

SPECIAL NUMBER

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL -
PRESS
CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 8 No. 76

30th 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, Schliesstach 213, Vienna IX.
Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

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

(FULL REPORT.)

Thirty-sixth Session.

Moscow, 18th August 1928 (Morning).

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

Chairman: Comrade Lacerda (Brasil).

Comrade PADI (Indonesia):

On behalf of our Delegation, I wish to make some few remarks on three points in the theses of Comrade Kuusinen:

In Par. 5, Page 5, we read:

"Colonial exploitation however, which is carried on by the same British, French and other bourgeoisies, far sooner retards the development of the forces of production in the respective countries."

On Page 14, Paragraph 15, we read:

"This poverty of the peasants means simultaneously a crisis in the industrial home market, and on its part constitutes a severe limitation on the capitalist development of the country."

In our opinion on the contrary, the poverty of the peasants and the declining purchasing power of the colonial proletariat hastens the capitalist development of the country. The poor peasants and the workers, on account of growing unemployment and cutting down of wages, cannot buy foreign goods. In order to enable the colonial proletariat to buy cheap goods the exploiting bourgeoisie is compelled to industrialise the colonies in

order to sell goods at cheaper prices. The chance of industrialisation of the colonies is not slight, because the raw materials are very easy to get and at cheap price and the wages of workers in the colonial countries are far lower than those of the capitalist countries.

We read further in Paragraph 6, Page 6.:

"A real industrialisation of the country, especially the building up of an efficient machine industry, which make for the independent development of the productive forces of the country are not fostered by imperialist monopoly, but are retarded."

Our opinion is that since the stabilisation of Europe a beginning is made to foster industrialisation in certain industries. We cannot say with certainty how big the amount of foreign new capital already transferred to the colonies since the stabilisation is, but it is certain that the transfer of enormous amounts of new capital in the different enterprises is going on. We believe that our comrades know very well that foreign capital, viz., accumulation of surplus value which is being transferred to the colonial countries gives more profit when it is put in sugar, rubber, tobacco and other enterprises than in heavy industries. For example, in Indonesia many enterprises pay 30-60%

dividends to their shareholders. This is a proof that capital in plantation is more profitable than in the heavy industries. We know that with the increased influx of capital in the colonies and simultaneously with the development of modern means of transport and of repair workshops for sugar, tea, coffee, tobacco, oil factories, heavy industries will arise inevitably to meet the direct requirements of machines and other articles at cheaper prices than imported from abroad. The chance of industrialisation is thus not a light one, because labour in the colonies is very cheap. We therefore believe that industrialisation of certain colonial countries will develop in the future to a certain extent.

We further note in the these of Comrade Kuusinen in Paragraph 12, which reads:

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

To show the difficulty to carry out this task, we will take as example the relation between the white workers and coloured workers in Indonesia, which we think may also be an example for the Negro workers in America. The white workers (Dutch) in Indonesia who are holding generally the position of overseers, mechanics, metal workers, form a group of well-paid workers with average wages far higher than the native workers. The white workers are earning not less than 100 to 300 guilders monthly, especially those who are employed in the sugar, rubber and oil industries enjoy enormous bonuses from 1,000 to 3,000 guilders yearly, while native workers (skilled labour) and coolies are getting not more than 20 to 50 guilders monthly without any other privileges. The white workers are generally a reserve cadre of imperialism. The white workers, knowing the higher life in Europe, work very hard in the colonies to earn as much money as they can. The class differentiation between the white and coloured workers in the colonies creates enormous hatred of the latter. This is being purposely promoted by the Dutch imperialists to continue its policy of divide and rule. This is being proved by many murders of white workers in tobacco, rubber, sugar plantations. These victims are used as tools by the exploited foreign bourgeoisie. The murder and attack on the white workers in Indonesia is growing in the last two years. This is not the fault of the coloured workers, but is the result of the policy of the Dutch imperialists who use the white workers as tools of suppression, strike breakers, etc.

Already since the establishment of the Sarekat Islam (The Union of Moslems in the year 1912) the hatred to all what may be called "Christianity" and "white people" was and is prevailing throughout Indonesia. After the outbreak of the November rebellion in Indonesia this feeling is becoming more acute than ever before. The sharp class-differentiation between well-paid white workers and badly-paid coloured workers and the cruel exploitation of the Dutch imperialists are factors creating a mood which in time of colonial revolution will take the form of revenge of the colonial peoples on all what is "white" and this revenge will be more cruel than that which the Russian workers took of the Russian bourgeoisie and Tsarism.

We are giving here the number of white workers organised in special trade unions. On the whole there are in Indonesia 170,000 Europeans of which 40,000 are male adults.

Federation of Public Servants.

In the year 1925 membership	9617
" " " 1926	6548

Union of Higher Officials.

In the year 1925, organised members	758
" " " 1926, " "	700

European Federation of Employees.

In the year 1924, organised members	2388
-------------------------------------	------

Group of Non-Affiliated Trade Unions.

In the year 1925 organised members	5,766
" " " 1926 " "	10,579

Some of these organisations are in the hands of Social Democrats or organised by Liberals. In time of peace they advocate co-operation, but in times of conflict between coloured workers and the bosses, they hire themselves to the bosses as tools. We have little hope of creating a revolutionary united front of white workers and coloured workers as proved by the critical situation in Indonesia. We therefore recommend to the Congress to instruct our parties in Western Europe to carry on propaganda against the coming of white workers to the colonies with the explanation that the position of the white workers is very dangerous and at the same time their coming to the colonies means the strengthening of the exploitation of imperialism.

Comrade LOZERAY (France):

Comrades, the French delegation does not think that it is necessary to deal again with the reasons for the colonial policy of French imperialism, as this point was already given due prominence by its representatives during the general discussion. On the other hand, we are willing to take the draft thesis as the basis of discussion, reserving to ourselves to make our remarks in the Colonial Commission.

As the reasons for the colonial policy of French imperialism have already been given, we will examine now how this policy is being effected.

First of all, we witness annexation of land belonging to the natives. This annexation takes various forms: 1. confiscation of land after insurrections and colonial wars (in 1926-27 40,000 hectares were taken away from the tribes of the French zone of the Riff and given to French colonists); 2. "legal" expropriation said to be of public utility, for the extension or creation of colonisation centres; 3. pauperisation of the natives owing to periodical famines, usury, taxes, fines, etc.

In Algeria 12 million hectares of the best land was taken away from the natives by imperialism out of 21 million hectares of arable land, and 3 million hectares are already the private property of European colonists.

In Tunisia out of 9 millions of arable land, 750,000 hectares are already the private property of European colonists. The average per French colonist is 850 hectares.

In Morocco 750,000 hectares are owned by 2,000 European colonists, mostly French.

In regard to the two latter countries, the figures we give refer exclusively to private property, but to have an exact idea of the magnitude of the dispossession of the natives, we must add the millions of hectares which belong to imperialism in the form of Crown land.

In Indo-China where expropriation has reached considerable proportions, it will be enough to give a few figures to give you an idea of the imperialist robbery. For instance the area conceded to 26 mining companies amounts to 150,000 hectares (coal mines in Tonkin: 22,000 hectares, Kebao area: 25,000 hectares); the area conceded for rubber plantations amounts to 120,000 hectares, etc. etc.

The same expropriation policy is pursued also in the other French colonies. It frequently leads to public scandals which reveal the predatory policy of the imperialists. This was the case in regard to the Maillot concession in Indo China which received 25,000 hectares, in regard to the Trechot Freres concession who received free of charge an immense area of 3 million hectares in the French West Africa; then there is also the Haut Ogoué Co., which owns 4 million hectares.

This expropriation policy has resulted in an accentuated pauperisation of the native masses. This pauperisation leads in its turn to the proletarianisation of a section of the natives, while another section is driven to the sterile regions where the natives are decimated by periodical famines.

Parallel with this policy of dispossessing the natives there has been since the war a tendency to develop industry. This industry takes mostly the form of transforming agricultural produce mainly into foodstuffs. Public works and electrification are also developed in the interests of the budding industry and the colonists.

The following figures will give you an approximate idea of the importance of industry in the chief French colonies: the capital invested in the colonies on the eve of the war of 1914 was estimated at 4,000 millions. In 1921 this figure had in-

creased to 8,000 millions, including 4.5 in North Africa, 2,000 millions of this being the share of Algeria. Although we are not in a position to illustrate by exact figures the progress of the investment of capital since 1921, we can say that it has not slackened. — the contrary is the case as is fully confirmed by the following fragmentary figures:

In Morocco capital invested in industry, railways, etc., amounted in 1925 approximately to 3,000 millions; in 1927 it amounted to approximately 4,500 millions, which means an increase of 1,500 millions.

The following figures will give you a very good idea of the industrial development of the French zone in Morocco:

				millions capital
In 1918 there were	157 industrial concerns with			40
" 1924 "	" " 615 "	" "	" "	247
" 1925 "	" " 709 "	" "	" "	280
" 1927 "	" " 800 "	" "	exceeding	450

Leaving aside Indo-China concerning which Comrade Ercoli as well as the Indo-Chinese delegate have already given figures, we want merely to point out that 2,000 million francs are invested in industry exclusive of loans and capital invested in railways.

In 1927, 13% of the total external trade of French imperialism, 11.5% of its import and 15% of its export were transacted with its colonies.

To maintain its economic predominance which began to be threatened by the other imperialist States it strengthens the custom barriers which it has established around the subjugated colonial countries.

The accentuation of contradictions between the imperialists in regard to a redistribution of colonies (Italian aspirations in regard to Tunisia), the necessity for French imperialism of securing an important strategical position in the Mediterranean and the Pacific, the recent colonial movements (Morocco, Syria, China) and their repercussions in all French colonies, have induced French imperialism to take upon itself the defence of North Africa and to reinforce its military positions in Indo-China.

In order to resist more effectively the other imperialists in Africa and to suppress more rapidly the rebellions of the colonial peoples which it oppresses as well as civil war in France, French imperialism reinforces the troops stationed in these countries, equips its gendarmerie with the latest weapons, corrupts sections of the native population in order to convert them into professional soldiers, increases its pressure on the native youth so as to compel it to enlist in the French army, increases the stocks of war material, creates in North Africa works for the manufacture of such material and constructs mainly for military reasons the Trans-Sahara Railway which will connect North Africa with Black Africa. All this is accompanied by systematic repression of the revolutionary proletariat and all those who struggle for the independence of North Africa.

In Indo-China French imperialism puts into repair the old fortifications on the Chinese frontier and constructs new ones, it reinforces its gendarmerie and military apparatus in the South of Annam, it pursues feverishly the construction of the Trans-Indo-China Railway; finally it gives a modernised equipment to the port of Saigon in order to convert it into an important naval and air base. All this in view of its future war in the Pacific against the other imperialist States as well as against the rebellions of the oppressed masses of Indo-China. Its policy in Indo-China aims also at participation in the division of China intended by the imperialists.

In all the colonies the pauperisation of the native masses — a consequence of the imperialist policy — increased imperialist exploitation and oppression provoke violent reactions on the part of these masses.

We have witnessed in Morocco, Syria, the insurrections of 1925-26. In Morocco armed struggles are even taking place now.

In Indo-China while peasant rebellions succeeded one another in the interior of the country, the revolutionary Annamites organised an armed struggle on the borders of North Annam under the slogan of "Independence of Indo-China"; there were also students' and workers' strikes, revolts of coolies on the plantations. All these manifestations are ruth-

lessly suppressed. We cannot help deploring the fact that the Communist international has no strong section in Indo-China capable of leading these actions and of converting isolated terrorist actions into a big and powerful revolutionary movement.

In Algeria, Tunisia, Morocco and Senegal industrial workers and agricultural labourers' strikes, isolated peasant demonstrations are becoming more and more numerous and frequent and are assuming a more and more combative character. Together with a radicalisation of the native masses we witness also a decided tendency towards organisation.

We will not enlarge on the role played, side by side with imperialism, by the French Socialist leaders and the colonial socialists in regard to the colonial oppression, as Comrade Ercoli has already dealt in detail with this question on the basis of material published by our Party.

Class differentiations are becoming accentuated in the main French colonies. Apart from a few feudal lords in the South of Morocco we notice an ever growing tendency among the big bourgeoisie and the native landowners towards imperialism.

We would like to deal with the results achieved by the French Party in the colonial sphere.

At the time of the Morocco and Syrian wars the C. P. F. was able to induce big sections of the French proletariat to give effective support to the national liberation struggle of these peoples; it has succeeded in impressing a considerable number of workers and peasants with the necessity of a broad anti-imperialist united front between the oppressed masses of the colonies and the workers in the mother country.

In the ranks of our Party we were able to make our membership adopt a clearer attitude to the extremely important colonial question. This was not such an easy matter. We had at times to struggle against colonial elements a long time resident in the Metropolis who have become dissociated from the masses of their native country. We have driven out of our ranks Right elements who considered the Moroccan people as an inferior race. We have expelled from our Algerian organisation Europeans imbued with the colonialist conception; we have to a certain extent succeeded in getting natives to join the organisations of the Party in North Africa and even participate in the Executive. In spite of the absence of organisations of our Party in the other colonies, we have succeeded in circulating our agitational material, in making known the standpoint of the Party in regard to unconditional independence of the French colonies.

The appreciable results which we obtained in the colonial sphere do not make us forget the weak points of the work of the French Party.

In regard to the wars in Morocco and Syria the Party has not done enough in the colonies to help and accelerate the development of class differentiations in order to intensify the revolutions and to give them a wider social basis, more in keeping with the aspirations of the chief masses: the poor and landless

peasantry.

In the mother country the agitation of the Party in regard to colonial questions, just as in regard to the other questions, was kept too much within parliamentary limits.

Generally speaking, in the colonies our Party did not dissociate itself sufficiently, as the Party of the proletariat, from other social sections of the population which are also struggling against imperialism.

We are determined to overcome our weaknesses which are greatly due to the Party's inexperience in this kind of work, because it was only after the V Congress of the C. I. that our Party began to turn its attention to colonial work. The big tasks confronting us are:

1) Making the Party as a whole better acquainted with colonial questions in order to enable us to carry on a more intensive agitation and propaganda among the masses of the mother country and especially among the many colonial elements in France from whose midst we will form proletarian cadres for the colonies.

2) Pursuing our work in the colonies and intensifying it for the purpose of establishing fighting organisations of the colonial proletariat; forming colonial proletarian cadres with a view to preparing them to assume leadership over their organisations.

3) Developing our agitation in the colonies under the slogan of the struggle for independence and against the national bourgeoisie. Accompanying this agitation with systematic organisational work among poor natives. Giving emphasis in the colonies to our class attitude especially in regard to the national revolutionary movements.

And in conclusion we reiterate our will to pursue and strengthen the work which we have begun in the colonies after the V. Congress and we ask the C. I. to watch over and control more attentively our activity in this sphere, enabling us thereby to overcome our weaknesses more rapidly and to strengthen our struggle for the national and proletarian revolution in the colonies oppressed by our imperialism.

Comrade NARAYAN (India):

Comrades, one of the most fundamental differences between the opportunistic attitude of the Amsterdam International to the colonial policy and the revolutionary attitude of the Third International has been very well defined at the Second Congress of the Communist International by Comrade Lenin in his theses on the colonial countries. Since that time the Communist International is following a definite revolutionary attitude towards the colonies.

From the Second Congress to the Sixth Congress, very fundamental developments have taken place in the colonial movements. On behalf of the **Indian delegation** I welcome the theses on the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies and especially because of the very great stress that has been laid on the Indian question. But there are some contradictions in the theses, which I want to point out.

At the 6th page of the theses, we find such a statement:

"The real industrialisation of the colonial countries, especially the building up of efficient machine industries which might make for the independent development of the productive forces of the country, are not fostered by imperialist monopoly, but are retarded. This is its basic function in colonial subjugation. The colonial country is forced to sacrifice the interests of its independent development... and to serve as the economic market for capitalism in order to strengthen the economic and political power of the bourgeoisie of the imperialist country, in order to perpetuate monopoly in the colony and to increase the expansion power of the respective imperialists as against the rest of the world."

Comrades, I consider that this statement does not give a true picture of the development of the dynamic growth of capitalism, of industrialism in India. Up to the war the policy of British imperialism in India was the policy of the classical form of imperialistic exploitation. It consisted in keeping India as a source of raw material and a market for the industrial products of British industries. There was a deliberate policy of keeping India a backward country, and not to allow it to develop its industries. High tariffs, high duties and embargoes on machinery were imposed by the British imperialists in order to prevent the industrialisation of India.

At that period British capital in India was solely used for railways, for irrigation work, for harbours, that is, for the sole purpose of the expansion of the market. British imperialism does not follow the same old method of exploitation in India today. There were fundamental objective conditions which led to the change of the policy of British imperialism towards India.

The reasons for this change are: first, the conditions during and after the war. It was necessary that in India war material should be manufactured to be supplied to Mesopotamia and other Eastern bases of war. England could not effectively supply war materials unless industries, especially war industries, were developed in India. This led to the setting up of the Industrial Commission in 1916 which marked a turn in the policy of British imperialism in India.

The second cause was that Japan and America seriously threatened British monopoly of the Indian market. England was unable, without developing India industrially, to cope with this situation. This led to the virtual abandonment of the traditional policy of free trade and the recognition of differential protectionism in India which we find, for instance, in the **Bombay industries**. This clearly shows that for the stabilisation of British industries during this period of decay it was absolutely necessary that India should be industrialised.

The industrialisation of India creates a market for British engineering and metallurgical industries. Cheap Indian labour could be more effectively exploited in order to achieve this stabilisation of British industry.

The taxation commission was set up. The sole purpose was to adjust the burden of taxation in order to expand the internal market. The scheme for modernisation of agriculture was formulated for the purpose of raising the purchasing power of the peasantry.

The third important cause which led to this policy was that India could not be made a military base of British imperialism in the East unless the support of the national bourgeoisie was bought over, and the national bourgeoisie could not be bought over unless some concessions were given to it.

What is the political expression of this policy? It means that in order to industrialise India, it is necessary to extend the internal market, to make certain agrarian reforms which it is impossible for British imperialism to achieve in India owing to the very complicated land tenure system in India.

This industrialisation leads to pauperisation of the peasantry which involves the possibility of an agrarian revolution; industrialisation gives rise to the development of the proletariat which brings with it the possibility of Socialist revolution; industrialisation causes a change in the attitude of the national bourgeoisie — all these are the political causes which give rise to the change of England's economic policy towards India.

Unless we see this process dialectically, we lose all perspective and we come to certain wrong conclusions on the role of the native bourgeoisie in India and we shall arrive at the same wrong conclusions as the author of the theses.

So long as imperialism was obstructing the capitalist development in India, the Indian bourgeoisie was a driving force. The change of policy has already led to a corresponding change in the attitude of the Indian bourgeoisie towards British imperialism. We find that to the same degree as the hindrance in the way of the capitalist development of India has been removed by British imperialism, the bourgeoisie is sliding more and more towards co-operation and one group after the other is capitulating to imperialism. The Indian bourgeoisie never in its history adopted a revolutionary attitude towards British imperialism. It never went beyond constitutional agitation; and when the critical moment arrived, they have betrayed the movement. Anybody conversant with the Indian National movement knows that the Indian bourgeoisie is connected with feudalism, it cannot raise the masses, it cannot bring in any agrarian reforms without cutting its own ground and it would never do it.

Now let us see how this role of the bourgeoisie has been formulated in the theses. We see on page 17, paragraph 19, that "as an independent class rule, a future of 'free' and independent capitalist development, a hegemony over an independent people — this will never be given voluntarily to the national bourgeoisie by imperialism. But this is precisely the class aim of this bourgeoisie, their future as an independent class, as a ruling representative of an independent nation. In this point the conflict of interests between the national bourgeoisie of the colonial country and the imperialists is objectively of a principle character, it is unbridgable, it demands **capitulation from one side or the other.**"

Too much stress on the nature and intensity of the conflict between the national bourgeoisie of the colonial country and the imperialist bourgeoisie has led to certain inaccurate conclusions. Let us see: on page 21, paragraph 23:

"In the first preparatory period of the revolutionary movement of these countries, when the organisation of the proletariat and the influence of the Communist Party is still weak, but that of the bourgeois parties on the other hand is much stronger, when the latter occupy the leading position in the national movement because in the interests of the demands of the national bourgeoisie for power they still temporarily demonstrate their opposition (no matter how vacillating and reformist) against the ruling imperialist-feudal power bloc, and when the masses of the population follow along behind them, in this stage (as at present e. g. in India and Egypt), it would be an ultra-Left mistake to start the Communist Party agitation by simply identifying the national-reformists (Swarajists, Wafdists and others)

with the ruling counter-revolutionary bloc of imperialists and feudal lords”...

... and a little lower ...

“It is not true that the Swarajists, Wafdists and others have already exposed themselves in the eyes of the toiling masses as allies of imperialism, as counter-revolutionary traitors to the national movement”.

A few lines later on:

“The Swarajists, Wafdists, etc., have not yet betrayed the national liberation struggle in the decisive manner in which e. g. the Kuomintang did in China.”

The conclusions are that the Communist Party in India should keep quiet and not criticise the vacillation of the reformist bourgeoisie because it has yet to play a certain revolutionary role. It is here said that “they have not betrayed the national liberation movement in a decisive manner.” This is far from being true. The **Bardoli decision** was a definite betrayal of the Indian masses by the nationalists in 1922 when the great mass upheavals took place and there was the greatest possibility of an agrarian revolution breaking out in India. The bourgeoisie decisively betrayed the movement under the leadership of **Ghandi**, out of pure and simple class interest. It was the menace of the agrarian revolution which forced the national bourgeoisie to betray the movement. Perhaps not in the same manner as the treacherous counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie which in China shed the blood of millions of proletarians and peasants, but it was also the Indian bourgeoisie which deceived the national liberation movement of the masses at this particular period.

At the end of the paragraph we find:

“The Indian Communists’ agitation in this stage should not concentrate the sharpest fight against the bourgeoisie, but should turn it against the present immediate chief foe, the ruling imperialist feudal bloc.”

I consider that also this statement does not give a realistic appreciation of the situation in India and of the growing counter-revolutionary attitude of the bourgeoisie towards the national revolutionary movement in India. This is a tactical blunder of the worst type.

Now I come to another question which is in the last paragraph of the theses — page 37, paragraph 32. Here in describing the activities of the **Workers’ and Peasant Parties** and drawing the conclusions, we read:

“The special Workers’ and Peasant Parties, no matter how revolutionary they may be, can all too easily be transformed into ordinary petty bourgeois Parties. Therefore the organising of such Parties is inadvisable just as the Communist Party cannot build itself upon a foundation of an amalgamation upon two classes, so it is just as wrong to organise other Parties on this foundation, which is typical for petty bourgeois members.”

It seems to me that some of the comrades are scared with the nightmare which is the result of their own irrational fantasy that the Workers’ and Peasant Party is a substitute of the Communist Party. Nobody has ever put forward that the Workers’ and Peasant Party would be a substitute for the Communist Party.

The petty bourgeois elements in the country who have been proletarianised are sometimes more proletarian than the proletariat themselves. The petty bourgeois intelligentsia, the urban petty bourgeoisie, have to play a role in the revolutionary movement in the colonies. What should be the organisational expression of the anti-imperialist front of the petty bourgeois elements? Can we afford to swamp the Communist Party with such petty bourgeois elements? We cannot. On the other hand, the Communist Party of India should utilise the revolutionary energies of the petty bourgeoisie. I think it is clear that this anti-imperialist front can only take the organisational form of a Workers’ and Peasant Party composed of the urban intelligentsia and the petty bourgeois elements, under the leadership of the proletariat. On this point we ought to call to mind what Comrade Stalin said in his speech before the Eastern University in May 1925, dealing specially with India.

These Workers and Peasants Parties which started in India in 1925 have been carrying on a definite line of action. This

Party organised 30,000 workers in Bombay in demonstrations against the Simon Commission under such slogans as “Down with Imperialism”, “Absolute independence of India” and other such revolutionary slogans. Strike movements today are being led by the Workers’ and Peasant Party. The strike in Lilloah was led by the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party under the control of the Communist Party of India. We have been able to take over some trade unions from the reformist leadership, to organise peasant unions; now we are told to liquidate all these Workers’ and Peasant Parties. This is pure and simple professorial dogmatism against which Lenin warned us so many times.

But if you look at the situation in India itself, which are the channels through which the Communists are making their influence felt among the masses? I think it is quite clear that, under the leadership of the Communist Party of India, the workers’ and peasants’ parties are a valuable help for the propagation of Communist ideas in India. There has been no other revolutionary orientation in the Indian Nationalist movement before the workers and peasants party appeared in the field. And today all the Left elements in the country are orientating towards these organisations, and a certain crystallisation of the Left forces has been taking place through these workers’ and peasants’ parties.

And therefore I think that this formulation is absolutely wrong, both in principle and tactically.

In the same clause it is said that this by no means excludes the organisation of the fighting bloc of the workers and peasant masses, which is necessary for the conquest of power in the bourgeois democratic revolution at the time of the uprising in the form of elected Soviets and in loose organisational forms. Loose organisational forms are admitted, and such organisations can be formed between the peasants and workers. But when the concrete party comes in the field as a Left party which gives an orientation to the whole nationalist revolutionary movement in India, it is to be liquidated. I do not understand the logic of this whole argument, and I consider it is a very weak and unrealistic attitude towards the Workers’ and Peasants’ Party.

Comrade GRIFFIN (New Zealand):

Comrades: In considering the theses on the revolutionary movement in the colonies and semi-colonies, is it not necessary to make some analysis which will include the **dominions of the British Empire**, which have been at one stage colonies, and have developed from that stage to a higher status within the British Empire? Is consideration of **Canada** of no importance to the revolutionary movement? Similarly, are **Australia** and **New Zealand** of no importance in considering the theses on the colonial question?

I consider that they are, and it must be obvious to the Congress as a whole that they must be considered in this question. Having already agreed on the danger of war, all other questions should be considered in relation to this. In the event of a Pacific war, Australia and New Zealand would be the base of operations for Great Britain in the Pacific, or else an objective of American imperialism, or both.

In addition to that, in the event of a revolutionary upsurge in **India** or **China**, the same situation appears to be quite possible, that Australia and New Zealand may be a base of operations for Great Britain against India or China. Therefore, I think the theses in that respect, apart from any other, lacks sufficient attention to this important question.

Apart from that, Australia and New Zealand, though dominions, have their own imperialist tendencies. It is not so many years ago since a military force was sent from New Zealand to Fiji to suppress a strike, which had taken place there, of Indian workers employed in the sugar plantations. Shortly before I left, New Zealand battleships had been sent to Samoa, and special military police were sent up there against the natives who had indulged in a strong agitation against the New Zealand administration of Samoa, over which New Zealand has control as a result of a mandate from the League of Nations.

Similarly, Australia has questions which must be considered in a colonial theses. The White Australian policy, which is supported by the Labour Parties in the States of Australia, and which excludes Indians, Chinese and coloured people in

general from Australia, has been considered of sufficient importance for the Indian nationalists to attack the New Zealand and Australian governments on account of this policy.

Australia also has its imperialist tendencies as far as New Guinea and Islands of the Pacific are concerned.

While I have classed New Zealand and Australia together, I do not want to create the impression that New Zealand is a tag on Australia. It has been said that New Zealand is a bobtail on the Australian kite. That is not correct. In the event of a war situation, New Zealand would be controlled by Australia. But at the present time, they are both independent politically and economically, and have their definite relations with Great Britain. New Zealand is five days by sea from Australia, and it cannot be considered as an appendage of Australia, although I have met that impression amongst comrades. If New Zealand is a bobtail on anyone's kite, it is on the kite of the British Financiers. New Zealand has raised large loans on the financial market to finance municipal undertakings and Public Works.

Apart from these facts, as far as Australia and New Zealand are concerned it seems necessary to include special reference to the British Empire in the theses and to the special character of its colonies and dominions. Further, I want to say that the absence of consideration of the British dominions is quite typical of all documents of the Comintern which I have examined since I came here.

From the point of view of revolutionary potentialities the British Empire is still the most important imperialist power. In quite a number of other respects the British Empire can be still considered the most important power in the imperialist world today, and special attention should be given to it.

The purpose of the theses to my mind should be to determine the tactics of the various Communist Parties in the different colonies and Dominions and the policy of the Communist International towards the colonial revolutionary movements. The third paragraph of the theses, on page I, makes this fairly clear. It says:

"On the other hand a vast colonial and semi-colonial world has become an unquenchable blazing hearth of revolutionary mass movements. The basis of this phenomena, which is of colossal historical importance, is furnished in part by changes which have taken place during and after the imperialist world war in the internal conditions of the most important colonies and semi-colonies, in their economic and social structure, such as the strengthening of the elements of capitalistic and particularly industrial development, the growth of the proletariat and beginning of its organisation, etc., etc."

The theses do not seem to be drafted from this basis. Nor are there references to the strengthening of the "elements of capitalism", nor to the degree of "industrial development". Yet in quite a number of places reference is made to the retardation of industrial development. In my opinion there is a contradiction between this paragraph and the theses itself.

In the first paragraph of section five reference is made to the question of tactics and the major tasks of the Communist Parties. There, we find the tactic or policy for the development of Communist Parties in the colonies and semi-colonies which is to be looked upon as "one of the most important tasks of the Communist International in the immediate future". (Paragraph 30. Section V, page 34.)

"This task encounters a series of objective difficulties which are rooted in the historical development and social structure of these countries."

Now if the difficulties are "rooted" in the "historical development" of these colonies and the "social structure" then these should be considered in the theses. In my opinion this is not done. Consequently, I hold that apart from other things the theses must answer some of the following questions: It must give some outline of the historical development of the imperialist colonisation process. It must give a clear classification of the colonies and dominions at present existing. It must give some idea of the economic relations of the dominations and colonies to the home countries. It must give some idea of the social relations, — of the ratio of the petty-bourgeoisie, etc. — if this were done it would give us an idea of the social structure. It must give us some idea of the economic relations of the colonies and dominions with the home country.

For instance, in the programme Australia and Canada are referred to as having centrifugal tendencies. There is danger of exaggeration in this. My contention is that Australia and New Zealand, as long as they are economically dependent on Great Britain, which is the chief market for their products, will not have a centrifugal tendency to any great degree, while at the same time demanding a certain amount of independence for their own bourgeoisie. New Zealand is one of the dominions which has no very marked centrifugal tendencies. It is claimed to be "the strongest link in the chain of Empire".

Similarly, the stage of industrialisation in the colonies and dominions in general must be considered and some definite information given on the question. If we get this information in the theses then we can judge the real revolutionary tendencies in the colonies and, consequently, the forces of anti-imperialism. We can then judge the directly proletarian, revolutionary tendencies and not be so vague about it as in the thesis. We can judge also the strength and relations of the forces of imperialism as a whole if we answer these questions.

