism between the imperialist Powers and Soviet Russia which is making common cause with the oppressed peoples. Furthermore, that one can arrive at Socialism in the colonies by skipping over the capitalist stage. Those were the main ideas. There was here no need for him to tell of the "grandiose" development of capitalism in the colonies.

Capitalism does of course develop there, and no one is going to dispute this fact. But imperialism as such impedes this development. This is a dialectic process. It calls forth capitalism and impedes its development, and then capitalism develops against it. For instance, the export of capital from Great Britain has stimulated the development of capitalism in India. When subsequently, American, Belgian and German capital penetrated into British India, they also developed capitalism there. But what else happened? British imperialism struggles against the penetration of foreign capital into India and endeavours to prevent this. Furthermore, when was the biggest development of capitalism in India and China? When imperialism was weakened. This allowed the native industry to develop. The same thing happened in India. But as soon as imperialism is on its legs again and going strong, the situation changes. We have witnessed this in China and in India. As long as imperialism was occupied with the world war, or had to do with complications in the colonies, it could not very well impede the development of the native industry in the colonies. This gave an impetus to the native industry. But certainly in opposition to imperialism, and as soon as British imperialism had strengthened its positions it began to impede this development.

But generally speaking, matters in regard to the export of capital in the post-war period do not proceed so smoothly as comrades Heller and Bennet represent it. The export of capital is certainly bigger now than prior to the war if one takes it on the whole. But the biggest export of capital comes now from the United States of America. As to France, the export of capital has now come to a standstill, and in regard to Great Britain we get the following picture: In 1927, Great Britain had £153,000,000 worth of foreign and colonial emissions; but prior to the war Great Britain invested abroad £190,000,000 to £200,000,000, which constitutes at the present purchasing capacity £250,000,000. Thus export of capital from Europe to the colonies is now much smaller. It plays now — I do not say that this will be always the case — a smaller role. It was characteristic of the post-war period that the export

of capital came from America and went to Europe for the reconstruction of European capitalism. I do not say that this will be so also in the future. It can happen that the export of capital to the colonies will again increase considerably. But not this is the main thing, but the form and function of the export of capital to the colonies.

I am coming now to another question which is connected with this. Comrade Bennet thinks that by defending the standpoint concerning the impending role of imperialism, one arrives at placing one's hopes on the revolutionary role of the national bourgeoisie in the colonies. This is utterly erroneous. In the theses on the colonial question a difference is made between the national-revolutionary and the democratic-reformist movement. Comrade Schüller is wrong when he says that this is an invention of the theses. Already Lenin said in his report on the work of the Commission for the colonial question at the Second Congress: we discussed very thoroughly in the commission whether one should retain the term "bourgeois-democratic" or if one should choose another expression. We are of course on the eve of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in the colonies. But as in the most important colonial countries the bourgeoisie has already approached imperialism and has made compromises with it, the difference between it and the national-revolutionary elements must be emphasised. Therefore, he said: although the anti-imperialist movement is, from the theoretical viewpoint, a bourgeois democratic movement, one should call it national-revolutionary. For instance, how does it stand now with the Swarajists? They are not a revolutionary party. They are a bourgeois-reformist party which will play a frankly counter-revolutionary role in the very near future. But although these reformists constitute now a loyal opposition to the British Government and are vacillating, this opposition creates a favourable situation for us, which we can utilise for the development of a truly national-revolutionary movement which must be directed also against the Swarajists as vacillating reformists. This should be certainly taken into consideration. One should make use of this contradiction, although they are not revolutionists, although they are reformists, although they will be frank counter-revolutionaries to-morrow, although they have already capitulated to a certain extent. I know that the more one talks about the counter-revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie, the easier it is to be considered revolutionists. Well, poor Lenin must have been a very "social-democratic" fellow; for did he not say that in certain cases and under certain conditions we can even enter into alliances with the national-bourgeoisie in the colonies. This was certainly a serious "error", an "opportunist" deviation on the part of Lenin. But the main thing which dissociates me from Comrade Bennet is not at all the question of the attitude to the national-bourgeoisie in the colonies.

One must distinguish between the character of the revolution and its driving forces. One must not forget that one can make a revolution against the bourgeoisie and in the struggle with the bourgeoisie, and that it will be nevertheless a bourgeois-democratic revolution. Just as Lenin said in 1905: we are going towards a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants; this will be a bourgeois-revolution, but it will be carried out by struggle against the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

The main thing the following: if we do not emphasise that imperialism is impeding the whole economic development of the colonies, we come to the conclusion that the proletariat will carry on its struggle not under the banner of anti-imperialism, that it will not act as liberator of the country from the imperialist yoke. But if the proletariat furls this banner it will find it much more difficult to rally around itself the millions of peasants and petty-bourgeois elements. If workers carry on their struggle only as proletarians who are exploited by the bourgeoisie they will enormously reduce their power of attraction, because the idea of national-liberation from imperialism is a colossal revolutionary force.

Therefore, we must resolutely oppose the idea that imperialism is an economically progressive force.

As to the formula of the resolution, I agree that insofar as one can draw from the resolution conclusions as if their authors have "forgotten" such trifles as the export of capital, the existence of a big industry in the colonies, the existence of modern technically well-equipped factories with millions of

workers, that all this should be more fully mentioned in the resolution: export of capital, masses of workers, big modern factories, etc. But one should add: insofar as an integral economic development is noticeable in the colonies, this is taking place in spite of the resistance of imperialism which is the greatest obstacle to this development. Thus the main idea of the resolution is to be retained. This main idea is important also in regard to what Comrade Ercoli said in his speech. What is the main idea of Social Democracy? That capitalism is playing also now a progressive economic role in the whole world. We must oppose this, we must set against this a counter-thesis: that it impedes economic development, that it does not play a progressive, but a reactionary role. Special stress should be laid on this. Just as in regard to the first question which Lenin raised when he spoke of the colonial theses, which was: how are we to struggle against reformism? How are we to struggle against the Social-Democrats, what are we to set against their reformist formula? We must act also now. Therefore the main idea of the theses must remain and one should not be led astray because this main idea is criticised under the tempting slogan: "The main thing is after all the increased exploitation of the workers in the colonies." If we set against this as our main slogan the thesis, that imperialism is a hindrance to the whole development, then we fight not only against the "increased" exploitation of the workers, but against exploitation in general, against the whole capitalist system.

Comrade TRAVIN (C. P. S. U.):

Comrades, the question we are now discussing is extremely complicated. We are trying to embrace a very complicated process of revolutionary movements in the colonies by one scheme. It can be said beforehand that we will not fully succeed in this task. It is therefore quite natural that the theses submitted by Comrade Kuusinen contain much that can be disputed. I have a good many corrections to make to these theses. I will not deal with all and will take up only the three most important points.

Firstly, the question of the relations between the revolutionary movements in the colonial countries and the Soviet Union have not been analysed in the theses.

Reading the theses one gets the idea that the question of the colonial revolutions is dealt with as if it were in a vacuum, without taking into consideration the fact that a proletarian dictatorship is already in existence in the Soviet Union. This fact, however, cannot but have enormous influence on the course and the outcome of the revolutionary movements in the colonies. The theses mention the Soviet Union only in connection with one phase, one stage of the colonial revolutions. This question should be worked out in connection with all phases and in connection with all groups of countries. I think that there should be a special paragraph devoted to this subject, giving an elucidation of the great significance of the existence of the proletarian dictatorship and the leading role of the Soviet Union in relation to all revolutionary colonial movements.

The second fact that strikes the reader of the theses is that there is no definite terminology. I found in the theses the following revolutions: a bourgeois revolution, a bourgeois-democratic revolution, a Soviet revolution (not a socialist revolution; the term is not used in the sense of a socialist revolution which leads towards a revolutionary democratic dictatorship of the working class and the peasantry), a class revolution, a workers and peasants revolution, a peasants revolution (interjection: "agrarian!"). No, I have not seen the agrarian revolution, perhaps I missed it. Then comes the "general national uprising or war against the imperialists". I think that in this question we must be more accurate because if we are not going to employ definite terms, if we are going to create confusion owing to inaccurate terms, if we are not going to say straightforward that a bourgeois revolution and a bourgeois-democratic revolution is one and the same thing although bourgeois revolutions differ in the degree of democracy which they attain, then our theses will suffer from great shortcomings and instead of leading us in the right direction they will mislead us.

Now as to the third question, that of the division of the countries into groups. It must be admitted beforehand that we will not succeed in making such a division which would fully correspond with the great variety of colonies. From this how-

ever it does not follow that we must be satisfied with the unsatisfactory division made in the theses and refrain from making the necessary changes.

I think for instance that it is wrong to classify the second group as a separate group. What distinguishes the second from the first group? From the point of view of class differentiations and from the point of view of industrial development there are no differences between these two groups. This is clearly stated in the theses. The only distinction is that in the first group there are the countries with a native bourgeoisie whereas the second group has a white bourgeoisie. That is the only difference between the first and the second group. In my opinion there is no need to draw these distinctions.

The colonies having a white bourgeoisie are divided into two sub-groups, one consisting of those which have a white bourgeoisie but no white proletariat and the other having both a white bourgeoisie and a white proletariat. This problem is quite complicated. The question concerning the colonies with a white proletariat must be very carefully studied. There is a certain degree of caution in the theses but the dangers arising for the revolutionary movement of those countries are not sufficiently emphasised. What are those dangers? We know them from our own experience, the experience of the U. S. S. R.

In the territories where we had a white (European) proletariat and no native proletariat or where the latter was weak and politically backward the former was at the beginning a revolutionary factor but later became an obstacle in the development of a native proletariat. For instance the railway workers in Turkestan, all of whom were Russians, were infected in the course of several years after the October Revolution with colonising ideas which have not yet been completely eradicated. At any rate our Party had to conduct a prolonged struggle against these colonising tendencies in Turkestan. Remember that our Party is a very strong and ideologically consistent Party. In the backward countries the Communist Parties are very weak and the danger therefore is still greater. These colonial tendencies will not be overcome so long as native proletarians will not assume the leadership. It must be remembered also that the white proletariat in the colonial countries frequently plays the role of a labour aristocracy in relation to the native proletariat. That is why this subject must be carefully elaborated in the theses and approached with the greatest caution.

As to the white bourgeoisie it is absolutely immaterial for the colonial countries whether that bourgeoisie resides there or whether it resides somewhere in New York or London in the form of joint stock companies, anonymous capitalists, etc. This category cannot be taken as a basis for the separation of these colonies into separate groups. I think that we must unite into one group all countries which have no native bourgeoisie. This is a very important element. We must therefore take those countries in which there is no native bourgeoisie but there is a native proletariat. Are there such countries? There are. They are included in the third group of the theses, although this is not clearly and definitely stated. The colonies which have a white but no native bourgeoisie and the colonies which have no white and no native bourgeoisie can be united into one group. Thus we will have three groups according to the following division: the first group having a native bourgeoisie with a native proletariat, the second group a native proletariat but no native bourgeoisie (this group includes also the countries with a white bourgeoisie but having no native bourgeoisie) and finally the third group consisting of peasant countries without a native bourgeoisie and without a native proletariat. Of course this division is also conditional. Nevertheless as a general division, as a basic division which gives a clear outline of the various types of development of the colonial countries it would, in my opinion, be more correct than the division given in the theses.

Is the division which I propose justified by what Marx and Lenin said? I think it is absolutely justified.

Marx admitted the possibility of non-capitalist development and of skipping over the capitalist stage under certain conditions. This opinion he expressed with regard to the Russian communes. He expressed it in his letters to Zaslitch and Michaelowsky. The theses also speak of the possibility of non-capitalist development. The third group of countries given in the theses precisely refers to countries concerning which it has been said that the path of non-capitalist development is possible and that

they can avoid the capitalist system. In that group there is no native bourgeoisie and no native proletariat. If the latter does exist it is poorly developed.

The question arises, is the possibility of non-capitalist development out of the question for countries in which the native proletariat is more highly developed but which have no native bourgeoisie? I think it is not out of the question. Concession-capitalism, imported and invested capitalism, can be quite highly developed in some of the backward colonial feudal countries, from which it would not yet follow that these countries cannot skip the capitalist phase of development only for the reason that they have no bourgeois order, countries which have capitalism and a proletariat but which have no bourgeois order. This is a question which we must study.

Precisely from the viewpoint of the possibility of non-capitalist development we must separate as a special group the countries which have no native bourgeoisie. We must deal with the subject separately, distinct from India and China, where non-capitalist development is out of the question, where the bourgeois democratic phase of the revolution, its bourgeois-democratic stage is already a fact.

I am now going to take up a concrete example, Latin America, as a complex of those countries where there is no native bourgeoisie or where the latter is very weak, and will raise squarely the question concerning the possibility of non-capitalist development of the Latin-American countries.

In Comrade Kuusinen's theses all Latin American republics are included in the first group of countries, i. e. among countries such as India and China which have a native bourgeoisie.

In one of the subsequent points of the theses it is declared that there is a comprador bourgeoisie in Latin America. I say that there is no comprador bourgeoisie there and that there is in general no native bourgeoisie and if the latter does exist it is weak both numerically and economically. In Argentina there is no doubt a poorly developed native bourgeoisie but it is rapidly being subordinated and subjugated to and becoming dependent upon American imperialism.

