

Special IV. World Congress Number

English Edition

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 2 No. 116

22nd Dec. 1922

Central Bureau: Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III. — Postal address Franz Dahlem, Berlin SW 48, Friedrichstrasse 225, III
for Inprekorr. — Telegraphic address: Inprekorr.

The Tasks of the Communists in the Trade Union Movement (Discussion)

Heckert:

(Germany)

Comrades, Comrade Lozovsky told us this morning we must adopt a clear, unequivocal policy on the trade union question; he warned us especially against precipitate policy and advised us to reject any tactics which might lead to a split in the trade unions. He stated this very clearly. He said: If we had accepted the slogan of splitting the trade unions, or in any way acquiesced in it, it would have meant destruction for the whole Communist movement. I also believe that we communists would have been guilty of the greatest error if we had propagated the splitting of the trade unions, or made any concessions to those elements that hant to bring about such a split. I hope that this Congress will express clearly that every splitting tendency must be fought ruthlessly. It is absolutely necessary to show to the working class that we are for unity of the trade unions, if we are to carry on any serious propaganda for the United Front. We would make ourselves ridiculous before, yea, despised by the whole working class if we were to fight for the United Front and sympathise at the same time with the splitters.

However, in many countries, the trade unions have already been split, not only just now by the Amsterdammers, but because parallel organizations existed in those trades before and during the war. At the last Congress we had put before our comrades that it was their task to work in those dual organizations for union. Our communist comrades have not done all they could in this line. In fact, in all countries where the trade unions are split, the communists, instead of fighting for one common goal, have often opposed one another. I would therefore like to say this: every communist who does not support other communists, who are active in some other organizations, helps the reformists and those who want to break up the trade union movement. It is therefore our first duty as communists to eliminate all our little differences and to work together for a common goal. I absolutely admire our Italian comrades who have brought it about in their organization that their members understand that they must be active even in Fascist organizations, that even there we must create our cells.

The policy of cell formation has been much attacked even after the Third World Congress. In the German Party, for instance, there was quite a conflict on this point. There was a whole group of comrades who declared that cells were bad, and there developed among those comrades a liquidating tendency which purposed to destroy the whole trade union work of the Comintern and the whole international communist trade union movement. We have opposed these elements. This tendency was

the cause of the Friesland crisis. We have expelled those people from our organizations and conducted a decisive fight to realise the unity of all revolutionary comrades. Naturally there have been unnecessary conflicts in this struggle; many a communist did not speak or act wisely enough: But it does not suffice to deal with the opposition to so-called revolutionary unions in our Party with a few words, as Comrade Lozovsky did when he declared that Comrade Masloff had acted very foolishly and written an idiotic article against the communists, and that Comrade Heckert and Brandler saved the situation.

Comrades, I will not agree to have this order of the Salvation of the Unions pinned on my breast; I will not accept to characterise Masloff's action as criminal and damnable without first saying that the unionists are partly responsible for it. We must divide the blame between both sides, if we wish to be just. The fault of the Party is that it did not realise that this policy would make for conflicts if we did not carry on sufficient preparatory work in the unions. We relied upon it that the Communists in the union would do the work. What happened was that our Unionist friends fought against the formation of factions and our Party comrades let the thing drag without any work. That is why it came to such conflicts with the union. Luckily, we were able to reach an agreement at the union Congress at the beginning of October and to create a basis for harmonious co-operation in the future. But many other Communist Parties have followed this bad example of not forming cells within the Unions.

I would like to mention especially two parties that have been guilty of this omission. First the French Party which in spite of its promises of last year to become active in the C.G.T.U., to build cells within that Federation, did nothing till the events came to a point when the split was accomplished and the French Trade Union movement became a perfect muddle. At its Congress in Marseilles, the French Party had the opportunity of gaining the leadership of the revolutionary movement in France if it had followed the advice which had been given it, namely, to create a program which would unite all revolutionary forces. The French Party did not do this; nothing was said at the Congress as to what the Communists should do in the Trade Unions; Comrade Magoux who has since been expelled is not a little responsible for the crisis in the French Party. This should be a lesson to us for the future. When a Party takes a stand on all questions before the working class, it will be possible to create closer connections between the leaders of the Unions and the Party as a result of which such people as Monmousseau and Monatte will become members of our Party, our Party will become a real proletarian organization and no one who does not base the policy of the Party on the proletariat will get the leadership. The old dissensions must be put an end to. The Comintern must

use all its influence on the leaders of the Party and the C.O.T.U. to co-operate in the interests of the working class of France.

A word on Czecho-Slovakia. We found the same tendencies in the Czecho-Slovakian Party. It was primarily the Trade Union leaders in the Party who opposed the formation of cells. Many comrades said quite openly: Why cells? That only leads to trouble; it suffices when the leaders of the Trade Unions are Communists. But it must have become apparent to our Czecho-Slovakian comrades that this did not suffice. Had they formed strong cells in the Unions a year ago, Tayerle would not hold to-day such a position as he does.

I believe that our bad experience in Germany, and the example of France and Czecho-Slovakia, will teach us in the future to pay more attention to the resolutions of previous Congresses.

A few words more on the German situation. We will not say that all our attempts to win the Trade Unions were good attempts. Comrade Lozovsky said this morning that tens of thousands of members are leaving the agricultural organizations without the Party taking any action. There are other causes for this, however, than those Comrade Lozovsky advanced.

It is true that the German movement of the agricultural workers has lost hundreds of thousands of members. But the reason is that these organizations are led by a bureaucracy which does nothing but make "Socialist" politics, and the interests of the workers are subordinate to the interests of the social-democratic politicians. Since no one interested himself in the agricultural workers, these workers rebelled. Unorganized before the war, the agricultural workers in Germany had an organization of 800,000 workers after the revolution. At the highest period of its existence, the "Deutsche Landarbeiterverband" numbered 27,000 members; during the war this number fell to 3,000. This post war organization was therefore something quite new, and the bureaucracy of the Federation made use of the organization to further its own interest.

We had already attempted to approach the agricultural workers in 1919. We formed a so-called Communist agricultural union. This was a complete failure. If the revolution had proceeded further, had we been able to do something in the interest of the agricultural workers, it would have been a different story. Since this was not the case, the Social Democrats kept the control of the agricultural workers organization in their own hands.

In the following years, hundreds of thousands left the organization. Our comrades were faced with the problem: should they reunite these working masses into a new organization led by Communists, but which would not be capable of fighting; or should we not be afraid that the Amsterdamers would use this as a new excuse for an offensive against the Communists, and would say, here you have another proof that the Communists are trying to split the Labor Unions.

Had we attempted to form a new organization at the time when we were not masters of the situation, the task would simply have been 100 times greater for us. I will not deny that we might have been more active in some questions. But our lack of strength on the one side, and the tremendous apparatus of the Amsterdamers on the other, makes it hard for us to undertake any action: there have been many cases when we have prevented a foolish action on the part of some impatient comrade only with difficulty.

At a time when class differences have become so great, when our problems are so difficult, it is inadvisable to undertake any action for which the working class is unprepared. To gain influence over the working class we must possess a well organized apparatus, and not only that, but also the confidence of the large masses of the working class in our communist policy. I believe that I can say in the name of the Party that we will be better prepared for a fight in the next month because our Party is gaining the confidence of ever larger masses of the proletariat. The Party can undertake greater actions now, because it has the broad masses which sympathise with it, and possesses an apparatus capable of leading a movement.

But we can offer no panacea. I wish to underline what Comrade Lozovsky said this morning; for every country we need a Trade Union programme which corresponds with the peculiar conditions of that country; we must state our task clearly so that the masses will understand us. We also need a different policy for every industrial group, often for every union, and if Comrade Carr allows, I will take two more minutes to explain this.

In Germany, for instance, we can organize the building trades for action. When we control a whole section, we can defeat the employers who are not yet strongly entrenched, not yet organized all over the country; the situation is quite different among the railroad workers. There are over a million workers among the railroad employers. But we are opposed by all the powers of the State. It has created laws to suppress the workers. We could tell the Building Trade workers: Break off

with Pölow; we will build our own organization and fight the employers for better conditions.