If we do that the task of the Communist Party will be far more clear, and, in general, the policy of the Communist International will be much clearer than it is in the thesis. The thesis must pay special attention to the British Empire, not neglecting an important question which is neglected in the thesis, the question of Ireland. It is obvious that in considering the colonial revolutionary movement, or any other revolutionary movements that have taken place in the last few years, Ireland has taken a conspicuous part, as James Connolly said, "It may be the torch to the world revolutionary movement", or words to that effect, Ireland is not considered in the thesis at all.

So the thesis, to my mind, is very inadequate in many respects and must be altered radically if it is to serve the purpose which it should serve. It may be of interest to some of those who are arguing on the industrialisation of India, to know that so far as New Zealand is concerned the producers of New Zealand iron have had to apply for protection to the New Zealand Government against Indian iron which is competing with New Zealand on the New Zealand market.

This seems to have some bearing, to my mind, on the question of the industrialisation of India, and is an indication of the economic relations of India with the other colonies and with the imperialist home centre.

These, in general, are my criticisms of the thesis as it exists. I consider that if the thesis is to serve its purpose it must be radically altered, otherwise it will cause confusion among the Communist Parties, not only in the colonies, but in the home imperialist countries as well. I must draw attention, also, to the fact that in my opinion the revolutionary movement in the colonies and dominions will not have confidence in the Communist International if we cannot produce a better thesis than this.

Comrade JONES (U. S. A.):

Comrades, the draft theses on the colonial question are by far the most thorough theses in point of detail that we have had up to now on this question.

We see from the discussion so far that there is a considerable amount of disagreement with some of the points in the theses, particularly on India and China.

From the point of view of revolutionary activity at present China and India are the most important colonies to be considered. But we must not overlook the world significance of the Negro question, which in the past has not been given sufficient attention by the Comintern.

At the Fourth and Fifth Congresses of the Comintern, there was some discussion on the necessity of the creation of a Western Colonial Bureau, dealing with the Negro question. It seems that as far as actual work is concerned, the Bureau has done very little, and nobody knows what became of this Bureau afterwards. We also find in the archives much dusty material on this question that has never been read by anybody.

Comrade Kuusinen remarked that at present there is very little revolutionary activity in the continent of Africa among

the Negroes. This is true, but here can be much more revolutionary activity on this continent provided we paid a little more attention to the various movements that are in existence on this continent, I have in mind Portuguese East Africa. There is a revolutionary movement under the leadership of Communists and they wrote to the American Negro Labour Congress asking to be put in touch with the Comintern, and when this was mentioned to the Comintern, we understand that they had never heard anything of this movement and had no connections at all with these comrades. And I think it is necessary to get more contact with these various revolutionary movements that exist on that continent.

We organised here at the Congress, a small sub-committee of the Anglo-American Secretariat which dealt with the Negro question in America. This Commission has done a considerable amount of work, which of course is by no means complete, but the first steps were made for a real investigation of this question. In this commission there arose some sharp differences as to the character of the Negro movement in the United States. One point of view is that these Negroes are a racial minority but are developing some characteristics of a national minority and that in the future they will have to be considered as a national minority. The other point of view is that these Negroes are a racial minority and are not developing any characteristics of a national minority and that the basis that would develop these characteristics is rapidly disappearing, that there exists no national entity as such among the American Negroes.

We have a sharp differentiation in classes among the American Negroes, particularly after the world war and this class differentiation tends to prevent a development of any national characteristics as such. We find the Negro bourgeoisie are becoming more and more an integral part of the whole of the American bourgeoisie and are completely separated as far as class interests are concerned from the majority of the Negro toilers. The historical development of the American Negro has tended to create in him the desire to be considered a part of the American nation. There are no tendencies to become a separate national minority within the American nation. I have material on this which will be submitted to the Colonial Commission, in support of our disagreement, together with the theses drawn up by the Negro Commission.

This is a very important question and deserves careful study before any definite steps are taken in drawing up a programme or advancing slogans for our work among the American Negroes. Some comrades consider it necessary at this moment to launch the slogan of self-determination for the American Negroes; to advocate an independent Soviet Socialist Republic in America for Negroes. There is no objection on our part on the principle of a Soviet Republic for Negroes in America. The point we are concerned with here is how to organise these Negroes at present on the basis of their everyday needs for the revolution. The question before the Negroes today is not what will be done with them after the revolution, but what measures are we going to take to alleviate their present condition in America.

We have to adopt a programme that will take care of their immediate needs, of course keeping in mind the necessity for organising the revolution.

A comrade remarked that it was necessary for us to establish a new line of work among the Negroes, to adopt a new programme. It is not so much the question of a new programme but of carrying out the programme that was adopted by the IV. and V. Congresses on this question. Up till now nothing has been done. The central slogan around which we can rally the Negro masses is the slogan of social equality. And the reason why we have not organised the Negroes in America and why we have such a small number of Negroes in our Party, is because we have not fought consistently for this principle. And this is due to the fact that we have white chauvinism in our Party. Therefore, before we should attempt to launch a slogan of self-determination for the American Negroes as a central slogan, we should give more study to this question. A Bureau should be set up in the Comintern dealing specifically with the Negro problem to analyse and study the objective situation in the various countries where there are Negroes and from this study formulate our programme.

Comrade CONTRERAS (Mexico):

Comrades, when the II. Congress of the Communist International endorsed the theses on the colonies and semi-colonies, the Communist movement in Latin-America was only in its initial stage and the problems of this vast continent were hardly known at all. At present we have almost in the whole of Latin America Communist Parties or groups of comrades who work energetically for the construction of such Parties.

Latin America has already embarked on the emancipation movement which is linked up with the capitalist crisis throughout the world. In the next revolutionary wave it is bound to play a very important role.

The Communist International must pay more attention to this vast continent, it must help these young Communist Parties in their struggles and must contribute to their formation where such parties do not yet exist.

The Second International, which did not trouble in the past to study the problems of this vast continent where the British and American imperialisms are contending with each other and are using criminal methods to bleed a population of 100 million, was induced to mention them in its colonial theses which were endorsed by the Brussels Congress:

"The Second International opposes the policy of economic subjection and military intervention on the part of the United States in the Republics of Central and South America."

What is the meaning of these four lines? The Second International is against the economic subjection and military intervention of the United States, but it has nothing to say in regard to what the people of Latin America shall do to emancipate itself from this economic subjection, and to resist effectively the military interventions. It has not a word to say against the policy of economic subjection applied by Great Britain in Latin America.

Why this omission? Being familiar with the policy of the leaders of the Second International, we come to the conclusion that the Second International is against the subjection policy of the United States in Latin America not because this policy exterminates the peoples but because it interferes with the interests of British imperialism whose instrument the Second International is indirectly.

Latin America is enormously important because it is the main base of the exploitation of the United States. The insurrections of the last years and the fact that the United States must continually maintain a state of war against these countries, show how insecure this base is. As control over commerce and industry depends on control over oil, the Standard Oil Co. (U. S. A.) and the Dutch Shell Co. (Great Britain) are struggling over the Latin American territories.

The scientific commission of the oil department of the United States has declared that if the exploitation of the oil wells in the United States continues as before, the oil sources of the United States will be exhausted in seven years. Hence, the increasingly brutal policy of Wall Street imperialism.

44.04% of all the loans placed by the United States abroad are in Latin America. The penetration has been vast and rapid. In this rivalry British imperialism has been obliged to cede gradually its positions to Yankee imperialism. In the countries where it still keeps some of its positions it is compelled to allow the penetration of Yankee capital into its own companies. We have concrete examples of these facts in Brazil and Peru.

In the biggest part of Latin America national problems are at present intimately connected with the political and economic domination of Yankee imperialism. The latter accelerates or retards industrial development according to its interests: it bribes the parties, it provokes racial conflicts as well as religious and frontier conflicts, it subsidises and directs coups d'état, etc.

In the course of 30 years 23 military interventions took place which cost hundreds of thousands of victims and were carried on at the expense of the oppressed peoples.

While in a general way British imperialism based its policy on the landowning class and while it has impeded the industrial development of the countries of Latin America, American imperialism rests on the big landowners in the countries where British imperialism was weak and it has helped the petty bourgeoisie in the countries where British imperialism dominated.

But immediately after the conquest of power by the petty bourgeoisie, either by a revolution or a military coup d'état, as soon as it came into power, the petty bourgeoisie was compelled

sooner or later to submit to Yankee imperialism, to collaborate with the latifundists. Consequently it cannot keep the promises made to the proletariat during the revolutionary period and it crushes all the rebellious movements of the proletariat and the peasantry.

We regret that in the theses on the colonial and semi-colonial question introduced by Comrade Kuusinen, the most powerful imperialism in the world is not mentioned at all.

In many countries of Latin America the internal situation, the economic and social structure have changed considerably owing to the industrial development, the creation of a proletariat and the accentuation of the agrarian crisis.

In all semi-colonies Yankee imperialism, standing in need of a social base, has become the ally of the reaction against the majority of the population. Illiteracy, religious fanaticism, epidemics, unemployment and the systematic pauperisation of the proletariat and the peasantry, — such are the tragic consequences of imperialist domination.

The development of productive forces is allowed only within the limits established by imperialism which wants to maintain its colonial monopoly. It puts obstacles in the way of industrial development, especially in regard to means of production required for the creation of a national economy. It wants to keep Latin America as a "hinterland", as an agrarian and raw material reservoir.

Throughout Latin America Yankee imperialism bases its colonial policy not only on the establishment of its monopoly through economic penetration but also on its control of the political life of the country.

If it does not succeed in bribing the central government it subsidises a coup d'etat or intervenes by force of arms.

Imperialism assumes a brutal colonialist form. This attitude helps to mature revolutionary crises, it intensifies them and gives to all revolutionary outbursts a mass character.

Agrarian revolution is the order of the day throughout Latin America; the revolutionary peasant movement is directed not only towards the destruction of semifeudal relations, but also against imperialism. The sale of goods manufactured in the mother country has ruined the small national industry. Exploitation of the soil by modern methods does not give a chance to small landowners. The national agricultural credit banks which are subsidised by foreign capital expropriate systematically small landowners who cannot pay the interest on loans.

The agrarian problem is especially in Latin America of vital importance to the revolution. The Communist Parties must do their utmost to win over the exploited masses of the peasantry and to bring them on to the path which alone will lead them to the fulfillment of their aspirations.

The national question is intimately connected with the colonial question. There is a national revolutionary movement especially in Central America and in the Bolivian countries. The proletarian movement of economically developed countries and the national movement of the colonies and semi-colonies are two aspects of the same great revolutionary movement. Communist Parties must pay more attention to this movement, they must struggle against the indecision and vacillations of their leaders and against the putchist ideology which is typical of the bourgeoisie of Latin America. The Communist International must keep watch over the young Communist Parties and must guide them in regard to their tactical and political lines towards these movements and in all other circumstances. It is very easy to commit ultra-Left errors which reduce the Parties to a sect and dissociate them from the masses. It is also very easy to commit ultra-Right errors which identify the Party with the national movement.

The colonial and semi-colonial thesis paid very little or hardly any attention to the native problem. In Latin America 25 millions of Indians constitute a mass of exploited and enslaved people who are not even entitled to a plot of land. It should be said in our programme that under a regime of workers and peasants democratic dictatorship they will have the right of self-administration and of developing their own culture, etc. But also under the present regime we must struggle for the recognition of these rights. Only thus will we be able to rally under our banner this mass of slaves who have always been the principal driving force in all colonial revolutions. Indians constitute that section of the population which was always most exploited and served as cannon fodder in all uprisings led by the bourgeoisie.

Side by side with this problem we have that of the black race. We have in America about 12,000,000 Negroes. We hope that the Commission for Work Among Negroes elected by this Congress will provide the Communist Parties of Latin America with a programme of action for winning this army of unfortunates.

The pressure of Yankee imperialism which is becoming more and more brutal has established solidarity among the oppressed peoples. There are many movements of various forms in Latin America: "Spanish-American", "Latin-American", "Indo-American", "Iberian-American". All these movements are under the leadership of bourgeois and petty bourgeois elements. They have a sentimental, mystical or philanthropic character. None of them has a sound basis.

About 18 months ago Sandino, at the head of a number of peasants and miners declared an anti-imperialist war in Nicaragua against American capital and its national agents. The Anti-Imperialist League of America took up immediately the cause of Nicaragua and initiated an international solidarity campaign; it collected money to help Sandino and his soldiers and also to provide medicines and medical appliances. In this movement the Anti-Imperialist League acts on a continental basis, it has been in the forefront of all the anti-imperialist movements of the continent. The Comintern together with the Anti-Imperialist League must pay more attention to these movements and must induce the Communist Parties to organise under the slogan of "United Anti-Imperialist Front", movements in the countries where the anti-imperialist League has no organisation of its own.

Only under the leadership of the Communist Parties can the Anti-imperialist movements assume a correct policy against imperialism.

By weakening imperialism in Latin America it is weakened on a world scale. In an imperialist war against Soviet Russia Latin America will be the economic reservoir, it will provide grain, meat, oil, etc. The North American comrades must concentrate all their energy on the establishment of a powerful anti-imperialist organisation in the United States. The anti-imperialist struggle in Latin America is an integral part of the struggle which the workers of the United States carry on against the Wall Street capitalists.

In the countries of Latin America we have a labour bureaucracy corrupted by imperialism, and this labour bureaucracy is more dangerous than the bureaucracy in the mother country.

Santiago Iglesias, Secretary of the Latin American section of the Pan-American Federation of Labour, said in a confidential circular addressed to the organisations of Latin America:

"It is clear that the American Federation of Labour is an instrument which will allow the countries of Spanish America to assimilate the realist spirit and the humanitarian ideal of our nation."

"Our nation", on the lips of Mr. Iglesias, means Yankee imperialism.

At its last Congress the Red International of Labour Unions made important decisions for combating this bureaucracy and setting against the Pan-American Federation of Labour which is an instrument of Yankee imperialism a revolutionary trade union federation of Latin America which, in close union with the minority trade union movement in the United States, will be a genuine instrument for the political and economic emancipation of the workers of Latin America.

The theses introduced by Comrades Kuusinen and Ercoli show very clearly what must be the main tasks and the tactic of the Communist Parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries. But for Latin America the Comintern must draw up on the basis of the general lines of the already introduced theses, special theses for the Communist movement in Latin America where new problems arise unknown in other colonial and semi-colonial countries.

A member of the Young Communist League of the United States declared at this Congress that the charge made against the Communist Party of America that it has not done its duty in regard to anti-imperialist work, is a false charge.

But this is not true to facts. The groups existing in the American Communist Parties accuse each other of not having

supported and developed the anti-imperialist movements in the United States. On behalf of the Communist fraction of the continental committee of the Anti-Imperialist League of all the Americas, I declare that both sides are right when they assert that the American Communist Party has not carried out its anti-imperialist tasks, and I assert that the responsibility for this deplorable error rests entirely with the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

Comrade Kuusinen, in his colonial and semi-colonial theses laid before this Congress, divides the colonial and semi-colonial countries into four groups. We think that the classification of any one country in one of these groups is closely connected with our tactical and political lines, with the development and the perspectives of the Communist movement of these groups, as well as with the interpretation of the character of the development and the driving forces of the bourgeois-democratic revolution.

The Latin-American Delegation is convinced that the division of the countries is of vital importance for the Communist movement and it thinks that instead of establishing an artificial division made so as not to form too many groups, one should take a logical viewpoint and extend this division in order to facilitate the study of the colonial and semi-colonial question and in order to separate more clearly the development of the Communist movements from the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. For instance, the delegation gives the case of Comrade Kuusinen who places into the first group all the countries of Latin America, that is to say, the Southern countries which are remarkably developed economically, the Bolivian countries which are in the initial stage of their development and the countries of Central America where, with the exception of Mexico and Cuba, hardly any industries exist and where semi-feudal relations still predominate.

Comrade Humbert Droz, in his theses on Latin America, laid before this Congress, says that the slogans of the Communist Parties of the South-American Continent must be those of "Latin-Americanism". Although the Latin-American Delegation is, in general, in agreement with Comrade Humbert Droz' theses, it cannot accept this slogan.

Latin Americanism is the ideology of a clearly petty-bourgeois anti-imperialist movement which struggles against the Communist movement and asserts that Marxism, as well as Leninism, are exotic plants for Latin America. These theorists accuse the Anti-Imperialist League of being an agency of Moscow. They sabotage our entire agitation and they give to understand that when they get into power they will not allow the existence of a legal Communist Party. The slogan "Latin Americanism" can be easily misinterpreted by the workers and peasants, among whom our influence is continually growing.

In Latin-America we must struggle against the conception, which will be strengthened by the slogan "Latin Americanism", that the proletariat of the United States and the Wall Street capitalists constitute one reactionary entity. Latin Americanism asserts that Senator Borah is a thousand times more the friend of the peoples of Latin America than the workers of the United States.

We have already succeeded in capturing a good position from which we can free the workers of Latin America of this dangerous conception. It is incumbent on us to issue slogans capable of strengthening the anti-imperialist struggle and uniting more and more all proletarians. There are already slogans in regard to this question which fully express the nature of the struggle and which are known by all, for instance, "Out with the Yankees from Latin America", "Struggle for the unification of the oppressed peoples of Latin America against imperialism", etc. Therefore, we think that the slogan proposed by Comrade Humbert-Droz is not only useless, but dangerous.

Comrade PEPPER (United States).

Comrades, Comrade Kuusinen's theses are built up on the discussion of two fundamental problems: firstly, the Colonial Policy of Imperialism, secondly, the discussion of the question of the Bourgeois-Democratic Revolution as a preparatory stage to the Socialist Revolution in the colonies. The arguments with which the basis of the theses was attacked here, are false. Of course, one could change a few sentences here and there. In some questions, for instance in the question of the peasantry and the urban petty-bourgeoisie, one should give more differ-

entiated formulae. But the attacks directed against the fundamental line of the theses, must be certainly rejected.

Let us consider first of all the Colonial Policy of Imperialism. Comrade Bennet raised the question; is there industrialisation in India or not? Does this industrialisation mean a certain decolonisation?

Comrade Bennet said: If he has to choose between two theories, he would rather choose the theory of decolonisation than the assertion that India is a "rural continent". But is the question really as simple as Bennet assumes, namely that industrialisation is tantamount to decolonisation? In my opinion, one should not confound decolonisation and industrialisation. Comrade Bennet has simplified the task too much.

We must examine: 1. Does industrialisation exist in India? 2. What is the character of this industrialisation, what dimension has it reached? 3. Is it an industrialisation capable of making the country truly independent? 4. What role does the British bourgeoisie play in these processes of industrialisation, in whose hands are the commanding positions of the Indian economy? 5. What is the relation between industrialisation and capitalist development in India, on the one hand, and the non-capitalist sector of the country, on the other hand?

Comrade Bennet has not dealt with any of these questions, he reduced the whole problem to the question of industrialisation in general. He failed to see the fundamental questions.

The first question with which I want to deal and which is fairly decisive, is the role and scope of the big industry and capitalism in general in Indian economy. One must admit that capitalism still exists only on the surface of the gigantic territory of India which has been justly called a "rural continent" by Comrade Kuusinen. Most of the population lives in many respects still under pre-capitalist conditions, which is one of the most important characteristics of the whole situation in India. The majority of the population in India suffers today from the disintegrative consequences of capitalism which is coming more and more to the fore and at the same time from the backwardness of the country, of those elements which are still pre-capitalistic. One must realise this. If one does not, this means that one has also not realised Lenin's theses at the Second Congress which designate India as a in many respects pre-capitalist country. One could of course say that since 1920, since the theses of the Second World Congress, a fundamental change has taken place in the situation in India. But if one holds this view, one should say so frankly. Comrade Bennet should have declared that Lenin's theses which designate India as an as yet pre-capitalist country, are no longer correct to-day, that India is no longer a colony, or at least that the main process of the development in India is the process of decolonisation.

Comrade Bennet declared — and this was actually his trump card — that Kuusinen is wrong; India is no longer an agricultural appendage of the British Empire, for if one examines the export trade of India, one finds that it does not export much raw material. In my opinion, Comrade Bennet is wrong in dealing with this question in this manner. It is not really a question of how much raw material India exports to Britain, the correct way of dealing with the question is a careful examination of India's relation not only to the British imperialism, but to all the imperialist countries. The correct Leninist way of dealing with the question is an examination of India's role and function in the imperialist world system. If one does this, one sees that India's main function in the imperialist world system is — supplying the mother country with agrarian produce and raw material. The industrial towns in India, the exploitation of the natural wealth, the development of the railway system, etc., serve the purpose of fitting India, as agricultural appendage of imperialism, for these functions. Imperialism is robbing India of its raw material and wants to export its goods to India. Capitalism can continue making great progress in India, it can for instance transform agriculture into a capitalist concern, but this will not change in the least India's main function in the imperialist world system, namely, that it is an agricultural appendage of imperialism.

Let us take the question of industrialisation in the narrower sense. As everyone knows, India has no or hardly any heavy industry, hardly any metallurgy. The two or three big metallurgical enterprises which India possesses are known by name to anyone who has made even a superficial study of the country. Indian industry, as far as its exists, is a light industry.

Its main branch is the manufacture of textile goods. There is industrialisation and industrialisation. We must now examine the question of what role the light industry can play in the development of a country. Two questions come here into consideration:

1. Can the existence of a light industry transform a country from an agrarian into an industrial country?

2. Can the existence of a light industry make a country independent of the imperialist Powers?

I think that both questions should be decidedly answered in the negative.

In this connection, I would like to quote Lenin and Stalin, so as to show what these comrades thought about these questions. Lenin made the following statement about Soviet Russia:

"Without saving the heavy industry, without its reconstruction, we cannot build up any industry, and without it we are lost as an independent country".

Comrade Stalin's statement is as follows:

"What is an agrarian country? An agrarian country is a country which exports agricultural and imports means of production, and which does not produce at all or hardly at all these means of production (Machinery, etc.). If we get stuck at the stage of development when we do not produce our own means of production, but must import them from abroad, we cannot be guaranteed against the transformation of our country into an appendage of the capitalist system."

Both quotations refer to Soviet Russia, which, as everyone knows, is much more industrialised than India. In Soviet Russia, the proletariat has a much greater specific weight than the workers in India. Soviet Russia has relatively a much stronger heavy industry than India. Soviet Russia is the country of proletarian dictatorship where the working class is already in power, where the political rule of imperialism has already been destroyed. Nevertheless, Lenin and Stalin declared that 1) the existence of a light industry does not convert an agrarian country into an industrial; 2) only the establishment of the heavy industry, the engineering industry, only the production of the means of production can make a country an industrial country; 3) without heavy industry a country cannot be an economically independent country; 4) without heavy industry, without the production of means of production any country is doomed to become an appendage of the capitalist, the imperialist system.

One of Comrade Bennet's most important arguments to prove the industrialisation of India, was the magnitude of the export of capital from Great Britain to India. It is of course a fact that Britain has exported much capital to India. But it is also a fact that no less than 90% of the British capital sent to India were invested in State loans and used to cover the war and administration expenditure. Even the remaining 10% were not entirely invested in industry, they frequently went to agriculture or to the extraction of raw material. Comrade Magyar said, for instance, in the Indian Commission that no less than 500 million rupees British capital are invested in tea plantations. It would be of course ridiculous to assert that there is no industry in India. That British capital plays an important role in the industrialisation of India, is a matter of course. But one should certainly not overlook the fact that Indian industry, as it exists today, is first and foremost a light industry. One certainly cannot deny the fact that hardly any heavy industry exists at present in India, that India can cover only between 4 and 8% of its requirements for iron and must import the rest. The industrial development of India has not yet reached the stage of production of the means of production. One cannot certainly overlook the fact that, on the one hand, pre-capitalist conditions still exist in many respects in big sectors of the Indian economy and that, on the other hand, British capitalism dominates all the commanding positions of the Indian economic life. One cannot deal with this questions as simply as comrade Bennet has done it, one must realise that Indian capitalism could not develop rapidly because it is hampered from above and from below. It is hampered from above by the world system of imperialism and from below by the pre-capitalist elements of the Indian economy. Surely one must realise that these two elements are still hampering the development of an independent Indian capitalism.

One also forgets the relativity of the development of industry in India. Certain processes of industrialisation no doubt exist in India, no one has denied this. But if one compares this development with the development of the big industry, with the establishment of the heavy industry and with the creation of powerful world trusts in the imperialist countries, one sees that India cannot keep pace with the development of the imperialist countries. This is the only explanation of the fact that in spite of certain industrialisation processes India is still an appendage of the imperialist system and must remain so till the revolution in India or in Great Britain changes this state of affairs.

Comrade Bennet's idea of the role of British imperialism in India is very one-sided, very undialectical. He merely sees that British capitalism is industrialising India, but he overlooks the fact that the same British capital is impeding the industrialisation of India by every possible means.

The entire economic and political system of British imperialism is one big conspiracy against the independent development of the economic life of India.

The greatest defect of Comrade Bennet's method is — that it is undialectical. He thinks that in India the revolutionary development will come because Indian capitalism will become very strong, because the industrial development of India is striding with seven-league boots. This is erroneous. Why does the revolutionary situation in India develop? Just because Indian capitalism, which is neither big nor broad and has not yet taken possession of the country, comes into collision with the pre-capitalist conditions, with the backwardness of the country, on the one hand, and with imperialism, on the other hand. This collision, these contradictions are the basis of the revolutionary movement in India, and not the absolute magnitude of capitalism. Conflicts and disintegrative elements and not the strong development of capitalism, constitute the basis of the revolutionary situation. One cannot deny that, on the other hand, capitalism which has reached a certain stage of development in India, has created a proletariat which can lead the revolution, but that, on the other hand, the industrial economic development is impeded in general by the pre-capitalist elements and imperialism. If one sees one-sidedly, undialectically only the existence of industrialisation and the strong development of capitalism, if one wants to see only the historical role of the proletariat, if one simply denies the colonial state of India, if one designates the process of decolonisation as the main process, one comes dangerously near the standpoint of the Second International. It is a well-known fact that according to the Second International the normal development of India and the other colonies is the capitalist development, that they decolonise themselves gradually and develop a proletariat, and that in a dim and distant future this proletariat will make the proletarian revolution against the native bourgeoisie.

The attitude of the Second International is tantamount to renouncing struggle against the imperialism of the colonies. In this connection, we meet with Comrade Bennet's second mistake which consists in an erroneous estimate of class-relations in India. To judge by his arguments, there are only two camps in India: the camp of the imperialists and the camp of the workers and peasants. The matter is not as simple as this. There are still three camps one cannot yet assert that the Indian bourgeoisie has gone over completely and finally into the imperialist camp. The Indian bourgeoisie has repeatedly betrayed the national-revolution and is bound to finally betray it in the future. But to-day we must still distinguish between three camps in India. One must realise that the chief enemy is still British imperialism. It is of course also clear that final victory over British imperialism is possible only through victory over the Indian bourgeoisie. But if one says: the Indian bourgeoisie is already now the chief enemy, this means an under-estimation of the importance of British imperialism, and this is rather dangerous. Comrade Bennet declared here ironically that he does not care if, on the strength of his arguments re decolonisation and class relations in India, he is called an ultra-Left. Comrade Bennet need not be afraid. We know Comrade Bennet, and no one in this hall will designate him an ultra-Left. The idea he brought forward here, is by no means an ultra-Left idea. He has certainly a few insignificant ultra-Left gestures, but the basis of his conception and criticism directed against Comrade Kuusinen's these is a rather fully developed Right deviation.

I am coming now to the second chief problem: to the questions of bourgeois-democratic revolution in the colonies. This question, too, is of general importance. Just as the imperia-

list policy in all colonies has fundamental traits which are valid generally, we can also assert that the bourgeois-democratic revolution is an inevitable phase, a preliminary stage of the socialist revolution in all colonies. Of course, the phase of development in a colony will have its special characteristic features, its concrete aspect will be different everywhere, the concrete intermediate stages will be different at all times and in any country, but the fundamental problem is the same for all colonies.

If one studies the problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution as a transition period to the Socialist-proletarian revolution, one must first of all study the experiences of the Chinese Revolution. In this connection one should point out that the executive of the Communist Party of China has been guilty of two historical errors in the appreciation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. From the standpoint of the leaders of the Executive of the Party, one could divide the history of the C. P. of China into two periods. In the first period the errors of the Party Executive sailed under the colours of Sun Yat-senism, and in the second period under the colours of the permanent revolution, not à la Marx, but à la Trotsky. In the first period, the fundamental errors of the Chinese Party Executive were: 1) relinquishment of the independence of the Communist Party — up to treachery; 2) under-estimation of the agrarian revolution up to suppression of the peasant rebellion on the part of the Communists. What was after all the basis of these errors? It consisted in the then opportunist Party executive failing to understand the independent role of the proletariat in opposition to the bourgeoisie and in its failure to see, when the agrarian revolution was approaching, that a new period was coming, that the old period of the so-called general national revolution has been transformed into the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. When the new period was approaching, the old opportunist executive of the C. P. of China simply overlooked it. This was a historical error.

In the second period, we witness just the opposite error. While in the first period the Party fused with the Kuomintang, it dissociated itself in the second period from the masses — as correctly pointed out by the theses of the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. — and a gulf opened between the Party and the proletariat. The second period, was the bringing forward of the theory of permanent revolution in connection with the conception according to which the Chinese Revolution is already a proletarian-socialist revolution. In connection with this question the Party Executive had the thesis that there is hardly any bourgeoisie in China. In the first period the Communist Party was an appendage of the bourgeoisie, and in the second period the Party Executive was running the danger of overlooking the existence of the Chinese bourgeoisie, the maintainer of the worst white terror.

These two errors have something in common. The period of Sun Yat-senism and the period of permanent revolution à la Trotsky have the following in common: in both periods the executive of the Chinese Party overlooked the transition of the revolution, in the first period the transition of the general national revolution into the bourgeois-democratic revolution when this second stage of the revolution was already there; in the second period the Party Executive imagined that the period of the Socialist-proletarian revolution had already arrived when the bourgeois-democratic revolution had not yet effected the transition. Thus the two sides have in common that a period was skipped. In the first period one failed to see the new phase; in the second period one thought that the new phase had already arrived when the old was still there. These two errors have in common that the Executive of the Chinese Party could not see clearly in two periods through what stage of development of the revolution one was going. Both errors were of course fundamental errors.

The big opportunist errors of the first period have been remedied by the Chinese Party with the help of the Comintern at the August Conference. It has sent to the devil the old Executive, and the new Executive has certainly not been guilty of the same fundamentally opportunist errors. The errors of the second period were remedied by the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. by rejecting the theory of permanent revolution à la Trotsky and by emphasising the necessity of mass agitation and propaganda for the work of the C. P. of China.

I think that it is necessary to say something about the theory of permanent revolution as brought forward in connection with the Chinese Revolution. This theory was not only brought forward in the November theses (1927) of the Central Committee of the Chinese Party, it was also defended at the sessions of the E. C. C. I. by Comrade Lominadze. What was Comrade Lominadze's theses? He brought forward two assertions. I quote from his report at the Chinese Conference prior to the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I.:

"There is now a workers' and peasants' revolution which can on no account be designated as a bourgeois-democratic revolution, inasfar as we raise the question of the forms, character and class forces of this revolution."