As to the other American republics they have no bourgeoisie at all. In some places it is now in the embryonic state. I therefore disagree with Comrade Kuusinen on the question as to whether there is a comprador bourgeoisie there or not. If there is such a bourgeoisie then we will perhaps have to include those countries in the first group, i. e., the group of those countries which must go through the bourgeois democratic revolution which cannot be avoided. If there is not, then, together with Comrade Kuusinen, we will have to classify the Latin America countries in the third group concerning which Comrade Kuusinen admits the possibility of non-capitalist development. In my theses I took the absence or extreme weakness of a native bourgeoisie in Latin America as my starting-point. The second thesis clearly says that the national bourgeoisie in the Latin American republics is numerically and economically very weak: there is practically no bourgeoisie there because all industry is in the hands of foreign capital. In the countries where the native bourgeoisie is beginning to arise it is entirely economically dependent upon foreign capital. Even commerce is in the hands of the imperialists, particularly in the hands of United States imperialists. As far as the rural and petty bourgeoisie are concerned it is typical of those countries that they are very few in number. In Mexico, for instance, where there are some attempts at statistics, there were only 5% of such peasants before the revolution who held land either on the basis of communal property, or on the basis of private property or on the basis of leases. Now these elements constitute about 10—15% of the peasantry. The Calles government returned to the peasants some of the land of which they had been robbed. But it has not created any big farmers such as Stolypin dreamt of in his days and upon which he relied. It created a pauperised peasantry which is being rapidly ruined, which is forced to give up the land it received, which is running its farms in a miserable manner as it has no machinery, no cattle, etc. All land in the Latin American countries is in the hands of big owners of latifundia, a good deal of which belongs to foreign joint stock companies. There are whole republics which are entirely the private property of New York bankers, and the slightest move of a finger of the manager of one of these banks suffices to ruin these republics. Thus in the Latin American countries the typical relation is —

there is no native bourgeoisie, there is no petty bourgeoisie or it is very weak and insignificant, there is a large class of landless agricultural labourers who are half serfs of the owners of the latifundia (the so-called peons).

There is also an urban proletariat of considerable magnitude and a small industrial proletariat. Such is the class structure of the Latin American countries. Who holds power in those republics? It belongs to an imperialist bloc, a bloc of reactionary landlords and foreign capitalists. This bloc is in some cases open, in others half-concealed and in others entirely hidden. We have now in Nicaragua quite an open bloc between the North American imperialists and the reactionary landlords. In other countries this bloc exists in a hidden form, but it is an undoubted fact that an imperialist bloc consisting of native and foreign landlords on the one hand and representatives of foreign imperialism on the other have power and rule all Latin American countries. It is not infrequent that the United States Consul or ambassador is for all intents and purposes the North American governor ruling the given republic. It seems to me that Comrade Humbert Droz and partly Comrade Kuusinen's theses do not pay sufficient attention to this fact. In the theses, for instance, it is said that in some of these republics the bourgeoisie also takes part in the administration of the country and also has power. This is wrong. It is not even the case in Mexico where a revolution has taken place. There is a liberal landlord government in Mexico, i. e. a government of landlords who are half-capitalists and half-feudals, landlords who engage in commercial cattle-raising and in some cases have small factories for the finishing of agricultural products, etc.

From these class correlations the formation of an anti-imperialist bloc of two classes, the urban proletariat together with the agricultural labourers and peasants, is inevitable. This bloc, as we see, is already beginning to take shape. The first symptoms, the first tendencies of the formation of such a bloc can be seen in Mexico, a country which is quite progressive as compared with the other Latin American republics, where they are becoming quite popular. The bloc has not yet been realised; perhaps it will take some time before it will be realised but the whole tendency of development drives the workers and peasants towards such a bloc.

Notwithstanding the fact that the proletariat of Mexico, owing to its backwardness, did not understand at the beginning of the revolution the revolutionary movement of the peasantry and acted under the leadership of the liberal landlords against that movement, this can no longer happen now in Mexico. Moreover, this is out of the question in any other Latin American republic. There are Communist Parties almost everywhere and this shows that the proletariat is already to a certain extent ripe and that the proletariat cannot act against the revolutionary movement of the peasantry.

What is the distinguishing feature of the South American countries? It is that the foreign capitalists are, in the eyes of the toiling masses, in the eyes of the landless peasants, in the eyes of the workers not only national foes but direct class enemies, because the workers of Mexico and of the other Latin American countries have no other class enemies. They see that the owners of enterprises, the capitalists owning the industrial enterprises, are foreign capitalists or foreign joint stock companies in whom they see their direct class enemy. The peasants also see that the imperialists are not only their national foes and that not only a national emancipation struggle is necessary against them. They see their direct class enemy in the foreign landlords and in the imperialist bloc ruling those countries.

The Mexican peasants perfectly understand now that they would be able to receive land were it not for the American capitalists, who at the slightest attempt to seize the landlords' land threaten Mexico with all kinds of repressive measures. This realisation is dawning upon the peasantry constantly more. They fight not only against their own feudal landlords, they understand also the compact and alliance of the native feudal landlords with the foreign imperialists and fight also against the foreign landlords who own vast stretches of Mexican land, about one-half of the total area. From this it follows first of all that the struggle of the peasants for land, the struggle of the workers for an improvement of their position and their working conditions, etc. are directed against imperialism. This is

the great distinction between these countries and such countries as India and China which have their own native bourgeoisie. In Latin America, where there is no native bourgeoisie or hardly any, the struggle of the workers and peasants against imperialism is not only of a national liberation character but also of a class character. Owing to its class character this struggle partly assumes a socialist struggle. The revolutionary movements which are now rising in the Latin American countries, the highest development of which we find in Mexico, are not only of a bourgeois-democratic character; they cannot be simply characterised as bourgeois-democratic movements; they contain from the very beginning certain socialist elements. Comrade Humbert-Droz could not see how it is possible that the revolution is neither bourgeois-democratic nor socialist, but this is not my fault.

Instead of trying to classify these revolutionary movements under the existing formulas given to us by history as bourgeois-democratic revolutions and socialist revolutions they must be taken such as they are. What are they? I give a detailed analysis of these movements in my thesis on the basis of the Mexican revolution.

The revolutionary processes in Latin America are described as follows: revolutionary movements begin as bourgeois-democratic movements for land but from the very beginning they reveal, as the result of the inner correlation of classes and owing to the semi-colonial character of Latin America, features which are absolutely not the attributes of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and are close to the type of social revolutions.

What are these features? The proletariat is drawn into the channel of the peasant revolution, the proletariat is revolutionised by the peasant revolution. Here in Russia the proletariat was revolutionised by the revolutionary movement of the intelligentsia, and in Latin America the proletarian movement is revolutionised by the revolutionary peasant movement which is assuming a broad character. The proletariat is drawn into the movement and in view of the absence of the bourgeoisie is pushed into the first place in that movement. It has not yet come to this point; the Mexican revolution is only on the threshold of this second period. But while the proletariat has been revolutionised, while it constitutes together with the revolutionary peasantry an anti-imperialist bloc, while it is taking the leadership in the movement, while the revolutionary movement of the various countries of Latin America is uniting into one movement under one slogan of an anti-imperialist league of the workers-peasant Latin-American republics, the socialist character of this movement is becoming absolutely clear.

I do not say that this is a social revolution, this is not my definition. Neither a bourgeois-democratic nor a social revolution. I describe them as they are. If you want a definition then we ought to call it a spontaneous worker-peasant revolution of a socialist type. I emphasise the word spontaneous. Perhaps it is not absolutely correct but in general it must be said that we can be convinced on the example of Comrade Kuusinen's theses that it is impossible to classify the most diverse revolutionary movements now in progress in the various colonial countries under common formulae. At any rate the characteristic distinctions of these movements must not be left out of sight. I will point out another circumstance which I consider highly important in characterising these movements. I already mentioned that in Latin America there is practically no private property in land. There are on the contrary strong traditions of primitive agricultural communism. The Mexican peasants did not want to take the land as their property, they wanted to turn it into communal property and to establish communal cultivation of land. They are accustomed to work the land collectively. This is also explained by the backwardness of the productive forces as a result of which they cannot till the land otherwise. There is only one cow or one plough for every ten families and they are forced to work together. Thus there is no traditional private ownership in land there. This great prejudice of the European petty bourgeoisie does not exist in Latin America, and this fact greatly facilitates socialist development or the transformation of the revolution into a social revolution.

I should not like to use the term "transformation" in relation to the Latin American revolutions because that term is specially adapted to the Chinese and Indian revolutions. There it may be a question of transformation from one phase into another, from the bourgeois-democratic to the socialist phase. I would prefer to characterise the revolutionary movements in Latin America as two streams running through one channel and fusing.

In the first phase only the peasant is revolutionary and the proletariat is not drawn into the movement. That phase naturally assumes a bourgeois-democratic, national liberation tendency although the peasant fights at the same time for land. Later, when the proletariat is drawn into the movement and is taking over the leadership, the socialist tendencies of the revolution become manifest because both the class struggle of the landless peasants against the landlords and the class struggle of the proletariat against the foreign landlords assume a direct socialist character. Comrade Humbert-Droz, who tried to refute my thesis in speaking of the Mexican revolution, fell into a curious error. He spoke of the degradation and retrogression in the fact that Calles the liberal landlord has begun to betray or has already betrayed the Mexican workers and peasants to the interests of American imperialism. In this connection he expressed the opinion that it is precisely the degradation and retrogression of the Mexican revolution that raised the Mexican revolution on to a higher level and revolutionised the workers and peasants, i. e. the retrogression of the revolution is its progress. That was Comrade Droz' argument. How did he arrive at such a curious contradiction? In my opinion this happened because he advocated a fundamentally wrong idea in connection with the Mexican revolution.

I maintain that the Mexican revolution is now at the threshold of its second phase, when the proletariat is taking over the hegemony and when the socialist elements of the revolution are beginning to be clearly manifested.

The question as to the nature of the revolutionary movement in Latin America must be answered. Why must it be answered? Not because Travin has a dispute with Droz but because we must answer to the workers and peasants of Latin America the question whether we are leading them. What are we to tell them? Should we tell them that they are confronted with the bourgeois-democratic phase of the revolution, that they must go through the capitalist order, that they cannot skip this phase, or should we tell them that this phase can be skipped if they unite in a Latin American anti-imperialist league of worker and peasant republics, create an anti-imperialist bloc of workers and peasants and join the revolutionary movement of the proletariat of one of the imperialist countries whereby they can march straight towards the socialist revolution? This is the question to which must be given a clear, unequivocal and definite answer. This is the main strategical question without the solution of which it is impossible to speak of the other questions.

Consider what has happened to Comrade Droz. Without much ado he has brought forward a new slogan, the slogan of Latin Americanism. What is Latin Americanism? We have heard this slogan for the first time. If we are to analyse it from the political viewpoint it is a petty bourgeois slogan. It will be gladly accepted by all petty bourgeois elements of whom there are so many in all Latin American countries. Why will they accept it? Because they will not want to accept the slogan of an anti-imperialist alliance of the worker and peasants republics or a federation of soviet republics of Latin America as some of our comrades propose. The slogan of Latin Americanism is only a new version of the Monroe Doctrine for Latin America — Latin America for the Latin Americans! This is a petty bourgeois slogan.

I think that a thorough discussion of this question is necessary. Perhaps I am wrong; I admit that is quite possible. I say that if there is a national bourgeoisie in Latin America then together with Comrade Kuusinen we will include it in the first group, but if there is not then the questions which I have mentioned must be answered. (Applause.)

(Close of Session.)

Thirty-fifth Session.

Moscow, 17th August, 1928 (Afternoon).

Continuation of the Discussion on the Reports on Questions of the Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies.

Chairman: Comrade CHITAROV (Y. C. I.). I call on Comrade An to address the Congress.

Comrade AN (Indochina):

There is a country which seems to be forgotten by the whole world, a country where cries of anger and rage, where the efforts of the people to liberate itself are absolutely stifled. This is the country about which I want to speak — **Indo-China**.

It is a fact that Indo-China which has 20 million inhabitants, has been enslaved for 70 years; it is one of the first French colonies, and if this "French stronghold in the Pacific" were to separate itself from the mother country, the latter would be considerably weakened. It is also perfectly clear that by its geographical position Indo-China is coveted by Japanese imperialism and has therefore become a source of sanguinary conflicts in the Pacific.

Thus the Indo-Chinese problem is one of the most important problems for French imperialism. Hence, its efforts to suppress any attempt on the part of the Annamite people to throw off its yoke.

I do not want to enumerate here all the misdeeds committed by the colonists in regard to the natives. Everyone knows that imperialism, by conquering the colonies, brings with it murder, pillage, assassination, robbery, syphilis, alcohol and opium; everyone knows that the colonial sharks, in order to impose their domination, destroy all the customs and habits, the civilisation of the conquered people; everyone knows that to reduce a people to slavery one must keep it as ignorant as possible, one must give it "horizontal and not vertical instruction", to quote the Governor-General Merlin. One must prevent it leaving its country to achieve "its civilisation" elsewhere, one must not allow it to go to the mother country to complete what the "civilising mission" has given it (the way to France is the way against France, said Cognac, Governor of CochinChina), everyone knows all this. Neither do I want to enumerate here all the outbreaks and rebellions drowned in blood by which, since the establishment of the French rule, the Annamite people has vainly tried to get rid of imperialist oppression.

I will merely give to the comrades an exposé of the present economic and political situation in Indo-China so as to find practical means to help this people to liberate itself.

I said that Indo-China is of enormous importance to France. Certainly as a reservoir of rice (Cochinchina is, after Burma, the second rice-producing country in the Far East), of mineral raw material: coal, iron, copper, etc., and owing to its enormous fields for the cultivation of industrial crops (rubber) and its enormous numbers of men who provide cheap labour power and can serve as cannon-fodder in time of war, Indo-China has not its equal as a colony.