If we attempt the same with the railways, we will surely be defeated because we shall be opposed by the whole power of the State. The State can defeat us and throw all the revolutionary elements at once out of employment. In this way, we lost about 2,000 of our best comrades last year.

And just as we require different tactics for the building workers than for the railroad workers, so we require different methods for the other organizations. Among the metal workers, for instance, we have progressed so far, that the Dissmanites do not dare any longer to expel us as a body, because we possess about half the membership and the opposition would be too great. Among the agricultural workers, we do not know the policy of the Amsterdamers. It seems as if we should proceed with the formation of a new organization, because we cannot tolerate that the gulf be widened.

In closing my speech, allow me to make the following recommendations: First, that all Communist Parties must proceed to the creation of cells and carry out the decisions of the Second and Third World Congresses; second, to create a program of action for every group of industry which will permit us to conduct our struggle as the circumstances require; third, to form our comrades, in the various revolutionary organizations or in dual Trade Union organizations, to fight each other and thereby afford great joy to our enemies.

Hertha Sturm:

(Germany)

Comrades, it was principally the formal side of the trade union question which was considered here from the viewpoint of strengthening the United Front. It was in the sense of ways and means for maintaining the organizational unity of the trade unions, and of the nature of the relations between the Communist Party and the trade unions, which would help in premeating the trade unions with the communist spirit. In both these questions we encounter the resistance of the reformists, of the Amsterdam trade union bureaucracy. These are of course political questions, for the organizational unity depends on the clear-sightedness, the solidarity, and the fighting spirit of the Communist Parties. This question was already discussed in connection with the capitalist offensive and tactics.

I should like to emphasize the close connection of both these sides with the part which the working woman are playing in the trade unions. This question is of particular importance because of the fact that the working women comprise a section of the working class, the numbers and weight of which are continually growing in the industries as well as in the trade unions. In the European countries the women represent 20-45% of the wage earners. During the war the numbers increased to a considerable extent, and it is higher in the post-war period than it was before the war. In the young capitalist countries—Korea and Japan, with their millions of workers, the working women constitute even more than 50% of all the workers.

On the other hand, it is a well known fact that the working women belong to that section of the working class of which Comrade Bukharin said (when dealing with this item of our program) that its exploitation by the capitalists and their lackeys helped to maintain and consolidate the capitalist power. The working women are used by the capitalists against the workers in the same way as the colonial peoples, at whose expense the European workers were able to achieve certain ephemeral advantages.

It is self-evident that the United Front of the workers and the organizational unity of the trade unions will be all the more solid if all the sections of the working class keep together, and if the passive and hostile sections are reduced to a minimum. It is of paramount importance to draw the working women without any further delay into the United Front, because the capitalist offensive is all the more dangerous to the working class if one section of it, the interests of which are bound up with the common working class interests, does not take an active part in the general struggle. The capitalist offensive proceeds quite systematically on the line of least resistance. I wish to draw your attention quite briefly to the following three points: Firstly, to the question of the 8-hour day and of labor protection in general. It is a common experience that the capitalist attack begins everywhere with the attempt to make the women voluntarily give up the 8-hour day and consent to work overtime. This generally leads to all the workers in these industries, and subsequently also in other industries working on the terms accepted by the working women. Real or alleged technical necessity is generally the pretext for doing away with the 8-hour day. There are clear indications in almost every country of the intended abolition of the

8-hour day by legislation. But, even now, the longer working day is being introduced either by special ordinances or by the infringement of the existing legislation.

The second question is that of wages which became very prominent when, owing to the introduction of machinery in the industries, the working women were thrown on to the labor market as the most willing and cheapest objects of exploitation. The wages question is a very pressing question today because capitalism, in the present state of crisis, is no longer able to accede to the demands of the workers. Being compelled to have recourse to the former methods of exploitation on the one hand through the introduction of longer working hours and the intensification of labor in order to make good the reduced productivity of labor caused by the wear and tear of the technical industrial apparatus, and on the other hand, by lowering the real wage. Low wages for the working women result in low wages for the men. The old watchword: Equal pay for equal work: should therefore occupy first place in our discussions and in our struggles in the trade unions.

The third question is that of unemployment, which is assuming almost the same character as at the time when women were brought into the industries. Again the working men are laboring under the illusion that the elimination of women's labor will make the struggle of existence easier for the men. Energetic action must be taken on this point, in order to prevent a wedge being driven between working men and working women, and make them look upon each other as competitors instead of working harmoniously together. We must work for the achievement of solidarity between men and women, not only among the employed, but also among the unemployed workers.

The second important point is this: The communist influence in the trade unions will grow in proportion as the wide masses within these unions realise that the struggles are concerned with their direct and immediate needs. If it is considered to be of paramount importance to explain to the working men that they must fight for their everyday demands, such is all the more the case for the working women, who owing to their greater backwardness, are less able to understand than the men the necessity of a struggle for ultimate aims. It is quite plain that the trade union bureaucracy has not worked and could not work in that sense because it knew that by mobilising the masses for such everyday demands they would create a fighting force against itself.

However, if we ask ourselves what the Communist Parties have done in this respect, we are obliged to say that they have done very little, and that they have done even less in connection with the mobilisation of the working women than in connection with the organizational work within the trade unions in general. This is of course not a passing feature, because all the weaknesses of the communist movement in general are reflected and magnified in the communist women's movement, for the latter is only a part of the general communist movement with which it is allied for weal or woe. However, the organizational and the ideological weakness of the communist movement is bound to find a stronger reflection in the women's section because the majority of the woman are more backward than the men organizationally, ideologically, and economically, and because their position in the social life of the various countries is not as important as that of the men. If the total membership of most of the communist parties is very small compared with the total number of workers, the absolute as well as the relative number of the women members is infinitesimal. In the most favourably placed party—the Czechoslovakian, the women members constitute, 20% of the total membership; in Italy, where the Party is strong, not even 2%, and on the average in all the communist parties (as far as we could obtain data) the women constitute about ten per cent of the total membership. This means that it is comparatively more difficult to penetrate into the ranks of the non-party workers. Moreover, not all the parties are as yet conscious of the fact that the revolutionising of the working women within the trade unions must be systematically organized. If the Communist International is still discussing the advisability of the formation of nuclei, if it has not yet been recognised, in theory as well as in practice, that the party must do its utmost to make all its members carry on intensive work within the trade unions, we need not be surprised that next to nothing was done by the Party in connection with the trade union training of communist women.

We are able to state that only in very few, and in the comparatively best organized parties (the Russian, Bulgarian, German and Austrian) was this work taken in hand. In the other countries it has not even been touched.

The two organizational tasks which lie before us, are as follows:

1. In establishing communist nuclei in the Trade Unions, care must be taken that all the women party members should be systematically included in their fraction.

Comrades, this seems to be obvious, and sounds almost like a platitude, but in reality it is not so. We notice that in the communist parties, especially in the younger ones, the women's movement is somewhat in the nature of a side issue, instead of being closely connected with the general party movement. Such a lack of contact is especially reprehensible in our Trade Union work. It is a well known fact that the party leaders and the responsible party officials very frequently do not even know which of their women members belong to Trade Unions, where they work and in what way they are connected with their nucleus. Such an investigation into the membership conditions of the women members is certainly laborious, but it is fruitful and is absolutely necessary as a solid basis for our further tasks.

Secondly, the Party Executive must see to it that a direct and close contact should exist between the organ appointed by the Party for the responsible conduct of the Trade Union work (be this organ a Trade Union department, section or a council) and the Central Women's Committee of the Communist Party. These organs must act in close collaboration and must draw up a plan, laying down in what way the work should be organised from the Centre and what steps should be taken for the training and systematic organisation of the women trade union members for their tasks among the wide masses.

The prospects of this work are very favourable, especially as we have in the masses of working women a good recruiting ground which, not being organised, is open to us. The majority of working women are not tied to a political leadership or to a trade union bureaucracy, and can be made amenable (with greater ease than the men) to the class struggle, owing to their saner and unalloyed class instincts. The working women are more likely than the men to fight for their class interests regardless of all those restrictions which make it so difficult at present to gain any ground among the masses of the social democratic working men and among the trade unionists of old standing.