"The Revolution in China has no longer a bourgeois-democratic character."

"The revolution has a continuous, permanent character".

The coupling together of these two assertions means skipping a whole phase of the revolution, namely: the bourgeois-democratic phase. Comrade Lominadze is of course right when he says that the class driving forces of the Chinese Revolution are not the bourgeoisie, but the proletariat and the peasantry, but he is completely wrong when he contends that the social character of the revolution is no longer bourgeois-democratic, but proletarian-Socialist.

This conception of Comrade Lominadze in regard to the Chinese Revolution is analogous with Trotsky's conception of the Russian Revolution in 1905. Trotsky's theory contained also these two elements: the revolution is permanent and it is no longer bourgeois-democratic. The resolution of the 9th Plenum of the E. C. C. I. condemned as follows the theory of the permanent revolution in connection with China:

"The present period of the revolution in China is the period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution... It is wrong to describe the present stage of the Chinese Revolution as a revolution which has already changed into the Socialist Revolution. It is also wrong to describe it as a 'permanent' revolution. The acceptance of a tendency to skip the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution accompanied by the assumption that the revolution is a 'permanent' revolution, is an error, analogous to that of Trotsky in 1905. This error is all the more harmful as such an attitude to the question eliminates also the greatest national peculiarity of the Chinese Revolution as a revolution in a semi-colonial country."

The theory of the permanent revolution is in itself not wrong if we conceive it as Marx and Lenin brought it forward, namely, that we oppose the idea that revolution must always lead to the most radical conclusion, and that we stand up for the idea, that one class after the other, always the most radical and progressive is getting at the helm until proletarian dictatorship has been established. This is the meaning of permanence in the theory of Marx and Lenin. But if this theory of permanent revolution is to mean that one stage is skipped, that the necessity of the stage of the bourgeois-democratic is denied and that the theory of permanent revolution plus socialist proletarian revolution is brought forward, as this was done by Comrade Lominadze, this is certainly an error analogous to that of Trotsky in 1905.

What does it mean if we simply skip the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution? I think that Comrade Kuusinen's theses give a very clear and unambiguous answer to this question. The theses are drawn up on the basis of the Leninist conception that the social character of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution is the agrarian revolution. If one skips this stage, this means of course that one overlooks the role of the peasantry, that one commits the historical permanent error of Trotskyism. This is of course a fundamental error in countries such as China or India where the overwhelming majority of the population consists of peasants, an error which cannot be committed with impunity. This cannot be done in a peasant country, least of all in a colonial country. In this connection I would like to quote a few sentences from Comrade Stalin's speech on the Chinese question at the VIII Plenum of the E. C. C. I.:

"But what is agrarian revolution? It is certainly the basis and substance of the bourgeois-democratic revolution".

"The bourgeois-democratic revolution in China is at the same time an anti-imperialist revolution."

"The bourgeois-democratic revolution in China combines struggle against feudal relics with struggle against imperialism".

Stalin's formula is classical. One could not put the question more clearly and precisely. In China the bourgeois-democratic revolution — and the same applies also to India — combines struggle against feudal relics, that is to say, agrarian revolution with struggle against imperialism. Who fails to see this, has not the least notion of the character of the colonial revolution. Who denies the existence of the stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, overlooks the necessity of struggle against feudal relics and imperialism. The permanence theory made Trotsky underestimate the role of the peasantry in Russia, it made Comrade Lominadze underestimate the struggle against imperialism in China.

This conception has nothing in common with the Leninist conception of the permanence of revolution.

In this connection, one should also discuss the question if there is after all a bourgeoisie in China. The question itself sounds of course a little ludicrous, but this problem has actually occupied the attention of the Communist International. Not only at the already mentioned Chinese conference, but also at the XV. Congress of the C. P. S. U., Comrade Lominadze disputed actually the existence of a Chinese bourgeoisie. According to the minutes, Lominadze said:

"The Kuomintang as a political party no longer exists." According to the minutes, Comrade Stalin interrupted him here and asked:

"And what has remained of this bourgeoisie?"

Again according to the protocol, Lominadze's answer was: "Individual bourgeois have remained of the bourgeoisie". According to the minutes, there was "laughter" at this.

I think that the VI. World Congress can heartily join in this outbreak of hilarity of the XV. Congress of the Russian Party. It is certainly a very queer assertion that only individual bourgeois have remained of the Chinese bourgeoisie. But this remarkable "theory" of Comrade Lominadze becomes a little more serious if one takes into consideration that he said this in December 1927, that is to say, when the white terror of the Chinese bourgeoisie against the workers and peasants was at its height. Comrade Bukharin described as follows the phantastic "analysis" of Comrade Lominadze at the Chinese Conference before the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I.:

"I think that this is a serious error. Comrade Lominadze repeats the opportunist Borodin estimate of the classes. Borodin says that there are no classes but only silhouettes of classes in China."

We must bring up here in a comprehensive manner the question of the character of Comrade Lominadze's conception which was also partly expressed in the November theses of the Chinese Central Committee. The elements of this conception are as follows:

1. It overlooks the colonial character of the Chinese revolution, in other words, it leads to under-estimation of the struggle against imperialism.
2. It denies the bourgeois-democratic character of the Chinese revolution, which necessarily leads to an under-estimation of the agrarian revolution.
3. It disputes the existence of the Chinese bourgeoisie, in other words, it leads to an underestimation of the struggle against this bourgeoisie, as one cannot very well struggle against a non-existent enemy.

These three viewpoints taken together result in an underestimation of the struggle against imperialism, the agrarian revolution and the bourgeoisie. Is this trinity of Comrade Lominadze's "theory" a left standpoint? I am convinced that the World Congress will not be so naive to designate this standpoint as a Left standpoint. If the words "Left" and "Right" have still a meaning, if they have still the same meaning as in the life of ordinary army recruits who want to know when they drill,

what is Left and what is Right, then this conception is a fairly clear right conception. In my opinion, it is not by chance that Comrade Lominadze has been guilty precisely of this error, that, according to the resolution of the IX. Plenum, he underestimates the anti-imperialist character of the Chinese revolution. This error is an integral part of his entire "world system". Comrade Lominadze under-estimates, generally speaking, on a world scale the struggle against imperialism. I remind you of the fact that Comrade Bukharin, in his concluding speech on the first item of the agenda, was compelled to argue against the conception of Comrade Lominadze who asserted that the internal contradictions in the individual countries and not the big contradictions in the socialist world system, are the primary.

Comrade Bukharin has already proved that the comrades who deny that the contradictions and antagonism in the imperialist world system are the primary which also determine, intensify and accentuate the internal contradictions in the individual countries, — are also under-estimating the war danger. And in the present situation the war danger is the greatest danger, underestimation of the war danger is the greatest mistake at the present juncture. Is under-estimation of the war danger a Right or a Left error? Comrade Bukharin has already declared in his speech: under-estimation of the war danger is at present the most important expression of the Right danger within the Communist International.

Whoever takes as starting point the internal contradictions of the individual countries and not the contradictions and antagonism of the imperialist world system, must necessarily arrive at an erroneous standpoint not only in regard to the war danger but also in regard to the fundamental question of the proletarian revolution. I would like to quote in this connection a statement of Comrade Stalin. This statement is probably the best formula of this fundamental Leninist theses. In his work on the "Fundamentals of Leninism" Comrade Stalin wrote:

"Formerly the proletarian revolution was considered exclusively as the result of the internal development of the respective country. At present this standpoint has been left behind. At present one must consider the proletarian revolution first and foremost, as the result of the development of the contradictions in the imperialist world system. As the result of the break in the chain of the imperialist world front in this or that country".

This formula is correct, but if it be correct, it means the complete collapse of Comrade Lominadze's standpoint. Comrade Stalin's subsequent arguments draw the necessary conclusions:

"For this reason the statistical figures concerning the percentage of the proletariat in the individual countries have not the decisive importance which the experts of the II. International who have not understood imperialism and are afraid of the revolution as of the plague, like to attach to them."

As you see, in this question too, Comrade Lominadze's conceptions — although accompanied by many ultra-Left gestures — do not lead to a real Left but to a Right conception.

But what are the tactical consequences of a conception which under-estimates the anti-imperialist character of the Chinese revolution? They are fairly serious. At present the situation in China is as follows: in the eyes of the Chinese workers and peasants the Kuomintang party stands revealed as the class enemy. But does the Kuomintang stand already completely and finally revealed as a friend of the imperialists? Not yet. Wide masses in China still believe that the Kuomintang is carrying on somehow the struggle against imperialism. If the Communist Party of China wants to expose completely the betrayal of the national revolution by the Kuomintang, it must carry on the struggle against imperialism with the utmost energy, much better, a hundred times better than in the past. But if the Chinese Party is advised to bring forward the theory of permanent revolution, if it is told that there is no longer a bourgeois-democratic revolution in China, that one need not therefore struggle against imperialism as the chief enemy, but that one should struggle directly for Communism, as Comrade Lominadze does, it is as clear as daylight that very bad advice is given to the Chinese comrades, advice which leads to neglect of the struggle against imperialism. Imperialism is the chief enemy. One cannot struggle properly against the Chinese bourgeoisie if one does not carry on the struggle

against imperialism with a desperate energy. Is it a Right or a Left standpoint if one disputes this line of action? I declare most emphatically: this is a **Right standpoint** which means an under-estimation of the chief enemy.

The characteristic feature of the present period in China is: serious attempts by the imperialists to partition China. The new feature of the situation is — that the present intervention of the imperialists is not directed against the nationalist bourgeoisie, but is carried out **with its help**. If one under-estimates in this situation the imperialist struggle, one ignores the most vulnerable point of the front of the Chinese bourgeoisie and commits thereby an enormous (and by no means a left) error. Lenin wrote in 1915 in "Against the Stream":

"In reality Trotsky meets half-way the Liberal labour politicians of Russia who understand by 'negation' of the role of the peasantry **disinclination to stir up the peasants**".

Comrade Lominadze denies the role of the anti-imperialist struggle just as Trotsky denies the role of the agrarian revolution. **This negation must necessarily lead to "disinclination" to stir up the mass of the Chinese people against imperialism.**

I am coming now to the next question. I must limit myself now to an attempt to sum up here the **main ideas** which, in my opinion, are contained in Lenin's work on this question of transition. One could perhaps sum up these main ideas of Lenin as follows:

1. In countries with feudal relics and national oppression, the revolution will have to go through a stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution as a transition stage to the proletarian-socialist revolution.

2. Victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is impossible as a victory of the bourgeoisie.

3. The victory of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is only possible against the bourgeoisie.

4. The social-economic substance of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is destruction of the relics of feudalism, agrarian revolution, and in the colonial countries destruction of imperialism.

5. The social character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is bourgeois (even nationalisation of the land is a bourgeois demand), but the driving class forces of this revolution are already the proletariat and the peasantry.

6. We must struggle for the permanent revolution in the sense that the revolution should not come to a standstill half-way. But at the same time we must fully realise the inevitability of the intermediate stages of the revolution.

7. The bourgeois-democratic revolution is not separated by a "Chinese Wall" from the socialist-proletarian revolution, even in China, in the country of the Chinese wall.

8. There are inter-relations between the bourgeois-democratic and the socialist-proletarian revolution, in the sense that the former develops into the latter, that the latter solves in passing the problems of the first, that so to speak, the solution of the problems of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is a by-product of the socialist-proletarian revolution, that the latter consolidates the results of the former. On the basis of the objective conditions only the class struggle and the progress of class-consciousness decide to what extent and how rapidly the former succeeds to develop into the latter.

9. The class character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

During the Russian and also during the Chinese revolution a series of mistakes were made by confusing the questions of these two stages of the revolution. The chief of these mistakes are as follows:

1. **Mechanical separation of the socialist-proletarian revolution from the bourgeois-democratic.** This separation can lead to the Menshevik conception that the bourgeois-democratic revolution must be carried out and that only when all the questions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution are solved one can begin to think of the organisation and realisation of the proletarian revolution.

2. **Confusing the character of the social economic substance of the revolution with the driving class forces of the revolution.**

On the basis of this error arises the Menshevik conception which says that, as the Russian revolution was a bourgeois revolution, the bourgeoisie and not the proletariat must be its driving force.

3. **The opposite error**, namely, the assertion that, as the driving force of the revolution is the proletariat, the revolution itself must also be proletarian. This conception constitutes the basis of the Trotskyist theory of permanent revolution which one could call inverted Menshevism.

4. **The question of Soviets can also become a source of errors.** Some comrades think that when the workers and peasants organise Soviets, this circumstance alone transforms already the revolution into a proletarian-socialist revolution. This is of course an error because Soviets can also be the State form of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants.

5. **Also the fighting methods used in the revolution can become sources of errors in regard to estimating the character of the revolution.** As in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution industrial and political strikes, labour demonstrations and proletarian insurrections are frequently used as a means of struggle, many comrades commit the error of considering the revolution itself as a proletarian revolution. But Lenin already said that in bourgeois-democratic revolutions in which the chief driving force is the proletariat, the means of struggle of the revolution will be pre-eminently proletarian means of struggle. But this circumstance alone cannot alter the social character of the revolution.

Where does bourgeois-democratic revolution end and where does proletarian-socialist revolution begin? One cannot give a straight mechanical answer to this question. Generally speaking, we can say that the purely proletarian revolution begins when political power is no longer in the hands of the dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry, but already in the hands of the dictatorship of the proletariat and when the latter makes a beginning with the realisation of its actual historical tasks, namely, nationalisation of big enterprises, occupation of the economic commanding posts and construction of socialism. Nationalisation of land is not at all a proletarian measure, it still remains within the framework of the bourgeois-economic order. The nationalisation of big enterprises is not yet, under any circumstances, a sign of proletarian revolution. One can for instance surmise that in China the bourgeois-democratic revolution, i. e. the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, will nationalise the big enterprises which are in the hands of the imperialists. Nevertheless, the revolution will not thereby become a socialist-proletarian revolution, because the **class character of the State power** will not yet be proletarian. The revolution does not become a socialist-proletarian revolution unless the State power takes the form of proletarian dictatorship. On the other hand, the proletarian dictatorship alone cannot make the revolution a socialist revolution if the **material conditions for socialism** are still lacking. In such cases, and this will be the case in most of the backward colonies, only the help of the proletariat of the developed countries, the adoption of the technical-economic achievements of capitalism, the help of the other Soviet republics can open gradually the road to socialism.

Just a few remarks about Canton. Many untruths and inexactitudes were indulged in here by various speakers in regard to the Canton insurrection and my attitude to it. **An attempt was also made to represent the decision of the Comintern in a false light.** I am therefore compelled to make here a statement based on the Chinese conference which took place before the IX. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. Comrade Lominadze and his followers endeavoured here to create the impression that I had taken a hostile attitude to the Canton insurrection. A few months ago the same comrades brought the same charge not only against me but also against other comrades, including Comrade Bukharin, of course with as little justification. I will quote Comrade Bukharin's speech at the already mentioned Chinese conference. Comrade Bukharin said:

"Thus the confirmation of a rent between the vanguard and the masses 'is a very serious and yet understandable

thing'. I will make the following concession. May be that even this description of the facts is not correct by 50%... (Neumann and Lominadze: It is correct by 100%!) But if it is correct, one should certainly give it first consideration in the discussion and the determination of our tactic." (Lominadze: If one rejects insurrection in general, then certainly yes).

As you see, Comrade Lominadze has accused also Comrade Bukharin — a monstrous accusation — that he rejects insurrection in general. In the same speech Comrade Bukharin made the following statement concerning the causes of the defeat of the Canton insurrection:

"A few words about Canton and its lessons. Some comrades made a fierce attack on Comrade Pepper. But much of what Comrade Pepper said is correct. I do not consider correct the main theses of Neumann's report that military-technical reasons are alone to blame for the Canton defeat. Such an analysis of the incidents would be utterly wrong; but that we did not have a sufficiently broad social basis for a victorious insurrection, is correct."

In regard to the problems of the defects of the preparation of the Canton insurrection, Comrade Bukharin made the following statements:

"Re inadequate organisational preparation, choice of right moment: I consider the various remarks made here by Comrade Pepper correct. I think that Comrade Pepper dealt in a right and proper manner with the problems of the attitude to the workers in trade unions, under the influence of the reformists. This is to his credit. He made correct remarks about several organisational problems and compulsory strikes. This is to his credit. One can say that this is a 'Menshevik deviation'; after all, from the standpoint of literature and pseudo-arguments, one can justify anything, but not from the standpoint of reality."

Comrade Neumann, as a student of revolutionary Marxism, was dealt with as follows by Comrade Bukharin:

"I also think one cannot deal with the question thus: Marxism — that is Neumann, Plekhanovism — that is Pepper, as this is put in some documents. Arguments of this kind are all right in an ale-house or in a students' corps, but for serious people this is rather ridiculous."

In regard to Comrades Lominadze's and Neumann's false assertion that I opposed the armed insurrection, Comrade Bukharin expressed himself as follows at that time in the discussion:

"It is not true that Pepper excluded armed insurrection. Pepper has never asserted anything of the kind."

I think that these quotations from Comrade Bukharin's speech are sufficient to expose the virulent campaign organised here by a few comrades in connection with the Canton insurrection.

I am sorry that I cannot discuss now the positive and negative sides of the Canton insurrection. The positive side was that the Canton insurrection represents the hitherto highest stage of development of the great Chinese revolution, the first insurrection under Soviet colours in a gigantic colonial country. This is the description I have given of the historical importance of the Canton insurrection in all my speeches and articles. All assertions to the contrary are untrue, and it is remarkable that hitherto no one has made even the least attempt to quote something that I have really said or written about Canton. No one has gone beyond general accusations. I have at the same time also criticised the negative sides, the political and organisational mistakes made by the Executive in connection with the Canton insurrection. This criticism should have been first and foremost the business of Comrades Lominadze and Neumann. They have up till now omitted it. The resolution of the IX. Plenum of the E.C.C.I. and the theses on the world situation which the VI. Congress has already adopted as a basis, have criticised the same errors, in my opinion, with as much justification as the comrades, including myself, who did so at the Chinese Conference. (Applause.)

Comrade SALA (Uruguay):

Comrades, the British and American imperialism have appropriated the main wealth of Latin-America. We see that the oil of Mexico, Venezuela and Colombia, the slaughter-houses of Uruguay and Argentine, the copper, nitrates and coal of Chile and Peru, the sugar of Cuba, the fruits of the countries of Central America, are in the hands of British or American companies. The strategical posts of the national economy of Latin America are dominated by the imperialism of the invaders. It should also be pointed out that the United States are ousting Great Britain in these countries.

At times, the trade and industrial bourgeoisie and even the capitalist landowners show certain anti-imperialist tendencies. Thus, when America wanted to impose taxes on Nicaragua, the press of agrarian capitalism in Uruguay raised a hue and cry against such an attack. When Great Britain committed an analogous crime in India, Egypt, etc., the press of the industrial and trade capitalists made even more fuss.

Workers, peasants, and the petty-bourgeoisie are anti-imperialist classes in the true sense of this word, and can constitute a genuine united front in the struggle for national emancipation.

Naturally, this struggle is linked up with the agrarian revolution in Latin America and with the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie. When the time will have come for the question of the agrarian revolution being raised seriously, the petty-bourgeoisie will be frightened and most of its strata will betray the revolution and will go over to the enemy camp.

The bourgeois-democratic revolution against feudalism and imperialism can only be accomplished under the hegemony of the proletariat. This must be clearly explained to the masses of Latin America and illustrated by examples taken from the revolutions in Mexico and Ecuador. The petty-bourgeoisie certainly promises land to the peasants and proclaims a struggle to the death against American imperialism, but this has never prevented it from capitulating.

Objective conditions for the bourgeois-democratic revolution exist in a considerable number of countries, but the subjective factors are lacking. In Colombia, for instance, there is not even a Communist Party, only a revolutionary workers' and peasants' movement organised into a Socialist-revolutionary party. In Ecuador a small Communist Party was formed recently. In Central America, in Venezuela and Nicaragua, the Communist International has no organisational base. In Brazil the Communist Party is still very weak and far from embracing the whole country. An enormous disproportion exists between the development of objective conditions and that of the subjective factors of the revolution in these countries. This disproportion must disappear.

I would like to say a few words about the workers' and peasants' bloc. We must organise peasant unions and not peasant parties. The peasant party runs the risk of becoming a danger to the Communist Party in the revolutionary epoch. The same applies to the workers' and peasants' party. We think that the workers' and peasants' bloc-slogan is a good slogan.

A few words on the character of the revolution in Latin America. Comrade Travin says that this revolution will not be a bourgeois-democratic revolution, but a Social-Revolution. In my opinion, this is an error. It is quite possible that in the beginning of the Revolution a considerable number of countries in Latin America will find themselves under the hegemony of the petty-bourgeoisie and that the revolution will issue the slogan of struggle against the reactionary governments, the big landowners and the imperialists. In the course of the struggle, the proletariat and its Party will naturally assume hegemony. Then the slogans of the proletariat and Socialism will be issued and the revolution will enter upon a new stage. It will be pursued in a non-capitalist direction and will lead to the democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants.

The development of the revolution in Latin America towards Socialism is favoured by the general tendency of the peasants to cultivate their land in common. This revolution is certain to need from the beginning the help of the world pro-

letariat and of the Communist International. With your permission, comrades, I will deal now with an important and decisive problem, a problem which Comrade Travin has placed before us. This comrade says that the revolutionary movement in Latin America cannot triumph "unless revolutionary movements take place simultaneously in various countries". Those are his very words.

What does this mean? That revolution in our country is impossible. Let us reason it out. The revolutionary process is not the same in all countries, and the maturity of this movement does not manifest itself everywhere at the same time. One cannot expect a simultaneous outbreak of Revolution in the various countries of Latin America, and consequently there can be no possible victory for the revolution if we are to believe Comrade Travin. One must say that this conception of Comrade Travin is absolutely defeatist and has nothing to do with the revolutionary policy of the C. I. Of course, the difficulties of a bourgeois-democratic revolution only in one country of Latin America will be enormous. We must not make ourselves any illusions on this subject. Imperialism will endeavour to crush it. But, it will find an echo among the masses of the adjoining countries and can depend on the support of the proletariat of U. S. S. R. and of the imperialist countries. This will interfere with the imperialist intervention. Moreover if the revolution adopts a correct political line it will be able to offer energetic resistance to the invaders. Even if the bourgeois democratic revolution be crushed, it will do a great service by giving an enormous impetus to the national liberation movement and also to the workers and peasants movement.

We must do our utmost to ensure in Latin America the development of subjective revolutionary factors. We must be very energetic in the trade union movement, must organise the masses, develop the industrial trade unions, direct the movement towards revolutionary strikes and must create a real federation of labour of Latin America. The peasant problem must also receive our attention. Peasant leagues must be created everywhere and must be grouped on a national and continental scale. Finally, the anti-imperialist movement must be systematically developed by creating everywhere Anti-Imperialist leagues and by transforming them into mass organisations embracing workers, peasants and the petty bourgeoisie for the purpose of supporting now the liberation movement in Nicaragua and rousing the peoples of Latin America against imperialism.

Comrade REMMELE (Germany):

Comrades, as a representative of the German Delegation, it would be my duty to speak about German imperialism and those manifestations of imperialism which indicate a new colonial policy on the part of Germany. I should speak also about the war preparations, armaments, etc. You know that at the very moment when at Brussels the Breitscheids, the Löbes and the rest of them lifted solemnly their hands pledging "No more war" and passed resolutions to the effect that the Social-Democratic parties should prevent war preparations; at the same time in Berlin their party comrades Hermann Müller, Severing, Hilferding and Wissell in the imperial government of Germany decided upon the first new programme of naval armaments. They consented to the building of the armoured cruiser "A". There is a German saying: "He who says 'A' will also have to say 'B'" — and so the naval programme has already been extended to include the armoured cruisers "B", "C", and "D". We have to deal here with a phenomenon indicating a revival of the idea of "Germany's future upon the sea". I should also speak upon questions like the participation of Germany in the League of Nations and Germany's membership in the Mandatory Commission for the colonies, stating the views of the German Party and the German Delegation.

However, the peculiar circumstances of the discussion compel me to touch but briefly upon these questions, and to turn to the main point of the discussion. What is it that we have to deal with as regards the group of comrades who spoke in the discussion about a process of industrialisation in the colonies in the direction of decolonisation? We have to deal here with nothing else but a revision of Leninism which has found its expression in the utterances that were made here. What is the import of the speeches of the comrades Bennet, Heller, and

a section of the English Delegation, for instance, Comrade Cox? We have to deal here with indiscriminate re-echoing of those theories which are now announced by the high priests of the League of Nations, with senseless repetition of those theories which are served to us by the Second International. Can we allow such revisionism? No, under no circumstances! It is necessary to wage the most determined struggle against this revisionism.

The three cardinal questions in our discussion are the following:

1. Is imperialism in the colonies a progressive force for the development of economy?
2. Is industrialisation going on in the colonies?
3. Is industrialisation likely to lead to the independence of the colonies?

Comrade Bennet said in his speech that the things said by Comrade Kuusinen in the theses concerning the effects of imperialism upon the population and the economic structure in the colonies were old and antiquated theories, that all this had existed during the first period of colonial conquests, but that now there was a new phase, a new development. Comrades, if this assertion be true, then we must also raise the question whether we have to deal with a new or an old dispute.

I maintain that we have to deal here with a controversy which is as old as revisionism itself. I may point to the fact that already at the Congress of the **German Social Democratic Party in 1907 at Essen** this question was raised. We could then observe three tendencies at that congress as regards the attitude towards capitalist colonial policies. Firstly, the most Right-wing, bourgeois standpoint of **Eduard David** who wanted to impose upon the German Party an active colonial policy. It was the standpoint which was more or less supported by the Dutch Social-Democracy and generally by the Social Democratic Parties of the leading imperialist countries. David's standpoint was to the effect that it was necessary to raise in opposition to the capitalist colonial policy of plunder and murder a Social-Democratic or a Socialist colonial policy. This policy was to be: the free unfoldment of industry, so that a proletariat might develop which would work in solidarity with the proletariat of the mother country for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. We there had views similar to those expressed by some comrades at this Congress. Comrade Bennet told us what he thought should be our policy as regards the colonial policy of capitalism. He believes that the revolutionary element is contained precisely in the industrialisation of the colonies, that an independent industrial proletariat will develop in the colonies, and that this colonial proletariat will play the role of a revolutionary factor. This was the idea expressed here by Comrade Bennet. Is it not a repetition of the old theory of Eduard David?

The second tendency at the Essen Congress was expressed by **Kautsky and Bebel**. Even a special work was published by Kautsky on this subject, under the title of "Socialism and Colonial Policy". It was stated there by Kautsky that no Social-Democratic colonial policy — whether positive or negative — could be put up in opposition to capitalism. The same was said also by Bebel, who declared at the Essen Congress that the controversy about colonial policy was a controversy about the Kaiser's beard. It was the typical Centrism, which buries its head in the sand in front of unpleasant problems, believing that they no longer exist.

There was yet a third tendency at the Essen Conference, which was the tendency of **Rosa Luxemburg**. And one should read again those speeches of Rosa Luxemburg on this question, in which she described the horrors, the crimes, the cruel methods employed by imperialism in the colonies, not only as regards the population, but even as regards the economic resources of the colonies. This third tendency — although it still lacked the clear insight into the colonial problem which we have today — was already an indication of the fact that the revolutionary section of the proletariat was already then on the road towards Leninism.

Comrades, I believe it would be possible by means of simple figures to demonstrate the fallacious nature of the views held by Comrade Bennet and the other comrades who expound the theory of decolonisation.

Let us first see what is the role played by the colonies in the structure of world economy. This is one of the decisive factors. What is the nature of colonial economy? This we may summarise somewhat as follows: the economic structure of each colony is determined by the coercive policy of the imperialism of the mother country. The economic structure of each colony is forcibly changed by the coercive policies of the mother country. When imperialism penetrates into the colonies, it finds there already a certain economic structure. But imperialism destroys the old structure, without creating a new independent economic structure in the colonies. It adapts the economic structure of the colonies to its own, so as to serve its particular ends.

It means that the whole of the old structure in India is destroyed, and the new structure is developed only with a view to serving England's economic interests. This is the reason why the Dominions are distinguished from the colonies.

The Dominions are self-governing, independent economic territories, whereas the colonies are part and parcel of the economy of the mother country.

But what does Comrade Bennet tell us? The same arguments as we hear from the Second International. I should like to read you something from the Brussels Congress. I take the literature of the so-called Left-wing Social Democrats, the "Kampf" of Vienna. I will quote a few passages of the French Leftwing Socialist Zyromski's article on "Socialism and Colonial Policy":

"Against the monopolist economic exploitation of the colonies, Socialism must work for the organisation of an international system for the distribution of raw materials.

"Against private capitalism, Socialism must establish the international collective economic management."

This is the theory of the Second International, which means the combination of the national imperialism with the imperialism of other powers into an uniform world-wide imperialism. Comrades, do we not get similar views expressed in the theory of colonial independence? We have absolutely similar views stated here.

The apostles of de-colonisation ignore entirely the essential nature of colonial economy, which is absolutely controlled, determined and influenced, not by the independence of the colonies, but by the policy of the mother country.

I now come to the questions which I have put in the beginning. Is there industrialisation in India? Then a supplementary question, is there an industrial development in India? Yes, there is an industrial development. To deny this would mean to tilt at windmills. Is there industrialisation in India? No, there is no industrialisation in India. And this gives also a rebuke to our good friend Pepper who also admitted a certain "industrialisation" in the case of India. What is industrial development, and what is industrialisation? These are two different conceptions which should not be confused. Industrialisation means when an agrarian country is developed into an independent industrial country. When does an agrarian country become developed into an industrial country? The main thing is not so much the proportion between agriculture and industry, but rather whether the country has developed an independent industry. When may an independent industry become developed? An independent industry may become developed when the country begins to produce the means of production. i. e. when it establishes and develops an industry which produces the means of production. This is the distinguishing mark between industrialisation and industrial development.

However, before going any further with the alleged industrialisation of India, I should like to deal with another matter, namely with the question whether imperialism is a progressive or destructive force in the economic development of the colonies. What is said on this subject by Furtwängler — an authority on India — in his work on industry and economics in India? He says on Page 95:

"India was already for thousands of years before its colonisation, an exporting country for manufactured goods, particularly textile goods, cotton, and silk goods."

Thus, before England ever got possession of India, the latter was already a country exporting textile goods. Furtwängler goes on to say on page 96:

"British rule meant the end of India's export industries."

Thus the rule of England has meant the end of Indian exports. England has destroyed the exports today. Further on he says:

"Customs duties of from 30 to 100% were imposed upon Indian textiles exported to England. However, in order to discourage the Indian manufacturing for the home market, the latter was eventually prohibited, as we have already seen in our historic survey, whilst the duty free importation of goods from England was enforced."

Thus the production of textile goods was prohibited.