In 1927, the total trade amounted to 9,200 million francs, 4,200 million for import and 5,000 million for export. This is an increase of 5,000 million since 1925. In 1927, France exported to Indo-China 2,100 million francs worth of goods and imported 1,200 million. Japan imported from Indo-China between 1922 and 1925, 385,407,000 yens worth of commodities and its export amounted to 33,689,000 yens. This shows the importance of the Indo-Chinese market in the far East, especially for Japan.

Industrial capital invested in the private industry amounts to about 2000 million francs and it is estimated that, provided public works and public services were properly managed, one could raise every year the equivalent of the invested capital.

To give you an idea of the exploitation of Indo-China, let us quote a few figures: the nominal capital of the **Bank of Indo-**

China, is 72 millions, of which 70,200,000 were set free. In 1919 the old 125 franc shares were set free at 475 francs. In 1925—26 net profits amounted to 36,000,000, that is to say 50% of the nominal capital. At this rate, the accumulated assets, the non-distributed profits of the Bank of Indo-China are estimated at 778 million! This is the result of 50 years of civilisation! The "Société Financière" of France which has a nominal capital of 50 million of which 26,602,000 were paid in on December 31, 1926, gained in 1926 24,385,000 francs, namely nearly 50% of its capital.

Moreover, France is not only exploiting Indo-China, it endeavours also to monopolise imports in this country.

Another significant fact is that the machinery imported in 1917 amounted to 5,480,000 francs whereas in 1924 it amounted to 64,885,000 francs. For cotton and wool in 1927 — 3,788,000 francs, in 1924 — 50,742,000. The consumption of coal in 1913 amounted to 199,400 tons whereas it amounted to 589,000 tons in 1924.

That increased exploitation is contemplated is shown by the extensive plans to penetrate into the virgin regions of Mocs in Annam, into Laos and Cambodia. French imperialism places great hopes on the completion of the Trans-Indo-China Railway which will facilitate the transport of labour power from Tonkin to CochinChina. It also reckons on the construction of the railway from Pnom Penk to Battambang (the cost of which is estimated at 16,400,000 piastres), for the exploitation of this as yet untouched region.

The increased exploitation of the imperialists is accompanied by a development of the national industry (I mean the industry in the hands of the national bourgeoisie), especially since 1925. Textile factories, etc. have been established with native capital. Trade capital is also developing. There are many trading companies throughout Indo-China. The native bourgeoisie has a bank of its own with a capital of 250,000 piastres. We know very well that Imperialism will not tolerate this. Although it is not yet proceeding openly, we can see that it is beginning to interfere with the development of the national economy. For instance it supplies engineers, students graduated from French universities with capital to keep them away from the native capital. Thus we can say that in the industrial sphere the industrialisation of Indo-China has already begun, that side by side with industry in French and foreign hands there is an industry controlled by the Indo-Chinese bourgeoisie.

This is accompanied by a decline of home industries. Foundries, lacquer works, cabinet making, are disappearing rapidly owing to the competition of the big companies. Thus there is nothing left to the artisans than to abandon their trade and to seek employment in the factories.

In the agricultural sphere, the production of rice is in a state of stagnation. If we calculate the production in thousand tons we get the following picture:

1914	1915	1918	1924
5497	5470	5407	5677

Thus, in ten years, production increased by barely 200,000 tons. On the other hand big progress has been made in regard to industrial crops, especially with the cultivation of the hevoi (caoutchouc) of which there are at present 6,208,586 plants. In 1925 the export of rubber amounted to 8,700 tons and in 1926 to 8,798 tons.

Let us study now the social strata of Indo-China, the life and labour conditions of the workers and peasants. We are told that there is no proletariat in Indo-China. Comrades, allow

me to disagree with this. Although we have not a numerous proletariat distributed throughout the country as in Europe, we have nevertheless a strongly concentrated proletariat in the big industrial centres. Although Indo-China's economic development is uneven, there is concentration. I will give a few figures to add weight to my argument. There are 33,883 workers in the Tonkin mines, including 26,000 in the coal mines. The cotton company of Mann-Dinh employs 4,500 workers, the Franco-Annamite Textile Company 2,050 in the factory and 4,000 home workers. Women are also employed by this company (400 in the textile factory). Children 8 to 10 years old are also employed. Their pay is ridiculously small. Men earn 30 to 40 sous per day, women 20—25, and children 15 to 20. They are kept at work 13—14 hours.

This concentrated proletariat has already shown that it can be revolutionary by the movements which took place in 1925-1926-1927 when they demanded higher wages and a higher standard of living. During a strike of 2,500 workers in Nam-dinh the main demand was: a wage rise in accordance with the cost of living. They also give trouble to the colonial government. Thus 8000 arsenal workers went on strike refusing to repair the s. s. "Jules Michelet" which was to massacre the Chinese people. I reiterate, there is a proletariat in Indo-China, and this proletariat is strongly concentrated.

As to the peasantry, I must say at the outset that most of the land belongs to the big landlords. The remainder is in the hands of the middle peasantry which is very numerous. Landless peasants must take land on lease, giving up 60% of the harvest to the big landlords; they must make presents on New Years Day (two piastres per hectare of the leased land) they must also work free of charge on the birthday of the landowners and also during the dry season (drying up of fish ponds, gardening for the landowners, etc.); in a word peasants live under abominable conditions. Overburdened with taxes, crushed by the high land rent, forced to labour for the landowner, the poor peasants are compelled to remain slaves of the soil which gives them hardly enough to live upon. They are also subject to the usurious regime of the landlords; during the labour season when agricultural workers are deprived of all resources they give them loans either in kind or in commodities at an interest of 18—30%. This compels many peasants to abandon their land and to go to the cities where they work as coolies and rickshaws. In a word, leasehold conditions, the feudal system of the big landlords, ever-increasing taxes, are the cause of the growing destitution of the peasants who turn their backs on the land which cannot feed them and go to the industrial centres. In addition to all these hardships we witness also attempts at land expropriation on the part of imperialism: The result of all this is — an evergrowing radicalisation of the peasant masses. This radicalisation finds vent in the resistance of the masses to expropriation which takes the form of rebellions which imperialism drowns in blood (rebellions in the village of Ninhanh Loi of Thung Thanh, etc. where all the houses of the natives were burned down). Thus the Indo-Chinese peasantry is of great importance to the future revolutionary movements.

Apart from the peasants and the urban proletariat we have a kind of proletariat which by its conditions of labour — from 5 a. m. to 6 p. m. — by its conditions of life and hygiene (63 deaths on an average per month on a rubber plantation) is even more destitute than the two former categories. They are the planters of rubber, most of them peasants whose land could not keep them or who were driven away from the land by floods, and were compelled to sell their labour power in these dangerous regions. These planters are terribly exploited by the settlers, who illtreat them mercilessly, kill and massacre them. This causes outbreaks which develop into armed rebellions which however lead only to the massacre of the insurgents. Thus the question of plantation workers is of considerable importance to us.

Let us now examine the political situation in Indo China. Big changes have taken place in Indo China since 1925. Although armed rebellions took place before, they did not assume a mass character. It is only since the arrest of the revolutionist Chan-Hoi-Chau on Chinese territory and his delivery to Indo China to be tried that an outbreak of rage and indignation swept over all the social strata of the country. But this was not only due to a nationalist feeling which took possession of

the whole people against imperialism which arrested the man whom it reveres most, but also to the miserable conditions of life and the oppression which is weighing heavily on the masses. This sudden awakening would have developed in 1925-26 into a mass revolution to oust imperialism if the arrival of the Socialist Varenne, sent opportunely by the French government, had not awakened illusions among the Annamite élite. We must bear in mind that the Chinese revolution has a great influence on the Annamite masses. The saying is: China is the dawn of Indo-China.

Comrades, more competent than I have already spoken on the treacherous attitude of the Second International. With your permission I will deal only with "our governor-general", "our viceroy", our "Socialist" Varenne. It seems that this old fogey of the Socialist and Labour International was very popular, it seems that he displayed remarkable statesmanship to make the government send him to Indo China just at the moment when the masses were prepared to take up the fight for their liberty. There were magnificent demonstrations for his reception at Hanoi, several thousand Annamites met him carrying posters bearing the slogan: "Long Live the Socialist Varenne". On his route old women knelt down to ask mercy for Chan-Hoi-Chan. He was received in Saigon by a delegation of 800 natives who had come from all the parts of the country to present a list of complaints and demand elementary reforms: freedom to hold meetings, freedom of the press, freedom of association, etc. . . . All this came about spontaneously with a great deal of enthusiasm because much was expected of the Socialist Varenne.

And the Socialist Varenne played his role, a role which he defined thus before his constituents of the seven mountain districts at the end of his farewell banquet:

"It (the government of the republic) was of opinion that the name alone of your representative would have in Indo China an appeasing and conciliating effect. I think that there are already sure signs that events vindicate the success of the government."

Certainly Varenne's "Socialist" label had created many illusions among the masses. To them Varenne, the "Socialist", personified liberty and liberation itself. Alas, the traitor to Socialism, Varenne, did not wait long to show the masses that their hopes were in vain. He was already taking off his coat to exercise unprecedented repression against those who had dared place their hopes in him, the representative of the French working class, the liberator of martyred Indo China!

After all, what has Varenne done for the Annamites during his reign? Suspension of newspapers interdiction of pamphlets, sentences of imprisonment for years for writers and editors of anti-imperialist organs, expulsion and arrest of students on strike, arrest of employees and workers on strike. There were never so many strikes as during Varenne's rule. He did his mission well. It consisted in being merciless with the malcontents.

What other benefits did the Socialist Varenne bestow on Indo-China? Decrees on the press, enormous subsidies for pro-French newspapers, increased taxes, increased police and army, construction of fortifications, of strategical railways to the Chinese frontier, a draconic decree against the working class. To this must be added the 7000 rifles which he allowed to go through to the Yunnan province to exterminate the Chinese revolution. There are also the tens of thousands of hectares of land which he stole from the natives to give them to his friend Maillot. One must say, governor Varenne is a loyal lackey of French imperialism.

But the important thing is that since the Varenne regime we can expose the role of the national bourgeoisie, which includes the elite of the Indo Chinese returned from France, and of its Party, the Constitutional Party, whose leader is Bui-Guang-Chin. The latter showed himself in his true colours on his return from France. When he arrived the Annamites thought to have in him their banner bearer and they came in their tens of thousands to meet him. But machine guns were levelled at the crowd. If Bui-Guang-Chin had not deserted his post a collision would have taken place between the French troops stationed in the port and the Indo-Chinese masses. Since then the leader of the Constitutional Party preaches collaboration

with imperialism. In an interview he said that the bourgeoisie and the Annamite elite have property and do not wish a rebellion to interfere with their interests. He also said that he is not anti-French, that he hates methods of violence, etc. No wonder that the Indo-Chinese masses have turned away from their bourgeoisie which is not concealing its counter-revolutionary character.

The policy of collaboration between the French capitalists and the national bourgeoisie is a very dangerous Entente for the masses. Varenne knew it. Therefore he granted certain reforms to the Annamite elite: accession to posts in perfect equality with the French, higher salaries for functionaries to render them loyal to the government. The recent terrible repressions are due to this policy of compromise and collaboration. The intention is to strengthen the civil servants cadre, to give authority to native lackeys to crush the masses; students returned from France are bribed by heaping on them honorary titles. It is intended to establish an Indo-Chinese hostel in the university settlement in Paris as a bribe to the native students. All this is done to repress the revolutionary masses which have already taken up a hostile attitude towards their bourgeoisie. They know that they must work out their own liberation. Unfortunately, they are not yet organised. Apart from the constitutional party we have also the **Annamite party of Independence** created in Paris by a Communist renegade, **Ng-Tch-Truyen**. This is a very dangerous party which creates illusions among the masses because it preaches Indo-Chinese independence by means of a peaceful evacuation.

There is at present in Indo-China a party which is in contact with the masses, i. e. the **Young-Annam party**, which, although weak and without a political platform, is at least a rallying point for revolutionary petty-bourgeois elements. Our task is a very difficult one. It is essential for us to have a **revolutionary mass organisation** if we are to take the lead in the revolutionary movement of Indo-China. The situation in Indo-China is by no means so peaceful as Varenne made believe after the expiration of his mandate. The masses are imbued with the will to liberate themselves. The peasant and planters rebellions, etc., are alarming symptoms for French imperialism. The recent military manoeuvres which took place around the villages have no other aim but to intimidate the population. Lately a search was made among the mountaineers for alleged stores of arms. This is a pure invention to engineer a conspiracy so as to have a pretext to use repressive measures against the revolutionaries.

Comrades, I would like to say a few words about the **Indo-Chinese working class**. It is mainly provided by Tonkin and Annam, where destitution and floods drive the peasants out of the country to seek employment in Cochinchina and elsewhere. The newspaper "Indo Chinese Argus" has made public how the colonial sharks carry on slave-trade by sending coolies to work in the Hebrides under perfectly appalling conditions. The recent labour code gives absolutely nothing to the workers. It is evident that we must turn our attention to the Indo-Chinese labour power as an export commodity.

As to the question of **Chinese in Indo-China**, they are mostly concentrated in Cholou where they own big rice-fields. They also own big works in Tonkin. They are well organised and have their own chambers of commerce. Side by side with the colonial government they are an instrument of oppression against the Annamite masses. Nevertheless, the Government knows that the sympathy of the Annamites for the Chinese Revolution is growing and that among the Chinese there are revolutionaries who can teach something to the Indo-Chinese natives. Therefore, it endeavours to sow discord between the Annamites and the Chinese (Haiphong incidents). We declare here that we will do our utmost to help the Chinese Revolution, we will tell the Annamite soldiers sent to China to fraternise with the Chinese revolutionists if French imperialism tells them to exterminate them.