I should like to draw a comparison which should teach us a lesson. When, as a result of the political events of 1918, woman's suffrage was introduced into various countries, we witnessed the phenomenon that the bourgeoisie succeeded, in bringing over into its camp large masses of women who were as yet untouched by any political bias. Thus, it is not only the bourgeois women who have become the best political agents of their parties, but large numbers of working women were drawn into the Nationalist camp, into the bourgeois parties, and into the clerical camp, viz., into the camp of our class enemies. They have contributed to the strengthening of the bourgeoisie, if only on the parliamentary field. We must not allow the same thing to happen on the trade union field, which is of far greater importance in the class struggle than parliament. The women will be won over by the party with the clearest aims and the most energetic action on behalf of the interests and needs of these masses who will follow it into the struggle for these needs. With these masses behind us, we shall succeed in strengthening our attack against the trade union bureaucracy and detaching still greater masses from that trade union leadership which is hostile to the class struggle and in bringing them over into the camp of the revolutionary class struggle (Applause)

Tasca:

(Italy)

I can claim to speak on behalf of the entire Italian delegation. This is possible because the Italian Communist Party has at once recognised the importance of trade union work and had started the forming of nuclei within the trade unions before the split of Leghorn, which has given us common experiences and unity of action.

I will dispose of secondary questions in a few words. First of all let me say that our delegation has accepted the proposal of putting off the discussion on the conditions of the unemployed within the Trade Union movement, but we emphasise the extreme importance of the Communist Party taking the initiative in defending the trade union rights of the unemployed of which the reformist leaders are trying to deprive them.

We have also agreed not to insist on mentioning in the general thesis about the activity of communists in the nationalist trade unions run by the employers, or as we call them Fascist unions.

Nevertheless, we ought to point out that the communists should work within the Fascist trade unions, only in cases when it is the only way to prevent our being rooted out of the trade unions, that is to say, when there is no possibility left for the Party in the Red trade unions.

Comrade Lozovsky's theses devoted a great deal of attention to the problem of unity and splitting. These are the most urgent and pressing problems of the Trade Union movement. On this point we are entirely in agreement with him, both for the

reasons which he has given and for a variety of other reasons. The disruptive tactics of the reformists, backed more or less openly by the employing class, tends to render it extremely difficult for expelled trade union minorities to take any action for the defence of trade unionism, denying the Red trade unions the possibility of any concrete daily work for the immediate interests of the workers.

Furthermore, since the communists find themselves in a minority in the trade unions and are driven from the workers' organisations, it becomes increasingly difficult to combine legal activity with the illegal work of the Communist Party, which could find in the trade unionist movement a valuable support.

It is absolutely necessary to clear up a few points in Comrade Lozovsky's theses. When one is speaking to Communists one ought to give very precise criterions which should serve the Communists in their trade union activities.

We did not quite understand whether it was necessary to break away from Amsterdam upon obtaining a majority of the International Federation, or upon obtaining a majority in the National Confederation. We ask Comrade Lozovsky to clear up this point.

We on our part are in favour of the second solution, namely to break with Amsterdam upon obtaining a majority in the National Confederation, because we think this presents the least danger of scission. Of course, it is impossible to evade all the dangers of scission if the Red International of Trade Unions is to become more and more a propaganda bureau, an international centre of trade union organisation, but a solution ought to be found that would present the least danger in this respect.

I have not the time at my disposal to deal with the problem of the alliance between the Comintern and the Profintern. But I maintain that this question ought to be solved by the Congress of the Comintern, for it is absolutely necessary that the Communist comrades taking part in the Profintern Congress should be agreed among themselves on the policy which they should maintain.

I would also ask Comrade Lozovsky to enlighten me upon yet another point, namely, about the Factory Councils.

The Factory Councils movement is becoming of very great importance in Germany. This problem has a direct bearing on the problem of scission, and we want some light on this point, because it is a question that may become of actual moment in other countries as well.

Regarding the question of nuclei, we agree that the Red International, by its form of organisation, should endeavour to create conditions for common activity with the syndicalists in order to oust the reformists and to oppose their influence. Yet we believe it necessary to ensure that the nuclei should consist purely and exclusively of communists who are active in the trade unions, and, at all events to make sure that our action is efficacious in directing the revolutionary struggle.

We are against inserting paragraph 20 in the general theses of Comrade Lozovsky. This paragraph comes after paragraph 17 which says that the communists cannot and ought not, in the name of abstract and anarcho-syndicalist principles, abandon their right to organise nuclei within the unions. This is a right which should not be denied them under any circumstances. Paragraph 20 goes on to say that in countries where important revolutionary syndicalist organisations exist (France), or where in consequence of a number of historical causes there is a pronounced mistrust in political parties among certain groups of the revolutionary workers, the communists should work out jointly, with the syndicalists, in conformity with the peculiarities of the country and of the labour movement, the forms and methods of common struggle and collaboration in all the defensive and aggressive actions against capital. As this comes on top of paragraph 17, the Italian comrades are under the impression that this would be the substitute of the direct work of the communist nuclei in France. We would like to be enlightened on this point. If it is a United Front formula we have nothing to say against it, because this should be carried out not only in conjunction with the syndicalists but with all the revolutionaries. If this means to say that the French communists, by reason of local circumstances, must give up their own methods of struggle and act only upon the preliminary consent of the syndicalists, we are against including in the general theses such a formula that could be construed in this manner.

Comrade Lozovsky declared that the relations between the parties and the trade unions are a question of relative strength; that is true, but an understanding is necessary. The application of communist principles and methods is always conditioned by the correlation of forces, but this does not mean to say that the correlation of forces should take the place of principles.

Lozovsky said: It is not the theory which makes the movement; it is the movement which makes the theory. I know quite well that Lozovsky is far from putting such interpretations, yet it sounds strikingly similar to a formula by Bernstein, which says: The Government is everything. No room should be left for such interpretation on the part of those who might be interested or disposed to take advantage thereof.

Even if it be true that in France the syndicalists, on account of their historic development, are to play the guiding role in the proletarian revolution, it would still be no reason for abandoning the formation of communist nuclei.

We are aware of the difficulties which exist in France. But since the syndicalist question forms the basis of the French question, it is not right to include in the general thesis a paragraph that is likely to be misinterpreted. This ought to be done in the resolutions of the French Commission, which is to give the necessary indications for communist work in the French trade unions. There it would be the proper place to make all the arrangements, to include that which cannot be imposed upon all communists active in the trade unions, so that concessions of a local nature should not become a source of development for those very evils which some comrades have come here to denounce.

It is for this reason that we oppose the inclusion of this formula in the general theses. The only objection that may be made in France against the nuclei is the French workers' mistrust of the French Communist Party. It is a vicious circle that ought to be broken adroitly. We are convinced that the question of creating the conditions for systematic communist work in the Unions is a life and death question for the French Communist Party, and it is for this reason that this should be dealt with in the decisions of the French Commission and not in the general thesis on the Trade Unions.

Now I wish to say a few words on the question of subordinating the trade unions to the party. On the whole we believe that the real guarantee for the development of any Communist Party consists of the ability of the party at all times to have its say on the events which affect the workers' life. How is the French Communist Party to have a say on everything that interests the French workers if it does not possess any organic ties with the workers' life, with all the phases of this life? It may seem easy to advance slogans, but it is imperative that the party shall draw them on the basis of direct experience of the workers' life.

This is the only guarantee that the working masses would understand the slogans, because they would be their very own and correspond to their real needs.

We are naturally opposed to subordinating the trade unions to the Party, but the Communists should endeavour to play a part of importance in the syndicalist movement, should join the trade unions, pay their dues and work in a systematic manner to gain the confidence of the masses. After gaining this confidence, they should not act like the reformist "experts" but they should place their experience at the service of the party and make it serve the general aims of Communism. They ought to make the non-communist masses realise that their slogans do not drop from the skies nor from very far away, but arise from the direct experience of the workers, who have to make only slight efforts to understand them. If the French Communists, like those of all the other countries will work in this sense, we will be enabled to make good the losses sustained by the Communist movement in the course of this struggle.