Here, comrades, we see the effect of imperialism. Comrade Bennet wants to teach us and he says: yes, this was the case in the initial stage, but today there is something different, something new. Well, let us see how things are in the new stage. This new stage is the stage of alleged industrialisation. Is there an industry in India? Does this industry develop? Yes, there is a certain industry in India, and it is developing. Now let us see what branches this industry comprises. On this subject we find the following on page 104 of Furtwängler's book:

"Before the war the textile industry was the only Indian industry worth mentioning from the economic standpoint. Things changed during the war period and in 1917 an Indian munition industry was established which had for its distinct purpose to turn all the existing industries of the country to war purposes. Those industries which were previously suppressed for fear of competition were now encouraged, and a native industry had speedily grown up."

Thus, we are told by Furtwängler that before the war there was a textile industry and no other industry. It was only on account of war necessity that other industries were established. But what industries were developed? Industries for raising the economic level of the country? No, those were industries for the destruction of property and human life, and not for the unfoldment and development of the country. And even this new war industry was not private industry, but was working under orders of the British War Office.

In all industrial countries the metal industry is the dominant industry, whilst all the others are subsidiary industries. This is characteristic of an industrial country. How is the situation in India? Let us take the number of workers employed in the different branches of industry. Let us first take the group of workers employed in the production of raw material, and in the first place, the workers employed on the plantations. We shall find that there were employed on tea plantations 741,661 workers, on coffee plantations 40,304 workers, on rubber 17,262 workers, altogether 799,272 workers. In mining there were employed: in coal mines 181,594, on Manganese, etc., 35,997, in ore mines, gold mining, etc., 22,186, workers, altogether 239,777 workers, or altogether there are employed on raw materials 1,039,004 workers, that is, over one million.

In the production of semi-manufactured goods there are 72,061 workers employed in iron and steel works. The semi-manufacturing industries in the jute line give employment to 298,582 workers, and the cotton mills employ 83,055. Altogether, there are 381,673 workers employed in the semi-manufacturing industry. **Transportation and commerce:** a) railways — 112,532, b) printing works — 49,378, c) Dockers — 21,329, d) gas and electricity — 11,704, altogether 194,943 workers. **The production of the means of production:** here it is hard to distinguish the manufacturing of metal goods from the construction of machinery, at any rate there is a total of 82,182 workers employed in this industry, so that it may be safely assumed that we have to deal here with perhaps thousands of small repair shops existing in India, but not with big engineering works turning out the means of production.

To be sure, there are big metal works, e. g., the Tata works employing 40,000 people. But this is by no means a plant for the manufacturing of means of production, it is a plant

which turns out chiefly raw material and semi-manufactured goods largely for export purposes. Thus, the total number of industrial workers are between three and three and a half millions, of whom barely 20,000 are employed in engineering, i. e. repairing, installation, etc.

The number of the workers employed in the different industries and trades, together with their families, is as follows: in the textile industry 7,849,000, in the clothing industry, 7,425,000, in the woodworking trades 3,614,000, in the food-stuff trades 3,100,000, in the pottery industry 2,215,000, in mining 1,754,000, in the metal industry, 1,802,000, in the chemical industry 1,194,000, in the hide and skin industry, 731,000, in sundry industries 3,484,000, altogether 33,168,000, and only 1.8 millions of them are employed in the metal industry, which turns out only raw materials and semi-manufactured goods, but does not build any machinery.

Now, comrades, if these figures do not suffice, I believe that the figures of the population in India, the fluctuation between town and country shows quite clearly the trend of development. India has a 320 million population, of whom about 10% live in the towns, that is, 32 million urban inhabitants. Now, let us take the case of an industrial country and see how the process of development from an agrarian into an industrial country has taken place, e. g., Germany. Germany had in 1871 a population of 14,790,000 in the towns, i. e. 36.1% urban inhabitants; in 1925 there were already 40,124,000 urban inhabitants, which means 64.4%. Thus, in the course of a period of 55 years there was a development of urban population from 36% to 64%, or in other words, the transformation of peasant masses into industrial workers. As the result of the war, the urban population in Germany declined by 1.3%. At the same time, during the war years in Germany the normal increase of the population was at the rate of 2.2% during a period of five years, so that the normal increase for the whole decade in Germany was 7.9%, and this corresponds entirely to the total increase since 1871.

What do we see in India? A state of stagnation, of no change in regard to the urban population. The Indian towns today have practically the same population as regards numbers which they had centuries ago. Let us look at the development in the Indian towns, from 1911 till 1921, during a period of ten years. In 1911 the urban population in India was 9.4%, in 1921, it amounted to 10.2%, which means a slight increase of 0.8%. During the same period the urban population in Germany has increased by 7.9%. This precisely constitutes the difference between an agrarian and an industrial country — what Comrade Bennet wants to dispute — namely, that India is a big agrarian hinterland of its mother country. Yet Comrade Bennet told us in his speech:

“According to the statements of Comrade Kuusinen, no industrial proletariat is developing in India, but a pauperised, miserable mass.”

Comrades, let us see who is right on this question, Bennet or Kuusinen. I am going to cite here the total consumption of textile goods by the Indian people in the course of 1910—21.

	Ind'an Consumption of Textile Fabrics, in million yards	Textile Output of handlooms, in million yards
1910	3,010	0,950
1911	3,180	0,990
1912	3,400	1,100
1913	4,050	1,100
1914	4,170	1,330
1915	3,450	1,300
1916	3,410	1,200
1917	3,110	0,840
1918	2,860	0,870
1919	2,290	1,130
1920	2,410	0,610
1921	2,860	1,180

Is this pauperisation when the consumption of textile goods in India has fallen off by one half since the pre-war period? I

believe that this is pauperisation, a state of impoverishment and misery, indicating that Comrade Bennet's theory is wrong, as well as his assertion that in India there is a growing proletariat with ever-increasing consuming capacity and a rising standard of living. Perhaps there are few tens or hundreds of thousands of proletarians whose living standard is in the process of rising; but the proletariat on the whole is being pauperised, sliding down to the very lowest standard of living.

Now, comrades, if this does not carry sufficient conviction, let us quote again what Furtwängler says on this subject. He writes on Page 114:

“If India under British rule did not achieve such transformation into an industrial country (thus, Furtwängler says that India is not an industrial, but an agrarian country. H. R.), so as to produce for its own market and even to cater for the requirements of other countries, it was because it had no national government interested in developing the industrial life of the country, as was the case in Germany. Its policy (Britain's policy in India) is guided by the interests of the English producers outside of the country. The Indian currency is experimented upon, without any regard to the interests of the country; no debts are contracted to stimulate industrial development, whilst the State revenues do not serve as a source of funds for the wise development of industry and trade. Whatever money remains in the country, is used to the advantage of shareholders who live outside of the country, whereas the native people are denied the means for development and prosperity.”

Now, comrades, this is the verdict given by a Menshevik. Now we are told that the new theory is based upon the industrialisation of India, so that we should not judge by the old period, but should turn to the new period. Well, the book was written only six months ago. Any number of statistical data could be quoted on the question whether India is an agrarian or an industrial country.

I am going to deal also with data showing the income per capita, which is also a criterion to distinguish between an agrarian and an industrial country. The annual income per capita of the population in 1919 in the different countries was as follows:

U. S. A.	1,440 Marks.
Australia	1,080 ”
Great Britain & Ireland	1,000 ”
Canada	800 ”
France	760 ”
Germany	600 ”
Italy	460 ”
Spain	220 ”
Japan	120 ”
India	40 ”

I believe, these figures speak volumes.

Well, comrades, the chief argument of the apostles of decolonisation was the argument of capital exports. The capital exports to the colonies are the chief arguments used to demonstrate decolonisation, or to use the milder expression, the industrialisation of the colonies. Now, let us see how matters stand as regards capital exports. I believe that there has been a good deal of confusion on this point. Even comrades who spoke against decolonisation were confused when they spoke of the importance of capital exports in the colonies. What are the real facts about these capital exports?

Let us examine more closely the figures relating to the export of British capital to India. British capital exports to India and Ceylon in 1908 constituted 22.3% of the total capital exports from England. In the same year the English capital exports to other British possessions amounted to 12.8%. Thus, about 35% of the total capital exports went to the colonies, and about 65% to the capitalist, independent countries. Thus it was in 1908. In 1915 these British capital exports to India amounted to 16.7%, and to the other colonies and British possessions the capital exports amounted to 0.7%. In 1927, the British capital exports to India amounted only to 0.5% of the total capital exports, whereas the capital exports to the other British possessions amounted to 34.2%. What does it mean when about

35% of the capital exports went to the colonies, and 65% to the capitalist countries of Europe, to the border States, to the Balkans, to Italy, etc.? It means that the British capital exports have gone chiefly to these countries and not to the colonies. I believe the subject of capital export was misused here in the sense that the connection with the colonies is based mainly upon capital exports.

Now as to the question of the development and importance of Indian economy on a world scale, or in regard to the other colonies. You know that the **consumption of coal** in each country constitutes a special criterion of industrial development, or of the relationship between industry and agriculture. What figures have we here? The consumption of coal per capita in 1913 in India amounted to 0.05 metric tons, in 1925 — 0.07, showing an increase of 0.02 in the course of 12 years. In South Africa the consumption of coal has increased from 1.2 in 1913 to 1.4 in 1925, so that there was a greater increase than in India, namely, by 0.2 metric tons. These figures show again the insignificant role of Indian industry from the standpoint of world economy. India is decidedly a country of agriculture and raw materials and not an industrial country.

A similar situation is indicated by the figures relating to mass consumption. We have already mentioned that machinery is not produced in India, and that it has to be imported. Is there a growing development in the use of machinery in India? The figures show quite a different story. In India in 1913 the consumption of machinery per capita amounted to 0.4, in 1926 it amounted to 0.7, whereas in South-Africa the increase has been from 10.5 in 1913 — already 20 times as much as in India — to 14.1 in 1926. In South America it amounted to 4.9 in 1913 and to 6.6 in 1926. In Germany it amounted to 32.3 in 1913 and to 36.2 in 1926. Thus, you see again the minimum development in this respect even as compared with other colonies.

There is a whole number of other domains where this relationship could be examined, for instance, as regards the use of Electricity. The consumption of electricity in 1925 amounted in America to 57.60, in Germany to 28.20, in Great Britain to 26.30, and in India it amounted in 1913 to 0.06, and in 1925 to 0.20. These figures are quite sufficient to show what industrial development or industrialisation is going on in India.

Comrade Bennet has raised yet another question, which was rather important. He said: If no industrialisation is going on in the colonies, how will the Revolution come in the colonies?

This is an exceedingly "revolutionary" argument. Our experts in colonial politics have not yet grasped the difference between the revolution in the colonies and the revolution in the industrial countries. But this is the very thing which Leninism wants to make clear. They picture to themselves the development in the colonies somewhat as follows: first, an independent development, then an independent proletariat, and then the revolution. If we should wait for the development of such a mass proletariat in the colonies, so to speak, so that it should constitute the majority of the population, before we might speak of having entered into the phase of social-revolution; then the world revolution would be a long time coming. We would then require a good deal of patience. But we do not possess so much patience. The process of development is much shorter. The fact that the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the colonies constitutes a component part of the social-revolution in the industrial countries is of tremendous importance. No revolutionary changes were caused in the colonies even by the world war and by pauperisation and militarism. It was the October Revolution in Russia which aroused the colonies. This is the very importance of the proletarian revolution in Russia that has aroused the masses of the enslaved and oppressed colonial peoples. These facts are insolubly connected. Comrades, I believe that the idea of waiting for a proletariat in the colonies before expecting the revolution, this idea has nothing whatever to do with the Marxian conception. I believe we ought to reject categorically such a revision of Leninism.

I should like to touch further upon the connection existing between the proletarian revolution in the industrial countries and the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the colonies. I believe this involves also the question whether Lenin was right

when he maintained that in the colonial, semi-colonial and backward agrarian countries the state of socialism might be reached without passing through the stage of capitalism, or whether the agrarian countries and the colonies and semi-colonies could reach such a stage as to be able to be led straight on to Socialism, without passing through the stage of capitalism, in connection with the social-revolution in the industrial countries. I believe that by raising the question in the manner which Comrade Bennet did, the reply given by Lenin to this question is repudiated.

In conclusion, I should like also to deal with some of the points raised here in connection with the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the colonies and semi-colonies in relation to the proletarian revolution in the mother countries. In the already quoted "Kampf" published by the Austro-Marxians, we find an interesting article by Max Werner (Heidelberg) dealing with this question. Max Werner — probably an assumed name of one of the Russian Mensheviks — is one of the most cunning Austro-Marxians. In this article, entitled "Colonial Problems of the Soviet Union and the Chinese Revolution" he describes Russia as a big colonial country. Let us allow him this jest, and let us hear what he says about the foreign policy of Soviet Russia in connection with these questions:

"The Soviet State carries on not only internal, but also 'external' colonial policies; it asserts itself as an active anti-imperialist force and advocates certain principles of colonial policy on the outside. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union is closely connected with this anti-imperialist policy."

And he goes on to describe how Russia has practised the three phases of this policy. Thus, as regards the period when British imperialism was intervening against the Soviets in the South and in the East, the German armies in the North, and the French, Polish and other armies in the West, he says the following:

"The resistance to the imperialist intervention was certainly a big historic achievement of the Soviet Power. Soviet Russia was the **only country** in the first years of the post-war period which offered armed resistance to the coercive advance of the Entente. The great Russian Continent was saved from becoming the plaything of the victorious imperialists, which would have been the outcome of the victory of the Russian counter-revolution."

Elsewhere in his article he says about a certain period in the struggle:

"As against this, England distinctly pursued the aim of direct colonial expansion when it intervened in Russia: The invasion of Transcaucasia and Central Asia was to crown the British victory in the Near East and to open new material resources and ways of communication to England's vast colonial empire."

Or let us take the statement made by Chaman Lall, the representative of the Indian Trade Unions at the Brussels Congress:

"The question of Indian independence is important not only to the Indians, but also to all the neighbouring peoples. As a member of the Indian Legislative Assembly, I have assisted in the rejection of the military budget during the last two years, raising the charge in this connection — which was substantiated by the speech of the Chief Commander of the Indian army — that the Indian army is maintained at a war standard in preparation for a war against the Soviet Union."

Thus you see that, the question of colonial policy is also here connected by the imperialists directly with the aim of destroying the centre of the world revolution, just as they did in 1917—18 in connection with the success of the October Revolution. The October Revolution meant the awakening of the colonial peoples and their striving to break their fetters. Max Werner says the following on the connection between the Chinese Revolution and the October Revolution:

"The most efficient and enduring intervention was carried on by the Japanese, which lasted until 1922. Japan exerted tremendous energy and employed large forces over the colossal territory of South eastern Siberia, but was nevertheless pushed back. It should not be forgotten that the Russian resistance has not only limited the world-wide

scope of the Versailles victors, but also has facilitated the future spread of the national movements. The ousting of Great Britain from Transcaucasia emancipated Turkey from the iron ring and helped the national rising in Angora, whilst the liberation of South-eastern Siberia from the Japanese has facilitated the rise of the national movement in China."

Here Max Werner clearly shows the connection which exists between proletarian revolution and the national-liberation wars and bourgeois-democratic revolutions in the colonies and semi-colonies. It is for the first time that a Menshevik has indirectly admitted here that the role of "democratic" Georgia was none other than that of a subservient lackey of British imperialism.

Every revolutionary cataclysm in the mother countries results directly in a rising tide of revolution in the colonies. This is the only way to treat and discuss the colonial question. Only in connection with the social-revolution should we consider our Communist, Bolshevik colonial policies, our Communist, Bolshevik activity in the colonies, in close alliance with the proletariat of the mother countries, marching on towards the liberation of the whole world. And it is from this standpoint and on the ground of these ideas that we shall be able to achieve the grand aims of the proletarian revolution.

(Applause.)

Comrade WOLFE (U. S. A.):

Comrades, I want to say a word about the thesis in general. I have seen in it certain formulations which need alteration or correction, amendments, and so on. I want to say that those who reject them fundamentally have a fundamentally wrong approach to the colonial question. I consider the theses unquestionably a most valuable contribution to the work of the Communist International.

The primary merit of this thesis is its effort, and in general its success, in picturing the complicated variety in the process of colonial development and colonial revolutionary movements in the various portions of the world. The theses represent a passing over from the general formula with which the Communist International has largely had to content itself since the basic work of Lenin at the Second Congress, to its application in detail to the concrete and the greatly complicated phenomenon of the colonial picture. In addition the theses utilise the rich experiences of some eight years of struggles in the various colonial and semi-colonial fields.

Other merits of the theses are the attempts to define the colonial regime as to its economic and political characteristics, classification of the colonies according to the degree of development of class relationship. The distinction is made clear between the driving forces of the various revolutions and their political content.

Comrades, in confusion of the distinction between the class driving forces of a revolution and the political content of a revolution, in confusion between bourgeois democratic and Socialist revolution, in confusion on the question of phases in a colonial revolution, — in confusion on these three fundamental lines lies the basis for the Trotskyist conception of the colonial question. The theses greatly clarify these important points.

I turn now to the question of "decolonisation".

1. There exists a general tendency of capitalism to draw the entire world into the train of capitalist production, to destroy the earlier forms of economy and to introduce capitalist conditions throughout the world.

2. This tendency is undoubtedly strengthened by the export of capital.

3. To bring the whole world into the orbit of the capitalist system, however, does not necessarily mean that all sections of it need be industrialised. Capitalist market relations, plus imperialist rule, plus capitalist agricultural relations would also satisfy this tendency. The basic in industrialisation in a country is the development of those industries which produce means of production.

4. In addition to this basic general tendency towards the development of capitalism throughout the world, imperialism

expresses a direct counter-tendency, namely, to intensify the parasitic exploitation and the restrictions upon the development of the backward portions of the world.

5. There have been two periods in the development of modern economy when this restrictive tendency was dominant. These periods were the period of early monopoly out of which modern capitalism grew, the period of "mercantilist" policy in regard to the colonies; and then the period of monopoly on the basis of finance capital, the export of capital and trustification.

6. While the industrialisation and the production of capitalist conditions in the backward nations is growing in an absolute sense of quantity, the parasitic restrictive aspect of imperialism is the dominant one.

7. The so-called decolonisation tendency of capitalism is to such an extent counter-acted by the parasitic restrictive tendency of imperialism that we even witness a tendency towards recolonisation or better, towards colonisation in the sense of reducing previously independent regions of the world to the status of semi-colonies. We have had in the post-war period, the growth of a whole series of such new semi-colonies where there was no question of colonial status before.

8. Of the two tendencies, that is, of the tendency to further the industrial development of the backward portions of the world and the counter-tendency to hinder, restrict, and prevent this industrial development, the latter is undoubtedly dominant. The fundamental in this period of finance capital and capital export, is not as Comrades Rothstein, Bennet and some of the other speakers said, the industrialisation tendency but the parasitic exploitation tendency of the countries which export capital. To miss this, comrades, is to miss the fundamentally parasitic role of imperialism. To hold the theory that the dominant tendency of imperialism is to develop modern production in the backward portions of the world, would lead objectively towards an underestimation of the oppressive reactionary role of imperialism, of the necessity of and the sharp explosive force of the struggle against it. Carried to its logical conclusion, it leads objectively to an opportunist and even an unconscious apologetic line in the question of the role and character of imperialism.

9. The contradiction between these two tendencies is one expression of the antagonism between metropolis and colony.

10. This antagonism, together with the class struggle within the various countries, together with the antagonisms between the imperialist powers and the Soviet Union, will lead to the destruction of imperialism long before this ideally conceived industrialisation of the world is completed or has progressed basically far. Only Socialism will complete the task but on a new basis of division of labour and planned economy on a world scale.

I want to turn now to Latin America. Certainly here also both tendencies are observable. But, again there can be no question as to which is dominant.

It is perfectly true that the United States, in certain countries of Latin America has found it necessary to overthrow certain reactionary forces. The reason is a historical one, namely, that Great Britain was in those countries first, picked in advance the best natural allies for imperialism in those countries, namely, the land owners and reactionary Catholic church. When the United States came upon the field to challenge Britain's privileged position the U. S. was faced with the accomplished fact of the union between landowners and Catholic reactionaries with British imperialism, and in order to break ground for the forward march of the dollar it was necessary to further certain revolutionary forces in those countries.

However, just as soon as Britain's puppet governments were overthrown, then the United States tried to stem the tide of the revolutionary development which it had helped to set loose. In those countries in Latin America, where the United States can take its pick, it links up with the semi-feudal, catholic landowning reaction and all the most backward class forces in the country. Thus, we find that the United States sets up a Fascist dictatorship, autocracies of the most brutal sort, in such countries as Cuba, Nicaragua, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile.

So far as Liberia is concerned this "progressive" American imperialism is attempting to go back to a system of chain-gang, chattel slavery.

The situation in Latin America presents us with a whole series of new forms of semi-colonies of various grades and kinds, most of them maintaining their formal independence while the power of the United States grows greater and greater.

American imperialism has developed many forms of intervention. We can distinguish the following:

1. **Military intervention**, primarily in Mexico and the Caribbean countries. In those countries we have witnessed no less than 30 military interventions in a period of a quarter of a century.

2. **Customs control**. The Orient is not the only portion of the world where the customs of so-called sovereign countries are controlled by imperialism.

3. **Direct fiscal control** of bank appointees who are nominated by the President of the United States and formally approved by the puppet governments.

4. **Military advisers**.

5. **The financing** of "revolutions" and financing of reactionary dictatorships.

The general progress of American domination is from North to South, from near to far, from the Canal to the Straits of Magellan. Of course, it is not a regular march; certain countries were temporarily overlooked in order to make the jump into Chile for the copper and other mineral wealth there.

This march involves not only a struggle with the peoples of Latin America but also a struggle with British imperialism. The United States has invested in Latin America at the present time something like 5,200,000,000 dollars. If we add Canada we find that the United States has invested in the New World something over 8000 millions, out of a total of 13,000 millions which is invested in the world as a whole, exclusive of the war debts.

To date the United States has invested in Latin America almost an identically equal amount to Great Britain. You can calculate both of them in round figures at about 5000 million dollars, but before the war Great Britain already had 5000 million dollars invested in Latin America, and has today only 5,200,000,000 dollars, whereas the United States before the war had only 2,200,000,000 dollars and has equalised with Great Britain now.

I want to underscore the importance of Latin America in the scheme of economy of the United States, and also its importance in the coming war period. Venezuela today with its oil resources scarcely touched is the third biggest producer of oil in the whole world; the first being the home territory of the United States. The Soviet Union is the second. Mexico is the fourth. Colombia and Peru have scarcely been opened up and are rich in reserves of oil. North Argentine and a section of Bolivia also show oil deposits. Metals are found in rich abundance and in the forms easy to extract. Raw materials of importance in making munitions are potassium and nitrates. There is rubber and, of course, agricultural products.

The Latin American revolutions belong to the bourgeois democratic revolutions. They represent a close fusion of revolutionary movements, primarily agrarian, with the struggles against American imperialism. However, the basic driving force in these revolutions is not the bourgeoisie, but the workers and peasants. This explains the vague socialistic aspirations which are in the hands of foreign capital, as are the banks, means of explains the Socialist phraseology, the radical gestures of the petty bourgeois governments that take advantage of these revolutionary forces for their own purposes.

During the electoral campaign of Calles and Angel Flores, for the Presidency of Mexico, Flores who represented the land-owning catholic reaction with the support of British capital, posted all over the country a placard with his picture and the words, "I am a Socialist and a Revolutionary". You can imagine what revolutionary phrases the "Socialist" Calles used if that was the character of the propaganda of the reaction.

We have in Latin America, for example, such dangerous careerists as Haya de la Torre of Peru who came to Moscow, who attended the Fifth Congress of the Comintern as a fraternal

delegate, who came to the Third Congress of the Profintern as a regular delegate, and who has attempted to cover with the mantle of Communism an essentially non-Communist movement.

A few remarks as to class forces in Latin America:

a) We must not, in the first place, forget the great weakness of the **national bourgeoisie** in most of the Latin American countries. All important industries in most of these countries are in the hands of foreign capital, as are the banks, means of communication, etc. Thus, in Mexico, in the field of petroleum, the investment of native Mexican capital comes ninth on the list and even Cuban capital has more money invested in Mexican petroleum than have native Mexicans. This weakness of the native bourgeoisie helps to account for the greater role played by the petty bourgeoisie in Latin American revolutionary movements.

b) We must note the peculiar character of certain sections of the Latin American **petty bourgeoisie**. Intellectuals who are partially declassed, play an important role out of all proportion to their numbers in the movements of Latin America.

There are two basic reasons for the existence of discontent among the intelligentsia of Latin America. One is that foreign imperialism in general, and American in particular, tends to maintain in power for indefinite periods autocratic governments, until these degenerate into cliques of super-annuated bureaucrats who leave no room for the young intellectuals being turned out by the universities to find a career in the important sphere of government. This was one of the driving forces which made the student body and the young intellectuals of Mexico virtually unanimous in their opposition to Diaz and his group after they had been in power for thirty years. A similar situation exists in countries like Venezuela, Peru, etc. Secondly, there is the tendency of American capitalist enterprises to employ as technicians, engineers, overseers, etc., Americans so that the only other field that might be open to intellectuals is thereby closed to them by imperialism. They have only one field of activity, namely, opposition politics and anti-imperialist politics and into this they tend to enter. They represent, however, a dangerous force combining with the usual vacillating characteristics of the petty bourgeoisie and intelligentsia, a peculiar susceptibility to both open and indirect bribery, being readily satisfied by a "share" in the government.

c) The proletariat in the Latin American countries, with the exception of the most developed of them, is extremely weak. This is a reflection of the weakness of the industrial development in general. Also, even where there is a proletariat developing it is still lacking in experience, organisations, technique and discipline, due to the newness of the proletariat as a class. It is closely linked up with the peasantry, often made up of only recently "deruralised" peasants. This infiltrates the proletariat with peasant ideology and makes popular a sort of "narodnikism".

d) As to the **peasantry**, it presents some peculiar features in many of the Latin American countries which makes it necessary to distinguish sharply between it and the European peasantry. The peasant in many Latin American countries is not a landowner of even the smallest parcel of land, he is a former joint owner of communal lands. The process of creating large estates, of dispossessing the peasant Indian communes, the process of enclosures has removed him from the land, pauperised him and made him into an agrarian worker. However, he retains the traditions of having been a possessor of land and the ambition of recovering the lands taken from him, or his immediate forefathers. Often he does not even demand private property in land, but demands that the communal lands be restored to the entire village unit or tribal unit that formerly possessed them.

e) There are whole sections of inland countries in Latin America where Spanish is not the language of the people, where there are still vast **Indian tribes** with strong survivals of tribal organisation. These Indian tribes speak their own language, retain strong vestiges of primitive Communism in their tradition and their economy and in some cases have a powerful tradition of former tribal glory. (Incas, Aztecs, Mayas, etc.) They view Europeans and even mixed white and Indian natives of the coastal and more industrialised regions of the country with suspicion and even aversion and can rarely be led

by those who cannot speak their own tribal language. The Parties of Latin America in those countries must work out a whole series of special measures to meet these problems, measures involving such matters as self-determination for the indigenous races, special propaganda in their own languages, special efforts to win leading elements among them, special educational activities for those Communists who are of Indian origin and who speak the Indian dialect so that they can go back into the inner regions of the country and organise the indigenous elements.

The history of the last generation in these Latin American countries where compact indigenous tribes exist, is characterised by a whole series of Indian uprisings, sometimes against foreign imperialist oppressors, sometimes against the landowners, sometimes against the native state bureaucracy — generally a fusion of these three revolutionary moments. These uprisings constitute the greatest reserve of revolutionary energy that exists in Latin America which reserve is only very imperfectly connected with the proletarian and agrarian peasant movements of the rest of the countries.

f) Emphasis must be laid on the lack of bourgeois democratic and parliamentary traditions in Latin American political life and lack of such traditions and illusions among the masses. The weakness and often times virtual non-existence of the native bourgeoisie is of course the basic explanation of this. The petty bourgeoisie makes up the state apparatus and often times the officership of the armies. A struggle for control of the treasury is quite literally an important force in the conflicts between the different so-called parties in Latin American life.

g) As to the rival imperialisms the conflicts between them often result in liberating revolutionary forces in a country where they are about equally balanced. Each of them supports contrary elements, and if one of them is tied up with the reaction, the other one has to tie up with the progressive elements. The result is a continuous see-saw manifested in Mexico since the discovery of oil there. This has tended to liberate revolutionary forces in the country. We may look for a similar situation now in a country like Venezuela where oil has been discovered in such quantities and where British and American capital are in pretty even balance.

h) The leaders of the American Federation of Labour, Green and Woll and their henchmen, Morones, Iglesias, Cariato Vargas, etc., with their Monroe Doctrine of Labour and their Pan-American Federation of Labour seek to paralyse the fighting will of the Latin American masses, and pave the way for the new conquest of the continent. The American and Latin American parties must set up the closest union of the working class organisations of Latin America with each other, with the Left wing of the American labour movement and with the R. I. L. U.

i) I think the Congress must categorically reject the proposal for the founding of Workers' and Peasants' Parties in the Latin American countries.

Our primary task in Latin America is to establish Communist Parties, build them strong and make their lines of demarcation clear. They must penetrate the mass movements of the workers and peasants and lead these movements. Particularly in view of the weakness of the parties, the political backwardness of the masses, the lack of parliamentary tradition and the excessively big role played by the petty bourgeois state bureaucracy and the petty bourgeois professional politicians in Latin America, there is the danger that such elements will get control of the workers' and peasants' party. The correct form for Latin America today is the worker-peasant bloc with leadership by a steadily developing Communist Party.

j) In the various struggles against imperialism and against internal reaction in the various countries, the workers and peasants must enter as a separate force. The Communist Party must make clear its own programme at every stage, must criticise at every stage the elements with which at times it must cooperate; must struggle consistently for the hegemony in those movements. At the same time we must pay special attention to the organisational form that the struggle manifests. For example, when elements of a still revolutionary character seek the support of the peasants and workers of Latin America, we must put down as one of the minimum organisational conditions the right of those workers and peasants to separate armed detachments under their own leadership, with their own programme, and maintaining the status of guerilla forces in the general

struggles that take place. This tactic has been applied with some success in Mexico, and as a result, whole sections of the peasantry are armed today, and in spite of the repeated efforts to disarm them, they retain their arms. There is a new wave of resistance against American imperialism; a new development of revolutionary forces in the agrarian revolution, and all the phases of the revolutionary movement in Latin America. I mention only a few instances: the long struggle in Mexico, the revolutionary struggle in Ecuador, uprisings in Brazil, in Colombia, in Peru, in Venezuela, in Bolivia, in Paraguay, in Northern Argentina; the sharpening struggle in Chile, which has only temporarily been defeated by the establishment of a brutal military Fascist dictatorship. And above all, the heroic resistance that has been manifested by such little countries as San Domingo, Haiti and Nicaragua and the other Central American countries to the aggression of the United States. Costa Rica has been quiet for a while, but we find here in an issue of a Costa Rican paper of May 18, 1928 that a motion of interpellation to the Secretary of Foreign relations as to why they are not recognising the Soviet Union, and a demand that the United States blockade be broken in this respect, was carried by the Chamber of Deputies. This means that there are stirrings among the masses, or these petty-bourgeois politicians would never attempt to frame such a demand.