I spoke already of the covetousness of **Japan** and of the role which Indo-China might play in a war in the Pacific. These assertions are borne out by the military and naval reinforcement of Indo-China, by the plan to construct works for the manufacture of commercial aeroplanes, which in wartime can be transformed into military aircraft.

In conclusion, I would like to draw attention to the fact that in this country which French imperialism represents as quiet and peaceful, but where nevertheless big demonstrations of tens of thousands of workers, peasants and poor intellectuals and peasant rebellions took place which are alarming the land expropriators, that in this country where the proletariat is growing, where the radicalisation of the masses makes headway, where the bourgeoisie plays its treacherous role quite openly, that in this country the revolutionary masses are still unorganised and therefore impotent.

The C. I. must seriously consider the question of the creation of an **Indo-Chinese Communist Party**. It must turn its attention to the question of the **formation of trade unions** for the workers and also of **organisations for the peasants**. The complete emancipation of the Indo-Chinese workers and peasants cannot be achieved in any other way.

In conclusion, I would like to say that we set our hopes on the proletariat of the whole world, especially on the workers of France and China and on the Third International. With their help we will be able to work out our liberation.

To the Social-Democrats we say that we do not need their policy of compromise. Enslaved people, oppressed workers, exploited labourers and peasants as we are, we want only one thing: to liberate ourselves from the yoke of imperialism, from the parasitical national bourgeoisie in order to enter into the concert of the socialist world, in order to seek refuge under the banner of the Communist International.

Comrade SULTAN-ZADE (Persia):

Comrades, when I received the Theses and began to read them, I imagined for a moment that I was not in Moscow, but in one of the colonies with which Comrade **Kuusinen's** Theses are dealing. And as much as I endeavoured to get Persia into this scheme which divides all colonial and semi-colonial countries into four groups, I did not succeed in this. How does it stand with Persia in reality? Can Persia skip over the capitalist development? Is it possible to establish immediately the Soviet regime in Persia, or must one proclaim there on the day after the Revolution the democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry? Can we develop in Persia the agrarian revolution, or should we abstain from this there also? Unfortunately, I have received no answer to these questions which are of such great interest to us.

I think that Comrade **Kuusinen's** scheme is **on too general lines**, there is no concretisation whatever; the countries are grouped in a manner which makes it very difficult to give every country its proper place. I do not think that I stand alone in regard to this. I am convinced that the **Turkish** comrades are in the same boat. I am sure that the comrades from the Arabian countries are as badly off in this respect as I. Syria is dealt with in several places together with India and China and gets thereby directly into the first group. I think that there is no justification for this. All this has happened because the scheme has not been sufficiently thought out.

Comrades, we know that to draw up a scheme especially for such enormous masses of people living in most diverse parts of the globe, is a very difficult matter. It is difficult because these countries live under conditions where we see the highest social forms side by side with the most backward. Under these conditions it is extremely difficult to give a schematic picture of all these various countries.

Now a few words about **tactic and strategy**. Comrades, in order to elaborate a correct tactic in this or that country one must first of all study conscientiously the driving forces of the revolution in the said country. It must be ascertained what ails this country, what direct consequences the predatory imperialist policy has there, what classes are the greatest sufferers under the imperialist yoke. In this respect the theory of the pauperisation of enormous masses of people in the gigantic Eastern countries is one of the most serious theories to which we must turn our attention and in regard to which very little is said in the theses. Only on page 16 it is casually mentioned that the pauperisation of the peasant masses is a general phenomenon in the colonial countries. Comrades, it goes without saying that imperialism does not only pauperise the peasantry. Conditions

in the colonies, the transformation of backward countries into purveyors of raw material for the industrial centres of Europe have brought about a state of affairs where these enormous continents have really become the rural districts of the capitalist town. At the same time thousands of workers employed in handicraft are unable to compete with the cheap articles of the European countries. Owing to this these sections of the population have become destitute, and this pauperisation process is steadily developing in all Eastern countries. In Persia even the simple fact of the import of a few thousand motor cars resulted in throwing tens of thousands of people employed as carriage drivers onto the streets. They are carrying on now a miserable existence. It frequently happens that these ruined starving masses come under the influence of reactionaries. Especially in Persia the reaction is doing its utmost to utilise this discontent for its own purposes. The clergy is particularly busy in this direction. In this respect the work of our Communist Parties consists in getting cleverly in touch with the masses in order to get them away from the influence of the reactionaries and to mobilise them for revolutionary purposes.

Much has been said here about the role of the export of capital and the industrialisation of the colonies. Already Marx has pointed out that in countries which have not yet gone through the epoch of original accumulation, foreign loans and import of capital can play this role of original accumulation. Marx used the United States as an example to show that transition to a higher stage of capitalist development is possible by means of import of capital. In that period the export of European capital to America has played a truly progressive role. But it would be a mistake to imagine that this export of capital has a progressive character also in the epoch of imperialism. In this connection it must be emphatically pointed out that at present not a single penny is exported from the mother countries to the colonies without a very definite aim. The imperialist countries base the export of their capital on entire strategical systems. The export of capital to backward countries is a peculiar form of strategy for the conquest of the commanding positions of the economic and political life of the respective country. The import of capital into this or that country has been for decades the source of terrible suffering because the imperialist countries interested in that country compel it to grant concessions of all kind, organise continually insurrections and assassinations and use threats and extortions till the aim which they pursue has been achieved. In many backward countries the foreign settlements have long ago transformed themselves into military strongholds which are the base for the further expansion of the imperialists.

The example of Mexico, Persia and a whole series of other countries is sufficient to explain the role of export of capital under present circumstances. We must set our revolutionary strategy against the strategy of the imperialists. We must pay special attention to the centres from where we can extend our revolutionary base. But the Theses do not make it clear which of the colonial and semi-colonial countries are to be considered the most important from the strategical viewpoint. It has already been mentioned here that the enormous masses of the Arabian people who have been torn apart by some of the imperialist big powers are even now an object of unprecedented oppression by these powers. There is hardly any indication in the Theses what tactics we must apply in the Arabian countries: in Syria, Mesopotamia, Tunis, Algiers and Morocco. These colonial countries are so dismembered geographically that hardly any hope exists to create a united Arabian State. What tactic must we adopt in Persia, which is situated between the country of proletarian dictatorship and the great colony, India? The Theses point out correctly that the forces of the social world revolution are the only reliable support and guarantee for the ultimate liberation of the colonies and semi-colonies from the imperialist yoke. These Theses must become an instrument in the hands of the oppressed colonial slaves with the help of which they will be able to enter upon the path of their liberation. But we find nothing of the kind in the Theses. It has been, for instance, pointed out that an important question such as that of the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, that this enormously important theoretical question especially in the initial period of the struggle in China, India and other countries, is not dealt with in the Theses. We welcome that part of the Theses which proposes to the Executive Committee of the Comintern to take up

energetically the organisation of Communist Parties in the colonial countries, to take measures for the consolidation of such Parties so as to strengthen the objective revolutionary conditions by something subjective, namely, by the subjective organisational will of the revolutionary masses of these countries. This is really of the utmost importance for the preparation of the coming struggles when the revolutionary masses will have to put up a decisive struggle against the imperialists.

As to the role of the bourgeoisie in the agrarian revolution, the Theses admit that agrarian revolution is possible also in the framework of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. I think that the bourgeoisie will steer clear of this. Where the proletariat is acting together with the peasantry, where it brings forward its special class demands, the bourgeoisie will not be in favour of an agrarian revolution, because it has learned something from the Russian Revolution. It knows that the agrarian revolution is a powerful base for the further development of the revolution. But even if the bourgeoisie were for the agrarian revolution, the imperialist countries would not tolerate it.

Several comrades have already pointed out here that in some countries enormous areas are owned by foreign capitalists, especially where the country possesses mineral wealth and natural resources. It goes without saying that the imperialist countries interested in this or that colonial or semi-colonial country, will endeavour to prevent the development of an agrarian revolution with all the means at their disposal. I am convinced that as soon as the proletariat comes forward energetically in the revolution with its own class demands, the bourgeoisie will look for allies among the landlords and foreign imperialists. It is therefore not so easy for the bourgeoisie to show an interest in the agrarian revolution.

As to the role of the petty bourgeoisie in the agrarian revolution, I am convinced that at the decisive moment it will betray the agrarian revolution just as the big bourgeoisie. Therefore we must not set our hopes on the petty bourgeoisie supporting us during the revolutionary struggles. The only force capable of making the agrarian revolution a reality is firstly, the proletariat and secondly, those sections of the peasantry which organise themselves under the leadership of the proletariat and the Communist Parties. It is only by organising the workers and peasants, by the energetic revolutionary struggle of the millions that we will achieve the liberation of the oppressed colonial peoples and will bring about the overthrow of the entire capitalist order.

Comrade ABERDERRAMÉ (Algeria):

Comrades, in agreement with the Algerian Delegation I will endeavour to give a brief exposé of the colonial policy of French imperialism in Algeria.

First of all I will give you a few facts and figures to show you the results of colonisation. By expropriation by force of arms, by sequestrations, quartering of troops and annexations for various causes, 11 million hectares of fertile land have already been stolen by imperialism out of 21 million hectares of cultivated and uncultivated land; expropriation of land assumes every year a more accentuated form, it ruins the Algerians and drives them more and more towards the sterile south where they are decimated by periodical famines.

On the other hand over one half of the capital invested in North Africa is invested in Algeria. Owing to these investments the French imperialists exercise absolute control over banks, railways, mines, in a word, over the whole economic system.

In regard to external trade, three-quarters is done with the mother country.

Algeria being a predominantly agricultural country, the French imperialists secure 80% of the agricultural produce. Moreover, Algeria is for them an outlet for their industrial produce to the extent of 90%. Suffice it to add that two-thirds of private capital are in their hands, as well as state power and finance, to give you a clear idea of the terrible grip French imperialism has on Algeria.

Nevertheless, it would be wrong to assert that Algeria is a purely agricultural country; we witness there an ever growing tendency towards industrial development.

Thus, in 1901 we had 1,000 industrial enterprises and in 1924, 22,000. Side by side with this an industrial proletariat is developing. From 60,000 industrial workers in 1921 the proletariat has increased to 180,000 in 1924. The production of iron increased from 74,000 tons in 1919 to 180,000 tons in 1925, and that of phosphates from 277,000 tons in 1919 to 815,000 tons in 1925.

Moreover, owing to lack of coal in Algeria the problem of electrification assumes an enormous importance for the development of industry. The distribution of electric power has increased from 28 million kilowatt hours in 1922 to 76 million in 1926.

This industrial development of Algeria is growing all the time and will continue to do so for various reasons:

1. The growth of agricultural production in the country is causing serious frictions with the producers in the mother country. To cope with these contradictions imperialism is compelled to create manufacturing industries to change the nature of the agricultural produce and facilitate thereby its sale.

2. Utilisation of the payments in kind owing to a better use of the ports (construction of railways, underground telephonic cables and improvement of the equipment of the mines).

3. Preparations for war and struggle against all the national revolutionary movements in North Africa for the domination of the Mediterranean basin.

To solve the problem of the self-defence of Algeria, imperialism has instituted "voluntary" recruitment of natives, a "voluntary" recruitment which owing to the economic and political pressure on the poor peasantry becomes compulsory recruitment.

In regard to repression, the following fact will give you an illustration of the regime of terror against the natives. For having dared to assert in public that a well known leader of the French Communist Party is an intelligent person one of our comrades was sentenced to 'two years' deportation to the Sahara.

We have 480,000 workers out of six million inhabitants of whom 370,000 are natives and 110,000 Europeans, that is to say, 13% of the European population. The industrial proletariat numbers 180,000 including 108,000 natives. The important thing is that the native proletariat is the real industrial proletariat.

We witness in Algeria a rapid social differentiation and a certain radicalisation of big sections of natives. An utterly new and important fact is that a great desire for organisation is manifest among all the social sections of the native population.

85% of the population live on agricultural produce; in spite of the development of industry the rural character of Algeria has not changed. 55 to 65% are landless peasants (khames). These khames constitute 30% of the population, the rest are native land owners with either inadequate or barren plots of land. 30% of the European population live in the country; among them 33% are land owners and the rest are tenant farmers or agricultural labourers.

To illustrate what I have just said I will give you facts: in Saida poor peasants offered armed resistance to imperialism which caused the troops to intervene. In Bel-Abes we witnessed resistance to the occupation of the land. In Bougie agricultural labourers came out on strike without the help of any organisation. Among the urban proletariat there has been a series of strikes lately: gas workers' strike in Algiers, a strike in the briquette factories Musel-Kabir, strikes among carpenters, tobacco workers, scavengers (Algiers). In almost all these strikes the natives behaved admirably and I am prepared to say that their attitude can serve as an example.

The attitude of the social democrats in Algeria is the same as in all the colonies. They support the imperialist policy against the natives, they are for assimilation and against independence and the abolition of the anti-native laws (Code de l'Indigénat). In their struggle against the Communists and the revolutionary trade unions the socialists have shown themselves as the most zealous servants of imperialism. I will give you a very characteristic fact which shows the social democrats in Algeria in their true colours. As a result of the struggle

carried on by our Party against the socialists during the last elections they published in their organ the list of all the native members of our organisation whom they knew and declared that the real leader of our organisation is a native comrade, knowing full well that by denouncing the names of the native comrades to the police they would expose them to severe penalties. As a result of this the government took proceedings against our comrades.

Let us now consider the policy of our Communist Party in Algeria. Owing to the social composition of our Party in 1924 (small colonists, employees,) the Party pursued a wrong policy, a colonialist policy which impeded the development of the Party among the native masses who distrusted the Communist Party. Considering that our Party has not gone through the internal struggles of the French Party by which the latter was properly formed, we are four years behind the French Party.