There is an ancient myth of a giant who always stood on his feet, even when wounded and mutilated he had only to touch the ground to regain his forces. The Communist Party cannot become the giant unless it puts itself in a position to touch the ground, that is to remain in close contact with the working masses, so as to be able to regain its forces and to carry on and extend the struggle for the aims of the revolution.

Garden:

(Australia)

Comrades, speaking on behalf of the Australian delegation I may say that we affirm the Theses as given by Comrade Lozovsky. Lenin has said that the greatest task of the Western parties is its organisational work, and I hope just to say a few words to the Anglo-Saxon section because everyone realises that there is a weakness in regard to the organisational work of the Anglo-Saxon movement. You will find that the German Party is able to manifest itself in the ranks of the masses. Even with all the disputes among the French workers you will find that there is still manifestation among the masses. The same in Italy. But when you come to the Anglo-Saxon movement you find that the Communist Party is weak, lacking that power among the masses that the other parties have.

Although the Australian Communist Party is a small party I believe it has found the keynote to organisation so far as the Anglo-Saxon movement is concerned. The Communist Party in Australia has a membership of just close on one thousand and yet it is able to direct just close on 400,000 workers—that is, including 237,000 in the State of New South Wales; all organised workers. It also directs 110,000 organised workers in Brisbane, Queensland.

The Communist Party in Australia is based on the nuclei system. Every union has its nuclei from 20 down to 2, but every union has its nuclei. All nuclei leaders must meet once a week and these nuclei leaders from the unions discuss the problems of their organisations, the problems of the working class of Australia.

In every discussion of problems they formulate their tactics and then go out to their various unions, factories, and workshops and mines and carry out the policy as directed.

The Communist Party along with the leaders of the nuclei formulate that policy. On every burning question that affects the working class you will find that the nuclei leaders are the first in the field to give direction to the working class how to meet the situation.

The Labour Council of New South Wales constitutes 120 unions. Yet the Communists Party has full control of the Executive. Out of the 12 members of the Executive eleven are members of the Communist Party and they direct these 120 unions and the policy of each union. We have the same basis of organization in the Labour Party of Australia as in the English Labour Party—that is, the party is based on the Trade Union Movement,—and we have the same difficulties confronting us as the English Party has. When we quarrelled with the Australian Labour Party in 1919, when we were beaten by six votes at the conference, we isolated ourselves, took no part in politics whatsoever, and directed all our energies to the industrial field. Everybody set out for the organisation of the workers to break down craft barriers and make one union in every industry, linking up all our forces into one union having six divisions—all the workers being linked up in that direction: that is all the transport workers together; all the miners together, all the agricultural workers; and in six departments we have linked up all the workers of Australia. We found also that by directing our energy inside we were able to liquidate the I.W.W. which was the militant organisation in Australia. The I.W.W. changed their tactics. They came inside with us and started to operate inside the craft unions for the formation of industrial unionism, and working within the unions to break down the craft barriers and link up all their forces into six great industrial departments through out Australia.

The moment we decided to conduct political activity there was the A.S.P., S.L.P., and the Breakaway section of the Labour Party. The A.S.P. called a conference of all militant workers of New South Wales to come together to form a Communist Party. The trade union movement decided to be represented and sent delegates.

At that conference we decided to form a Communist Party. After a short time there was a split, but ultimately we came together and we are the only Communist Party in Australia at the present time. The result being that the Communist Party directs all the work of the Trade unions. As far as the Labour Party was concerned—we found that we could also direct the policy of the Labour Party, the party that was full of opportunism, that was directed by reformists—we found that the militant section of the working class could even direct the policy of that party. In June 1921 the Labour party put out a signal of distress. It called upon the workers to give all their aid, and we decided that we would attend this conference called by the Labour Party. In Melbourne in June 1921 the largest conference that has ever been held in Australia assembled and there were present delegates representing 700,000 workers. What did we find? We found that we were able to change the policy of the Labour Party. The Labour Party believed in the maintenance of a White Australia, believed in nationalisation. We changed the objective from nationalisation to Socialisation of industry by revolutionary political and industrial action. But the Labour Party was not satisfied—they went aside from the conference and called a conference of their own in October 1921. They deleted the words "by revolutionary political and industrial action" and inserted the words "by Constitutional means." Another Congress was held in June, of this year, and the Trade Union movement along with the Communist Party said to the Labour Party that they would only endorse the policy of the June Conference of 1921—The 1922 conference endorsed the policy of June 1921, and went further, it instructed the Labour Party to throw open its doors for the affiliation of the Communist Party with freedom for the Communist Party for propaganda and organisation. That they would not agree to in 1921, so you see that in one

year of operation in the trade unions the units were able to accomplish something that we could not accomplish previously.

Again, when the capitalist attacks against the workers were launched we got all the workers together, and instead of allowing one section to go down one after another we said, "The working class of Australia must stand solid, speak with one voice and act together." We decided on these lines. The Commonwealth Government was appealed to by the employers, a conference was decided to be held. Some of the Unions objected. We authorised delegates to go to the conference, and out of eighteen delegates from Australia on the employees side we found nine Communists from different parts of Australia at this great conference called by the commonwealth Government. And what were the results of that conference? The employers left the conference. They said that all that we were doing there, was enunciating the doctrines of Lenin and Trotsky; we were nothing more than in the pay of Russia and that we were not there for the good or the benefit of the working class of Australia. We came back with the propaganda message to the masses. The masses rallied round our banner and Australia is the first country in the world that was able to withstand the offensive, was able to say, "No longer will you reduce our wages, no longer will you tamper with our hours, no more lengthen our hours. We will shorten our hours instead of lengthening them". It was the only country in the world because the masses rallied round the slogan "Hands off wages and hours." And the whole policy was directed by the Communist Movement in Australia—small in numbers but strong in power and influence.

Again, we not allow everybody who applies for membership in the party to rush in. When a man applies for membership in the party from any union we give his name to the leader of the nuclei in his union and the applicant is watched for a period. Any proposal that is put forward in his union for the benefit of the mass and that is opposed by him—is registered against him and we say he is not a fit person to be a member of the Communist Party of Australia. We believe in influence among the masses and we use every means to extend that influence by directing the policy of the masses and organizing them, because we believe that the masses at all times are willing to fight, eager to fight, determined to maintain their conditions, and it is the business of the Communist Party to get to work and line them up in that direction.

And now a word about splits. The splitting movement amongst the trade unions started in 1918. For two and a half years we were fighting the reformists with the results that the militant section won out. The reformers went down. The revolutionary movement kept hammering away amongst the trade unions because they had the control of the machine that issued the propaganda.—The Labour Council of New South Wales which directed the whole policy of the State and the revolutionaries held that machine so that the propaganda continued to go out. When the split started in the Trade Union movement the reactionaries wanted the expulsion of all revolutionary workers. We got among the rank and file and got their full support. We advised the I.W.W. to go right into the Trade Union movement, which they did and "White-ant" it. Let me explain here that the white ant is an animal that attacks only dead wood, it never touches living matter. The result of our activities was that in the agricultural department there is one union comprising 120,000 workers. In the mining industry we have linked up all the workers in and around the mines, miners, engineers, blacksmiths, 45,000. In the domain of land transport we have all the workers of the railways, from engine drivers to porters, linked up—58,000 in all. We have seventeen building trades in Australia and they have agreed to form one organization, the Building Trades Industrial Union of Australia. This comprises 42,000 workers. All these affirm the class struggle and maintain that capitalism can only be overthrown by revolutionary political and industrial action.

The result of this militant activity has been the linking up of these forces into one big union which is breaking down all craft barriers. One other thing. This is what we are giving to our nuclei which meet weekly. When a policy is decided upon, the details are printed and we give it to the leaders of the nuclei, to give directions to the union how to act.

I will close by giving the direction to support the Labour Party that has been issued by the Labour Council. Here it is:

1) The Labour Council recognises the class struggle and bases its organizational plans and its propaganda on this fact.

The council further recognises that this struggle of the classes in capitalist society is a political struggle—i. e., a struggle for political power—and the council can no more be neutral toward political parties engaged in this struggle than to the struggle itself. Therefore this council declares the following to be the basis of its attitude to the existing political parties.