The outstanding example of the new strength of the resistance of Latin America to American imperialism is the struggle in Nicaragua. This is the first time that Nicaragua, or any of the small Central American countries, has been able to put up so brave a resistance for so long a period. For a year and a half, in one form or another, the forces of national liberation in that diminutive country have been holding at bay the marines of the United States and carrying on, with more or less success, incredibly heroic guerilla warfare. The United States has still not succeeded in winning this war in Nicaragua. Never before has such a struggle awakened so much echo in the rest of Latin America and gone so far towards unifying the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces in Latin America for a common struggle.

In the face of the dominant power of American imperialism in the world today, Latin America assumes more importance than ever; in fact, it moves up to the first rank among the vital questions concerning the entire Communist International. The United States and the Soviet Union represent the two poles of the earth today. The whole Comintern must turn its attention to this natural enemy of American imperialism, this natural ally of the proletariat of the world — the revolutionary movements of the Latin American peoples. At the 5th Congress Latin America was represented by one Party and two League delegates for all of these numerous countries put together. The large representation at the 6th Congress is an evidence that the Comintern has already turned its eyes in that direction, and an evidence also of the rapid development of class relationships in Latin America. But the entire Comintern, and particularly the American section of the Comintern, must multiply by many times its attention and its aid to the Communist Parties and the revolutionary movements of Latin America.

The Latin American countries are still in the so-called Latin Secretariat. Because our apparatus unfortunately is built on a basis of language, in place of common political problems. I think that some reorganisation must come after this Congress in which common political problems become the basis of grouping, and not common language.

Finally, I want to say that as far as the question of "Latin-Americanism", which has been raised in the discussion here, is concerned, we cannot slavishly accept the general proposals for Latin American unity which are made by the petty bourgeois intellectuals of Latin America. The proposal for a union of all the existing governments and countries as at present constituted in Latin America is a fundamentally false and reactionary proposal, because they include whole series of puppet governments of American imperialism, and some governments which are still puppets of British imperialism. We must raise the slogan of the union of the revolutionary forces, the workers and peasants movements, of Latin America with the revolutionary workers of the United States; and we must add to that the slogan of the Union of Soviet Workers and Peasant Republics of Latin America for a common defence against American imperialism, and for a common federation in a Soviet Union.

Thirty-seventh Session.

Moscow, 18th August 1928 (Afternoon).

Comrade SCHÜLLER (Chairman):

I declare the Session open. The item on the agenda is the continuation of the debate on the **Colonial Question**. The first speaker is Comrade Fachri-Turkey.

Comrade FACHRI (Turkey):

Comrades, in the main, the Turkish delegation is in agreement with Comrade Kuusinen's theses and particularly with that section which deals with the non-capitalist development. In one section of the theses the capitalist development in Turkey is dealt with. The principal idea underlying the description of this development is that Turkey, i. e. Anatolia at the time of the national-revolution was at a level of development similar to that of the countries in Type 4, as for example, Abyssinia, Tripoli, Arabia, etc. But it should be clear to all that it is impossible to speak of any industrial development in these countries. These countries have not even reached the feudal stage of development. At best we can say that in these countries handicraft and primitive trade has developed, whereas Turkey had already reached a certain stage of industrial development. Capitalism has been developing in Turkey for the last 70 or 80 years and we have a proletarian class there. The industrial development in the interior of the country had reached such a stage that a bourgeois revolution was possible. The process of class-differentiation had penetrated the rural districts. The industrial development of that time and the number of workers employed in industry were never less than in any of the Balkan countries. In Constantinople there were about 100,000 proletarians and in other parts of Anatolia they numbered approximately 500,000 including those in Adana, Smyrna, Simgulak, Samsun, Eskişehir, Kaiseri, etc. Therefore, it cannot be said that Anatolia is a backward country. It is evident also from the reports of the E. C. C. I. that the masses of the proletariat in Turkey are even more developed and more numerous than in some other Balkan countries.

Why did the bourgeois revolution in Turkey proceed on capitalist lines? First of all we must of course, bear in mind the objective causes, but we must not lose sight of the subjective causes, for these also are very important. This line of development was possible because the proletariat in the various parts of Turkey was scattered. An important section lived in the territories occupied by the imperialists, and therefore had no contacts or even the possibility of establishing contacts with each other. Secondly, the past history of the country, and particularly the history of the proletariat, prevented the working class from organising itself at the proper time, from commencing the class struggle at the proper time. Moreover, owing to the national liberation character of the national-revolution, the proletariat was easily influenced by the crafty policy of the bourgeoisie. Thirdly, the Communist Party was only in a rudimentary state. It had only just begun to establish contacts with the masses. It had only just begun to organise the masses, to influence them and to lead them into the struggle. Fourthly, the international Labour movement at that time had not yet had any experience in carrying on the anti-imperialist struggle or in the colonial struggles for liberation. At that time the Comintern had only very loose connections with the Turkish proletariat, and yet it was of extreme importance that these contacts should have existed in order that the Communist Party of Turkey might lead the struggle for proletarian hegemony.

Fifthly, notwithstanding the fairly strong peasant movement, the organised movement was weak and very often organisation was completely lacking. Sixthly, the bourgeoisie, as a result of the development of commerce, and particularly of industry, had had considerable experience in legal and illegal fighting against the old regime and in participating in Government. It organised the revolutionary forces of its class and had the army on its side. Hence, it was well-organised and strong. Seventh, the mutual antagonisms among the imperialists enabled the Turkish bourgeoisie to achieve a speedy victory. The bourgeois class managed to exercise considerable influence over the masses of the workers and in this way pave the road for capitalist development. These are the factors that made it possible for the bourgeois revolution to proceed along capitalist lines in

Turkey and not the pre-feudal conditions as is stated in the theses.

Having made this clear, I would now like to go into the internal situation in Turkey. This is all the more necessary for the reason that in recent years the development of capitalism in Turkey has taken an altogether different direction. **Kemalism** has completed the first stage of its development, i. e. a development by its own means and resources. The Kemalists, who established their power after the victory over the imperialists, utilised this political power for the purpose of laying down at least a minimum economic basis for their power at the expense of the non-Turkish elements, of the agents of imperialism the comprador bourgeoisie. At this stage they not only set to work to restore the old workshops and factories, but to establish new ones and crush their competitors. We observe an extraordinary increase in taxation, an increasing employment of State funds for the purpose of establishing their economic power and for industrial development. We see the application of monopolist methods and the mobilisation of capital in the country. This development, which lasted for several years, brought the Turkish national bourgeoisie nearer to their erstwhile competitors, the comprador bourgeoisie.

This stage of development came to a close about a year and a half ago. **Kemalism** has reached a point when it cannot develop any further. The bourgeoisie is compelled to increase and accelerate accumulations. But all the attempts on the part of the national bourgeoisie to secure independent development by the methods they previously employed have failed. They are now compelled to an increasing degree to import foreign capital; **Kemalism** is compelled to take imperialist capital into partnership in the exploitation of the masses of the workers. Imperialism has taken advantage of this situation to compel the **Kemalist** bourgeoisie to settle the **Mosul** question and lately the question of the public debts in its favour. On these two supreme points **Kemalism** has surrendered to imperialism. But that is not all. In order to satisfy the appetites of the imperialists, **Kemalism** is compelled to grant even greater concessions to foreign capital. Thus, **Kemalism** has been forced on the road towards betraying the independence of the country.

Another result of the present situation is the severe suppression of the working class. The **Kemalist** bourgeoisie is not only persecuting the Communist movement, but also the revolutionary trade unions and all labour organisations that have the courage to fight. Thus, the **Kemalist** bourgeoisie has gone over entirely to the camp of the counter-revolution. It represents a characteristic example of the national-bourgeoisie in colonial and semi-colonial countries going over to the side of the counter-revolution even when it is victorious. Moreover, we see that colonial and semi-colonial countries that have entered on the road of capitalist development are unable to carry the development of that capitalism further independently. They are compelled after a certain time to submit to the influence of foreign capital. These countries which have carried their struggle for liberation to a victorious conclusion, but which have not taken the Socialist road of development gradually revert back to the position of the semi-colonial countries. This applies also to **Kemalist** capitalist Turkey. The Kemalists are already concluding treaties with the imperialist bourgeoisie, for example with **Italian** capitalism. These treaties are directed towards a war against the Soviet Union and against the revolutionary front of the international proletariat. This is the most characteristic aspect of the new turn in **Kemalism**. This is the second stage, the stage of colonisation, of the subordination of Turkey to imperialism; the stage of the treachery of the national bourgeoisie and their complete transition to the counter-revolution.

This situation naturally found an echo in our ranks. Differences of opinion arose in the Party over **Kemalism** and the line the Party should take. One section in the Party was of the opinion that capitalist development in Turkey bears an anti-militarist character and that in this period the bourgeoisie not only represents the interests of its own class, but the interests of all classes in Turkey. Hence, we must not take up a political struggle or a class struggle against **Kemalism**, but at most

an economic struggle — a struggle for partial demands, for the improvement of the conditions of the workers. No revolutionary attack against the capitalist system and therefore no leading mass Party, but a study circle.

Another section, which lost their heads owing to the severe terror, which were driven to despair by the severe measures taken by the bourgeoisie against the working class, and embittered by the betrayals of agents-provocateurs committed a mistake of another kind. They resorted to acts of individual heroism, they abandoned the workers in the Kemalists trade unions, they ceased to strive for the unity of the trade union movement, but advocated splitting the movement. They committed anarchistic mistakes and betrayed strong symptoms and tendencies of sectarianism. They went too much to the Left in advocating slogans which are applicable only for highly developed capitalist countries. Turkey has undergone a bourgeois revolution, but this revolution has not fulfilled all the tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. It has not solved the agrarian revolution, the national question, etc. In Turkey we have remnants of semi-feudalism. Turkey is not a highly industrial developed country like Germany, for example. The majority of the population consist of peasant small producers. Hence, the Turkish proletariat can only take up the task of the transition from the workers' and peasants' dictatorship to the proletarian dictatorship. This transitional period will be a short one in Turkey, because industry is developed to some extent. There is a fairly large and adequate working class and a Communist Party that is linked up with the masses. Needless to say, this dictatorship of the workers and peasants must be under the direct leadership and hegemony of the proletariat. This is the correct line that the Communist Party of Turkey must take up. This is the correct perspective that emerges from the analysis of the concrete situation.

The tasks of the Communist Party in this period are: to strengthen the Party organisationally and to transform it into a mass Party. To recruit the masses of the workers, particularly the unorganised workers for the trade unions; to combat the dangers in the working class principally from the Right, those from the Left to be subjected to criticism and removed. We must denounce the Kemalists to the masses of the workers of Turkey as the betrayers of the independence of the country, as betrayers of the revolution, as a counter-revolutionary class, and we must establish a revolutionary fighting front of the workers and peasants against the Kemalists bourgeoisie. We must carry on an unceasing and untiring campaign against Kemalism and against its preparations for war against the Soviet Union. These are the principal tasks that the Communist Party of Turkey must fulfil in the present period.

Comrade MURPHY (Great Britain):

Comrades, it is necessary to explain that I am not speaking in the name of the English Delegation but expressing my own point of view.

I want to say from the outset that whilst I think that certain formulations may be improved and that certain omissions be made good, I agree with the main line of the theses presented by Comrade Kuusinen and it is my intention to defend this line against a number of comrades in the British Delegation. Comrades Bennett and Rothstein used some very strong language in describing the theses and were very bold in their denunciation. I propose to be equally bold and challenging, in short to show that they are presenting a Menshevik picture of the colonial problem and drawing ultra-Leftist conclusions.

These comrades concentrate first of all upon the second part of Paragraph 6 which described the general principle of imperialist economic policy as follows: "As the 'classical capitalism' of the pre-imperialist epoch best demonstrated, precisely by its plunder economy in the colonies, all its negative basic trend of destroying the old without an equivalent creative building of the new, so also the most striking feature of the decay of imperialism, its rascally usury, becomes particularly obvious and pronounced in its business in the colonies. It may be taken practically as the general principle of imperialist economic policy that the colonies in their relation to the so-called 'motherlands' are always transformed into an agrarian hinterland for the industrial city, an agricultural appendage to the vastly bloated body of the capitalistic big industries. But this transformation of the colonies into producers of cheap foodstuffs and raw materials for the developed capitalist coun-

tries, contains not only the sensible principle of world-economic division of labour, but it turns this upside down by purchasing it solely at the expense of the artificial restriction of the forces of production in the colonies... etc.

Both take the strongest exception to this description of the general principle of imperialist economic policy. The essential feature of this description is the fact that the contradictions in the relations between the imperialist and the colonial countries far outweigh and interfere with the 'normal' development of capitalism which is towards the industrialisation of countries. This is the most important and fundamental feature of the situation in the colonial countries and has the most profound relation to all the tactical questions to which it will be necessary to refer.

Against this description of the situation Comrades Bennett, Rothstein and others demand that all the emphasis shall be laid upon the industrialisation of the colonies. We are told that if we do not lay emphasis on this fact as the dominating feature of the situation in the colonies, especially India, then we shall be blind to the relation of class forces, 'blind to the development of sharp class struggles'. Comrade Bennett says if we accept the picture presented to us by the theses then "under such circumstances there is no future for any development of sharp class struggles, there is no basis for the proletarianisation of the masses, the place of the proletarian masses will be taken by the pauperised masses."

As an alternative to the thesis, Comrade Bennett takes the hand of Comrade R. Palme Dutt and comes forward with the following:

"Great Britain cannot stop the inevitable process of industrialisation and for that reason it has recourse to a skilful volte-face, by taking the industrialisation into its own hands in order to turn it to the profit of British capital."

"Here", says Comrade Bennett, "you have a clearer explanation of the fact in a real deep Marxist form..." The question is not about colonisation or de-colonisation of India; the question is about the carrying through of the industrialisation of India under the control of Britain. Great Britain understands perfectly well that if they will not take into their own hands industrialisation, others will."

Comrade Bennett is not anxious to draw the political conclusion from this argument and become openly the advocate of de-colonisation. To become an advocate of this theory, is to become a fit and proper candidate for the leadership of the British Labour Party and to pass into the ranks of unadulterated Menshevism. To place before us the perspective of the industrialisation of India and other colonies and the transfer of the centre of gravity of big industry from the metropolis to the colonies under the joint control of the imperialists and native bourgeoisie, whether for the reasons advanced by Comrade Bennett or Comrade Rothstein, whether for military purposes or due to export of capital on the part of finance capital, is to destroy all revolutionary perspectives until the process of industrialisation has out-distanced the industrialisation of the metropolis, to hold before the colonies the perspective of expanding industry capable of making concessions and raising the standards of life of the masses. It is precisely this perspective of industrialisation of the colonies that is held before them by MacDonald, Thomas, the I. L. P., the Amsterdam and Second Internationals.

To deny the existence of the process of the development of industry would be stupid. But Marx did not say, nor did Lenin, that the main task of the imperialists and the dominating feature of the colonial countries is the "carrying through of the industrialisation of the colonies" and especially creating the heavy industries. The normal development of capitalism in general means eventually industrialisation of a country; but the imperialist exploitation of the colonies forbids the normal industrialisation of the colonies such as occurred in the metropolis. Instead of imperialism playing the liberating role to the inherent forces of production in the colonies, it adds its own contradictions to the contradictions within the colonies whilst sucking the life blood from them by its monopolist control. It is this multiplication of contradictory interests between the requirements and needs of the metropolitan industry with the requirements and needs of the colonial economy that become the dominating factors in the colonies retarding the development of industry and giving rise to the mass struggles and revolutionary crises. Those who do not realise that the do-

minating factor in the development of the forces leading to colonial revolutions is precisely this factor of the intensification of contradictions and not the "carrying through of industrialisation", fail to realise the nature of imperialism as decadent capitalism, as a power fettering the forces of production, subordinating their development to the plunder of the toilers of the earth.

This conclusion appears to me to be glaringly obvious in the history of all colonies. Does the history of Ireland reveal the British imperialists "carrying through the industrialisation of Ireland?" Britain has not only retarded the development of industry in Ireland, but strangled it and denuded the country of its population. The total population of Ireland today is not more than 4½ millions as compared with the 8½ millions of a century ago. Only a year ago Vickers purchased two dockyards in Dublin employing 4 to 5000 men and immediately closed them down leaving about 200 men in charge. Is "this" carrying through industrialisation? Does the history of Korea reveal the Japanese "carrying through the industrialisation" of Korea? Japan crushed the native industry and completely subjected Korea to the process of extracting raw materials and the provision of semi-manufactured materials for the Japanese industries. Does the history of India reveal the British "carrying through the process of industrialisation of India"? Everybody agrees that for more than a century the British whilst there have been fluctuations in their policy, have retarded the development of industry in India, that what there is of industrial development has come more in spite of the main policy of British imperialism, not because of it.

Now there is advanced the theory that the diversion from the main policy exemplified by the development of the war period is not a diversion from the main line, but the launching of a new policy due to the development of finance capital which disregards the requirements of the industries of the metropolis for the great profits to be extracted from "carrying through the industrialisation of the colonies". Under the impetus of the war and post-war policy, Indian industry forged ahead. Thanks to the steel protection Act of 1924, the export of metal from India rose enormously. In 1921—22 the total export of metal was hardly 127,000 tons, but in 1925—26 India exported iron and steel alone 382,000 tons: the U. S. A. taking 156,000 tons, Japan 140,000 tons, Britain 20,000 tons, Germany 11,000 tons, Italy and France 27,000 tons, etc. The import of pig iron was almost negligible. Other industries were also developing fast: tin, lead, jute, textile, metal, manufacturing, leather, cement, etc. The pre-war British share in Indian imports was 64.1% of the total. In 1926—27 it had fallen to 47.8%. The profound effect of this development on British industry is obvious. At the same time there is a drop in the export of capital from Britain to India due to the fall in the rate of accumulation of British capital. The Baldwin Government signalled the change of front once more. It repudiated governmental pledges with regard to industry and became the apostle of agricultural development. It threw out the steel protection Act and passed an act giving a preferential tariff to British products. It pushed through the currency Bill which struck at the roots of the Indian industry by making cotton, wheat, and other exports 12.5% dearer. The effect of these developments is phenomenal. In 1926—27 the U. S. A. purchases of iron and steel dropped from 156,000 tons to 41,000 tons. The German purchase fell by 8000 and British by 4000 tons. The Peninsular Locomotive Co., the South Indian Railway Locomotive Workshop, the Steel Wire Produce Co. Ltd., and others were liquidated. The shares of Tata Iron Works fell from 100 rupees per share to 53 rupees, Russa Sugar to 19 rs, Steel Products to 820, etc. etc. A few months later the Indian Government placed important railway orders in Britain: 47 locomotives to the Vulcan Works, Glasgow, 26 locomotives to Armstrongs and similar orders to Ransome and Rapiers. It is impossible to describe this policy as other than a deliberate retardation of the industrialisation of India and a consideration of the industry of the metropolis.

An examination of the textile industry will reveal a similar phenomenon — the retardation of the manufacture of fine cotton textiles for the benefit of Lancashire while concessions were made with regard to coarser goods. Statistics also show that whereas of companies registered in 1921 there were 55% industrial concerns, 25% banking and loan companies, 18% trading including railways and navigations, the first half of 1927 shows 8% industrial, 7% banking, 40% loan, 39% trading. These developments are not accidental but the product of a

definite policy arising from the contradictions of the imperialist and Indian capitalist interests. Nor are they unrelated to the new developments in agriculture initiated by the Linlithgow Commission. Comrade Dutt says the changes in agriculture are being introduced to make a market for the industrial products of India. But do these facts show that? It appears to me that the **Bombay Chronicle** is nearer to the truth in the matter when it says:

"Indian industry interferes with England's market. England is obviously determined to hold India as a market at the point of the sword, for the products of her own industries against the nascent enterprises of the country..."

Contrary to the opinion of Comrades **Bennett**, **Rothstein** and **Dutt**, I am therefore of the opinion that the industrialisation of the colonies cannot be "carried through" by the imperialists and native bourgeoisie. Just as the principal custodianship of the fight for colonial liberation falls historically upon the proletariat and peasantry of the colonies, so also upon these classes falls the task of "carrying through industrialisation" after the conquest of power. Until then industrialisation is a tendency, demanding development, yet held in the strangle hold of imperialism. It is precisely because this is the case that the colonial war of liberation has historically become the order of the day and the revolutionary perspectives before the colonial countries are assured.

Naturally, this has an important bearing upon our tactics. If the perspective of the "carrying through of industrialisation" is correct then we are faced with an upward development of the colonies and the revolutionary perspectives are eliminated indefinitely. Comrade **Bennett** and his supporters, having laid down the basis of this perspective, are afraid to draw the logical conclusion and openly declare their adherence to the Second International politics. They proceed therefore to the opposite extreme of Leftism and bid us lump the imperialists and native bourgeoisie into one camp, denounce all and sundry as counter-revolutionary without regard to the dialectics of the struggle. Shouting with an extra-loud voice that all the bourgeoisie, native and imperialist are counter revolutionary does not constitute a political policy in the period of fluctuation struggle leading up to the revolutionary crisis. All Comrade **Bennett** said about Das is true, but will the denunciation of Das or the shouting in the face of Mr. Bose the present head of the Indian Republican Party who declares for "Indian Independence", "a united front of the workers and peasants to secure economic concessions", be the means of convincing the workers and peasants of India that the bourgeois party is counter-revolutionary? Will the denunciation and shouting in the teeth of the bourgeois elements, who supported the Bardoli "no tax" strike of the peasants, convince the strikers when they are fighting, that the Communist Party is right and that they are counter-revolutionary? We must know better than this how to destroy their influence over the masses. Will Comrade **Bennett** also say that even in the Chinese revolution there is no further possibility of bourgeois elements fighting against imperialism, that the Chinese revolution has ceased, and we are faced with the "carrying through of the industrialisation of China", by the imperialist and native bourgeoisie? Will Comrade **Bennett** declare there is no possibility, and no probability of bourgeois forces in Ireland waging further war upon British imperialism? Only when such is the case can we accept the policy of Comrade **Bennett** and lump all and sundry of the bourgeoisie in a single counter-revolutionary camp. But such is not the case and our tactics must be conducted accordingly on the lines of the Second Congress of the Communist International, on the lines of Comrade Lenin upon which these theses are based. The need of the hour in every colonial country is a strong independent Communist Party which understands how to expose the bourgeoisie and destroy their influence over the masses through the correct exploitation of the differences between them and win the masses in the numberless crises which precede the revolutionary overthrow of all counter revolutionary forces.

I wish to identify myself with Comrade **Schüller's** observations on Ireland and to observe for the benefit of Comrade **Carney** and our Irish comrades that whilst the British Party will gladly undertake its task of working among the Irish in Britain, a very considerable asset in this direction will have arrived when our Irish comrades have fulfilled the pledges they gave years ago to build a Communist Party in Ireland. In this task also the British Party will gladly assist.

Comrade MONDOK (Czechoslovakia):

Comrades, the great significance of the colonies and semi-colonies for the revolutionary world movement was first fully recognised and understood by the Communist International. Nevertheless we must say that, while the discussion of the colonial question in the C. I. as well as in the various countries met with interest and understanding, the question of the semi-colonies has been given much too little attention in our revolutionary practice.

This even found expression in the theses put before the Congress. This can be seen by the following: in the general section of the theses the valuation of the question of the semi-colonies was treated correctly and exhaustively, but in that part of the theses which illustrates the general situation by concrete examples, and typifies the colonies and semi-colonies, the European semi-colonies remain in the shadow, if one can express it so. Yet the question of the semi-colonies and of the conquerer States with their European semi-colonies is for us of equally greater significance. When I speak of semi-colonies I have in mind States which, on the one hand are dependent upon the great capitalist powers, but on the other hand are themselves conquerer states, in whose cases foreign territory has been robbed from other countries. These territories find themselves in a semi-colonial, and at times colonial position. In the governmental system of these territories the basic methods of a colonial regime find application. One can therefore designate them as European colonies.

Since my speaking time is limited, I shall only touch upon this type of State. I have in mind: **Poland, Czechoslovakia, Roumania and Yugo-Slavia.** These States are on the one hand dependent upon foreign capital and imperialism, but on the other hand conduct a semi-colonial or even completely colonial policy in the foreign territories which they have annexed. In the case of these States there is a series of territories of which one can say that they are to a certain extent European colonies. These are for example, Croatia, Bessarabia, West Ukraine, West White Russia, Bukovina, Dobrudja, Transylvania, Trans-Carpathian Ukraine, Slovakia, Slovenia, Vojvod, etc.

In Poland 60% of the total population are Poles, in Czechoslovakia there are 6 million Czechs out of a total population of 14 million, Yugo-Slavia there are 5 million Serbs out of a total of 12 million, in Roumania 10 million Roumanians out of a total of 14 million. This is of great significance when one considers the fact that the so-called ruling nations of all these States strive to subordinate completely to themselves the annexed territories, economically and culturally, and follow a policy of denationalisation and colonisation. This policy meets with great difficulties, and arouses the indignation and self-defence of the broad masses of these annexed territories.

The conquerer States cover their exploitative methods in the annexed territories by national slogans, and conduct a policy of denationalisation. As a result of this, there matures in the annexed territories the outbreak of a national liberation movement which has a completely revolutionary character. This fight is participated in also by non-proletarian elements, who attempt to put themselves at the head of it. The Comintern in general, and its various Sections in particular stand here before a great task: they must turn this fight into a thoroughly revolutionary one, put the national-liberation fight at the service of the class struggle, not allow the bourgeoisie to use this fight to undermine the proletarian solidarity between the workers of all countries of the States concerned, prevent them from making it an object of bargaining between the ruling bourgeoisie and the oppressed nation.

The character of the forms of exploitation and oppression of the annexed territory is very manifold. The general line is nevertheless the same in all cases and consists in the following: to restrict industry or to keep it dormant, to turn the territory into a source of raw materials and an output for exports, to increase exports for the purpose of paying usurers' interest to foreign capitalists, to strengthen their domination by using a narrow governmental apparatus based upon violence, to denationalise the country with the aid of its educational policy, of colonisation, and of a system of national favouritism. Such a policy is pursued by all these countries in the territories which they have annexed. The methods and the tempo of this policy of oppression is nevertheless dependent upon the stage of development of the territory and upon its resistance.

Let us for example consider the situation in **Yugo-Slavia.** As a result of the Versailles Peace there were annexed to the little-industrialised old Serbia the Croates, who in this respect were far more industrialised and the industrialised countries of Slovenia and the Vojvod territory. The Yugo-Slav Government restricts the development of Croatian industry and liquidates it in the other annexed territories (for example it transfers heavy industry from Slovenia to Serbia), conducts a protectionist policy in favour of the Serbian capitalists in transportation and credit matters.

Since the Roumanian capitalists are not in a position to liquidate the industry of Transylvania in favour of Old-Roumania, they take over the shares of stock of the Transylvanian factories and mines.

In Czechoslovakia the Czechish capitalists set limits to the industrial development of the annexed territory (for example, in the case of Slovenia).

The taxation systems are also built up upon a protectionist basis. For example in Yugo-Slavia, the peasants of the conquered territory pay about twice as much, as the Serbian peasants. The case is similar in Roumania.

The economic policy of Poland in the annexed Ukrainian and White Russian territories is simply a naked robber policy of export. The cutting down of timber and its export for one year, for example, exceeds the yearly growth of timber by three-times.

The more backward the annexed territory is from an industrial and cultural point of view, the more brutal, unconcealed and bold are the forms of exploitation and oppression. To characterise some forms of this sort I will take the example of the colonial regime of the Czechoslovak Government in the **Trans-Carpathian Ukraine**, which is one of the most backward countries of central Europe.

The Trans-Carpathian Ukraine is almost exclusively agrarian and has an impoverished peasantry. The Government not only does not advance the industrial development of the country, but it gradually eliminates even the small factories which existed there until now. The forests, the only source of riches of the country, have been leased to French capitalists, who are conducting a robber-like deforestation.

The Government pursues a typically colonial credit and transport policy. To characterise the transport system, we can mention the fact that transportation from the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine to Czechoslovakia is twice as dear as the same transportation in the opposite direction.

The tax burden in the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine is much heavier than in Czechoslovakia, and taxes are collected with greater severity. The well-being of the working masses has retrogressed in comparison with the pre-war period; the retrogression can be reckoned at about 50%. The taxes which the Trans-Caucasian Ukraine pays serve to defray the costs and to strengthen the brutal state apparatus.

The whole Government is in the hands of the Czechish bourgeoisie. Only Czechs are accepted into the Government service, so that they make up 95% of all government employees, police and gendarmes. The purpose here is to spread the domination of the Czechish language, which the local population does not understand, into all sections of the country.

The agrarian reform is used for the purpose of strengthening the kulak elements, to corrupt some of the local politicians, to colonise the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine with Czechs. The native peasantry is land-poor and completely ruined. There are districts in which there is no end of hunger.

In order to ensure fully the Czechisation of the native population, the Government conducts a special national policy, which has not its like anywhere else in the entire world. The Ukrainian population has been deprived of the right to call themselves Ukrainians. There was a time when one was summoned before a court for the use of the word "Ukrainian", "Ukrainian people", and even until to-day the censor does not permit the country to be designated as the Ukraine. The Government is artificially creating a new "Ruthenian" nation, and is carrying out reprisals against the Ukrainian national movement.

The education policy is completely at the service of this denationalisation and Czechisation.

To strengthen the domination of the Czechish bourgeoisie and to insure the exploitation they carry on, jails, police and gendarme stations, courts and tax offices, government em-

ployees' quarters, etc., are being built throughout the country, to an intensive degree.

To complete the picture we must mention the fact that the annexation of the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine to Czechoslovakia was carried out against the will of the broad masses of the population. After the comedy of the "voluntary" joining of the country to the newly erected Czechish Republic was performed in 1919, the council of ambassadors guaranteed it the broadest autonomy and its own legislative parliament, in the name of Entente. The law referring to this was put into the Czechoslovak Constitution.

So much could the native Ukrainian bourgeoisie acquire. But since the Communist Party possesses the overwhelming political influence among the workers of the Trans-Carpathian Ukraine, and fights for the right of self-determination, inclusive of the right of separation, the Czechish as well as the native bourgeoisie refused to fulfil this written and solemnly guaranteed law, and substituted this autonomy which on paper is so far-reaching, by a military dictatorship with French generals at its head, then by a state of siege, further through force on the part of appointed commissioners, and now by a special law, which is even more reactionary than the imperial law of corporal punishment of the middle of the previous century.

The Polish Government in West Ukraina and White Russia uses quite similar methods of violence. The Yugo-Slavish Government does the same in Croatia, Slovenia and Macedonia, the Roumanian Government in Bukovina, Bessarabia and Dobrudja. The difference between them consists in the fact that the Fascist white terror still rules in these countries and one cannot carry the nationalist experiments there to the complete negation of the nation.