In 1925, after the 5th congress, the colonial question was taken a little more seriously, but it was very much the same policy as in 1924.

Then came the Moroccan war. You know the attitude of the French Party. This attitude has very important consequences for our Party in Algeria which enabled us to take a series of measures. In 1926 the Party suffered from all the mistakes committed after the foundation.

In 1927 there were big internal struggles within the Party which led to the rectification of the Party in 1928. At present we have no more "colonists" in the Party, the natives participate in the Executive which has issued the slogan of Algerian independence.

It was for the first time that during the elections in Algeria our Party has carried out the policy laid down by the Communist International. The present executive is not yet what it should be; it suffers still from a certain political weakness but it is willing to work and has enough experience to put the Party on a sound new basis by getting rid of colonialist and vacillating elements and by supporting itself upon the natives for the struggle against imperialism. I want to say that these results could not have been achieved and such a rectification could not have taken place if it had not been for the close collaboration between the Algerian district and the C. P. F.

In conclusion, I will indicate what are the tasks of our Party:

1. It must become a real Communist Party of Algeria, by its composition and work.

2. It must win the peasants and agricultural labourers (I should like to say that nothing has been done in this sphere, but nevertheless we have attempted something in this direction since our last regional committee meeting).

3. For the improvement of the national composition of the trade unions with a stronger orientation towards the natives.

At a time when French imperialism is preparing to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of the Conquest of Algeria, let us prepare to give our answer to the assassins and robbers of the colonial peoples and of ours in particular by mobilising the toilers of Algeria under the banner of struggle against French imperialism, for the independence of Algeria, as a stage towards the complete emancipation of the Algerian workers.

Comrades, to make it easier for us to carry out to a certain extent the tasks which the Sixth Congress will set us, we will have to raise the political level of the native active Party workers through the formation of upper and medium cadres capable of leading the revolutionary movement in the colonies under the banner of the Communist International.

Comrade VASSILIEV:

In my speech I am going to deal with three questions.

The first question relates to the central points of revolutionary activity in the colonies which had to be particularly emphasised by the Comintern. The whole of the tremendous colonial world today represents a colossal cauldron of potential

revolutionary energy; nevertheless, some individual points of this world are of exceptionally great importance to the struggle of the Comintern against the bourgeois world. These points are, in my opinion, **China, India, Egypt** and the **Latin American countries**. As regards China and India, I believe it needs no particular comments for anyone in the Comintern to realise the tremendous importance of these two countries to the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. In regard to **Egypt**, it ought to be seriously emphasised that lately there has been a tremendous growth of the national-revolutionary struggle in that country, whilst the activity of the proletariat and the fellahin (peasantry) has grown tremendously. This intensification of the political situation in Egypt is keenly watched by the oppressed Arabian peoples in the vicinity of Egypt. It was pointed out by Comrade Heidar that the Comintern should take all steps to prevent its appearing too late upon the scene of the events which are developing in Egypt. I believe it would be more proper to say: the Comintern should forthwith take all the necessary steps to support the young and very weak Egyptian Party. Everything points to the fact that the C. P. of Egypt, without the support of the Comintern, will not be able to develop the proper attitude with specific regard to the national movement.

Let us now turn to the **Latin-American countries**: these countries are at present acquiring tremendous importance as regards the struggle of the colonies and semi-colonies against imperialism, particularly in view of the directly revolutionary situation now developing in a number of Latin-American countries, which have evolved in some places into an armed struggle, whilst generally each act of the class struggle and each independent national action in these countries leads to exceedingly acute and even armed conflicts. The case of **Nicaragua** demonstrates the tremendous force of resistance contained in these countries, even in the little Latin-American countries which challenge the force of mighty American imperialism. All this naturally leads to the idea that if the neighbouring countries had lent the proper assistance to the potentially revolutionary countries of Latin America (Ecuador, Colombia, Bolivia, Brazil, etc.), and particularly to Nicaragua, a mighty anti-imperialist bloc could have been formed upon the grounds of a common programme of action, a common fight against American imperialism. In this manner a tremendous front of the revolutionary struggle would have been established.

It behoves the Comintern to pay the utmost attention to these important points in the study of the events in the colonial countries generally. Whilst supporting the revolutionary movement in all the colonies, the Comintern and its Sections (particularly the Sections in the imperialist countries) should particularly aid the revolutionary struggle of the workers and peasants in those countries, lending particularly energetic and quick assistance in the consolidation and development of the Communist Parties in such countries. We must draw the attention of the comrades to the fact that the strengthening of the revolutionary movement in the colonies will no doubt meet with armed intervention on the part of the imperialists. The respective Communist Parties should be prepared to act whenever a situation arises like the one we recently witnessed in China. Under such conditions, it becomes tremendously difficult to establish contact with the expeditionary troops. Thus, the Communist Parties of the respective imperialist countries had no contact with the troops that were despatched to China, and we had to try and establish such contact already after the arrival of the troops in China. We had to overcome tremendous difficulties and to lose a tremendous amount of valuable time in trying to penetrate among the expeditionary troops. Steps must be taken to prevent a recurrence of such experiences. If it ever comes to a new intervention by the imperialist Powers against the revolutionary movement in the colonial countries, the respective Communist Parties must be fully prepared so that this intervention should not catch them unawares. The Communist Parties should take particular care to take timely steps to influence such colonial troops before they are despatched to take part in the suppression of revolutionary upheavals in the colonies.

The **second** question with which I should like to deal relates to strengthening the Communist Parties in the colonial countries and the formation of Communist Parties where they have not yet been formed. It should not be forgotten that in a whole number of colonial countries there are still no Communist Parties; even India, occupying such a foremost position in the revolutionary struggle of the colonies, has no Communist Party.

The strongest Communist Party we have in **China**. It has more than doubled its membership in the course of 1927—28, nevertheless, its social composition has grown worse during the same period. The C. P. of China has lost many workers during this period. We have asked the Chinese comrades: are these losses the result of the ferocious terror, of the physical extermination of the workers, or have the workers partly withdrawn from the organisation on account of the mistakes committed by the Party? And our Chinese comrades frankly replied that it was only to a very small extent due to physical extermination, that the major portion of those losses was due to the mistakes of the Party and the weak points in its organisational and political activity. Consequently, we have in China a tremendous numerical growth of the Party, and at the same time a weakening of its contact with the working class and its transformation into a peasant party.

There is yet another grave menace today to the C. P. in China. Its root is in the motley social composition of the peasant section of the membership. In the districts where **Soviet rule** was established, entire villages joined the C. P., i. e. both the proletarian section of the peasantry as well as the middle peasants. The result is, as may be seen from the materials of the C. P. of China, that in connection with the discussion of individual questions **within the Party organisations** in the rural districts, it came sometimes to a direct class struggle between the proletarian and the possessing sections of the membership. The proletarian section, for instance, is in favour of dividing the land, whilst the possessing section is bitterly opposed to it. The dangerous nature of its internal situation is fully realised by the Chinese Party, but apparently it needs the support of the Comintern to cope with all these difficulties. Generally speaking, however, the C. P. in China is very strong and it has been hardened in the fire of revolutionary struggles.

The situation is a good deal worse in the Communist Parties of other colonial and semi-colonial countries. Where Communist Parties exist, they are numerically as well as ideologically weak. In many countries there are no Communist Parties at all. A great hindrance to the activity of the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is their ideological weakness: even among responsible comrades at the head of these Parties, there is frequently a lack of a proper understanding of the nature of the Communist Party, and of its relations to other political and class organisations. In the course of the deliberations of the present Congress of the Comintern, in conversing with the delegates of the different colonial countries, one had to hear statements like the following: our Communist Party is very weak — said a Syrian comrade — and it is therefore necessary to organise a national-revolutionary party as a means for the activity of the Communist Party. Other comrades told us it was necessary to form workers' and peasants' parties in order to strengthen the activity of the Communist Party, and so forth. This question must be particularly studied in regard to India.

If we try to analyse the position of the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, we generally have to observe the following principal defects which are rather typical of all of them.

Firstly, these Parties are still to a large extent organisations made up of leaders. They have no local rank and file organisations, no nuclei firmly established in the factories, no strong faction in the trade unions and in the other proletarian and peasant mass organisations.

The second defect is as follows: as a rule, the influence of the Communist Parties in these mass organisations of the colonial and semi-colonial countries is based solely upon the personal influence of individual leaders of the Communist Party, but not upon the organisational activity of strong Communist factions, not upon the whole Communist Party as such. This causes a great many serious difficulties to the activity of the Communist Party. For instance, if a leader of the Communist Party at the head of a trade union or a peasant organisation should be opposed to the majority of the C. C. upon any question, he takes advantage of his position and influence to get his organisation into opposition to the Party majority. We could mention a number of such cases, for instance in the Latin-American countries.

The third defect in the activity of the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is that, as already said, there is generally a lack of understanding among their leaders as to the proper tasks of the C. P. and the other revolutionary organisations of their respective countries. This question — the development of the Communist Parties as such, as Parties relying upon strong local organisations and factory nuclei, the carrying on of extensive ideological activity to clarify the role of the Communist Parties — this question is just now in the very centre of the activities of the C. I. in the colonies.

A few words about the national-revolutionary and the workers' and peasants' parties. I believe, comrades, this question ought to be taken up somewhat in the following manner. Before the betrayal of the Kuomintang there had been attempts spontaneously made by all our Sections in the colonial and semi-colonial countries to call into existence various national revolutionary parties. Matters went so far that the Brazilian comrades decided to form their own Kuomintang. Nevertheless, the experience of the Kuomintang should have caused serious misgivings to all those comrades who previously believed that it was both possible and necessary to form various national-revolutionary organisations in all the colonial countries and under all conditions.

If we examine the four points of the colonial activity just mentioned, we have to consider the question of the workers' and peasants' parties somewhat in the following manner. In China there can be no talk of the C. P. taking the initiative in forming a national-revolutionary organisation, whether in the shape of a Left-wing Kuomintang or of any other kind, which should prepare the workers and peasants in the Kuomintang ranks for a new rise of the revolutionary tide. This is altogether out of the question in China.

On the other hand, this question is of tremendous practical importance in India. In India there is no C. P., but isolated and weak Communist groups. In four of the Indian provinces there are workers' and peasants' parties which are affiliated to the National Congress. According to latest information, it is the intention of the different workers' and peasants' parties to amalgamate into an All-India Workers' and Peasants' Party. It is quite possible that this amalgamation has already been effected.

There are Communists active in those workers' and peasants' parties. As a rule, they form no factions and are not led by the C. C. of the C. P., because there is none in existence. I now ask you: is it not clear that these workers' and peasants' parties of India and this All-Indian Workers' and Peasants' Party are in great danger of becoming transformed into a petty-bourgeois, nationalist, anti-Communist Party, unless quick and energetic steps be taken to merge all the existing elements and groups into a solid Indian Communist Party which should lead the whole activity of individual Communists in the Workers' and Peasants' Parties? Yet there is a still more important point. The C. P. of India should create strong factions in the existing peasant organisations and trade unions, so that by relying upon them, it might capture these mass organisations and thus secure a solid class basis within the workers' and peasants' parties. Thus, the Indian Party has to concentrate chiefly upon the consolidation of the Communist Party and upon the formation of Communist factions in the workers' and peasants' organisations. Relying upon these class organisations, it will be its further task to carry on manoeuvring activity for the organisational formation of a Left-wing of the national movement under Communist slogans.

In Egypt the situation in the national movement is as follows: at the head of the national movement is the Wafd-party which, however, has no proper Party organisation. Like all the national parties of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, it is an organisation of leaders, nevertheless, it relies upon the sympathies of considerable strata of workers and fellahin. Those at the head of the Wafd party are most intimately connected with the regime of political and colonial exploitation practised by British imperialism in Egypt.

Naturally, the workers and the fellahin can in no way sympathise with the existing regime. Our comrades in the C. P. of Egypt therefore raise the question whether it would not be possible to get hold of the masses of the workers and peasants who are now forming the mainstay of the Wafd-party and get them to join the revolutionary struggles, and in this

manner to cause a radical democratisation of the Wafd-party, or perhaps even to form a Left-wing in that organisation. I believe such an idea to be erroneous. In view of this, it will be necessary to introduce the necessary changes and more clearness into the points of the theses of Comrade Kuusinen which deal with the relations between the C. P. and the national-revolutionary movement in the colonial countries. With regard to the present situation in Egypt it ought to be said that the chief enemy of the Egyptian workers and peasants is the Wafd, and that therefore, the main struggle of the Egyptian Party ought to be directed against it. Just as in India, it is essential to strengthen the Communist Party, to strengthen to the utmost its activity in the trade unions and in other class organisations of Egypt, and to carry on a persistent educational campaign of under-mining the influence of the Wafd and exposing it as an organisation of treachery to the national movement and of compromise with British imperialism. These are the central tasks to be taken up by the C. P. in Egypt.

A few words on the situation in Latin-America. In all the Latin-American countries where Communist Parties exist, and even in those where they do not yet exist, we are witnessing a tremendous striving on the part of the working and peasant masses towards Communism, and the manifestation of popular sympathy for the U. S. S. R. Quite frequently the masses have no idea about the real substance of Communism and of the Communist Party. They are almost ignorant as to the aims and tasks of the Communist International. Equally vague are their ideas about the U. S. S. R.; nevertheless their sympathies for Communism and the U. S. S. R. are immense. If I had the time, I could cite a sufficiently long list of instances showing how strong these sympathies are. Thus, for instance, the Congress of the Socialist Party of Colombia carried a resolution in favour of establishing the proletarian dictatorship and of passing immediately from words to deeds. Nevertheless, the delegates in the Congress had a very hazy idea as to what was to be the nature of the deeds, and the whole thing fizzled out in negotiations with representatives of the Liberal Party.