2) The Trade Union Movement in Australia combines a mild recognition of the class struggle with the recognition and support of a reform party—The Australian Labour Party. Full support of this party, its methods and its objectives means that the awakening revolutionary consciousness of the workers, together with their desire to wage a class war against the capitalist system, is transferred by the machinery of the bourgeois political state, into the hands of the labor politicians, into social peace, which is the negation of the class struggle.

3) The Labour Council holds that the Labour Party is a part of the working class movement, and serves the interests of the workers from time to time by its organization and propaganda in the defence of the every day struggle of the workers when they are engaged in fighting such questions as the maintenance of a basic wage, the 44 hour week, etc.

At times the Labour Council will support the labour party in so far as support of the everyday demands of the workers necessitates this action. Also the council holds that in face of the organized attacks being made by the capitalist class upon the workers of this country it is in the interests of the working class that the Labour Party at this juncture should be returned to power.

a) Because it will offer a more effective resistance to the onslaught by the capitalist class on the basic wage than the National Party.

b) Because there will be given greater facilities for working class propaganda and organization.

c) It will also demonstrate to the workers that the Labour party cannot bring about any lasting betterment to the workers by legislative action within the capitalist State.

d) This council, while fighting in the everyday struggle for an improvement in the Standard of living for the Working Class, realises that it is impossible to obtain economic security for the workers under capitalism. Therefore, this council attempts to direct this everyday struggle of the workers into a struggle for the abolition of capitalism and the establishment of a working class political state. Such a struggle can only be adequately organized and carried through in the interest of the workers as a whole, when the trade unions will act in perfect unity with the revolutionary political party of the working class.

This is a sample of the mandates we are giving to the nuclei, to go into the unions, the police of working amongst the masses. We believe that if the Anglo-Saxon countries—England, America, Ireland, etc.—develop the same lines of policy, that we have developed, it will be found that the Anglo-Saxon communists will have the power to direct the future policy of the masses in those countries.

Kucher:

(America)

Comrades: I am not here to tell you any long story but present a few facts as briefly as possible.

I would like to have it understood that I am not here as an opposition force from America, but as the representative of a distinct movement—the Independent Unions and on behalf of the United Labour Council of America. I am here rather to protest against the opposition of the propaganda group who have come here claiming to speak for all American labour.

The independent Unions, who are industrial unions in structure and activity, are being accused of being the cause of the weak trade-union movement in America because the militants are within them. You are informed "dual unionism" is the root evil;—even if that were so, the unions now known as Independents are not the cause of this, in so far as they are in no way "dualist".

In their origin they are partly the results of countless expulsions for many years, of militant individuals and minority groups who, unable to get back to the Federation Unions, were forced to combine and form themselves into organization. Due to the fact that the A. F. of L. confined itself to organizing the more highly skilled workers into distinct craft unions and altogether ignored the great masses of unskilled and semi skilled,—the neglected workers spontaneously formed unions, often local in scope, and who remained isolated. These organizations refused to become part of the Federation or its unions.

In order to unite and combine the activity of all these groups it was necessary to form the United Labour Council in order to co-ordinate the activity and weld kindred unions into "One Union for each industry". The existing Independent Unions have never followed the policy of "splitting" or inducing minorities to withdraw from the so-called "general movement". The field for activity among the unorganized was large and we have directed our energies in that direction, and find the workers responsive to industrial formation. The workers in general realise the weakness of craft unionism and even were the militants to join the Federation the masses would not respond. The

only thing we would accomplish would be to discredit the militants who now have the confidence of these workers.

To say, in the face of these facts, that the United Labour Council of America can only expand at the expense of Federation unions, proved the lack of knowledge of these self-appointed spokesmen from America.

We are accused of attempting to form a "dual" federation, whereas we are trying to unify the various forces outside the Federation in order that a common policy and aim be created throughout the movement that we may eventually have a united movement that can and will fight for the workers against the combined capitalist interests.

We are in accord with the program as laid down by the R. I. L. U. and protest against certain elements in America distorting the intent of the program to serve their own ends.

Those who do not understand the American movement say the Independent Unions are an artificial creation for the purpose of establishing "ideal" unions. This is not so. The independent union development in America is a national development, and in so far as it is a natural trend we must recognise it as a factor, and being a factor we must make allowance for it in all our activities.

We find here in the report of Comrade Zinoviev's opening remarks that he mentions the Communist membership in America above 8,000 and we find in the reports of the Trade Union Educational League delegate who spoke previously, that they claim to have active forces inside the trade unions numbering 422,000. Comrade Zinoviev pointed out the inconsistency of that—that it was not natural that the party could be so weak and yet, have such powerful influence in the industrial field.

In regard to the American problem I had hoped that the Germans and Russians particularly, as well as all of you for that matter, would make it a point to consider the various phases of the American movement before any definite action is taken in regard to the question of liquidation or disbandment of groups known as revolutionary or independent unions. I wish to protest while I am here against the use of the official press by a part of the movement in order to merely present its own viewpoint, without having any substantial facts to work upon. If it were a matter of keeping to facts good, but in this case the misrepresentations are so great that it is a crime to the movement to permit such a publication. I wish to state that as far as the Independents are concerned, we applied for admission to the Red Trade Union International when it was formed. The bulk of the fighters, the bulk of the militant workers have been naturally drawn to the revolutionary unions. The question of affiliation with the Red International of Labour Unions was carried unanimously, showing the sentiment of the workers of these unions.

Another point that should be emphasized is this. It has been mentioned by a previous American speaker that the independent unions should disband—liquidate,—and go into the American Federation of Labor. The slogan they use is "Go to the masses." But we do not find the masses in the American Federation of Labor. The previous speaker on the American question stated that there were 36,000,000 eligible workers. Yet at no time have there been more than 4,500,000 workers in the American Federation of Labor, and today you will hardly find much above 2,000,000 workers, if that. The masses will not join the Federation. They are opposed to the Federation. Any hope of inducing the masses to join the Federation of Labor is bound to meet with failure. The A. F. of L. has so discredited itself that the masses will not respond. If the slogan be "Go to the masses" let us go to the masses, do not let us look for them in the decayed structure of the American Federation of Labor. The chief plea is to go into the Federation in order to reform it. You cannot reform any such structure as the Federation. Again to understand the American movement clearly, is to know that any thought of reforming the Federation is futile.

There are many things that I might speak of in regard to the agitation that has disrupted, or at least caused differences in the ranks of the American movement, but I will refrain from this where all remarks would be recorded. Having the interest of the movement at heart I will not enter any further remarks as to the records or statements or claims made by the opposition force.

I wish to propose this. We in the independent unions recognise that in so far as there are certain valuable elements in the American Federation of Labor, and insofar as there is a structure which can be utilised at least for one purpose, activity should be carried on within that Federation for the purpose of merely reforming it—for that is next to impossible—but in order to expose the methods used by the reactionary officialdom; in order to further carry on the agitation for the general amalgamation of industry,—not because we hope to achieve that—but as propaganda means, and for that reason we are in favor of the

Trade Union Educational League carrying on its work of confining its main activity to within the Federation itself. The Independent Unions must be given sole responsibility for the activity amongst the Independent unions and amongst the unorganised workers.

With such an alignment, the Trade Union Educational League proves itself by activity within the Federation, and the Independents prompted and backed in their activity amongst the Independent and unorganised workers carrying on activity in their respective groups, ultimate unity becomes a possibility. For these two lines of activity there must be an intermediate group which can coordinate and correlate the work of both groups to carry out common activity for both groups simultaneously. This is one line of action open to the American movement. The point that is raised in objection is that you are creating a dual movement. Such is not the case. You are merely creating a medium which will link up the activity of both groups in order to carry on simultaneous action. We do know, and have seen enough to confirm the fact that the American Federation of Labour has gone on record as favoring expulsion of all Communists from its ranks. Now, are these groups to be merely thrown out of these unions and set aside? That will occur because you have not as yet the machinery to carry on the

agitation to stay within the Federation unions and until such time as you have, activity must be carried on independently of the Federation. There must be a body prepared to absorb the elements that cannot fight to go back to the Federation. Until the Trade Union Educational League has some semblance of structure that can fight for readmission of the expelled elements, until you can create a central committee or a council to coordinate the activities of these two groups you can hope for no united movement in America. The sooner you recognise that the better.