In our literature we write much of the fact that just these types of conquerer nations, which are from the national point of view so varied, are a reservoir of revolutionary potentiality.

Nevertheless it cannot be maintained that our Parties have really done everything that is possible and necessary under the given conditions. The elementary dissatisfaction of the masses reaches its highest point in these countries; the waves of the national liberation and peasant movement roll over. All this creates a revolutionary situation and should serve to strengthen and extend the influence of the Communist Parties.

Czechoslovakia is very varied from the national point of view and the Czechish Communist Party must consider this in its work. Meanwhile in the practical work of the Czechish Party, particularly in its nationalist policy, we find great shortcomings. In connection with the Ukrainian question, the well-known resolution of the V. Congress of the Comintern was put into effect only two years ago, and only a year ago the Party leadership recognised the great significance of this question for the revolutionary movement. The basic shortcoming consisted in the fact that each organisation worked by itself on the national field and conducted its fight against national oppression separately from the others, instead of turning this into a general fight, which the masses of the Czechish proletariat will be drawn into.

Such an under-estimation of the national question by us makes room for the native bourgeoisie and Social-Democracy and makes it possible for them to speculate on this question. An illustration of this situation is, for example, the fact that in Czechoslovakia the clerical Slovakian and Polish leaders have behind them great masses of the poor peasants, that the Hungarian and Ukrainian Fascists who sympathise with Horthy have behind them a part of the Hungarian and Ukrainian peasantry, and so forth. All these speculate upon the slogan "Out with the Czechs". To this we can have only one answer: Real and effective protection of the oppressed minorities, a fight also on the part of the Czechish proletariat for the right of self-determination of all nationalities, inclusive of the right to separation.

The necessity of developing this work among the broad working masses was never so pressing as to-day. Poland, Roumania, Yugo-Slavia and Czechoslovakia — these are just the regions in which the imperialist war conflagration will be started. The Communist Parties of these countries may very soon stand before the necessity of stifling imperialist war with a revolutionary conflagration, and calling upon the masses to come to the active defence of the U. S. S. R.

We must test our work in these fields, lay bare all shortcomings and improper viewpoints, achieve the real hegemony of the revolutionary movement of the working masses by following a correct line and practice, and collect under our banner all workers of these States which have such varied nationalities. We must become the factor which will hasten the Social Revolution and conduct it to a successful conclusion.

Comrade LOZOVSKY (Communist Fraction of the R. I. L. U.) The Theory of Decolonisation and the Industrial Development of Colonies.

Comrades, the colonial question occupies an important place in the theory and practice of the Comintern. Therefore, detailed discussion of all the questions connected with this question, on the one hand, and the discussion of the concrete situation in which the struggle has to be carried on, on the other hand, is the premise for laying down a correct Bolshevik line for colonial Parties, Parties in capitalist countries and for the whole Comintern.

Over two-thirds of mankind have a colonial status. One has to reckon with an exceptional diversity of countries, races, political and social-economic systems, and therefore the most important and absolutely necessary task is — concretisation and study of questions and problems which concern this or that country. If we speak of China as a semi-colony, and of India as a colony, if we speak about Egypt and at the same time mention also Mexico or Chile and Colombia, it is very difficult to bring all these countries under the same heading. Every separate country represents a complex of very intricate phenomena; colonies differ as much from one another as capitalist countries. The attempts to pigeon-hole all the colonies according to types, are not very successful. One should ask oneself the question: what makes the colonial question different now from what it was in 1920, when Lenin's theses on the colonial question were adopted by the II. Congress of the Comintern. What change has taken place in these 8 years?

The following change has taken place: **during this period, in a number of colonial and semi-colonial countries there has come onto the historical arena the proletariat as the main force of the revolutionary struggle. This was not yet the case in 1920.** At that time the proletariat did not yet come forward as an independent revolutionary factor, as the main force in the struggle for independence. That is why we can and must already speak now about the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and about the leading role of the proletariat in the national struggle. I think that this new element must put its mark on all the theses and the tactic of the Comintern in regard to this or that colony.

However, the advent of the proletariat as a serious, decisive revolutionary factor, at least in some countries as for instance, China, India and others, the advent of proletarian organisations, — is linked up with a certain capitalist development of these countries, a development which is forced into imperialist moulds, which is to a considerable extent distorted and which is pursuing an excessively meandering and painful path as far as the masses are concerned. Nevertheless there is a certain amount of industrialisation and in connection with it the advent of a compact proletarian mass capable of carrying on an organised struggle against imperialism and the native bourgeoisie.

One cannot of course make from this the deduction which was made in the press concerning the decolonisation of the colonies. I think that this theory of the decolonisation of the colonies has no foundation whatever. A few formal signs, a change in the forms and methods of exploitation are taken as a substantial change in the relations between imperialism and the colonies. Decolonisation is possible only after the victory of the revolution in corresponding colonial countries, as a result of a prolonged struggle of the proletarian and peasant masses effectively supported by the International Communist movement in the shape of the Comintern and by the Communist Parties of the biggest imperialist powers. To speak of peaceful decolonisation, means begging the question, it means, instead of elaborating tactics adaptable to new conditions, circumstances, methods and means of enslaving colonial countries, trying to get off with abstract formulae instead of concrete revolutionary tasks, because the decolonisation theses does away with the

whole question of struggle for national independence. Since the entire decolonisation takes place automatically, by means of the further development of capitalist relations, it is but natural that the **national-revolutionary** movement becomes unnecessary. That is why it seems to me that the theses are quite right in opposing this theory and in emphasising its non Communist character.

But this certainly does not mean that nothing has changed in the colonies. We witness there a number of facts which compel us to watch carefully the new forces which have made their appearance on the historical arena, to study thoroughly the new phenomena which are cautiously mentioned in the beginning of the theses in the casual phrase about "the reinforcement of the elements of capitalist and especially industrial development". It seems to me that this caution is out of place. We can speak more definitely about the industrial development of some colonial countries, especially China, India, etc. But just because, even according to the theses, we witness a "reinforcement of industrial development" in some colonies, it is wrong to describe all colonies as "hinterland", as "agrarian rear", because this is not true to facts.

We witness two phenomena in a number of colonies:

1. Penetration of capitalism into agriculture (gigantic sugar, cotton and rubber plantations in Cuba, Africa, Indonesia, etc.).

2. Growth of extracting (oil, minerals, etc.) and manufacturing (textile, etc.) industry and growth of transport (water transport, railways). Agrarian rear is one thing and raw material rear (cotton, rubber, minerals, oil, etc.) and the existence of a manufacturing industry is another. The creation of raw material bases in the colonies — and in connection with accentuated competition every imperialist power creates its own cotton, rubber, oil and mineral base (Japan and Korea) — contradicts the theory of a solid "agrarian rear", the theory of the "hinterland", the theory of the "continent of rural districts". If we speak of India as a "continent of rural districts" and of all colonies as "world rural districts", as this is done in the programme without sufficient justification, all talk about proletarian and peasant dictatorship must cease automatically. In the "world rural districts", in the "continent of rural districts", there can be no industrial proletariat, and therefore no room for proletarian and peasant dictatorship. With such terminology the proletariat disappears as leader. And yet, when we speak of proletarian and peasant dictatorship, we evidently assume the existence of a definitely constituted proletarian mass, the bearer of the presupposed hegemony. This bearer of hegemony could come into being only on the basis of the development — be it only a slow, meandering and very painful development — of **capitalist relations** in the colonies. That is why all these political slogans which are correctly issued for colonies of the first type (China, India, etc.), slogans of proletarian and peasant dictatorship, do not tally with the preliminary description of all these countries as "continents of rural districts", as "world rural districts", as the one and only "agrarian hinterland". By insisting on these slogans, we leave no room for phenomena which are indisputable, which are reflected in the struggle of the Chinese and Indian proletariat, in the struggle which has become possible in the last years owing to the development of capitalism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. That is why it seems to me that this part of the theses will have to be carefully revised, so as to vary the description of these countries and not to apply a terminology which will make it difficult subsequently to arrive at correct political conclusions. We must in this respect bring into harmony the beginning, middle, and end of the theses. To use poetical language, such harmony is conspicuous by its absence.

Artificiality in the Classification of Colonies.

The second group of questions to which I would like to draw your attention, is the classification of all colonial countries given in the theses. I must say that classification in general is necessary and useful but the classification placed before us, in spite of its undisputed conscientiousness, shows that an utterly impossible task has been set, and as you know, it is rather difficult to carry out impossible tasks.

Let us take these four types of countries. According to the classification we find in the first group China and India

together with Indonesia, Egypt, Syria (!) as well as several Latin American colonies. In the second group we find South Africa, and Cuba, and in addition, Algiers, Tunis, etc. I have been asking myself what peculiarities have led to this classification? It appears that the classification rests on "the peculiarity and degree of development of the class differentiation". The degree of development of class differentiation, means, translated from the social-political into the economic language, degree of development of capitalist relations in the given country (numerical strength of the proletariat, degree of industrial development, etc.). But the next paragraph gives also other characteristics for classification. This additional characteristic is: "importance of colonies and semi-colonies in the present system of the colonial policy of world capitalism". But these two signs or characteristics are not brought into harmony. If we take as the basis the latter point, we get of course one classification. If we take the first point, i. e. "peculiarity and degree of class differentiation", we get an utterly different classification. But as both characteristics are taken, the result is a considerable muddle. Why is Syria in the same group as India and China, whereas the Philippines and Cuba are not in it? If we read this classification very carefully — and I suppose that everyone of us has read all the theses very carefully — we find that it suffers from a certain artificiality. However, it would not be so bad if there were only a certain artificiality in the construction, unfortunately political deductions are made from this construction concerning our policy in the corresponding type of country. This classification or these barriers erected among the colonies, must determine our tactic. This is the crux of the matter. Well, if this is so — and according to the theses it is so — the question of classification acquires an enormous importance. If we take the theses, we see that the united national front, proletarian and peasant dictatorship, etc., are made to depend on the type under which a given country is classified. It was the intention of the author of the theses to facilitate for us by classification the elaboration of tactics, but instead of this classification has made this process more complicated. I personally think that this classification is artificial because it is based on principles of diverse character. It is difficult to carry this classification to a conclusion, it is difficult to make from it political deductions in as far as — according to the diverse characteristics by which the countries have been classified — one has to make the **same** political deductions for colonies with a **different** development, **different** social relations, **different** class differentiation and a **different** economic system.

The Bourgeois Democratic Revolution.

Very naturally the bourgeois democratic revolution occupies much space in the theses. One must say that our Communists from the colonial and semi-colonial countries and Communists in countries which are not yet colonies but will soon become colonies (Latin America), are rather suspicious of the terminology "bourgeois-democratic revolution". It seems to them that to describe the revolution as bourgeois-democratic diminishes the role of the Communist Party. "How is the Communist Party to play a leading role in the bourgeois-democratic revolution?" — asked many comrades. Hence the deduction that the Communist Party must be for the Socialist Revolution at all times and under any circumstances and cannot descent to the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Hence, the attempts to call a purely bourgeois revolution a Socialist Revolution (Ecuador). It must be made quite clear that an exact definition of the class-character of the revolution is the premise of a correct tactic. This failure to understand is not only a characteristic of the representatives of colonial countries, it was also a characteristic of many of our comrades in certain periods of the history of Russia. This lack of understanding must be avoided.

After all, what does bourgeois-democratic revolution mean, and how did Lenin, and with him the Bolshevik Party, understand it?

We have on this subject a wealth of literature and experience. If you turn back your mind to 1905, when this problem loomed big and when the dispute between Bolshevism and Menshevism went for the first time beyond the limits of organisational questions and got into the sphere of fundamental problems confronting the working class of Russia — if you

remember the struggle at that time, you are aware what it was about. From the estimate of the revolution as a bourgeois-democratic revolution, the Mensheviks arrived at the conclusion that the bourgeoisie must play a leading role in the revolution. From the same estimate the Bolsheviks arrived at a different conclusion: although the revolution is bourgeois-democratic, the leading role in it must rest with the proletariat and its Party, and only the proletariat, together with the peasantry can lead a real democratic revolution to a conclusion against the bourgeoisie. This is how Bolshevism put this question. This is how this question must be put for the whole Comintern and especially for the Communist Parties of the colonial countries. This must be told to those of our Parties which are considering revolutionary problems for the first time. It must be explained to the Communist and non-Communist masses what bourgeois-democratic revolution in the Bolshevik sense means, and what must be the tactic of the Party in this kind of revolution.

Moreover, it is absolutely necessary to give an answer to the question "what is dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry?" The slogan "dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry" has also its own history. This slogan has been our political device for many years. We owe to Lenin its most clear and most Marxist elaboration. He has explained what bourgeois-democratic revolution and dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry mean. On the basis of this experience the Comintern must say what bourgeois-democratic revolution is, what shapes and forms it takes, what the proletariat must do in this revolution when, together with the peasantry, it establishes dictatorship, what our desire should be also after the establishment of proletarian and peasant dictatorship. Unfortunately, we do not find an answer to this in the theses, and this is a very serious gap. We must bear in mind that this is the first time that the Comintern wants to give an exhaustive answer to all the fundamental problems which confront the revolutionary, colonial and semi-colonial labour movement. The general principles have been laid down by Lenin; but under new circumstances and a new correlation of class forces, in view of the birth of new mass revolutionary movements, in view of a new distribution of forces, we have to give an answer to these extremely complicated questions, we must explain all this as clearly and simply as possible so that every worker, especially every Communist worker, could understand, because he will have to act up to it wherever he is.

The Leading Role of the Proletariat and its Party.

In this connection of the utmost importance to the Comintern is the question of the form and expression of the leading role of the Communist Parties. This is laid down in the theses because this is our policy. The proletariat must have hegemony in the revolution and in the entire national-revolutionary movement. Well and good, the Communist Parties must lead the proletariat. This is a matter of course. But what does all this mean concretely, practically? How is this to be achieved, what does it mean for every separate country — these questions must be answered. The general formula is the canvas. The patterns must be selected according to countries because the colonial world is so diverse that one cannot possibly compress all this into one general formula. In spite of the thorough elaboration of the theses and the evident desire to lay down concrete lines, we have not succeeded in doing this because conditions are too diverse to compress all this into four types, into a rigid and to a certain extent immovable framework.

Here generalisation must make room for specification. The theses go from the general to the particular. The reverse should be the case. The tasks confronting the proletariat of China, India, Indonesia, Egypt and the Philippines are the same in the sense that the workers of all these colonies must struggle for their national and social liberation. But this general standpoint is clear even without the theses. Our task consists in telling every proletariat, on the basis of a thorough study of the state of affairs and of the correlation of forces in the given country, what and how one should do now. While in China the leading role of the Party has already been secured — it is true at a heavy price — and has stood the test, in other colonial countries mass Parties are still to be created. Under such circumstances one should say first of all how a fighting mass Party is to be created, otherwise there will be talk about proletarian hegemony and the leading role of the Party whereas the Party is still in embryo. It is self-evident that in this respect one

cannot limit oneself to a general formula; one must lay down concretely the lines and methods for the establishment of a labour movement independent of the national bourgeoisie and of fighting Communist Parties.

Two Phases and Three Stages.

The next group of questions which, it seems to me, are also not sufficiently clear and require elaboration (Comrades, I am mentioning here only matters which are not clear), are all the chapters which lay down the various phases and stages of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. There are four types of countries, two phases and several stages. Such a scheme is too complicated. For an average Communist all this must be considerably simplified.

There is much that is valuable in the part which deals with phases and stages: I personally read with the greatest interest and attention all these considerations, but they are too abstract. We do not write theses for ourselves, neither do we write them only for the European Communists; we write them also for the colonial workers, and maximum simplicity is absolutely necessary because otherwise a whole series of annoying political errors might arise. If we establish for several types of countries several phases of bourgeois-democratic revolutions and want at the same time to say what will happen when the given revolution will go from one stage to the other, we will inevitably get a scheme which it will be difficult to unravel. We do meet, for instance, with such terminology in the theses: "From the first phase to the end of the first stage", "embryonic genesis of proletarian hegemony", "third stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution". I want you to think a minute: four types of countries, two phases, in each phase three stages, and in addition to this "a preliminary phase", "preliminary phase of the first stage", "unfinished first stage of the first phase", "preliminary situation of the second phase", etc. All this sounds very well, but it is a bare scheme accessible only to a few people. Such an abstract structure can only confuse our Parties. For this reason, I think that this part of the theses should be revised.

The Proletariat and the Bourgeoisie in the Colonial Countries.

The question of relations between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in colonial countries deserves all our attention. This question is dealt with in the theses from two viewpoints — the theoretical and the practical, applicable to India. Insofar as theory is concerned, the theses say correctly that not only support, but also agreement with the colonial bourgeoisie is possible for struggle against imperialism. The proletariat and its Communist Party must support the national-revolutionary movement, they must develop, widen and intensify and carry it further. But, comrades, if a correct standpoint is mechanically transferred to India without studying concrete conditions and class forces, the evolution of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in the last years, etc., this is bound to lead to erroneous tactical conclusions. One should have first taken the country where such an experience has been gone through, one should have studied this experience, and only then one should have transferred to India what is suitable for it. It seems to me that one should take China and find out what this tactic has produced, pointing out the difficulties which arose in its application and making a study of all the mistakes which were committed (this is done, but not in this connection), and then make deductions: has the tactical line stood or not stood the test when it came face to face with practice. I think that our general line has certainly stood the test, in spite of the mistakes which were made. If we had begun with China and had then gone to India, we would have taught the Indian proletariat not to make the mistakes which were made in China. This is one thing, but it is not all by far. Is it possible to draw a simple analogy between our policy in China and India? Insofar as these two countries are placed into one group, the same tactic is presupposed for them. This is not only wrong, but dangerous. Other circumstances, other correlation of classes.

What is said after all in the theses about our tactic in regard to the Indian bourgeoisie?

"It would be an ultra-Left mistake if the Communist Party began its agitation by simply placing on par the national-reformists (Swarajists, Wafdists, etc.) and the ruling counter-revolutionary bloc of the imperialists and feudal lords. The Swarajists have not yet betrayed the national-liberation struggle

as this has been done in China by the Kuomintang, although they have capitulated ignominiously in certain cases before the imperialists and have even participated in the suppression of revolutionary and semi-revolutionary actions of the workers. In this phase, Communists must concentrate the main fire not against them, not against the national bourgeoisie, but against the present chief enemy, the ruling imperialist-feudal bloc⁷.

In this paragraph the tasks of the Indian Communists are not laid down correctly. First of all, what makes it necessary to wait with our struggle against the Indian bourgeoisie till it turns traitor like the Kuomintang, i. e. till it begins to hang and shoot thousands and tens of thousands of workers and peasants? Moreover, one cannot lay down the tasks of the Indian proletariat only from the viewpoint of external policy (struggle for independence). The Indian proletariat has as important tasks also in the sphere of internal policy: agrarian revolution, 8-hour day, etc. What constituted the fundamental error of the Chinese Communist Party in the period of the bloc with the Kuomintang? It was this: the Chinese Communist Party subordinated the social-economic demands of the workers and peasants (land, eight-hour day, etc.) to the struggle for national independence. In the meantime the Comintern has never visualised this bloc as relinquishment, renunciation on the part of the working class of its and the peasants' immediate economic demands. This applies also to India. The Communist Party of India must define its tactic in regard to the national bourgeoisie not on the basis of the latter's phraseology about Indian independence, but on the basis of its entire internal and external policy, and this policy is directed against the labour and peasant movement. This is the main thing; all the rest is empty phraseology.

Moreover, is the centre of gravity for India coquetting with Left tendencies for the sake of relations with the Swarajists? Is the main question for India: to support or not to support the Swarajist bourgeoisie? Certainly not. If we compare the Indian bourgeoisie with the Chinese, we will find that in India the bourgeoisie is stronger, better welded together and better educated politically than in China. In India the correlation of class forces is different from that in China. We have in India a national bourgeoisie which is always ready for compromise with the British bourgeoisie against the toiling masses. Therefore, in India our main task is establishment of independent labour organisations. It is essential to create, organise and educate politically an independent labour movement, independent of the Swarajists. It is essential to establish independent trade unions, a base for the labour movement. This central idea gets lost in the discussions "about the chief firing line" and about the possibility of supporting the Swarajist bourgeoisie under certain circumstances. I think that this is politically incorrect. We must say in regard to India, especially in the present stage of development: If you really want to achieve something in India, establish as rapidly as possible a Communist Party and trade unions, get away the labour movement from Swarajist influence, eliminate national-bourgeois elements from the labour and peasant organisations, otherwise all these mass organisations will get into bourgeois hands and will be used for counter-revolutionary purposes. This is the centre of gravity of the question, but this is not expressed with sufficient clarity.

The Labour Movement in the Colonies.

These theses are called: The revolutionary movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries. The revolutionary movement must be carried on in the industrially more developed countries under the hegemony of the proletariat. But it would seem that those who exercise hegemony should also be given a place in these theses, i. e. those who will lead the national-revolutionary movement. But you can look through these theses from beginning to end, and you will not find those who exercise hegemony. What is the proletariat in China, what is the proletariat in India, to what extent are they organised, what is their level, what lessons can be drawn from the class struggles of the last years? These matters are mentioned casually in connection with other questions. Although everything which concerns the position of the proletariat is of the utmost interest, least of all is said precisely about this point. The labour movement in colonial and semi-colonial countries deserves our full attention. What took place in Europe and America in the course of the last 150 years (since the industrial revolution in

Great Britain), we witness to-day in the colonial countries, but only horizontally. The relatively compact masses of the proletariat in China and India which knows what factory life is, the proletariat of Indonesia, Cuba, Central America, etc., which has gone through the school of capitalist agriculture on the cotton, rubber, sugar, coffee and banana plantations of the Spaniards, the Pariahs among Pariahs — the black proletariat in the mining industry and on the plantations of South, West and East Africa, hundreds of thousands of expropriated natives of Africa and the Antilles, are caught in the cogs of the gigantic imperialist machine. We have before us the proletariat of all colours, all races and all degrees of development — from the slave labour of the Negroes and Malays to the "free" labour of the workers of Shanghai and Bombay. We have before us as on a screen the whole past and present of the working class. This diversity in the composition, quantity and quality of the proletariat is placing before us a series of very difficult problems, both organisational and political. In some colonial countries there are already experienced fighting Communist Parties (China), fighting revolutionary trade unions (China, Cuba). In other countries the Communist Party, although it has not the experience of the Chinese Party and trade unions, has already a glorious past (Indonesia). In others again Communist Parties and trade unions are only in the making and are growing in the process of the industrial struggles of the proletariat (India). There is a series of countries where no organised Communist movement exists although there are labour organisations (Philippines). Finally, there is a series of countries where the newly born coloured proletariat is not organised at all, but answers from time to time to unheard of exploitation by spontaneous rebellions and desertion from the place of employment (East and West Africa, Congo, Portuguese colonies in Africa, etc.). Our tactic must be adapted to the diversity of the colonial countries, "it must be able to lead the advanced proletarians of Shanghai and Bombay, as well as the black slaves of the rubber plantations." That is why we must have different slogans and special programmes of action for every country. The main thing is — organisation of the rising proletarian masses. How are the workers of this or that colonial country to be organised, where is the beginning to be made, on what should one concentrate one's attention — the Comintern must give an answer to all these questions. A general scheme constructed so that it should apply to China and India, cannot give us anything. The main slogan for the proletariat of colonial countries, no matter how small this proletariat be, is — organise yourselves, create your own trade union organisations which must be independent of the national bourgeoisie, create fighting Communist Parties for struggle against external and internal enemies.

Home-Made and Imported Reformism.

A big lacuna in the theses is the absence of the question of home-made and imported reformism. And yet, this is a question which deserves all our attention. There are no objective conditions in the colonies for solid and lasting reformist influence on the workers. That is why the awakening of the workers in colonial and semi-colonial countries means at the same time that these workers' turn about face towards Moscow, the Comintern, and the Red International of Labour Unions. We have seen this in China, Indonesia, Latin America, and Africa. Only in India, owing to the peculiar development of the labour movement there, nationalists and home-made reformists are at the head of the labour organisations. But even there the labour movement is veering to the Left. In China only the mechanics' union in Canton is an organisation of the Gompers' type, whereas in the rest of China neither the Right nor the Left Kuomintang has been able to establish genuine mass organisations, although they resort to all kinds of European-American reformist methods to deceive the workers. In Egypt the Government has destroyed the revolutionary trade unions and is endeavouring to establish national-reformist organisations. The same happens in Turkey where Kemalism, after destroying the trade union movement, is establishing its own law-abiding trade unions. In Indonesia, after the suppression of the insurrection, a Social-Democratic "party" appeared on the scene. It consists of Dutch officials and of a small section of the local petty-bourgeois intelligentsia. This Party is also endeavouring to establish its own trade unions. We witness the

same kind of thing in some other colonial countries. National-reformism or police reformism are appearing on the scene as soon as the colonial bourgeoisie and its imperialist masters notice that workers are coming forward as an independent factor in the struggle. But local reformism is not very dangerous because objective circumstances do not favour adherence of considerable sections of the proletariat to reformism.

Then social imperialists come to the rescue. Their special task is to tame the colonial labour movement. In this respect, very characteristic is the work of the Labour Party and the General Council in India, Thomas' trip to West Africa, the canvassing trips of the Right and "Left" (Purcell) members of the General Council to India, establishment of a reformist party in Indonesia with the help of the Dutch Social Democrats, the efforts of the Japanese social-monarchist Bundji Suzukhi to plant his reformism in China and the sudden interest of the Second and Amsterdam Internationals in the colonial countries of Latin America. The agents of imperialism are alarmed at the development of Communism in the colonial and semi-colonial countries and are endeavouring, under the protection of the imperialist and native bourgeoisie, to divert the rapidly growing labour movement of the colonies into Social-Democratic channels. All these phenomena must be pointed out in the theses because struggle against the attempts at the reformist corruption of the workers of the enslaved countries is one of the most important tasks of the Communist International. International reformism wants to impede the organisation and welding together of the workers and peasants as well as the development of the revolutionary struggle in the colonial countries. We must resist these efforts energetically.

The International Importance of the Chinese Revolution.

Although much space is given in the theses to China, the experience of the Chinese Revolution is not made the most of, especially from the international viewpoint. After the October Revolution, the Chinese Revolution is the most important event of the present century. The greatest importance of the Chinese events consists in the response they found among the Asiatic peoples. The last three years of revolutionary struggle in China produced such a wealth of experience that it will have to be studied a long time. This experience will have to be studied from the internal and especially from the external viewpoint. The experience of the Chinese Revolution must make us study very carefully the question of mutual relations between the proletariat and the national bourgeoisie in colonial countries. Have the errors committed in China been taken into account for the benefit of other countries? They have not. In the meantime we should raise the question of the independence of the labour movement from the national bourgeoisie, the development of the industrial struggle of the workers in the trend of the general struggles, the struggle for immediate improvement of the material position of the masses, the development of the agrarian revolution, the struggle against disguising the class struggle under the colours of a united national revolutionary front, — all this is a necessary premise of the utilisation of the national-revolutionary movement in the interests of the mass of the workers and peasants.

The Chinese Revolution is also instructive in regard to the mutual relations of the working class and the peasantry. The Chinese Communist Party, as represented by its Central Committee, looked upon the peasant movement, for a considerable period, as an impediment to the development of the national revolution. The Central Committee picked up the theory of excesses circulated by the bourgeoisie and, instead of placing itself at the head of the peasant insurrections, impeded and suppressed them together with the Kuomintang. Has this negative experience an international importance? Most decidedly so. All Parties in colonial and semi-colonial countries must be told that only in a bloc with the peasantry will the working class be able to solve the bourgeois democratic tasks confronting any given country. Agreement with the national bourgeoisie under definite circumstances and on definite conditions, with simultaneous indefatigable work for the consolidation of our own ranks, is admissible, an agreement with the peasantry is obligatory. The former is temporary, episodic, the latter is continuous, and under no circumstances whatever can and must the proletariat sacrifice the interests of the peasantry —

as this was the case in China —in favour of a united national-revolutionary front.

We must lay special stress for all colonial countries on the necessity of feverish organisational work for the consolidation of the Party and the labour and peasant organisations. This feverish constructive work must follow the line of promotion from below, from the thick of the mass movement, of new leaders and of purging all organisations from bourgeois elements, even if they be national-revolutionary elements. Establishment of **their own** organisations, **their own** proletarian leadership, — this is what we must impress the colonial Parties with. In this respect the Chinese experience is very instructive. The Communist Party and trade unions of China were almost entirely in the hands of intellectuals, representatives of petty-bourgeois circles. The more critical the situation, the more unstable became the leadership. More working class elements in all the links of the Party organisation, **more manual workers in the Party Executive, more peasants in the leading posts of the peasant organisations!** — such must be our slogans. It seems to me that it would be useful to take into account the experience of the Chinese Revolution also in this respect.

Conclusion.

Comrades, from all I have said here I will make the following conclusion: I think that the theses laid before the Congress have very much that is valuable and deserve to be adopted by the Communist International. But to enable the international Communist movement to make use of the theses adopted by us, to be able to spread them everywhere, to make them a practical guide for our work in all countries, they must not be abstract. Abstractness and a schematic form hinder a proper understanding of the theses. Thus, if we supplement the theses by a whole series of questions which I brought forward here, if we define correctly the relation of the Indian proletariat to its bourgeoisie, if we pay more attention to the description of the labour movement in the various colonial countries, to its trade union organisations and if we explain a whole series of points which, owing to their abstract character, even I found difficult to understand, — these theses will become what they should be. The international Communist movement stands in need of fully elaborated instructions re our tactic in the colonial countries. This is necessary for colonial workers as well as the workers in capitalist countries, because only on the basis of the correct tactic will it be possible to establish a closer union between the workers of capitalist and colonial countries.

It is of the utmost importance to emphasise in these theses in separate paragraphs the necessity of creating and organising labour organisations independent of the national bourgeoisie. This is mentioned casually in a whole series of paragraphs, but a question of this kind must be a **central question**. The premise for correct leadership in the revolution of colonial countries are proletarian and peasant organisations which do not depend on the bourgeoisie, and indefatigable struggle against imperialism, feudalism and the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. (Applause).

Comrade NEUMANN (Germany):

Comrades, we correctly take as the basis for the discussion of the colonial question at this Congress, the theses of the Second World Congress of the Comintern. In the eight years which have gone by since then, we have acquired a tremendous amount of practical material, we have collected a great deal of experience, above all the experience of the Chinese Revolution, which in all its basic features, and one can almost say without exception in all details, confirms the correctness of these theses. The Chinese events have proved in their chief lessons, above all those basic view points of Lenin's theses, which say that the colonial revolution is an immediate part not only of the general democratic world movement, but also an immediate part of the proletarian world revolution. And more than that. They are not only a simple quantitative part, but they also act as an independent force for the furthering of the revolution in the great capitalist ruling countries; they have played the part of an accelerating factor, the driving force. In this connection a passage from an article written by Marx about China, which

was recently published by Comrade Riazanov, is very interesting. When in 1853 the Chinese revolutionary movement began for the first time against foreign capital, when already then slogans of Socialism appeared in confused form — a remarkable fact, about which a German pastor, a missionary wrote at that time — Marx made the interesting comment:

“Chinese Socialism may be compared to European, as Chinese philosophy compares with the Hegelian.”

