

Oct 25/28

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comrade PAREDES (Ecuador):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Comrade MARTYNOV:

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

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

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

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

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

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