The trouble has been that a good many of those calling themselves spokesmen and leaders had very little actual understanding or experience in the movement in America. It has been mainly a theoretical discussion as to what should be done, not a question of what are the facts. It is only a question of "what are the facts"—and acting accordingly. They have been building up a theory and trying to piece the facts to fit the theory. I will not take up any more time because. I only wish to emphasize these points. That is our viewpoint, and we think that the entire problem should receive a thorough consideration especially in the face of the development in other countries where the splitting of the movement is taking place, and it is a problem that we will have to face in America just as well as in Europe.

The Situation in Turkey

Orhan:

(Turkey)

Comrades, you have read in the papers about the mass arrests of communists in Asia Minor and about the dissolution of the workers' Union of Turkey, in Constantinople. In order that you may well understand the significance of this new turn in the policy of the Kemalists and of these recent persecutions in particular, I find it necessary to inform the Congress of the general activities of the Communist Party of Angora and of Constantinople as well as the policies of the Nationalist Government.

The Turkish Communist Party was formed at the time when the bourgeois nationalist government, initiated by the workers and peasants, took a position detrimental to the vital interests of the toiling masses. The Turkish Communist Party therefore, at the time of its formation, found itself faced by two enemies: imperialism and bourgeois nationalism. The Party, considering that the struggle against imperialism, our greatest enemy, was of world wide importance, decided to support the government so long as it fought imperialism, while demanding democratic reforms for workers and peasants and trying to organise them. These decisions were in conformity with the resolutions of the Second Congress concerning nationalist and colonial questions. The Party has not changed this policy from the time of its formation until the present. As proof of this, I might refer to the proclamation issued by the Party to the army, and to the workers and peasants, summoning them to the struggle for the final victory. In another Party proclamation addressed to the Greek army and working masses, the latter were invited to rise and to disorganise their army, which was fighting only for the Greek bourgeoisie and British imperialism.

Still another proclamation was issued by the Party calling upon the people of Constantinople to form a united front against reaction and imperialism, and not to allow the Sultan to escape but bring him before the supreme tribunal of the people.

The Home and Foreign Policies of the Government.

The Government of the Great National Assembly, born out of the struggle for independence and proclaiming that it is fully for the "National Pact" and against imperialism, has shown during the last three years by its conduct, that its policy has been one of betrayal. The following facts are instructive in this respect:

- 1) When their relations with the Soviet Government were just started, the representatives sent by the government to Moscow stated that there was a large Communist Party in Turkey, that this Party had a numerous following among the peasants, and that peasants' soviets were already functioning in several localities.
- 2) In the first period of its existence, trying to deceive Soviet Russia, the government formed under the name of the Green Army, a would-be Bolshevik Party consisting exclusively of bourgeois elements.
- 3) After the arrival of the first soviet ambassador at Angora, the government formed an official Communist Party composed of the remainder of the Green Army, high government officials, and intellectuals.

- 4) The delegation sent by the government to the London Conference, to please the imperialist Powers announced in all the European capitals through which it was passing that a score of Communists, among whom were our brave Comrades Soubhi and Ehdin Nejat, had been slaughtered and that they were going to put an end to all the other imprisoned comrades, so that the plague of Bolshevism would no more infest the country.

- 5) The agreement with the French in 1921 proves that the government is betraying the East, and that it has given away the "National Pact."

- 6) Finally, we have the recent persecution directed against the Communist Party and the Turkish Labourers' Union, coinciding with the convocation of the Lausanne Conference.

As to its home policy, the activity of the Angora government consisted in checking all free activity on the part of all parties and groups favoring democratic reforms, in annihilating all opposition before it had time to crystallise, and in deceiving the people by solemn promises. This policy has found its concrete expression in the following facts:

- 1) The government strangled the "People's League," which had been formed within the great National Assembly and which advocated a program of extensive reforms.

- 2) It rejected the electoral system of occupational representation proposed in the original draft of the constitution.

- 3) In order to stifle the opposition in the Great National Assembly, the government organised the "Group of Solidarity"; and, in order to ensure its domination over the masses, it formed in all parts of Asia Minor, so called Defense of Law and Order groups composed exclusively of capitalists, landholders and speculators.

- 4) In spite of its promises, the government inaugurated no reforms for the benefit of the working masses. On the contrary, it prevented by every means the establishment of working class organisations, and it is crushing the peasants under an unendurable burden of taxation.

The relations between the Party and the Masses.

The slogans advanced by the Party found an echo among the masses of wage-workers and exploited masses, of whom the most enlightened are joining the Party. In spite of the campaigns of persecution which the government has launched against the Party, the workers and peasants supported it in ever greater numbers. Within a very short time the Party has gained important victories. During the period of its activity from March to October 1922, it did good work of education and propaganda and advocated also the Red International of Labour Unions and the Young Communists. Because of its influence on the masses, the government felt it necessary to put an end to its activities.

Constantinople.

I wish to say a few words on the working class movement in Constantinople, and on the influence of the Communist Group in that city where the government has recently dissolved the Turkish Laborers' Union on the ground that it was conducting communist propaganda. In Constantinople, the work was much harder. Comrades, I need not describe the difficult and tragic situation of our comrades struggling against the reactionary

Turkish government, and against imperialism, the arch enemy of communism. But, in spite of all these difficulties, in spite of the terror, the Communist Group of Constantinople, working illegally for two years, has attained great influence among the masses, by forming nuclei within the factories, workshops, and everywhere where there are workers, by publishing legal and illegal pamphlets, magazines, manifestoes and leaflets, and by distributing communist publications which they receive regularly from other communist organisations.

It is obviously not possible for me to tell you all that the Constantinople Communist Group is doing. However, to give you an example of the nature of its activity, I might mention that in July it called a conference of the most important working class organisations in Constantinople in order to form a United Front against the general offensive of capital. But the International Workers' Union, which we had considered until then as the most class-conscious working class organisation in that city, sabotaged this attempt, declaring that the working class was not yet prepared, and that it must first be educated. We said, however, that it was the leaders who were really opposed and that unity will be achieved through action. We also added that if we did not establish the United Front the bourgeoisie would crush one by one all labour organisations. Consequent events amply proved that we were right.

The New orientation of the Government and its Perspectives.

In summing up the new orientation of Kemalism, we may say that the imperialist bourgeoisie which at the London Conference was full of hatred against imperialism, anticipating now the possibility of getting its share in the exploitation of the toiling masses of Turkey, has changed its policy of relentless warfare into a policy of concessions and treason. Since the London Conference the nationalist bourgeoisie is no longer revolutionary. It is for this reason that the Angora Government, desirous of obtaining at the Lausanne Conference favorable conditions for itself, and for the interests of the big bourgeoisie which it represents, is preparing to make concessions in the national pact at the expense of the toiling masses.

The General Offensive of Capital, and the policy of Repressions.

As you see, the Angora Government did not keep out of the general offensive of capitalism against the proletariat and the communists. At the opening session of the Congress, when comrade Clara Zetkin condemned the execution of communists in Italy, Poland, Roumania, Greece, Latvia etc., we were already in receipt of the telegram which informed us of the barbarous repressions carried on by the government of Mustapha Kemal against the Communist Party of Turkey. We cannot describe these repressions otherwise than barbarous, because police-officers armed with razors and iron nails tortured their prisoners.

The government of Mustapha Kemal, in carrying out wholesale arrests, has accused our imprisoned comrades of espionage on behalf of Soviet Russia, and consequently of high treason. The arrests are still going on, according to the latest news received. Over 200 comrades have already been imprisoned, and even at Constantinople the Turkish Labourers' Union has been suppressed and the Communists are persecuted. In no other country was there so large a number of arrests made in time of peace. But notwithstanding the repressions and terrorism, the workers and peasants, having learned to distinguish their true friends from their enemies, have rallied to their Party with increased devotion. In proof of this we may mention the following few facts:

1. During the arrest of communist workers at an Angora ammunition factory, the non-communist workers demanded the reason for these arrests. On being told that our comrades were arrested for being communists, they declared: "Since you arrests those who defend the interests of the proletariat, you arrest us too. Until now we were not communists, but now we have become communists too."
2. The proclamation of protest against this brutal act, calling upon workers to rally to the Communist Party, was supported by the majority of the workers present. A scuffle occurred, and the police had to work hard to restore order.
3. During the arrests among the peasant organisations the latter offered formidable resistance.
4. At Constantinople, in spite of the combined terror of foreign imperialism and the native bourgeoisie, the Communists remained at their posts.