He was undoubtedly correct in this point of view. He put the question as to what action the Chinese Revolution would have upon England, and through England upon Europe. And he answered with the well-known sentence:

“that the Chinese Revolution throws a spark into the powder barrel of the present industrial system and will cause the eruption of the general crisis which has been preparing itself for a long time, which will spread abroad, and be accompanied by political revolutions on the continent in the immediate future.”

Marx writes directly, that “China carries the uprising into the Western world”. And the lessons of the Chinese Revolution now in the new revolutionary world situation confirm a thousand times this prediction. The colonial revolution is not only a part of the proletarian world revolution, it is at the same time an accelerating factor, it carries the uprising into the capitalist countries, just as inversely the proletarian revolution in the great ruling countries leads to a rising of the colonial peoples.

I want to put another question which needs much more light in the theses. That is a question which Lenin in his theses worked out especially, **the question of non-capitalist development**. I believe that the experiences of the past two years in the colonial revolutions oblige us to move this question of the possibility of non-capitalist development to the foreground in our theses, to take it as the point of departure in working out our common strategy for all colonial revolutions. Lenin said at the Second World Congress that it is incorrect to assume that the stage of capitalist development is unavoidable in the colonies. But at the same time he put before the Communist Parties a task. He said:

“In all colonial and backward countries we must not only build up independent cadres of fighters, Party organisations, we must not only make propaganda for the organisation of peasant soviets, and thereafter strive to suit them to the pre-capitalistic conditions, but the Communist International must also put forward the theses, and found it theoretically, that the backward countries can go over to the Soviet regime with the aid of the proletariat of the most advanced countries, and — at a certain stage of development — to Communism, avoiding the capitalist stage of development.”

This sentence is so much clearer than the most quoted sentence about the possibility of going around the capitalist stage, in that it speaks directly of the transition to Communism.

I believe this is a point which ranks among the keenest thoughts Lenin ever expressed. It is the one in which Lenin refers to Marx, where he adds something new to certain ideas of Marx about the possibility of non-capitalist development.

But it is not only this theoretical significance which specially obligates us to carry through these teachings of Lenin, but also a practical question. If put into the foreground the Socialist path of development, not in the vulgar sense of jumping over this or that stage of the bourgeois-revolution, but in the sense of a world historical perspective, in the sense of the programmatic notation of the path of development of all colonial revolutions, then we have a much stronger guarantee than in the period just past against the merging of the Communist Parties in the colonial countries with all sorts of petty-bourgeois ideologies, against making them fit all sorts of mish-mashes, such as Sun Yat-senism, Gandhi-ism, etc. We must say clearly: The Communist International considers the colonial peoples not only as allies, as coloured auxiliary troops against imperialism, but it regards them as a part of the population of the whole world, which we are leading to Socialism; not as colonial troops which help us, but as the world village, as the world periphery which we are leading to Socialism just as we are leading the proletariat of the great ruling countries to Socialism.

Another reference to this point is given us in a letter from Marx to Engels written in 1858. There Marx puts the important question as to whether victorious Socialism can maintain itself in Europe alone. This sentence was also opportunely cited in the last Russian Party discussion. Marx said in 1858:

“The difficult question for us is: The revolution is imminent upon the Continent and will at once assume a Socialist character. Will it not of necessity be smashed in this little corner since the bourgeois society is still developing on the upgrade upon a much greater terrain.”

The Leninist perspective about the development of the colonial countries, no matter how backward these may be, to Socialism, gives the answer to this question. Through it the world revolution in a small corner, in which it was already imminent 70 years ago, will be carried over to the entire earth, and thereby the danger of the throttling of the European and American Socialism by the gigantic masses of the backward countries disappears.

It is clear that to-day there is absolutely no longer any doubt as to the possibility of a Chinese Socialist revolution, and of Chinese Socialism. To-day, we no longer have the Hegelian philosophy, to-day we no longer have the Chinese philosophy, but the philosophy of Marxism and Leninism, which applies to Europe and America as well as to the colonies. And looking at it from this great point of view of world development, which is not only of theoretical but also practical significance for the working out of the independence of the Communists, of the Communist Parties, of the independence of the proletarian classes of the colonies, — from this great point of view we must let our Party step forward, in the programme of our colonial work, in the initial phase of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution, as that Party which will fight towards Socialism as its final aim in the colonies, in India, China, etc. Only so will our Parties be able to find their way in the difficult question of the growing over from the bourgeois-democratic, to the Socialist, the proletarian revolution, in which many Party leaderships have already been wrecked. Of course, it would be a quite vulgar conception to assume that the Leninist perspective means that to-day there stands upon the order of business the task of the direct transition to Socialism; of course it would be a Trotskyist point of view, to say to-day that the bourgeois-democratic possibilities of the revolution in China are exhausted, that the bourgeois democratic phases of the revolution have already been passed through. In the analysis here there are possibilities of mistakes of a Trotskyist type, but there are also possibilities of mistakes which the Resolution of the Comintern at the VII. Plenum of the E. C. C. I. characterised as follows. It said:

“It would be an error to limit the tasks of the Chinese Revolution to: 1. The destruction of imperialism; 2. the liquidation of the feudal remnants upon the plea that the revolution has a petty-bourgeois character in its initial stage. The Chinese revolution cannot destroy imperialism, **without growing out beyond the limits of bourgeois democracy.**”

In the theses of Comrade Kuusinen there are various places which require a basic re-working, but on this question paragraph 16 of the theses states quite clearly and plainly:

“The phase of the bourgeois-democratic Revolution, about which we are talking when we refer to countries of the first and second types (the reference is to China and India — H. N.) is the phase of the transition to the Socialist Revolution. The historical sense of this phase consists just in the preparation of the pre-conditions of the proletarian dictatorship and of the Socialist Revolution.”

I believe that this characterisation of the present phase of the bourgeois-democratic revolution is correct and is the only one which will make it possible for our Parties to fulfil their tasks. We still have the bourgeois-democratic revolution, not yet the Socialist-proletarian revolution, but none of the chief tasks of the bourgeois-democratic revolution has yet been solved. But we no longer have the simple, naked — if one may say so — bourgeois-democratic revolution, as one could speak of this stage of the revolution in the period of the Northern Expedition up to the Wuhan Government; to-day we have the obligation to differentiate, to work out the difference between

the earlier period of the bourgeois-democratic revolution and the present one, to-day after Canton, after the betrayal of the bourgeoisie. If we do not do that, then we lose every concrete characteristic for differentiating between the various stages, and for judging the bloody turning point we have lived through, which was achieved by the revolutionary workers and peasants with such enormous sacrifices.

To-day we have, as the theses of the 9th Plenum stated, the **Soviet phase**. The Soviet phase is only a political form. But that which makes up the basic content of this political form, is the phase of the transition to the Socialist Revolution, which smashes the limits, the restrictions of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, even though this bourgeois-democratic revolution is still before us. Therein consists the process of growing over.

In this question of **growing over** there are two mistakes. The first is the Trotskyist mistake, that which sees only the Socialist Revolution, and overlooks the bourgeois-democratic revolution; the other error consists in seeing only the bourgeois-democratic revolution, but only going beyond the limits of this revolution, and forgetting the Socialist Revolution. This point of view is in contradiction to the Leninist theory of the growing over of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into the Socialist one. It is known that Lenin already in 1905 said in "The Position of the Social Democrats to the Peasant Movement":

"We must at once begin to go over from the Democratic Revolution to the Socialist Revolution, of course to the extent to which our strength, the strength of the conscious and organised proletariat, permits us. **We are for the permanent revolution.**"

Of course not in the Trotskyist sense, but in the Marxist sense:

"We shall not remain standing at a half-way station... We shall help to make the democratic revolution with all the strength of the whole peasantry, so that we, the Party of the proletariat, will be more easily able to go over quickly to a new and higher task, to the Socialist Revolution." (Lenin, Vol VI, p. 449.)

Whoever does not understand that, whoever only speaks of having a bourgeois-democratic revolution in China, whoever does not want to recognise that we are in the midst of the transition to the Socialist Revolution, he is making a mistake. Lenin wrote about this in 1921 at the fourth anniversary of the October Revolution as follows:

"The Kautskys, etc. . . could not understand the relation between the bourgeois-democratic and the proletarian-Socialist revolution. The first grows over to the second. The second solves in passing the questions of the first, the second strengthens the work of the first. **The fight and only the fight, decides how far the second succeeds in growing out over the first.**" (Lenin, Vol. XVIII, I, p. 365.)

And this sentence is undoubtedly the most decisive. How far will it be possible for the second, for the Socialist Revolution, to grow out over the first, the bourgeois-democratic revolution. I believe it is also necessary to refer to the fact of how we understand this conception of "growing over"; many comrades, also in the colonial parties, understand this word growing over in a much too schematic sense. When Lenin speaks of it, he has not in mind, that from the imminent laws of economy, from the natural laws of revolution, there results this growing out to Socialism, automatically without activity on the part of the fighting classes. He says that it is just the fight, and only the fight which decides, and therein "growing over" with Lenin means undoubtedly also the conscious, the active leading over of the Revolution to a higher stage. It does not grow like a tree, it does not grow biologically, it is pushed, lifted forwards, driven by the driving, moving force, — the proletariat. Of course not of its own accord, but on the basis of the existing conditions, of a given relation of class-forces. But on the basis of these forces the proletariat decides, the fight decides and only the fight, about the transition to a higher phase of the revolution.

And here arises the further question: what function has finance capital in the colonies in general in the present stage of imperialism?

Lenin worked out this question only in its first essentials. He had in mind first of all the epoch of finance-capital in the great capitalist countries. But he gives us extraordinarily important hints as to the function of finance-capital in the periphery

of the capitalist world, in the colonies. Hilferding in his "Finance Capital", which as the discussion on the programme question stressed correctly, contains much that is orthodox Marxism, discussed the role of capital export in the colonies. I see such a tendency in the debate on India, which says that capital export in the colonies of necessity creates industry, that the profits of this industry are used for the good of the country itself. Hilferding refers, however, to just the difference between capital transfer which is used for the good of the dependent country, and capital export which serves exclusively the interests of the exporting country. That is the specific characteristic of capitalist export. Hilferding refers to the fact that capital export, even in the form of industrial capital, does not serve to industrialise the country, or — as he expresses it — to develop the country industrially — a comparison with other countries shows this. Why does not capital export in the dependent countries of Europe, such as in the Pyrenian Peninsula, in Sweden, where there is every pre-requisite for industrialisation (iron-ore, raw materials, capital in its most expansive form, labour power) — why does it not there create a machine industry, production of the means of production? Why do we have there only raw material industries? Hilferding refers to the fact that this is based upon the laws of capital export. He refers to such a type of development, where capital export first of all begins (and the Indian experience confirms this fully) as capital export for the purpose of investment in the transportation system, then goes over to industry producing the means of consumption, and then in its latest phase goes over to the sphere of raw materials. The colonies are purveyors of raw materials to the mother countries. Undoubtedly this does not mean industrialisation, such as has been presented somewhat unclearly. We must confirm just what industrialisation means. Does it mean the industrial development of the country? I believe not. It means, undoubtedly under capitalist relations, that industrial capital becomes the dominant form of economy, it subordinates all other spheres of economy to itself. Such an industrialisation presupposes the smashing of the feudal remnants on the land. It means carrying through the agrarian revolution.

Is that the function which finance capital fulfils in the colonies? No. This assertion is a mistake, which Rosa Luxemburg already made. Rosa Luxemburg wrote in her "Accumulation of Capital" much that was valuable and correct about the colonies. But she presented the process in too primitive a way. She put the question in such a way that capitalism not only destroys the natural economy and the simple commodity economy there, but fully conquers for itself absolute domination. The "third persons" disappear completely and thus there arises "pure capitalism", from which the theory of collapse results. We have criticised the theory of Rosa Luxemburg from various points of view. But what is decisive for the colonies? Wherein is Rosa Luxemburg incorrect? In that she presupposes the complete extermination of pre-capitalist elements by capitalism. What does practice show us? Practice shows just the opposite. It shows that finance capital penetrates, that it does not conquer the non-capitalist forms, but develops them. It does not change the non-capitalist forms into capitalist ones, but it lives alongside of them, it undermines them, but it does not create a higher form of production. When one puts this question correctly on principle, one must reject the assertion of the industrialisation of China. But also for another reason. If the theory which Comrade Bennett here represented is correct, that does not mean the decay of capitalism, but its ascendancy. And then comes the question which Marx put: While the movement of capitalist society is still on the ascendancy, then there is really the danger that the proletarian world revolution becomes isolated and squeezed into a little corner, the danger that the revolution will be smashed. But this danger is not present, and therefore, I believe that the point of view of Comrade Bennett and of the English comrades is in contradiction to the teachings of Lenin about the colonies. Of course, these theories alone are not decisive, the facts decide.

The third question: What is the bourgeoisie in the colonies? It is not only the industrial bourgeoisie, but to a great extent also the commercial bourgeoisie, commercial and usurers' capital. But does commercial, usurers' capital, which arithmetically as well as from the point of view of its significance is much stronger than the industrial bourgeoisie, represent the bourgeois-democratic revolution? No, in its decisive strata it opposes it. It is not the bearer of the bourgeois democratic transformation. We can find in Marx a mass of quotations bearing this out. Usurious

capital lives in the pores of the old society, creates no new society, ruins the old one; usurous capital signifies just the absence of modern capitalistic relations. In this connection it is only necessary to cite the well known sentence:

"The independent development of merchant capital is in an inverse relationship to the general economic development of society."

That is true of all colonial bourgeoisies, and that is the basis of their special weakness as a revolutionary force, of their reformism, and of the weakness of the industrial bourgeoisie within the whole bourgeoisie.

And finally, the last matter, the question which was touched upon by Marx in his "Theory of Surplus Value", the question of the so-called "territorialisation". That is the fact that the bourgeoisie in the colonies is narrowly developed just because of the pre-capitalistic kind of capital, usurous capital, because of the role of commercial capital, which is grown together with feudal remnants, because the industrial bourgeoisie is partly tied together with usurous capital in the village, with the feudal remnants on the land.

What are the conclusions that follow from this? Capitalism is not the dominating economic form, but on the other hand it possesses all its strategical positions. That seems to be a paradox. On the question of feudalism there were various opinions. There are comrades, who are not followers of Trotsky and the opposition, who contest the fact that in China feudalism is the ruling economic form at the moment. Because of lack of time and because of the complicated character of the question, I will not go into the question of Asiatic types of production. I will only say that such a student of Marx as Lenin says that we have feudalism in China. He says:

"The objective conditions in China, a backward agricultural half-feudal country, put upon the order of the day for the life of a people of almost half a milliard quite a definite historical peculiar form of oppression and exploitation, namely, feudalism. Feudalism is based upon the domination of agriculture and of national economy; the source of feudal exploitation of the Chinese peasants was the fact that they were chained to the land in one or another form. The political representative of this exploitation was feudalism."

And what follows from this?

"The need for the smashing of feudalism in all its varieties and forms."

From this we have very definite conclusions as to the character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in general and as to the role of the bourgeoisie in particular.

In the weakness of the bourgeoisie, as bearer of a certain economy, lies one of the chief causes for the possibility of going around the capitalist form and for a socialist development. The revolutionary role of the bourgeoisie can only be an exception. It could be that in China for a time. The whole Chinese bourgeoisie, however, transformed itself into a reactionary force, before it solved a single one of its tasks. This we did not have in France, etc. And I put the question: Do we have reason to assume that this Chinese bourgeoisie can by itself solve the tasks of the revolution in the fight against imperialism and feudalism, even if it be in a compromising-reformist way? We have no reason to assume this. We must not fall into revolutionary fatalism. But when we start with an analysis of the economic situation, with a sober estimation of class forces, we must see that there are two ways. Either the completely imperialistic one, the division of the country and then in a round about way a long torturous capitalist overturn; or the transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the socialist one, to the final victory of Socialism.

One can put the question: if the bourgeoisie is so weak, why has it played a revolutionary role, why could it play a revolutionary role for a time? This question must be answered. It could play a revolutionary role because the pressure of imperialism was so tremendous that it had to make some steps forward. And at the moment when it made its first forward step, on the 30th May, the masses of the proletariat and peasantry began to move. In his excellent speech, Comrade Strakhov mentioned an absolutely correct Chinese proverb: there is no magician who creates for himself a demon, where the demon does not tear himself free and kill the magician. That is the relation

of forces, of colonial forces to the industrial bourgeoisie, which unfetters them.

How long has the revolutionary breathing spell of the colonial revolutionary bourgeoisie in China lasted? When one takes their appearance as a revolutionary factor, it lasted from the 30th May 1925 to the 14th April 1927. And when one considers the acute stage of the fight against feudalism, the offensive to the North, the revolutionary breathing spell of the bourgeoisie lasted from July 26, 1926 to April 14, 1927. Just ten months did this revolutionary breathing spell of the national bourgeoisie last. Then they became bloody hangmen, using the most reactionary mediaeval methods.

What lessons do we learn from this? I firmly believe, the lesson that the national bourgeoisie in India cannot play a revolutionary role for a long, and not even for a short period. On this question it is my opinion that it would be useful to make changes in the theses, with whose basic line I am otherwise in agreement. We must strike out some things in it, because they have been struck by the course of development in China.

We should not prevent our Indian comrades from saying even now: the Indian bourgeoisie will betray you, it is the party of betrayal. The worst, the greatest error that we made in China was that we did not tell the Party this. We must shout from the house-tops, the Communist Party must spread this as its most important teaching: the national bourgeoisie will absolutely betray you even at the beginning of the revolutionary movement.

A few words as to future perspectives. What is now the situation in China after all the experiences we have had? We carried through the tactic of the united front with the nationalist movement in a certain stage. We must put the question: who has benefited by this tactic? Who has cheated whom with it, has the bourgeoisie really cheated us, because we supported them for a time, because we used them for ten months? What is the balance for us, for the bourgeoisie? The four basic tasks of the bourgeoisie are at least these: first, removal of the imperialist yoke; second, liquidation of feudalism; third, national unification and the creation of a domestic market; and not last, the conquest of political power.

What has the bourgeoisie accomplished? None of its tasks was achieved. What have we accomplished? We have accomplished a peasant organisation numbering 4 millions; we have above all achieved one thing; the independent fight of the working and peasant masses, the independent movement of the working and peasant population, the leading role of the proletariat. Was the tactic correct? Does the defeat signify that this tactic was false? In no way. In 1905 the Bolsheviks also suffered a defeat with a correct tactic. 1917. The same perspectives are now present there.

What is the present situation in China? Taken from a purely economic point of view there is a deep economic crisis. Foreign trade in 1927 did not reach the level of 1926. A financial crisis, a heavy industrial crisis. Heavy industry is at a standstill. The coal mines are not working throughout a great part of the country. The silk industry is completely shaken to pieces. The agrarian crisis becomes ever sharper.

In the last number of the Russian journal "Novy Vostok" (New East) there is a polemic against Lominadze, an article in which Lominadze refers to these symptoms of crisis. It is stated there that Comrade Lominadze's mistake consists in that he only considers signs of conjuncture. We must put the question as to whether we have at the present time symptoms of a crisis, evidence of conjuncture. The Chinese agrarian crisis is one in which not only the product is becoming destroyed, not only the means of production, but even the conditions of production themselves, where the peasant is not only freed of his means of production, of his product, but in growing masses is even being freed of his life, as a result of the militarist war, famine, etc.

And this crisis, which has lasted decades, which has reached its highest point, the highest ever reached in the modern history of China, is this a crisis of conjuncture or a structural phenomenon? It is a structural crisis. And another fact is of significance: we have in China, as all comrades know, no national market as yet. But the market which we have there is already closely connected with the world market. It is a quite peculiar phenomenon, that many parts of Chinese agriculture are being economically smashed, rooted out by the competition of the world market. The two classical, most important branches

of Chinese agriculture, tea and silk production, are being destroyed little by little. These are facts which result from the international division of labour on the world market.

Is the crisis resulting from the international division of production on the world market of a structural nature? Yes. Are prospects for the elimination of this crisis at hand? No, for the elimination of the crisis presupposes the fulfilment of the tasks of the revolution.

The Chinese Party has today been attacked here. I will not here go into the whole speech made by Comrade Pepper. Comrade Pepper attempted to bring forward again, without any need, without any basis, decisions of the Comintern which were long ago settled, and disputed questions which have been closed. Nobody touched upon these questions which were already settled at the IX. Plenum. He tried to tie up these questions, I believe, in an unprincipled manner with questions which were discussed under the first point on the order of business. I do not consider it necessary to go further into these matters here. But he attacked the Chinese Party and reproached it with errors of Sun Yat-senism in the first period of the revolution, and with errors of Trotskyism in the second period. What then remains correct in the Party's tactics? Such an estimation is false. The Party has corrected the great mistakes it has made, it has developed through all mistakes upon the path of Bolshevism. It deposits in the arsenal of the Comintern as a contribution for the coming fights in colonial countries, a rich treasure of lessons, which it has gained by practical experience. Let us take such matters as the question of the independent organisation of the working and peasant masses, their independent revolutionary uprising under the leadership of the Communist Party, which was carried through in China, the question of the element of double-power in case of a transition from the bourgeois-democratic revolution to the social revolution, in the form of delegates in Shanghai, and also in various forms during the Wuhan period, the question of the tactic and technique of the peasant uprisings, which will also play a colossal role for the movement in India, further, the fact that a Soviet system existed inside a counter-revolutionary environment.

Our Party was reproached with having a membership consisting of 90% peasants.

(Comrade Pepper: Did I say that?)

I do not speak of Comrade Pepper, who in this question is no decisive revolutionary force, but I speak of another comrade who made this reproach. And this reproach was made correctly, but this fact also shows that today in China where the peasants are rising, and, under the influence of the proletariat, are also coming to consider the Communist Party as their Party. Also the backward peasants are taking up the slogans of the Communists, and that is an evidence of the fact that our Communist Party in China is playing an important role on the land and has become a revolutionary force.

Let us take the mistakes of the Rights in the Chinese party. In what do these mistakes consist? They have accepted obligatory arbitration in hindrance of workers' struggles, they have issued numerous documents against "excesses" of the peasants. The instruction of the C. C. at that time wrote against these excesses, against the independent uprisings of the peasantry, against the agrarian revolution:

"We must keep firmly in our minds the fact that the Party must in its peasant policy pursue strictly the line of suppressing the excesses directed against the petty bourgeois landowners and against the military."

The suppression of excesses — that was the Right error, which was on the point of a transition to the counter-revolution. A decree of the Communist Minister for Agriculture says:

"It is necessary to correct all infantile sicknesses of the peasantry, especially must we exclude all elements who run off the correct path, and harm a great part of the peasantry. So far as the fight with the counter-revolutionary elements is concerned, the punishing of the Tuchow and Gentry, one must be directed by the instructions issued by the Government and the Party, namely: 'to give them over to the government organs, and not act arbitrarily.'" And finally the last document, a decision of the C. C.:

"The workers' troops in Wuhan must be disbanded or attached to the army, for the purpose of avoiding any misunderstandings."

That was the line of the old leadership. The new leadership which then took over the direction of the Party, made putschist errors, exercised too much patience as against putschist errors. The lack of understanding of trade union work, the putschist conceptions, these are the errors which must be criticised ruthlessly. To hush up these errors, to exercise patience or forbearance towards them would be false. But one thing we must see: the effects of these putschist errors are the same as the opportunistic ones, but their sources are different, and Comrade Strakhov is quite correct when he says that these errors are not symptoms of degeneration, but must be considered as infantile sicknesses. But on the other hand, there is a false conception present, that is the going over to the bourgeoisie, the throttling of the forces of the proletariat, and the new leadership has eradicated this putschist error.

I will not speak about Canton. It has today become a banality that the Canton uprising is no putsch. But the positive side is, and this the Communist International must keep in mind in the future: The Canton insurrection is of tremendous significance for colonial uprisings. It signifies the erection of the Soviet power for the first time in such a country.

Since the Canton uprising the Chinese peasant knows that he can receive land, peace and freedom only from the hands of the workers, from the Soviet power. Every coming step of the Communist uprising in China will begin exactly there where the Canton uprising stopped, namely, with the slogan of the Soviet power.

I cannot close without referring with a word to the unheard of difficulty of the conditions under which our Chinese Party works. Comrade Strakhov said in his first speech, that in the Russian language there are no words to describe the conditions under which the Party works. We have no expressions in our language for the methods of white terror used against our Party. When we here consider the work of our Chinese brother Party, it is our duty to recognise that they have done a tremendous work.

Our Party must become a closed front. The leadership of the Communist Party must never again fall into the hands of the representatives of an opportunistic policy. When recently the representative of an imperialist power came to Canton, Li Ti-sin had yellow sand strewn upon the chief streets of the city, in order to greet him — an honour which previously was offered only to emperors and kings. He had this sand strewn upon the same streets upon which only a few months before the corpses of the Red guard lay literally mountain-high. But despite the present difficulties there are already symptoms of a new uprising. On the same streets of Canton, and not only of Canton but also of Shanghai, will the Chinese workers' and peasants' revolution be successfully carried through under the banner of the Communist International, of the Soviet power, of the Chinese Communist Party.

Comrade ARNOT (Great Britain):

Comrades, I speak here on behalf of the British delegation who have instructed me to move an amendment to the thesis on the colonial question. First of all, I must comment on the very nature of the debate which we have had the last two days. It has been really a singular debate, particularly in the fact that so large a number of speakers did not know what was the question at issue. A number of speakers jumped to the conclusion that the British Delegation was unaware that India is an agrarian country and that, moreover, the British Delegation imagined that there must be an extremely high development of industry in India before a revolution would be possible there. On the basis of this, various speakers spoke about the English Delegation, stating that they were "revisionists", "non-Marxists", "non-Leninists", and guilty of "adulterated Menshevism", "ultra-Leftism of the worst type", etc., etc. Comrade Murphy, who was alone in the English Delegation, in having another point of view, had a particularly choice supply of epithets.

Secondly, many comrades who have spoken in order to combat the supposed delusions of the British Delegation have taken great pains to inform themselves of certain facts of an elementary character about India, which facts they have then huried at the heads of the British.

Comrade Remmele, having as he told us, gone to the Information Department, was especially voluminous with his figures. If I did not mis-hear him he gave us a great number of figures

including some showing that the consumption of coal per head in India was extremely small. This is what he told the British Delegation. Thank you very much.

In return I will give you a piece of information, Comrade Remmele, I will tell you that if the consumption of coal per head in India is very small, well, then you must remember, Comrade Remmele, that India is rather a warm country; and they don't need fires as much as we do here. Moreover, if you had asked for a little more information from the Inform. Department, you would have learned that in India there is no domestic consumption of coal whatever, that the fuel of the peasants is not coal, but dried cow-dung.

I will give you some figures about coal which will give you a much truer picture than these rubbishy "per head" figures you have been given. I am quoting from the "Economist" of July 28th of this year, which gives the production of coal in India for the last months as well as the last years. Here are the figures for the first four months of this alone: "Production of coal in India in metric tons: 1, 923,000 tons, January; 2,341,000, February; 2,185,000 March; 1,894,000 April. That is to say roughly at the rate of production of 24 million tons per annum. When you compare that with other countries, you discover that it is only a few hundred thousand tons less than the production of Japan, that it is half the production of France, that it is twice the production of Canada, and is of course considerably larger than Czechoslovakia and other countries. This gives a somewhat more correct picture of the true figures of coal production.

This controversy which has been carried on here the last two days began some months ago. Some months ago, towards the end of last year, Comrade Rathbone, a member of the British Party, compiled a study of "Industrial India" in which he gave the results of some very good research into what had been happening in the development of industry in India. This book was not a theoretical pamphlet, it was simply preliminary material towards the preparation of a theory. Comrade Varga, a little later, partly using these materials of Comrade Rathbone, wrote in the *Inprecorr* referring to India as "the focus of the British Empire"; and therein Comrade Varga did take up a very definite theoretical standpoint. This theoretical standpoint was contested at meetings of the Indian Commission which sat in March and April. It was contested first of all by the Indian comrades on that Commission and by the British comrades on that Commission. Comrade Varga was further answered in an article which appeared in the British journal "The Labour Monthly" where Comrade R. Palme Dutt replied to the theoretical standpoint taken by Comrade Varga. So the question stood as a controversy that had gone on for some months before the Congress began. It is a pity that this material was not made available for the delegates in view of the fact that Comrade Kuusinen devoted so much of his time in his opening speech to this important controversy.

Now, Comrade Kuusinen in his speech devoted himself mainly to India in dealing with the colonial thesis, and there, in the portion dealing with India, he dealt with two words: "decolonisation" and "industrialisation". He used them in a certain sense and endeavoured to show that in the sense that he ascribed to them, they were wrong. Meantime, the British Delegation received the colonial thesis and found in it certain errors and confusions and they indicated this by means of their speakers, Comrades Bennett, Rothstein and Cox.

Since then the British Delegation have been assailed as villains of the deepest dye, as "revisionists", "non-Marxists", and so on and so on; and there has been ascribed to them in particular that they are in favour of this bogey, "decolonisation".

Now with regard to "decolonisation", the British delegation are not partisans of it. So far from that, we have never mentioned it in any speech except to say it was a bogey. We have never supported it, not a single one of our speakers has supported it, and in our amendment which I have to put to the colonial thesis, we expressly disclaim it. So that the whole of the speeches which ascribe a belief in decolonisation to the British delegation, were completely wasted wind. With that I think we may let that flea stick to the wall.

With regard to the theoretical difference we say that the colonial thesis is wrong. With regard to the question of mixed fact and theory, which I am taking separately, we say (in relation especially to India) that the wrong formulations of the theory have led to an eclectic seizure of facts and a misinterpretation of facts. These are the two points upon which I wish

to speak. In addition, I will deal at the end with various smaller points and certain tactical questions.

Let us take the Kuusinen thesis. Comrade Kuusinen, after stating his conception of imperialist policy, says in the second paragraph, second sentence:

"It may be taken practically as the general principle of imperialist economic policy of the colonies in their relation to the so-called Motherlands, they always transform into an agrarian hinterland";

in the 7th paragraph, Comrade Kuusinen goes on to say:

"in practice there may be also certain deviations from the general anti-industrialisation trend of imperialist colonial policy due to the interest of financial capital in exporting capital, especially if the machine-building industries of the metropolis feel acutely the restriction of their export markets when there is a rival demand in their colonies."

Now comrades, the contention of the British Delegation is that this formulation, so far from being correct, actually stands the correct Leninist theory on its head. Instead of beginning with imperialism, instead of beginning with the export of capital, this thesis as it stands here, begins with the classical stage of the development of capitalism, and I will proceed to show you it never goes out of that stage. Naturally, therefore, it regards the later development as a deviation; whereas what they call the deviation from the general line should be the cardinal feature of any present-day analysis of finance capital.