Take another case. In Uruguay a lecture was delivered by a Liberal who had come back from a visit to Soviet Russia. An Anarchist in the audience tried to contradict the speaker, asserting that he knew that in the U. S. S. R. there was a reign of dictatorship, arbitrary rule, and so forth. The indignant audience dragged him out of the hall and carried him to the adjacent river where they drowned him, and passed a resolution on the spot, on the river bank, condemning his views.

In view of such facts, the question is raised by some people, whether it would not be advisable instead of a Communist Party to form a workers' and peasants' party, a sort of Kuomintang, or such-like organisation. Some people ask, on the contrary, why should such organisations be formed if the Communist International is so popular among these masses of workers and peasants, and it is their ardent wish to join the Communist International? This Congress is considering applications by the Socialist Parties of Ecuador and Colombia to become affiliated to the Comintern. I believe that under such circumstances in those countries it would be a political and tactical error on our part if we yielded to the argument of those comrades who want to retard the formation of Communist Parties in those countries on account of Latin-American backwardness. It is necessary to strike the iron while it is hot. The Comintern must extend to the Latin-American countries the most efficient aid to strengthen the Communist Parties where they exist and to form them where they do not, preparing the progressive revolutionary forces in those countries for the great revolutionary struggles to come, for the struggles which are maturing and which are even going on uninterruptedly in some of those countries.

Comrade GERMANETTO (Communist Fraction of the R. I. L. U.):

It is a well known fact that from July 17 to 31 the R. I. L. U. carried on a campaign in aid of the Chinese Labour movement. It is not necessary to point out here the importance of such a campaign at the present juncture. Everyone is aware of it. A special commission was appointed in the R. I. L. U. for the organisation of this 14 days campaign.

The Commission did excellent work. Apart from the telegrams addressed to all countries in connection with this campaign, a series of letters were sent out containing minute instructions concerning the organisation of this campaign. The R.I.L.U. had elaborated special material for conferences and speakers at meetings and assemblies devoted to the Chinese Revolution. Slogans had been drawn up under which the campaign was to be run; a series of articles, some of them in the form of economic and political exposes and others drawn with a view to serving as agitational material — articles contributed mostly by Chinese comrades, eye witnesses and participants in the revolutionary struggle in China, — were sent out.

In a word the R.I.L.U. has done everything in its power to prepare as efficiently as possible the organisation of this very important campaign. I can say without hesitation that in spite of the importance of this campaign it did not meet anywhere with the response which it deserved. In most countries our comrades took up a too official attitude to this campaign, this in spite of the fact that the VI Congress inaugurated its work by an urgent appeal for support to the Chinese revolution and adopted a special resolution on the support to be given to the International Fortnight's campaign of aid to the Chinese labour movement.

To judge by the information provided by the press, we can get an idea of the **exceptional negligence** displayed by the biggest and most powerful sections of the C.I. in regard to this very important campaign.

First of all **Great Britain**. One would have thought that in the country of the most ruthless oppressors of the Chinese Revolution a particularly intensive work would have been done; that our British comrades would have paid special attention to this Fortnight Chinese campaign. But what did we see? A few articles in connection with the campaign in our press, **one article only** on the attitude of the General Council of the trade unions and the Amsterdam International to the Chinese Revolution, a few illustrations in regard to white terror in China and of course slogans. In the press we have received up till now, not a single suggestion with regard to the organisation by the national Minority Movement of demonstrations, mass meetings, etc. . . . And what is more, in all probability no collections were taken up as an expression, most accessible to the masses, of international labour solidarity. Thus in Great Britain, whose imperialism is the most predatory in regard to China, the campaign in aid of the Chinese labour movement was ignored; as to the so-called "moral" aid, it bears such a character of official passivity that we are really ashamed of our British Party.

In **Germany** the campaign went off a little better. Reports on the situation in China and the Chinese labour movement were illustrated by lantern slides. The press devoted considerable space to the campaign ("Rote Fahne", "Welt am Abend" and others). On July 27, a demonstration was even organised in **Berlin**. However, the following circumstances attract our attention.

1. In all 4,000 people participated in the demonstration, a truly ridiculous figure for Germany. 4,000 demonstrators when working class Berlin is in the habit of seeing tens of thousands of participants marching in the gigantic Communist demonstrations.

2. The demonstration was organised not by the Left wing of the trade union movement and not by the Party, but by the "Hands Off China" Committee. But the most characteristic feature is that our German comrades approached this matter in a purely official manner: direction has been carried out. Here too, one cannot help wondering that in our Party press in **Germany no mention is made of any collections on behalf of the Chinese labour movement**.

In **Austria** the same picture: articles in the "Rote Fahne"; in factory newspapers not a word about China; one meeting only (and not a public one). No reply to repeated requests to send a fuller report on the preparation, organisation and result of the Fortnight's campaign.

In **Switzerland** matters were still worse: in regard to press agitation, only the appeal of the All-Chinese Federation of Trade Unions and an article on white terror in China were published, and nothing else. No collections were organised either in **Austria or Switzerland**.

Let us take now the countries where our Parties had better facilities to carry out the campaign — **France and Czechoslovakia**. Independent revolutionary trade unions exist there whose apparatus could have been used for an efficient organisation of the Fortnight campaign. Well, how did our comrades work there?

In **France** the Chinese Fortnight campaign took almost entirely the form of a Communist and revolutionary trade union press campaign. In "L'Humanite", "la Vie Ouvriere" and in the provincial press a number of articles were published devoted to the revolutionary labour movement, the conditions of labour and the standard of living of workers in China, to the attitude of the reformists in regard to China, to the policy of the imperialists, white terror, etc.

However, the characteristic feature in France was that from the beginning the Chinese campaign was merged with the joint campaign of the Party, the unitarian Confederation of Labour, the Young Communist League and the Association of Revolutionary ex-soldiers, a campaign devoted to the struggle against war in connection with the anniversary of the declaration of the world war. I will not deal with the manner in which this campaign was carried on. One thing is evident: the French comrades fused the two campaigns to such an extent that not a vestige was left of the campaign in aid of the Chinese labour movement. In fact the entire Fortnight Chinese campaign was reduced to the publications of a few articles on China in our press. As to meetings and demonstrations devoted **specially to China and to nothing else**, to judge by the press which we have received, there was nothing of the kind.

No collections were taken up either in France or in the other countries. Everywhere an official attitude to the directions of the C.I. and the R.I.L.U.: as long as articles on China are published, the campaign goes on. What more do you want?

The campaign went off better in **Czechoslovakia** than in the other countries. A considerable amount of material on China was published in the press. We are pleased to be able to say that these articles were published in a considerable number of organs. The Party press paid very little attention to the campaign, being evidently too much taken up with drawing up the balance, formulating its viewpoint and elucidating the reasons of the failure of the "Red Day".

However, it should be stated that, although this is a valid reason, the fortnight campaign should not have been neglected in this manner. What strikes one most is that no mention is made in the press about the meetings, conferences and demonstrations devoted to China.

However, I must say something else about the campaign in **Czechoslovakia**: to judge by the press, **collections were organised**. In any case subscription lists were sent to the basic organisations, but we have not yet heard about the results of these collections.

As to the **Scandinavian countries**, we have received recently a report of the **Norwegian Party**. We can see by this report that there too, the campaign was not carried on under better conditions. The Committee was organised much too late and the campaign lasted only from July 28 to August 4. Only our material was published (4 articles); as to meetings (not to mention collections) and demonstrations devoted to China, they were conspicuous by their absence. We have no information from the other Scandinavian countries, but it is not likely that the campaign there was more satisfactory.

We also lack information from a number of countries where the Communist Parties are working **illegally** (Italy, the Balkans, the Baltic countries, Hungary, etc.).

In regard to certain other countries, information is so scanty that one can assume that nothing has been done there. To judge by the "Daily Worker", the whole campaign of the **United States** was limited to a few articles. No collections were taken up. I must tell you that I have all this information exclusively from the press. As to reports on the preparation, conduct and results of the campaign, we have received none up till now.

To sum up: one thing is evident, the purely official attitude of all the countries in regard to the directions of the C.I. and the R.I.L.U. concerning this campaign. In most cases a few articles were published apparently under the impression that

thereby our duty to the Chinese proletariat had been fulfilled. The directions concerning a big campaign among the masses were utterly ignored; neither was any attention paid to the necessity of arousing the interest of the masses in the Chinese labour movement; even the main object of this campaign — financial support for the Chinese proletariat — was forgotten. In most cases there was neither moral support through the organisation of meetings and demonstrations, nor material help through well organised collections.

Such an attitude must give us food for thought. On the one hand utter disregard of directions of the C.I. and the R.I.L.U.; on the other hand, inadmissible indifference towards the fate of the Chinese revolution and the struggle of the Chinese proletariat. When the social imperialists in the II International and the Amsterdam Federation of Trade Unions are indifferent to the labour movement in China, this is only logical. But when the sections of the C.I. are so indifferent to this question, we must put an end to this kind of thing as soon as possible, because such an attitude is contrary to the policy of the C.I. This indifference in regard to the Chinese campaign is due to the fact that many of our organisations are still under the sway of European traditions: local interests are stronger than international interests. Moreover, one realises that there is a great deal of ignorance in regard to colonial events. Our Parties and trade union organs have not yet fully realised the importance of this historical phenomenon, namely that the growth and development of the labour movement of the colonies constitutes an important factor in the process of the world revolution. Indifference in regard to what is going on in the colonies, disregard of the campaigns propagated by the C.I. and the R.I.L.U., watching the events which are taking place in the colonies "in the rôle of disinterested spectators", — all this must be vigorously opposed in our ranks because those who do not realise their duties towards the labour movement in the colonies, who take up a formal attitude to the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples, — jeopardise the very foundation and principles of the Communist International.

Comrade COX (Great Britain):

Comrades, I want to deal specifically with the question of industrialisation of the colonies, and secondly with the bourgeois democratic revolution.

It is quite obvious that the thesis is confused upon this matter. Despite the fact that in general it supports the theory of imperialism retarding the industrialisation of the colonies, it contains several contradictory statements. For instance, on page 6, it speaks of the colonies being "economic (agrarian) appendages of imperialism", and also of the colonies "always transformed into an agrarian hinterland for the industrial city". On the same page, it endeavours to qualify this by saying

"in any case the capitalist enterprises cultivated by imperialism in the colonies, with the exception of a few workshops established for possible military needs, are primarily, or almost exclusively of an agrarian capitalist sort with a low organic composition of capital."

And still further, it endeavours to qualify this by speaking of "a real industrialisation" of the colonial country, as though the comrades drafting the thesis were not quite confident of their previous statements upon this matter. And still, towards the end of the thesis, they admit a comparative development of heavy industry, including mining.

Another example of this confusion is on page 13, where it speaks of imperialism breaking down the pre-capitalist conditions, in one sentence, and in the following sentence, it says that imperialism adapts itself to pre-capitalist conditions. There is a vein running right throughout this section which seems to indicate that imperialist colonial policy depends, not so much upon the objective development of imperialism itself, as it does upon the subjective desires of the imperialist bourgeoisie. I claim that this is not a correct way of putting the question. The realisation of imperialist subjective desires are always limited by the strength of the objective circumstances facing them. If it depended upon the subjective desires of imperialism, then there would be no proletarian development even in the home

country. If it depended upon the subjective desires of imperialism, then there would be no opportunity for the proletariat to overthrow the capitalist system by any method.

I think the best way to put this question is not so much as a formal question as to whether imperialism retards industrial development in the colonies, but to put it first in its broadest aspects. What is the result of the development of imperialism in the colonies? I think it would be true to say that one of the fundamental laws of imperialism, one which was emphasised by Comrade Lenin, is the transformation of agrarian colonies into spheres for industrialisation on the part of the imperialist bourgeoisie. It is true to say, in my opinion, that in the early stages, the imperialist bourgeoisie retarded the development of industry; they were satisfied with the production of cheap food-stuffs and raw materials in the colonies, because this form of industrialisation served the interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie. But the imperialist bourgeoisie cannot prevent the colonial bourgeoisie from having desires to embark upon other forms of industry. And therefore, what the imperialist bourgeoisie does in the colonies is not to retard industrial development in the absolute sense, but to get control of the heavy industries under the aegis of the colonial bourgeoisie.

I think the thesis is incorrect to put the question in such an absolute sense, that the imperialist bourgeoisie retards the industrial development in the colonies. It would be more correct to say that it retards the industrial development in the colonies when such industries are controlled by the colonial bourgeoisie. Whether this raises the perspective of the whole of industry being controlled by the imperialist bourgeoisie rather than the colonial bourgeoisie, is mainly a question first of all of the strength of reserves of imperialism, and secondly, the relation of forces between the colonial bourgeoisie and the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Therefore, I think that the thesis should be changed in this respect: that the imperialist bourgeoisie endeavours to prevent the colonial bourgeoisie from getting control of those industries which clash with the interests of the imperialists. Otherwise, if we are going to say that imperialism does not take any interest in the industrialisation of the colonies, what becomes of our general theory that imperialism transforms the agrarian areas into industrial colonies?

I am of the opinion that this thesis has been drafted and has been given a general interpretation more or less upon the particular experiences in India during the last two or three years. The fact that the imperialist bourgeoisie endeavours to control heavy industry and other industries necessary for imperialism, does not necessarily mean that there is a continuous and consistent expansion of industry in the colonies. Neither does it mean that the colonial bourgeoisie has complete control of the industries. The particular experience in India cannot be regarded as a basis for a general theory, but rather as an exception to the general rule. In India, imperialism temporarily retards industrialisation in the absolute sense because of its endeavours to wrest from the control of the colonial bourgeoisie the important industries essential for Imperialism.