Conclusion.

Comrades, from what I have just said, you can see that the Communist Party of Turkey and the Constantinople Party organisation are carrying out the instructions of the Communist International, and have always supported the national liberation movement. Considering the general situation, they have spent

the major part of their activity in organising and educating the proletariat, demanding democratic reforms to benefit the large masses of the workers. But in spite of their conciliatory and favorable attitude, the bourgeois nationalist government has constantly persecuted the Party, and today we witness its determination to stamp out the movement of revolutionary communism.

It is truly strange that the government, in its blind fury against Communism, should act in this manner at the very moment when all the imperialist forces are acting in coalition for the complete enslavement of Turkey, and when it is in greatest need of the support of the working masses and the entire world proletariat. But the counter blows that are bound to come from the working masses themselves, and from the world proletariat who have supported it during the three years of struggle, will make it realise the magnitude of the heinous crime committed by them.

Comrades, the Turkish delegation proposes to the Fourth Congress of the Communist International to send, on behalf of the world proletariat, an open letter to the toiling people of Turkey languishing under the dictatorship of imperialism and the treacherous national government, and to the imprisoned comrades who in their dungeons courageously await the imminent breaking of the dawn. Here is the text of the proposed letter:

To the Communists and to the Working Masses of Turkey.

The Fourth Congress of the Third International, held contemporaneously with the Fifth Anniversary of the great Proletarian Revolution, sends its warmest greetings to the workers and peasants of Turkey, wishing them success in their heroic struggle for independence against Western imperialism.

Comrades of Turkey! you have given a live example of a revolutionary movement of independence to the entire East and to all the Colonial countries subjugated by imperialism. But the latest events show that the bourgeois nationalist government intends to usurp the fruits of this victory won at the price of your tremendous sacrifices.

The nationalist government of Angora is ready to come to terms with the imperialists at the price of some concessions obtained for the benefit of the big bourgeoisie of Turkey. It inaugurated this new policy by dissolving the Communist Party and suppressing all its organisations, by making wholesale arrests and maltreating our imprisoned comrades in barbarous fashion, and finally by suppressing the Turkish Labourers' Union at Constantinople.

The Turkish Communist Party has always supported the bourgeois nationalist government in the struggle of the toiling masses against imperialism. The Turkish Communist Party consented even, in face of the common enemy, to make temporary concessions in its program and its ideal.

In view of these facts, the attitude of the government towards the Communist Party demonstrates the desire of the government to banish all the conscious representatives of the working class and the peasantry who will insist on realisation of the democratic reforms which were solemnly pledged in order to obtain your aid, and also in order to make the appearance of a real bourgeois government at the Lausanne Conference.

The bourgeois government of Turkey has the audacity to commit against you and your representatives such crimes that arouse the indignation of the entire world proletariat led by the Russian proletariat which grudged no material or moral sacrifice during the most trying period, when all the imperialist and capitalist Powers made common cause for the purpose of strangling the toiling people of Turkey.

The nationalist government, in preparation for an understanding with the imperialists, endeavours to destroy your true representatives and to separate them from their friends abroad.

The Fourth Congress of the Communist International protests vigorously against this barbarous act, and considers it as its duty to solemnly proclaim its readiness to support any government or political party that will refuse to play the part of the gendarme of imperialism, which will continually fight against imperialism and reaction and which will realise the democratic reforms for the benefit of the toiling masses of Turkey. You, the imprisoned comrades, the Third International—the general staff of defence of the world proletariat—affectionately salutes as the most conscious and most devoted representatives of the toiling masses of Turkey.

Remember, comrades, that the gloom of dungeons has never yet obscured the sun of the revolution.

Remember, comrades, that on the eve of the victory of the revolution, the impotence of the ruling class manifests itself by increased ferocity. This is what we are witnessing now, when Capitalism breaks down under the weight of its inherent contradictions, when the shock of imperialist conflicts has reached its highest point, that the international bourgeoisie redoubles its

persecutions against the heralds and the builders of the new Communist society.

But no white terror ever succeeded in intimidating those who are firm in their faith of the inevitable and final victory of the social revolution. The place of every comrade that is imprisoned or shot is taken by hundreds of comrades arising from the exploited proletarian ranks, who will continue to fight for freedom with increased vigour.

Comrades, the Third International considers it as its essential duty to do everything in its power to rescue you from the hands of your hangmen.

Long live the World Revolution!
Long live the faithful Communists of Turkey!
Long live the Third International!
Long live Soviet Russia!

Lozovsky:

Comrades, The discussion which took place yesterday following my report proves to us above all, that we agree in substance and principle. However, certain differences present themselves as regards form and method of practical work of the Communists in the trade unions. In this respect, it seems to me, that some of the comrades expressed themselves incorrectly, I shall begin with Comrade Heckert's objection.

I pointed out in my speech that in Germany certain incidents occurred when our comrades acted unwisely and the results of their actions had a detrimental effect upon the Communist movement. I will give two examples. The Union of Hand and Brain Workers and the Union of Agricultural Workers.

We fully agree with our comrades, the members of the German Communist Party, that all is not well in the Union. What is the Union of Hand and Brain Workers? It is an organisation embracing various Syndicalist, Communist, and non-Party elements: it contains also a great many backward workers who lack a clear and definite understanding of both the theoretical and practical side of Communism, but who are at the same time, excellent fighting revolutionists. It is evident then, that our forms and methods of action as regards this organisation should differ from methods applied to an organisation directly connected with the Communist Party.

When we have muddle and confusion within the Communist Party we take very decisive Party measures against it, of a disciplinary and a political character. When we have confusion in a non-Party organisation then it becomes necessary for us to conduct an educational political, and organisational work so as to raise these non-Party masses to the Communist class consciousness.

Our difference with Comrade Heckert is not whether the work to raise the consciousness of the proletarian masses to the Communist level is necessary or not, but merely as to forms and methods of action. The criticism of our German communists directed against the Union is in the main correct—the Union in fact is a confused organization, but the steps taken by our German comrades in connection with the Union were incorrect because they tended to drive away the best revolutionary elements from the Communist Party. A conference of the Party and Trade Union workers which took place in Berlin is quite characteristic of this very fact.

In the Ruhr District during the conflict between the miners and the employers, the old Union proposed to warn the former of the coming strike two weeks ahead. Each individual worker had to hand in notice of the strike. This was a round-about way of acting, but it was possible to bring some pressure thereby upon the employers. Acting in this manner the Reformist Union calculated that the threat of the strike would have a quieting influence upon the employers, who were getting ready to advance upon the masses. But the Unionists declared that these tactics were unacceptable to them. Such tactics are opportunist they declared, we recognise exclusively, revolutionary methods of struggle and refuse to send notices to the employers.

The Party declared itself against the tactics of the Unionists, stating that the Reformists are making a certain definite step, and advising them to do the same, at the same time making it clear to the workers that this step is insufficient; more radical and revolutionary measures of struggle against capital are necessary—at the same time, if you refuse to give notice as the Union of Mine Workers propose, the reformist workers will say that you are merely revolutionary phrase-mongers, and refuse to cooperate in the struggle. The Union was wrong in the given case, its action being governed by abstract and internal principles, and not by realities.

We held a conference in Berlin in which Comrade Kolnig, Secretary of the Rhine Westphalian Communist organization, also participated. At this conference I asked Comrade Kolnig the following question: How many members of the Union are in the Rhine Westphalian Organization, and received the answer: 70,000—and to the question as to the number of members in the Party the answer was 29,000. And in answer to my last question: How is it possible, having 29,000 members in the party you are unable to influence the Union, Comrade Kolnig frankly stated to me "Confusion reigns among the communists". My reply was: "If confusion was so great within the party, then it was necessary to clear your own ranks before attempting to eradicate confusion amongst the non-party members of the Union".