Now there are two processes which can be fairly clearly seen. There is the classical process by which the capitalist country exports its goods to the colony, destroys incidentally the native industries in the colony, forces the population back to the soil, causes a pressure on the soil which results in pauperisation of the peasantry and which finally puts on the order of the day the agrarian revolution. This is the process that begins with the first export of manufactured goods into a colonial country by capital. But as capitalism develops and reaches the imperialist stage, export of capital becomes of increasing importance compared to the export of goods; and colonies hitherto only a market for goods become a market for capital also. These two processes are, to an extent, contradictory. Nevertheless, they have certain joint results. And that joint result is the growth of industry in the colony. I say a joint result because the industry rises both from the measures taken by classical capitalism to create a market, the building of railways, etc., etc., and also from the export of capital itself.

From this comes a somewhat complicated series of contradictions. Comrades, the question of present-day imperialism in relation to the colonies is a question in which there is a very great deal of contradictions and not merely the simple contradiction of the early 19th century, which is the contradiction that you get set out in this thesis. Involuntarily, capitalism, which is not in any way desirous to stimulate the productive forces in the colony, nevertheless must stimulate the creation of its future rival.

Thus the export of capital which was to solve the contradictions at home, enlarges the contradictions in the world sphere. This is a general law of capitalist development, and this law should have been set out in this thesis. This is the contention of the British Delegation. It is necessary, of course, to show how relatively small is the scale of this growth of industry, arising from these two processes. But the first thing to do, and the thing which the thesis does not do, is to set forth perfectly clearly the general law of capitalist development. This must come first, and unless it does, we say this thesis will be unclear and incorrect in itself, and extremely confusing for any worker who tries to understand it.

Next, the British Delegation says that imperialism can accelerate or can retard the operation of this general law of capitalist development. And it will accelerate or retard according to the pressure exerted on the capitalists by their search for profit. For profit is the goal they are after; and on the basis of profit, and the conditions on which they can get it, so will their policy alter. Now, comrades, one can undoubtedly say that the general law of development was retarded by capitalism. There was a retardation, in the classic period of capitalism. But Comrade Kuusinen gives this as a general picture of development. Mark you, this retardation is a process

which does not cease at the present time, but goes on. But there comes in a contradictory process, a second new tendency comes which works against the retardation. The reason is clear; that in the era of finance capital, export of capital develops more and more, bursts into the colonies, and has inevitable reactions there. The inevitable process of the growth of industry is no longer retarded, or rather, the balance between the tendency towards retarding and the tendency towards accelerating, becomes increasingly more and more towards acceleration. When that stage is reached, you find that the imperialists, faced with a development which is inevitable, decide to control the development of industry in order the more effectively to keep the colony in subjugation for ever and ever.

In saying this, of course, I leave out certain pictures of class relations, etc. But this gives the general picture.

Now beyond that statement which we suggest as our amendment to the theses, we say that it is not easy for Comrade Kuusinen to give any general law of development beyond what we suggest; but that in each case the problems of each country must be approached separately, and the class relations discovered. Only in this way is it possible to make an approach towards a generalisation which will cover all cases. In every colony — let this be clear — whatever happens to class relations, imperialism to the last moment clings to the colony like a leech clings to the body of its victim.

Now we come to the second point, the question of mixed fact and theory. And here we come to this word "industrialisation". It is a pity, comrades, but I think to a certain extent there has been a misunderstanding about words. What is industrialisation? Does it mean that India would become a predominantly industrial country? No, nothing of the sort. But Comrade Pepper insisted on this absurd meaning, and so became another of the kindly instructors of the British Party this afternoon. I always like to hear Comrade Pepper, because he is a comrade who has a great aptitude for mastering the ins and outs of any question, or any art and craft, in a very short space of time. But I suggest to him that this afternoon he was mainly engaged in mastering the ins and outs of an ancient craft that we possess in Britain, the craft of teaching your grandmother to suck eggs.

What is the meaning of the sense in which we have used industrialisation? The simple plain meaning which we must attach to the word industrialisation is — the growth of capitalist industry. Now, comrades, with regard to the growth of industrialisation, meaning the growth of capitalist industry, does this exist in India? Yes, it does exist. Comrade Kuusinen in his speech admitted this.

Does this industrialisation, this growth of industry bring a new problem and an acceleration of contradictions? Yes it does. Now let me put the question this way. Is the policy of British imperialism nowadays the same policy as it was in the epoch of industrial capitalism? Well, if the comrades supporting the thesis answer no, that is the main part of our case. If they say yes, then it is up to those who wrote the thesis to explain away the facts of industrial development in India and further they must explain away the statements of the British Government with regard to the new policy.

What are those statements? They are perfectly definite and clear. The statement is made first of all by the British Government in the Legislative Assembly in 1923. Without any division at all, but by unanimous vote a resolution was carried as follows:

"that this Legislative Assembly recommends to the Governor in Council that we accept in principle the policy of the Government of India which may be legitimately re-directed towards the development of the industries in India"

and a rider was added to the effect that a tariff board would be set up. What are the further facts as regards Government policy? There was first of all an Industrial Commission set up in 1916. The report of this Commission envisaged a steady growth of industry in India and in that connection they proposed or recommended that a series of other problems should be examined and reports given in connection with the growth of industry. These reports were supplied year after year by various commissions, the last of which was this year. There was the Fiscal Commission, the Export of Capital Committee, the Currency Commission and there was the Agrarian Commission which has reported only last month. Comrade Murphy is wool gathering when he thinks that it is the Baldwin Government

that is responsible for this Commission, because the lines of this commission were drawn out already in 1916, 12 years ago and before the Baldwin Government was in power. Furthermore, there is no distinction on the question of India between the Baldwin and the MacDonald Governments.

I know it is said that those resolutions, the declared policy of the Government of India, are all eye-wash, with no meaning whatever. This is an answer which does not fit the facts. To me the thousand million pounds Sterling of British capital invested in India demands something as its Gosplan; and this ten-year long series commissions is the Gosplan of that thousand million pounds of exported capital.

Now why has this industrialisation question arisen? It is because, whereas there was a continued rapidly growing export of British capital in India, particularly just after the war, in the last four years there has been a catastrophic drop in the export of capital. Now it is necessary to explain here why there has been that export of capital. Furthermore it is a fact that 8 million pounds have been subscribed in the last five months for export to India (twenty times more than that subscribed in the same period last year) which shows the possibility, at any rate, that this lean period as regards export of capital is coming to an end.

Now, comrades, once the game is afoot of thinking that this recent drop in the export of capital means that there has been no change in the policy of imperialism, those who adopt this point of view at once begin to start another hare. They go on to deny any growth of heavy industry in India. They deny that capital export goes into industry, because they say, it goes into State loans, harbour works, etc. Let me deal with this point. Ninety per cent., it is said, goes into State loans and only ten per cent. into industry. The comrades who bring forward this particular line of argument, if they wish to make it convincing as regards India, must go to every other colonial country and show that India is a special case and that the situation is different from that of other colonial countries. They must prove that before the argument has any validity as regards India. They have not done that. I cannot because I have not the material here to give the figures, but I will say from memory that some five years ago when Comrade Rathbone and I were both engaged on working out what proportion of British and American capital was invested in Brazil, we discovered that the amount of British capital that had been invested in about 40 or 50 days in Brazil was in the region of two hundred million pounds. That is my recollection, and if you look at the share quotations of the British Stock Exchange you will see if only from the titles of the Brazilian stocks that the money there also goes into State loans, into State and provincial loans, or into railways and harbours and means of transport.

This particular argument that its export of capital is not export of capital pure and simple, but must always be split up into 90% State Loans and only 10% industrial investments has therefore no special validity for India. But in any case in our arguments here it is necessary simply to take the term "export of capital" in the sense in which Lenin used it in "Imperialism" instead of misusing it. While on this question of State Loans, one would find, I think, that this is the only way in which capital is exported to colonial countries in the main. Beyond that, suppose we take this 90% of all capital exports which, they say, goes into State loans in India. What happens to that 90%? The Government of India subscribes for a loan of 10 million pounds. What does the Government of India do with it? You don't suggest that they buy champagne with it and drink it at Simla! Not at all! That 10 million pounds goes into the Indian economy and by the laws of its own development, it keeps growing and growing.

The next point used is, that you only find the growth of industry in textiles, and that the growth of industry does not take place in every industry, nor in the production of means of production, nor in machine-shop industries. Of course, no one would deny it! This industrialisation is a process. What countries have machine shops? What countries have means of production? A very small list of countries. We do not speak of industrialisation of Britain in 1928: nor Germany, nor even France. We use it and speak of the industrialisation of Russia, of India, of other countries less developed than Britain, and it is a process which goes on first in light industry, then in heavy, then into the industry of means of production such as machine shops, etc.

Steel is heavy industry. If that is developing it is a sign of the growth of industry in a real sense. I quote from a paper by Richard Mather who is a metallurgical inspector to India, a paper read to the Royal Society of Arts, last year. In this paper there are given facts in regard to the iron and steel industry in India. The figures show that the pre-war yearly average of steel imports into India was 995,000 tons; and that Indian production was only 30,000 tons. The average of the three years 1924-25-26, for steel imports is a little less than pre-war, namely, 939,000 tons. But the Indian production has risen from 30,000 tons to 303,000 tons, an increase of no less than ten times, bringing it right up to the $\frac{1}{3}$ of the total import of steel. This is a figure which cannot be argued away. We may place it against some of the statements made by Comrade Kuusinen who said "in recent years almost all metal works founded after the war have gone into liquidation".

So the conclusion of the matter is this: that there is a growth in industry, admittedly; there is a declared new policy of British imperialism, admittedly; and it is for those who hold that the policy of imperialism viz-a-viz the colonies is the same as it was in the period of free competition, it is for them to explain away these facts.

Comrade Remmele asked a number of questions. He asked the question: is imperialism a progressive force in the colonies? A very curious question to ask. From certain points of view, capitalism is progressive, for example, when looked at from a feudal standpoint. Again, from the point of view that it is nearer to Socialism, it might be said that imperialism is progressive. But the fact is one cannot formulate the question in this simple way. The thing is much more complicated. As imperialism develops, as the decay of imperialism sets in, as there comes a growth of the rentier class, etc., etc., so the symptoms of stagnation and parasitism steadily accumulate. But that growing stagnation is not the only factor. At the same time there still remains within imperialism a power of advancing production forces in spite of the incoming stagnancy. So thus the contradictions become stronger and stronger and clash more and more violently till the point is reached when imperialism is burst asunder. With this process in mind it is impossible to ask or answer with a yes or no the simple questions of Comrade Remmele. But Comrade Remmele answered his own question. He said that capitalism was entirely destructive and he referred to its destroying of native industry; and of course this is also the standpoint of the thesis. I should like to quote from the article written by Marx in 1853 in the New York Tribune, in answer to Comrade Remmele, when he speaks of capitalism as being only destructive and in reference also to the thesis.

Karl Marx, dealing with the "British (economic) invasion" of India which "shattered the hand-loom and smashed the spinning wheel to pieces" writes:

"It is true that England in setting into motion this social revolution in Hindustan was actuated solely by the lowest interests and proceeded stupidly in its endeavour to bring it about. But this is not the matter at issue. Rather the question is: can mankind fulfil its mission without a fundamental social revolution in Asia? If it cannot, then England, whatever the crimes she may have committed, has in the carrying through of this revolution acted only as the unconscious instrument of history."

In our analysis we must be scientific and must not make a picture of classic capitalism without remembering these words of Marx.

I will omit other points which Comrade Kuusinen gives in his speech, because of the shortness of time, and I will merely read the amendment of the British Delegation to this theses; this of course is only a draft amendment but it gives the British Delegation's point of view. Instead of the theory as put forward in Chapter 2, we suggest the following:

"For countries where the capitalist mode of production prevails colonies represent at once a source of raw materials and the market for manufactures. The inflow of machine products destroys the handicrafts and other pre-capitalist forms of native industry. From this comes an over-pressure of population on the soil, which in turn leads to a pauperisation of the peasantry. This pauperisation proceeds at an ever-increasing rate with repeated struggles until at length history puts the question of agrarian revolution upon the order of the day.

At the same time as industrial capitalism develops into monopoly capitalism, the export of capital becomes of increasing importance compared to the export of goods. In the era of imperialism, which is characterised by the growing together of all forms of capital under the dominance of finance capital, colonial countries, hitherto a market for goods only, begin to be a market for capital in its unrelenting hunt for profit.

The inflow of capital arising from this latter process at once gives a new impetus to the rise of capitalist industry already begun in the era of classic capitalism as a result of the first process: for in the very process of finding a market for goods, capitalism has been forced to create the conditions (railways, means of transport, formation of a proletariat, etc.), for the development of the capitalist mode of production within the colonies. Involuntarily, capitalism thus stimulates in the colonies the creation of its future rival; and the export of capital which was to solve the inner contradictions in the home country becomes the source of new contradictions in the world market. This is a general law of capitalist development. This is the process of industrialisation.

This process can be accelerated or retarded by the policy of imperialism. Where a single imperialist country has the monopoly of exploitation of the colonial country, there the policy of retarding industrialisation has been possible. Only when the need for capital markets has reached the stage that causes violent contradictions within capitalism, will the imperialists be compelled to acknowledge that industrialisation in the colonial countries cannot be prevented and to bow to the inevitable. In such a case, where the policy of retardation seems about to pass over into its exact opposite, monopoly capitalism is driven to accept industrialisation, but only on condition that in this acceptance it will also control and subjugate in its own interests a process which it can no longer hope effectively to retard.

When this stage has been reached the question of further developments in the relation of the "home" country and the colonies can no longer be answered on the basis of the laws of development of classical capitalism. Only by taking into account the relation of class forces in each country and their relations to world economy can the lines of development be found.

Meantime, the process of peasant pauperisation brings agrarian revolution nearer and nearer while though on a smaller scale (there is an island of industrialisation in a sea of pauperisation), the latter but parallel process of industrialisation brings the growth of a native bourgeoisie and of a native proletariat. This proletariat has as its eventual role, in conjunction with the pauperised peasantry, the carrying through of the bourgeois democratic revolution and the preparation for its passing over into the Socialist Revolution. In the process of resisting the liberation movement, the imperialist bourgeoisie, which from the beginning is allied with the feudal and semi-feudal strata in their exploitation of the peasantry, will endeavour to buy over a section of the native bourgeoisie by "concessions". But such concessions only represent an attempt to find a new social and political basis of support in the rising bourgeoisie by developing a common exploitation of the masses. No matter what words are used, it never can mean a process of withdrawal, of automatic "decolonisation", of "peaceful liberation", etc. The leech does not withdraw its suckers till it is torn from the body of the victim." An amendment to add after paragraph 21.

"In India the bourgeois revolution has already reached the stage when it is no longer possible for the Indian bourgeoisie to enter the national-revolutionary camp. The historic betrayal of the national revolution in 1922, summed up in the decisions taken by the leaders of the National Congress at Bardoli, signalled with the utmost clarity the decisive class alliance of the Indian bourgeoisie with the landlords and with British imperialism in opposition to the proletariat and the peasant masses. Since then, the Indian bourgeoisie have played the part of a national reformist opposition to imperialism. Although the conflict between this opposition and British imperialism may have played a certain objective revolutionary role in the development of the conditions for mass revolutionary action, and although the Indian bourgeoisie have made use of revolutio-

nary phrases in order to keep the petty-bourgeois masses behind them, they have always retreated at the first sign of a revolutionary movement, and must be regarded as a camp of counter-revolution. The Communist Party of India leading the proletarian masses and the toilers has therefore to fight on two fronts, on the one hand against the camp of British imperialism, and on the other, the camp of the national bourgeoisie."

Comrade DE VRIES (Holland):

I am going to speak mainly on the question of the Anti-Imperialist League. The Dutch Communist Party and its leadership were never in favour of winding up the League, nor in favour of winding up the Dutch Section of the League. On the contrary, they were always in favour of strengthening the League and its Dutch section, and they are still so to-day. It is entirely wrong to assert that the Dutch Party had handed over the leadership of the League to a Social-Democrat. Quite a different thing happened. That Left wing-Social Democrat Schmidt had attended the Brussels Congress of the League and had played a certain role at the Congress. In full agreement with the international leadership of the League, it was proposed by the Dutch Communists in the League that Schmidt should be invited to be on the leadership. I believe there was nothing wrong in that. We must not refrain from cooperating with Left-wing Social Democrats, providing that they really support the aims and objects of the League. Surely no one should be reproached for this. However, Schmidt has since betrayed the League. The Social Democrats ordered him to give up his position in the League, and after some wavering and hesitation, he gave in. Our Party comrades, as well as the non-Party people in the League who are under the influence of our comrades, have sharply condemned this Social Democratic treachery. I believe no reproach can be made to the Dutch Party on this account. Comrade Ercoli has quoted another Social-Democrat, namely, Fimmen, who had expressed himself against the slogan of the separation of Indonesia from Holland. Well, as far as we know, Fimmen is still a member and one of the pillars of the League, nevertheless the League still holds to the standpoint of the absolute independence of the colonies, including Indonesia, of course. This standpoint was also endorsed by the Dutch Section of the League. We believe, however, that our comrades in the League should ask him to clear up his position on this point.

I have already said that we are not for the liquidation of the League, but rather for strengthening its Dutch section. Particularly the Dutch section will have to carry out an important task in regard to Indonesia, for it ought to be borne in mind that the nationalist parties in Indonesia, since the time of the crushing of their insurrection, have lately recovered to a certain extent and resumed their agitation. Neither can it be asserted that these parties have completely made their peace with Dutch imperialism. There are considerable differences between these parties and the Dutch imperialists. We therefore believe that an organisation like the League has a vast field of activity in contact with these parties and groups, of which there are a good many in Indonesia. It will therefore be the task of the Party to support in every way the activity of the League. We believe, however, that in the future the activity of the League should be increased rather in depth than in breadth. In regard to the activity of the League it would be desirable in future to have less talk and spouting, less advertising, but more serious and earnest work. We thought it necessary to state this in opposition to the erroneous view entertained by Comrade Katayama. This is the standpoint of the Dutch Party as regards the League and its tasks.

Comrade DUTT (India):

I want to touch on three questions of particular importance to India which are in connection with industrialisation, the role of the Indian bourgeoisie and the question of the Workers and Peasants Party.

With regard to industrialisation, I wish only to contest a view which has been put forward in an extreme form, for example, by Comrade Martynov, when he accused Comrade Bennett of saying that industrialisation was going forward by leaps and bounds in India. This gives the idea that there are two

sharply opposed views, that it is possible to say either that there is no industrialisation in India, or that there is a large industrialisation in India; or that either industrialisation as a process is not going ahead at all in India, or that it is making great headway; or, in regard to policy, that the policy of British imperialism is to prevent the industrialisation of India, or that the policy of British Imperialism is to permit the industrialisation of India. None of these formulations are correct. While I do not support the simple view that British imperialism put "impossible obstacles" in the way of the development of Indian industry, I do not think either that the contrary is true, that British imperialism makes every endeavour to develop the productive forces of India, that all kinds of industry are developed, or that there is an independent development of Indian industry, or a development of Indian industry in the interests of the Indian bourgeoisie as considered from their point of view. None of these things would be correct.

India is not an industrial country. It is quite true to say that British imperialism in certain directions, under certain conditions, retards the development of Indian industry. Of course, Indian industry under independence would develop at a greater rate than under present conditions. But the question around which I think the discussion has centred is, does industrialisation and its development present new problems with which the British bourgeoisie are faced? In fact, is the situation the same, and can it be described in the same terms as it could be, let us say, at the beginning of the century. I think the only correct formulation is to say that the development of capitalist industry is inevitable and that British imperialism seeks to control it in such a way as to receive the maximum benefit.

But it is necessary to say that there are different sides to this question; also that it is not true that the only essential feature in the situation in India at the present time is the question of its industrial development. Nevertheless, the industrial development is one problem which we have to take into account. It is not sufficient, as Comrades Pepper and Remmele have done, to take the attitude that industrialisation is very small, and that it need not be taken into account. But to stress the importance of the problems presented to British imperialism by the need to control industrial development in India does not mean to hold an exaggerated view of the development of Indian industry. We must emphasise that the development of industry in India is a process full of contradictions. We have to remember that under present conditions British imperialism is passing through a very difficult period both at home and in India, and it is faced with difficulties in a considerable degree in adapting its tactics to the situations arising owing to those conditions. Therefore, the difference must be taken account of.

Now I want to make one point with regard to the bourgeois democratic revolution in India and the role of the Indian bourgeoisie. I want to emphasise that, while the stage of bourgeois democratic revolution in India is such that it is now impossible for the Indian bourgeoisie to enter the national revolutionary camp, this does not mean that we cannot make use of the national reformist oppositional struggle of the Indian bourgeoisie against imperialism. It is necessary to make this statement, because various statements have been made that to hold this view of the counter-revolutionary character of the Indian bourgeoisie, means to put it into the same camp as British imperialism, and let us say, the semindars and landlords of India. Both Comrades Pepper and Murphy made this assertion, that Comrade Bennett, for instance, is lumping the counter-revolutionary elements into one single camp.

The question is, what is the stage of the present bourgeois counter-revolutionary revolution in India. It is a stage in which the first experience of a mass national revolutionary movement has already been gone through. It ended with the historic betrayal at Bardoli in 1922, when the Indian national bourgeoisie, faced with an impending mass revolution, clearly and definitely expressed their class position and took their stand with the zemindars and British imperialism, and against the proletarian and peasant masses. This betrayal revealed the class position of the Indian bourgeoisie. It showed that their development had gone so far under the conditions of British imperialist rule in India, that, there is no possibility after that for them to play a revolutionary role.

After that the description of the possible vacillation of the reformist section of the Indian native bourgeoisie which is described in paragraph 21 of the theses does not apply. There

is no question of their possible entry into the national revolutionary camp or their affiliation, even temporary affiliation, with the revolutionary mass movement. The Indian bourgeoisie has shown itself throughout the last six years to be characterised by a most extraordinarily developed class-consciousness. I need to make this point because it has been suggested that in this lumping together, of which we are accused, we put such a man as for instance **Subash Chandra Bose** the Bengal Nationalist Leader in the same counter-revolutionary camp as the British imperialists. Comrade Murphy, who accuses the men, who take the opposite view of this question as being in the camp of the Second International, or words to that effect, yet puts his faith in a man like **S. C. Bose** whose record is such that I can, speaking for the delegation here, say that we all know that he is in the counter-revolutionary camp as far as the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants is concerned.

(Benett: Murphy defends him here).

The position of the Indian bourgeoisie is a factor of antagonism in relation to imperialism, but is counter-revolutionary in relation to the proletariat and peasantry. It is correct, therefore, to speak of two camps of enemies of the mass national revolution in India. It does not mean that our tactics should be the same in regard to both. It does not mean that the Indian national reformist bourgeoisie, the Swarajist Party, is equivalent to a counter-revolutionary organisation in India for the suppression of the Indian masses, and that our tactics should be only that of attack and onslaught all along the line. The Indian bourgeoisie is a counter-revolutionary force, but that does not mean that we cannot use even it in the development of the mass revolution. We can make use of its oppositional role in this way, this must not be lost sight of; but while it is our primary task to expose and explain the counter-revolutionary character of the nationalist reformist Indian bourgeoisie, in the process of wresting from them the hegemony over the petty bourgeoisie and revolutionary mass, one of the means that can be used also for this purpose is that of making the fullest possible use of their restricted quarrel with British imperialism. The best example that we can give you of the actual putting of this principle into practice has been in connection with the reformist opposition of the Indian bourgeoisie to the Simon Commission. In that connection the example given by the workers in Bombay in making use of that agitation for developing an independent class movement is of the greatest importance.

Finally, I would say, it is necessary for us to look forward not merely to the immediate development of the bourgeois democratic revolution in India but also to the next stage which we have also to keep in mind where the bourgeois-democratic revolution will be transformed into the **Socialist revolution**.

I want to make one point now with regard to **workers and peasants parties**. The sentence in the Theses says:

"Special workers' and Peasants' parties, no matter how revolutionary they may be, can all too easily be transformed into ordinary petty bourgeois parties, therefore, the organising of such parties is inadvisable."

The point I want to make is that the question of the workers' and peasants' Party cannot be dismissed with a phrase of this sort. I want to contrast the curt dismissal of the question of the Workers' and Peasants' Parties, which in India alone is a subject of the utmost importance, in a single sentence with the careful and tender treatment of the national reformists which is a camp to which we are essentially opposed. The characteristic feature of the Workers' and Peasants' Parties in the present stage of development in India is that they are forming an important route through which the Communists are finding their way to the masses.

But at the present time, when there is no strong organised Communist Party, the question has to be very seriously raised as to whether the Workers' and Peasants' Parties are not now in danger of acting as a screen between the Communists and the revolutionary mass movements. We have a position in India now which in some respects is akin to that of 1920. There is a big ferment of mass strikes, there is an independent development of the proletarian activity, both in the economic and political fields.

It would be a great danger if in these circumstances Communists did not go directly to the masses and develop their leadership in the movement. We have in this comparison of 1919, a perspective of a new development of the national revolution in more complicated conditions but giving the greatest possible opportunities for the Communist Party; and the or-

ganisation and consolidation of the Communist Party is the first essential. In this connection I say that it is essential to deal with the relation of the Communist Party to the Workers' and Peasants' Party but that this cannot be done in a single phrase.

Statement by Comrade BENNETT (Great Britain):

Comrades, in view of the many accusations made against me today, I consider it my duty to present a short statement.

You all know, today, that I was only one of the comrades who was defending a certain amendment to the thesis. Still, too many attacks were directed against me and I want to make just five remarks.

First, concerning **misrepresentation**. All I can say is this. Those who heard, let us say, **Pepper's speech**, I recommend them to compare what he criticised with what I said. The conclusions I will leave to you.

Second, on the question of **democratic revolution**. **Murphy** was the man who made the strongest attack, accusing me and my colleagues of being Amsterdam men, men of the II. International. All the attacks made, were made for one reason. Because I said and insisted that it is a crime today to speak about a possible revolutionary role of the Indian bourgeoisie. Now, comrades, I got my inspiration, not from Amsterdam, but from the speech made by Lenin in presenting the thesis to the Second Congress of the Communist International. Lenin said:

"A certain rapprochement has taken place between the bourgeoisie of the exploiting and colonial countries, with the result that very often even in the majority of cases, the bourgeoisie of the oppressed countries, although supporting the national movements, simultaneously in agreement with the imperialist bourgeoisie, that means together with it — fights against the revolutionary movements and the revolutionary classes."

Now comrades, I leave it to you to judge about the wisdom of Comrades **Pepper** and **Murphy** when after eight years, after **Bardoli**, after the Chinese revolution, they want to defend a thesis which says that in an acute revolutionary situation there is a possibility that the bourgeoisie will join the nationalist revolutionary camp and thereby for a time play an objectively revolutionary role. I say this is impossible. If the bourgeoisie join the national revolutionary movement, it is not to play a revolutionary role but to mislead and betray the movement.

Third, on the question of **industrialisation**. To be sharp and to be clear, those who quote me as a man speaking about the development of industrialisation by leaps and bounds, well, to put it mildly, they were simply lying. All I said was this: **Marx** formulated the following idea: "once machinery is introduced into the communication system of a land possessing coal and iron, it is impossible to hold it back from its own development. The railway system in India is in fact the forerunner of modern industry". And I want Comrade **Pepper** and Comrade **Murphy** to show us how through a thesis this law can be changed. To this I will add, as late as 1923, **Lenin** wrote that the development of India along capitalist lines is a definite fact.

Now, we are supposed to believe and accept that India is a continent of villages, and if you dare to speak about industrialisation there, then you are given a new explanation of this word "industrialisation" by **Remmele** and a new theory by **Pepper**.

Fourth, on the question of **decolonisation**. Now, comrades, you have already a statement of our delegation and that statement says clearly:

"No matter what words are used, it never can mean a process of a withdrawal, of automatic "decolonisation", of peaceful liberation, etc. The leech does not withdraw its suckers till it is torn from the body of the victim."

If you take the stenogram of my speech, on page 77, you will see: "the question is not about colonisation or decolonisation". If you will take page 78, you will see: "Now one word about the famous **bogey** 'decolonisation'." That is the way I spoke of decolonisation.

Fifth, I was told, and I believe I was rightly told, that my quotation, or more correct, my reference to Comrade **Bukharin** could be misleading. For that reason an explanation and a correction is necessary.

First the explanation: Without ever trying to apologise, I said I was shocked when I read in the thesis the reference to

some phrases used by many of our very good Indian comrades which can be interpreted as a certain acknowledgment of decolonisation in the sense of industrialisation, that such theories are theories of lackeys of capitalism. I considered this as an uncalculated attack and I took exception to it, and said among those who spoke about decolonisation was also Comrade Bukharin, who did not describe those who speak about decolonisation as lackeys of capitalism, although he met them face to face.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding at all, I will quote what Comrade Bukharin himself said:

"I must state here that in elaborating their theory of the decolonisation of India, the Indian comrades sought support in a statement I made, in the course of which, while I made no reference to the decolonisation of India, I nevertheless pointed to the large investments of foreign capital to be observed to India. It is true that I made no reference to the industrialisation in India in my report".

Now I want you to listen very carefully:

"I may not have employed the term 'industrialisation!' But I spoke of big capital investments during the war and post-war periods; is that not industrialisation?"

I would now ask Comrades Pepper and Remmele to give a lecture to Comrade Bukharin that no one dares to use the word "industrialisation" in such a way. He used it, many others used it and I believe it was correctly used. (Interjections from Congress).

I will read further:

"However, it is not a decisive factor in analysing the present situation in India."

Yes, comrades, not a decisive factor, but about which you cannot keep silent. Further:

"A decisive element is the following: Has the policy of British imperialism changed in regard to India or not? Is there any change to be observed in the economic policy of British imperialism? I think the flow of capital to India has greatly diminished of late. We no longer observe the feverish investments of capital. There is no longer an upward curve of large investments such as we saw before. That is why the surging process of economic development that was observed some time ago is not observed now. Hence the impoverishment and pauperisation now in progress which is converting the peasants not into urban workers, but into semi-beggars of the land robbed and enslaved on all sides."

Comrades, I hope that Comrade Bukharin will not refuse to give us himself his opinion; but if the very fact that he called the investment of capital "industrialisation", and Bukharin is a Marxist and understands that capitalism once started cannot stop, even if the flow of capital diminishes, then Bukharin will say as we say in our amendment, that we have the process of pauperisation and we have simultaneously the process of industrialisation. This is the present situation. Those who want to give only one side of the picture are exactly as Comrade Murphy who wanted to give us a wonderful example of a bourgeois revolutionary and he found a man like Bose. My final word is that if a comrade, before the thesis is accepted, before we have come to any conclusions, could have made a speech like Murphy's speech today that we should not expose the betrayals and counter-revolutionary role of the Indian bourgeoisie: I say that if Murphy's speech is the first consequence of the thesis, then our efforts to improve the thesis have been justified.

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.