Now with regard to the bourgeois democratic revolution. To a certain extent, the same confusion is reflected in this section, and is due more or less to the fact that the second section upon imperialist colonial policy does not indicate any definite line. And just because the economic basis outlined in section two is not definite, it naturally follows that in this section on the bourgeois democratic revolution, there is an obvious fear of being definite upon any particular point. In the beginning of paragraph 20, there is the following statement:

"It is not excluded that the reformist bourgeoisie in a colony may be driven by the logic of the struggle, especially in an acute revolutionary situation, to give up to some extent its policy of pendulating between the imperialist and nationalist revolutionary camps. If it is thus forced to choose between the two camps then in all probability it will affiliate (or approach) the imperialist camp sooner than the revolutionary camp."

Then in paragraph 21, the thesis speaks of the probable attitude of the national bourgeoisie towards the revolutionary camp and it gives a positive and a negative picture. The nega-

tive picture of the bourgeoisie participating in the national revolutionary movement is definitely as follows:

"On the one hand it exerts a retarding, braking effect upon the development of the revolutionary movement in so far as it succeeds in dragging the toiling masses in its wake and in keeping them away from the revolutionary struggle. These masses, above all, the peasant masses, must first of all be liberated from the influence of bourgeois-national reformism, they must be won for the revolutionary struggle by exposing this national reformism before victory can be achieved."

Then in dealing with the positive factor of the participation of the national bourgeoisie, it goes on to say:

"On the other hand the activity of the bourgeois opposition, even though with empty phrases, against the prevailing imperialist (or feudal) subjection, may have an accelerating effect upon the process of the political awakening of the broad toiling masses. The concrete open conflicts of the national-reformist bourgeoisie, even though of little importance in themselves, may under certain circumstances indirectly serve as the occasion even for the unleashing of great revolutionary mass actions."

Not that I want to say that there is one general line for the national bourgeoisie in every colony. But there is certainly a basis upon which we can proceed to indicate in general lines what would be the attitude of the bourgeoisie.

For instance, this section also speaks of two phases in the first stage of the bourgeois democratic revolution. It does not state whether in China we have reached the beginning of the first phase, or the beginning of the second phase. In the first phase it advocates participation with the national bourgeoisie. In the second phase, it advocates struggle against the national bourgeoisie after having gone over to the counter-revolutionary camp. But there is no indication whether the Chinese struggle will develop, as indicated in the first stage, or as in the second stage.

I want to conclude by saying that it is possible from our experience, especially our rich experience of the Chinese revolution, to say in more definite terms what would be the attitude of the national bourgeoisie in definite concrete circumstances. As the thesis is at present, it gives no assistance, no indication either to our Chinese comrades or to our Indian comrades.

The question of the imperialist bourgeoisie hampering the industrial development in those industries controlled by the colonial bourgeoisie, and the fostering of industry controlled by themselves, does not necessarily mean, as Comrade Martinov suggested, that there is an era of rapid expansion and that we are falling into the social democratic error of stating that imperialism in the colonies has a progressive policy. The fact that the imperialist bourgeoisie endeavours to foster industry in the colonies for its own purpose, does not by any means exclude the brutal treatment of the masses of the peasantry, the inhuman conditions in the plantations and mines, as at present, and therefore does not hold out a perspective of a greatly improved and rapid development towards capitalism. On the contrary, the struggle of the imperialist bourgeoisie to wrest certain industries from the control of the colonial bourgeoisie, while, of course, giving concessions to the highest strata of this bourgeoisie, holds out a perspective not only of struggle on the part of the masses of the workers and peasants, but also of the petty bourgeoisie and even a section of the bourgeoisie against the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Comrade LYU WAN (China):

Comrades, the very fact that the question of the colonial and semi-colonial countries has been put before the Congress in its full scope shows that the national liberation movement plays a colossal role especially now when world capitalism is experiencing an acute crisis. The importance of the colonial and semi-colonial countries has been emphasised already by the Second Congress of the Comintern. The liberation movement of the oppressed peoples is an inseparable and constituent part of the world Socialist revolution. But an important role in the national liberation movement is played by the youth. Comrade Kuusinen's theses and the speeches of many other comrades do not deal

with the youth movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries properly. To my mind this is one of the greatest shortcomings of the theses and speeches on the colonial question.

The basic policy of the imperialist powers in the colonial and semi-colonial countries is that of systematic hampering the development of industry so as to preserve their monopolist position. This fact is so clear and undoubted that there is no need for any special discussions on the matter. The hampering of the development of industry retards the development of the productive forces. This, however, does not mean that there is no industrial development in the colonial countries whatever. On the contrary, we see in China, especially during the war, a development of light industry. It has developed only to an extent commensurate with the requirements of the metropolis. To the extent that light industry develops (the production of cotton goods, silk, etc.), the number of young workers in industry increases. The youth has been playing a colossal part in the struggle of the working class in China. It has taken a most active part in the strike movement. The entire history of the labour movement in China during the last five years bears this out. It would therefore be wrong for the Communists to ignore the role and importance of the youth in the struggle of the working class and the struggle for emancipation of the oppressed peoples in general.

There is to be observed a pauperisation of the peasantry in the colonial and semi-colonial countries as a result of which there is a vast number of unemployed youths. This circumstance gives the capitalists a chance to intensify their exploitation of the youth. The employers hire unemployed youth whom they keep in their homes as slaves. This is now known as the system of "youth training". The masses of unemployed youths find no work in the towns owing to the scanty development of industry. The latter is due to the imperialist policy of hampering the development of industry. In view of this the masses of young workers are becoming declassed. They remain outside of the process of production, and fall into the hands of the militarists as soldiers or become ordinary bandits. That is why the question of the young workers becomes of such vital importance for the development of the Communist movement in the colonies, and especially in China.

As to the petty-bourgeois intellectuals of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, they are somewhat different from the intellectuals of the independent capitalist countries. The colonial and semi-colonial intellectuals play a revolutionary role in the first phase of the revolutionary liberation movement of the masses against imperialist oppression. But the Chinese Revolution has shown that the upper strata of the petty bourgeois intellectuals often vacillate between the forces of reaction and revolution and go over to the side of the counter-revolutionaries when the revolution takes a sharp turn. This experience must be taken into account by all Communist Parties of the colonies and semi-colonies.

During the united front of the national movement, the bourgeoisie attempted to split up the revolutionary youth. Thus, for instance, the Youth Department of the Kuomintang in 1925-26 tried to set up its own youth organisation to compete with the Young Communist League. Of course, it did not succeed. But we already know that the bourgeoisie is trying to do that. From this it follows that the Young Communist League must fight against every effort at organisation of a parallel independent youth organisation as this would greatly hamper the development of Communist influence among the youth.

The first phase of development of the Chinese Revolution is rich not only in positive experience of revolutionary struggle, but also in experience of a negative character. I will take the liberty to remind you of the fact that the Communist leadership in China committed grave errors in that period. It did not wage a determined struggle for the hegemony of the proletariat; it did not stimulate, but, on the contrary, hampered the development of the mass movement; it did not understand the transition of one phase of the revolution into the other; it did not do the necessary preparatory work for that transition; it did not alter its slogans at the proper moment, etc. That was one of the main causes of the defeat of the Chinese Revolution. It goes without saying that the defeat of the Chinese Revolution is also due to numerous objective causes. But the subjective causes of the defeat must be stressed lest the Communist Parties of the colonies and semi-colonies in general commit the same mistakes in as much as they are still young and have not much experience in leading mass struggles.

Comrades, the experience of the past struggles show us that the young workers, peasants and soldiers take most active part in the revolutionary struggle of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The importance of the soldiers' participation in the revolutionary movement is very great. Unfortunately, the work done by our Party in this sphere was inadequate. This lesson must be learned so that the necessary measures may be taken in the future. Experience has shown that the youth movement in the colonies and semi-colonies can be widely developed only on the basis of the specific interests and demands of the youth in their daily struggle for existence. It shows that the development of a Young Communist organisation and the creation of a real strong proletarian basis is inconceivable without an energetic struggle for an improvement of the economic and labour conditions of the youth. Notwithstanding the fact that numerous youth organisations have been destroyed by the white terror the organisation of the young workers and peasants is growing and the influence of the Communists among them is increasing.

We agree with the main theses on the colonial and semi-colonial countries. On the whole it is correct. But this notwithstanding, it has some deficiencies. The experiences and lessons of the past struggle of the Chinese Revolution, for instance, have not been taken into account in the theses. It seems to me that this is very important because these lessons are of great value for the Communist Parties of all colonial and semi-colonial countries.

I want to emphasise also that in the first place the question of the tasks of the youth movement has not been dealt with in the theses, and, secondly, the part dealing with the tasks of the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries at the present time does not formulate the question clearly enough. Nothing is said about the tasks of the anti-imperialist movement. This is also one of the major shortcomings of the theses. I think the Congress will take all this into consideration and will properly define the tasks of the Communist Parties in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and outline the correct course of development and consolidation of the youth movement.

Comrade MARTINEZ (Venezuela):

Stated figures indicating how American imperialism has been penetrating the Latin American countries; and events during recent years have shown the effect of these investments in the economic and political life of these countries. The process of industrialisation is creating a working class that is beginning to play its revolutionary role. Venezuela has been ruled during the past 25 years by the bloodiest dictators ever known in the history of Latin America. All previous revolutionary attempts were made by members of the landed class with sections of the petty bourgeoisie, but without any revolutionary programme. The recent uprising clearly shows a great difference; it was led by the students with the participation of a large section of the workers who went on strike, not for any immediate economic demands, but in solidarity with the imprisoned leaders of the insurrection. A country where there were practically no workers, now employs in the oil industry alone more than 25,000 workers. Out of a population of 3,000,000 it has an industrial population of 262,000 according to the last census.

This economic penetration is producing the same effect in all Latin American countries, but at a more rapid tempo in those countries in the northern part of South America whose economy is of a more backward type. This in its turn will force the United States to extend the policies which have been applied to the Caribbean, Central America and Mexico, to a wider field.

During the past 30 years Latin America has been invaded 36 times, these interventions were made at different intervals, but as a result of the increasing revolutionary activities they are becoming more frequent. Let us take the case of Nicaragua. The first intervention took place in 1899, then in 1907, 1910, 1912 and then 1925—26—27 and 28. During the last four years the United States have been at war with Nicaragua, culminating in the present struggle of Sandino against the mightiest imperialist power, a struggle which is arousing the whole of Latin America.

The rest of the Caribbean is actually a protectorate. American intervention assumes any function according to the peculiar conditions of the country: General Receiver of Customs, High Commissioners, Financial Advisors, etc., but as a matter of fact it is developing more and more into actual military interventions.

Up to now imperialist intervention was limited to Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean Islands, but the American investments in Colombia and Venezuela have increased, since 1913, 615% and 5,300% respectively, mainly in the oil industry. This is very important, because England having been earlier in the field controls in certain places more oil than the U. S. The refineries of the Royal Dutch have a capacity, at the present time, of 70,000 barrels per day. Now comrades picture yourself American imperialism with as many naval bases as England has in the Caribbean, with these tremendous supplies of oil and other important raw materials in the neighbourhood of the Suez Canal, and it will give you an idea of the tremendous importance of the coming struggles in Latin America.

In Mexico the struggles between England and the U. S. took the form of supporting different factions and individuals. But this was in an earlier period, when an actual occupation would have been very costly. In 1902 when England, Germany and Italy tried to test the Monroe Doctrine with the bombardment of Venezuela, they retreated after a very serious situation which almost led to war. Today the situation is different, the antagonism between England and America is much more serious.

We must be very clear in our estimation of the situation in order to prevent that the workers and peasants should fight the wars of the imperialists. In this direction we must do more than we have done up to the present, particularly in relation to all the forms of penetration used by American imperialism. I do not think that sufficient attention has been paid to the question of the Pan-American Union which is the Colonial Department of American imperialism. There is not one field of social activities in which the Pan American Union does not have an active committee functioning. They have Press Conferences, Road Conferences, Railway Conferences, Airway Conferences, etc. etc. These small conferences are the real link that chains Latin America to American imperialism.

Of course, it would not be a complete colonial Department without its labour section, and again we see, the U. S. built and organised the Pan American Federation of Labour at the right moment, in 1917, in order to prevent the labour movement in the Caribbean Region, to get some inspiration from the Mexican Revolution.

In a recent article Comrade Humbert-Droz writes:

"With the exception of the Mexican C. R. O. M., no Labour Movement adheres to it (the Pan-American Federation of Labour) because of its imperialist character".

I do not agree with this formulation. At the last Congress of the P. A. F. of L. there were representatives of Cuba, who represented workers, of Nicaragua, Guatemala, Panama, and Dominican Republic, Salvador, Peru, Porto Rico, Venezuela and Colombia. Some of them were appointed by their own governments (Peru, Cuba, Panama, the Dominican Rep., Guatemala). The Colombian representative did not represent anybody, Venezuela represented a group of exiled workers. But this only shows that in Latin America all forms of reformism, of class collaboration, of working with the existing dictator (the case of Cuba, Machado, with Gomez in Venezuela) is taking place.

I maintain that American Imperialism will start a campaign of corruption amongst the newly rising working class through the Pan American Federation of Labour, and that it will extend parallel with American imperialism. There were no representatives from the Southern countries at the last Congress because British imperialism is much stronger in the South, they go with Amsterdam. This is the reason why at the last Pan American Congress at Havana the only semblance of opposition came from Argentine, and it was the opposition of British imperialism.

I believe that the last two Congresses: of the Pan American Federation of Labour at Washington, and of the Pan American Union, at Havana, give us weapons that we must use to unmask

the real functions of Pan Americanism, the role of the Latin American bourgeoisie and the Labour Fakirs of Latin America. Both Congresses took place at a time when hundreds of Nicaraguans were being slaughtered. A resolution protesting against the crimes of American imperialism was voted down by the Congress at Washington. At the Havana Congress we saw for the first time the whole of Latin America represented. This clearly shows that the increasing revolutionary temper of the Latin American workers and peasants illustrated in those days by the great Sacco and Vanzetti demonstrations is bringing the Latin American bourgeoisie closer to American imperialism.

We expect from the revolutionary workers and their vanguard just as much attention. The Profintern has already initiated work that will organise opposition to the lackeys of American and British imperialism in the labour movement, the P. A. F. of L. and Amsterdam. We have no doubt that the Comintern will also send to Latin America its most capable advisors to help us in the organisation of our parties, that are the only force that will lead the struggle against American imperialism, to its final conclusion: the creation of the Workers' and Peasants' Soviet Republics of Latin America.

Comrade MUSTAPHA (Tunis):

In the Colonial theses, my country, Tunis, is mentioned in the second category, a country where the differentiation of classes is relatively little developed.

The countries of Northern Africa, where Tunis is situated, are primarily agricultural countries. Industry there is very slightly developed; it is reduced to the mining of iron and lead and principally phosphate. The few factories which exist in Tunis are connected with these mining industries. At the present time the proletariat employed in mining comprises 110,000 workers largely unskilled.

Almost the entire population of Tunis lives from or is dependent upon agriculture. In Tunis we have two million inhabitants, 1,500,000 of which live on an income of 100 to 210 francs. It is principally a country of the poor peasantry. For this reason, the question is of great importance, a fact which is not sufficiently emphasised in the theses. In Tunis we see different types of peasant economy. First of all there are the feudal peasants, who are numerically small, and the big landed proprietors. These feudal peasants exploit the great mass of Khammes, that is to say a kind of serf who cultivates the land of the big proprietors in a primitive manner. Then we have the middle and small peasantry owning their own land or else renting Habou or Wakf land. This Habou and Wakf property is inalienable property, very widespread in Tunis. Collective land cultivated by tribes also exists. These tribes have been driven out from the Northern region, but such collective economic units are still to be found in Southern Tunis. This great mass of tribes periodically suffers from drought and famine, and supplies the large army of nomads which regularly travels North to find work and greater resources.

Apart from this backward state of peasant economy, there are the large properties of capitalist cultivators and societies. These cultivators, bourgeois who have come from the ruling country, play a fairly large part. The contradictions between this foreign population and the majority of the native population aspiring to national liberation, give an agrarian character to the national revolution.

At the present time we can say that there is an intensification of the control of imperialism over the colonies, in Northern Africa particularly. It is what they call utilising the colonies. This utilisation takes the form first of all of the extension of colonisation. The new agricultural programme envisages the distribution of 300,000 hectares to the cultivators. A stronger pressure upon the natives must therefore be foreseen, as well as a more intense, more violent or more or less indirect exploitation, and a more complete alienation of Habou and Wakf property. But at the same time the big landholding bourgeoisie is to receive certain political and economic advantages, distribution of new lands, agricultural credits, etc. . . . In this programme there is a plan for a new distribution of 20,000 hectares to some of the native families.

The utilisation of the colonies is manifested also by the extension of the mining industry, by the perfecting of methods

of exploitation, by the construction of new railways and roads, and by the building of new factories for the primary transformation of these mineral products as well as agricultural products. In this way the French capitalists are going to build factories in Tunis for the transformation of phosphate and also of lead, instead of exporting them in raw form as is done at the present time. New tariff conventions will enable French industry to find a greater outlet in Tunis. These new tariff conventions, which will have their effect on industrialisation of the country and on light artisan industry which is still well-developed in Tunis, are directed also against Italian competition.

A few words on the subject of the French-Italian conflict which is growing more and more acute. At the present time French imperialism is taking a great many measures for the defence of its colonies against the designs of Italian imperialism. First of all in the development of the naval base of Sidi Abdallah, the building of new railway-lines and strategic roads, especially in the direction of Tripoli. All this is being carried out in connection with the French plan of autonomous defence for Northern Africa, of which the Algerian comrade just spoke.

The Franco-Italian conflict has its effect also upon the internal policy of the French Government in Tunis. Through a clever policy of naturalisation, it is winning over part of the Italian population of Tunis, which constitutes a permanent danger for imperialism, because this population is numerically greater than the French population. Secondly, French imperialism is attempting to win over a part of the native bourgeoisie to its policy, because Italian imperialism is seeking to influence this native bourgeoisie. This Franco-Italian conflict threatens to give the national movement in Tunis an orientation in the direction of the defence of Tunis, i. e. in the sense of the defence of the Tunis "fatherland" which would actually result in strengthening French imperialism.

Our Party has reacted energetically, denouncing this policy of French imperialism in a manifesto. It has warned the population of Tunis against the manoeuvres of the two imperialisms and has issued the slogan of struggle against both these imperialisms and for the independence of Tunis.

I shall now pass on to the national movement itself. There is a national party, under the leadership of Destour, which demands the constitution. During the past years this party has gone through an evolution which is very characteristic. Formed immediately after the war in 1918, it carried on a certain revolutionary struggle in the course of the crisis of 1918-22, resulting in great mass action; many of its militants were beaten up. At one time there were more than 100,000 members, and its demonstrations forced the Bey of Tunis to submit the national demands to France. I must tell you that at that time the Destour party comprised nearly all strata of the Tunis population: feudal, petty-bourgeois and peasant. It was then that French imperialism began to practise its policy of corruption the first act of which was the concession to Tunis of the famous "reforms" of 1922, which conceded certain political rights to the feudal landowners and big landed proprietors and assured it the support of this class. The Destour party, after the events of 1922, slid into a policy of frank compromise and capitulation before French imperialism.

This policy of capitulation was evident at the time of the coming into power of the Left bloc, when Destour immediately attempted to calm down the effervescence which was evident in Tunis. It was shown by the alliance of Destour with the reformist-socialists, who are the worst lackeys of imperialism in Tunis. And when the workers' movement reached its height in 1924 we found Destour renouncing this movement and attempting to break it up. Destour did nothing to support the militants among the ranks of his party who were persecuted by imperialism. He even abandoned some of these militants. This policy of capitulation was evident also during the Moroccan war, when Destour maintained a completely passive attitude.

This policy of capitulation and compromise was the cause of the almost complete liquidation of the Destour party which at the present time is kept alive only by a few remaining organisations.

Parallel with this treachery of the national party, the French Government practised an extremely clever policy of corruption. After having won over the feudal and landed proprietor class, it undertook to get a new strata of the population to break away from the Destour party, namely the middle section of landholders. I just told you that it distributed a large quantity of

land among them. Although this measure was of no importance whatsoever, it sufficed to give the bourgeoisie a certain hope of seeing their lot improved by French imperialism. This policy of corruption was also one of the chief factors in the almost complete liquidation of the Destour party.

Recently the Government granted new reforms. These new reforms were received with satisfaction by the intellectual bourgeoisie which makes up the leadership of the Destour party, as certain political rights were given to them. The revolutionary manifesto of the Destour party in 1922 has been completely changed, although this programme contains nothing further than demands of the intellectual bourgeoisie.

While the leaders of the Destour party were carrying out this policy, we participated in vigorous struggles: resistance of the peasants to expropriation, unrest caused by the great famines in 1923 and 1927, demonstrations of the small traders and poor students, as well as the great wave of strikes of the Tunis proletariat during 1924 and 1925, which involved thousands of workers and were marked by the bloody strikes of Bizerte, of d'Harmann-el-ly, in factories and quarries and even in the mines. This great wave of strikes resulted in the formation of a national revolutionary autonomous trade union organisation of the Tunis proletariat, the Tunis C. G. T. But French imperialism at once launched a policy of ferocious repression against this great mass movement. In addition to the firing on strikers at Bizerte and the suppression of the strikes, it took the form of the arrest of many workers, the dissolution of the C. G. T. of Tunis and the Communist Party, the suppression of revolutionary publications and the banishment of the whole Central Committee of the revolutionary trade union organisation.

After this period of bitter repression there was a certain lapse in the labour movement. But with the increased exploitation of French imperialism, we are now facing a revival of labour struggles. At the present time the proletariat shows a strong desire for struggle and organisation. This organisation is being now carried on in the formation of reformist trade unions, within the C. G. T. trade unions of **Jouhaux**.

The **Socialist Party of Tunis** is composed of French, chiefly employees. Its policy is to serve French imperialism by upholding the illusions of the Tunis masses and also by the acute struggle against Communism and against the revolutionary national movement. The Socialist Party, which at the time of the big strikes carried on a huge campaign against the C. G. T. of Tunis, has a completely imperialistic policy which we can expose by careful systematic work. The organisation of the workers of Tunis which is now being carried on in the reformist C. G. T. is largely due to the loss of influence of the Communist Party.

I should like to say a few words about the Communist Party. Our Party was formed in 1920. In the beginning it had a great influence on the masses of Tunis. It even had a daily paper and a weekly. It was this Party which led the big struggles of 1925—25; and which was at the head of the C. G. T. of Tunis. Several of its militants were banished with the Central Committee of the revolutionary trade union organisations. But our Party could not hold out against the repressions. This was due chiefly to its poor social composition and to its poor organisation. But even though it was reduced to a very small group, the Communist Party was able to maintain its influence among the working masses. But it committed serious errors: for instance in 1925, the under-estimation of the repression, as well as the failure to understand the desire for struggle and organisation among the working class; also its tendency to work as a sect, especially after the repression of 1925 and 1926 which tendency was favoured by the illegal existence it has been forced into; and then the under-estimation of the government policy of corruption and of the Socialist policy of illusions.

At the present time these errors have been in part corrected thanks to the intervention of the French Party which has already devoted a great deal of attention to colonial work, — which has not always been the case, particularly not in 1924 and 1925, when we were completely cut off from the French Party.

This new situation and these new conditions have forced us to adopt new tactics in order to put the Communist Party again at the head of the labour movement.

Our tasks now are:

1. The support of the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement and the exposure of its conciliatory elements.
2. The trade union organisation of the native workers, the necessity for regaining our former influence through an effective struggle in the very ranks of the working class, and by a serious effort to combat the reformist and Socialist policy.
3. The organisation of a strong Communist Party.

The labour struggles and the present situation offer great possibilities for us to develop the Party, and we must therefore devote our efforts above all to a vast recruiting as well as to a strong ideological reinforcement of the Party.

I am convinced that through the new orientation of the Party, through serious efforts on the part of the French Party in the colonies and thanks also to the definite decisions contained in the colonial theses, we shall be able to form a strong Communist Party in Tunis, a Party which is truly Bolshevik in its social composition and ideological strength, and to gain again the influence which it had among the Tunis masses. (Applause.)

Comrade IBAROLA (Paraguay):

Comrades, as a political entity Paraguay has lost its national stability. There is a struggle going on there between British and Yankee imperialism for supremacy. The British economic sphere extends through the Eastern Section where the plantations are and covers part of the railroads of Alto Parano and 40 stock-raising farms with 200,000 animals. These farms are favourable for stock-raising because they include large pasture-lands of 600 to 800 "leguas" (one legua is equivalent to 3 square kilometres). The British are also in possession of large forest property from which they export lumber to Argentina. They rent out part of their farms to the peasants at a rate reaching 30 and 35% of their harvest. Their refrigerating stations in Zaballos-Cueque handle 1,000 animals a day. They also own two navigation lines. In addition to that, British imperialism has a representative who collects each month the taxes on the export duty which serves as amortisation for a debt of 3,280,000 pesos contracted with England. Recently the British also bought tramway and electrical concerns.

Yankee imperialism dominates the Western section, that is to say, the "Chaco" (swamps) as well as the exploitation of forests to the extent of 500 to 700 "leguas". It also owns industrial enterprises (refrigerating stations, etc.) in the towns of Pinasco, Sastre and Guarani. The harbour of the capital of the country has been turned over to it by a 14-year concession. It is the chief harbour of the country and practically all the trading is carried on there.

Recently negotiations have been in progress with a view to granting a concession of the iron mine at Ibicui to Americans who, through secret purchase, have also acquired the oil fields in the district of Chaoco on the Bolivian border. These secret sales are still concealed from the military government; attempts are being made to gain its sympathy first by corruption of officials and Parliament. To facilitate this sale of the oil lands, the American Government has offered a loan of five million dollars, which, according to official indications, should serve to guarantee the metal reserve of Paraguayan money which has greatly depreciated: 1,000 gold pesos are worth 4,125 Paraguayan pesos. On this question of the economic intervention of Yankee imperialism, the national bourgeoisie is divided into two fractions, one upholding Yankee imperialism and the other backing British imperialism. The Communist Party is successfully combatting the intervention of both imperialisms, denouncing the activity of Yankee imperialism, which through a war between Bolivia and Paraguay, is attempting to get control of the oil region of Chaoco as well as this secret sale of the oil wealth of the country which was carried out by the leaders of the liberal-radical party.

I said in the beginning that Paraguay has lost its political stability, that its bourgeoisie is divided into two opposing camps. In the course of this struggle, the Communist Party has successfully held a number of meetings.

Consequently we are on the eve of great events in which the Communist Party will play an important role in the political arena and will facilitate the political conquest of power by the proletariat.

TO OUR READERS!

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

England	2 sh.
America	50 cents
Germany	1.50 marks
Austria	2 schillings
Norway	1.50 crowns
Sweden	1.50 crowns
Denmark	1.50 crowns
U. S. S. A.	1 rouble

For all other countries the subscription rate is 3 dollars for six months.

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 Business Manager.