Although in comparison with the general workers' movement of Germany the strength of the Union is not very great, counting 150,000 members only—however, 120,000 of these are mine workers of the Ruhr Basin, a force not to be ignored, but which should be reckoned with. The Profintern and the Comintern was successful in solving the conflict which has just arisen between the Communist Party of Germany and the Union. All the resolutions introduced by the Profintern were finally adopted by the Congress of the Union.

Comrade Heckert puts the following question: How can we organize the workers who are leaving the trade unions? If we took up this work, this fact alone would have caused a split. I think that this question needs careful consideration. Take for example the Union of Agricultural Workers of Germany. This Union comprises perhaps more than 500,000 members. During the course of two years it lost from 200,000 to 300,000 members. The following alternative confronts us: Either we remain passive, or the Communist Party of Germany should take upon itself the task of organizing the workers who have left the Union. Are we to be reproached for splitting the Trade Union movement upon the fact that we are organizing those elements which are leaving the Trade Unions? Of course not. If we fail to organize these workers we cannot be called communists.

For we Marxists, organization is not the end, but a means to achieve our end. We are fighting for unity in the trade union movement, but we cannot sacrifice the organization of hundreds of thousands of workers for the sake of abstract principles.

I shall pass on to France now.—Some of the comrades will say that Comrade Lauridan's speech is a call to arms against syndicalism. I do not share this point of view. His speech is worthy of a communist. Comrade Lauridan related to us common ordinary things, but things that every communist should know. We agree with him that communists should remain communists, at all times, whether in trade unions, Co-operatives—and not act separately as individuals, but should be guided by a united collected communist will. First of all, did the Communist Party of France have a Trade Union policy? It had resolutions upon the Trade Union questions, but it had no Trade Union policy whatsoever, for the reason that it lacked collective influence and will to carry out this Trade Union policy. Our desire is that our practical slogans, our decisions as to methods of class struggle, be accepted by Communists.

And for this purpose there must be unanimity among them even if there are only three of them together. When I arrived at St. Etienne I put the following question to our Communist comrades: How can the fact be explained that three or four thousand anarchists can exert a greater influence in the trade union movement than the Communist Party numbering 100,000 members. Does it signify that one anarchist is worth 50 communists? This is only possible when Communists refuse to carry on communist work and when each individual communist considers himself independent of his Party. If a Communist fails to be aggressive, then he is not a Communist. I do not mean aggression in words, but aggression in deeds, in actual struggle against the bourgeoisie. A Communist should always be in the vanguard. To be a Communist does not signify to merely have a party ticket—it signifies having a firm conviction in the correctness of the Communist programme and tactics.

It is true, that in the organs of the Communist Party, anarcho-Syndicalists published articles directed against the Comintern, Profintern, and even against the Communist Party of France? You will admit that it was so. Is it true, that the anarcho-syndicalists conducted their propaganda through the organs of the French Communist Party? Yes, it is true. I could cite hundreds of examples. Is it true that a bloc existed between some of the anarcho-syndicalist and members of the Communist Party? (Lauridan: A secret "agreement" was signed.) Yes, it is true. The Communists, together with the Anarcho-Syndicalists, signed a secret agreement. How did the Communists react to this publication of this agreement? In what manner was this agreement made public? The Central Executive Committee of the Party failed

to take any measures to hold those Communists responsible who secretly concluded an agreement directed against Communism and the Communist Party.

Neither the Trade Union Commission nor the Central Committee took any measures against those members of the Party who had signed the anti-Communist agreement. I emphasize the fact that this is abnormal. It is immaterial whether Left or Right or any other comrades fail to fulfill their obligations—the responsibility falls upon all.

One can state the fact, at the present time, that the Party as a whole does not exert the influence in the Trade Union movement of France, corresponding to its strength. If unity of action existed in the Communist Party then its influence would have been ten times as great.

I wish to refer to another, perhaps a delicate question. Prior to the St. Etienne Congress I read an article written by Comrade Frossard, in which he wrote among other things, that "In the Trade Union Movement we follow the fine tradition of Jean Jaurés." We all deeply honour the memory of Jean Jaurés—but his traditions nevertheless, are not Communist traditions. One can say this without dishonouring his memory. Jaurés was one of the most prominent leaders of the Second International. He paid with his life for his convictions. But our respect for him should not compel us to assert that all that he did was praiseworthy. No. The tactics of Jaurés are absolutely inapplicable to the Communists, to the Communist Party. If the Communist Parties were to be guided by traditions—then very little would have been accomplished. There are useful traditions which should be reckoned with and foolish traditions which should be cast aside.

The French Trade Union movement has various traditions. The traditions of the industrial proletariat of northern France are quite different from those of the small artisans of Paris. The strength of the industrial districts consists in the fact that the Trade Union movement is interconnected with the political movement. And if one is to consider traditions then I would give the preference to the traditions of northern France.

In conclusion, The Communist Party of France during the whole of its latter period, has not taken a definite stand of its own, but all the time appeared to be overborne by the syndicalists. But the French communists, while admitting the autonomy of the syndicalists, should keep in mind that they themselves are autonomous and independent, and should have the courage to express their own ideas without regard to the syndicalists.

I shall pass on to Italy—to the speech of Comrade Tasca. Comrade Tasca drew a very sad picture and referred even to Bernstein and his Reformism. What facts in my report served as material for the mournful picture as drawn by Comrade Tasca? What frightened him? Is it my expression that it is impossible to bend life to theses, but that one must write theses in conformity with life? This sounded like Bernstein to him; but there is nothing in common between my words and the principles of Bernstein.

The reformists state that it is possible to reach the goal without a revolution, we say however, that in the basis of the daily struggle we shall succeed in organizing a fighting army which will gain victory over the bourgeoisie and will achieve our final aim: Communism. How can we achieve this ideal? This ideal will be achieved differently in the various countries, for the development of the working class is not the same in every country, and we are guided by the various stages of development of each country in the tactics we adopt to reach our final goal. The special development of each country should be taken into account and corresponding tactics applied.

Putting the question thus, is not equivalent to Bernstein's refusal to attain the final aim. Therefore the fears of Comrade Tasca are unfounded. At the given moment we have strong reformist unions which are in need of great educational work in order to change the ideology of the working masses. Before we attain our goal we must overcome obstacles and historical difficulties.

These difficulties consist in the abnormal relations between some of the Communist Parties and the Trade unions arising on the basis of the traditions of Parliamentary Socialism etc.

What is the essence of the 20th paragraph of my theses? It is stated there that in the countries where the Party is not sufficiently strong and where internal struggle exists, it is essential to establish such relations between the trade unions and the Party which would correspond to the situation at the given moment.

In France, as is well known, a Syndicalist Party was formed within the Trade Unions. Our task is to unite the best elements of the present Communist Party and the Trade Unions.

On the basis of co-operation the best elements of both organizations will get into closer contact, and a real fighting unified Communist Party will arise which will be the actual undisputed vanguard of the French proletariat.

Both the Syndicalist and Communist Parties do not develop along parallel lines; their lines will intersect each other, and when that happens the Communist Party of France will be finally formed.

When we determine the principles of our work for one country or another, we must base ourselves on the existing relation of forces and on the existing relations between the trade union organizations and the party. For this reason we included in our theses clause 20. By inserting it we followed the advice of Lasalle: to state the real facts and speak the truth under all circumstances.

Comrade Tasca said in his speech that the Profintern is no more than a bureau for propaganda and if it should desire to become a centre for the unification of the International revolutionary trade union movement, it will thereby precipitate a split in the world trade union movement. This is an untrue assertion. Of course, we are also a bureau of propaganda, but at the same time we are an organization, and the distinctive feature of the Profintern consists in that it unites revolutionary organizations directly allied to it as well as revolutionary minorities remaining within the Amsterdam trade unions. The Profintern represents a real international organization enjoying immense moral and political influence among the working masses. If we would have decided to separate the working masses which are sympathetic to us from the Amsterdam trade unions and attach them directly and exclusively to the Profintern, we could be working for a split. Not wishing to bring about a split, however, we said: Notwithstanding the greatest obstacles, we shall remain within the Amsterdam trade unions and work there in favour of the Profintern.

Comrade Tasca referred to the Factory Council. This question was discussed at the II Congress and to my mind there is no need to take up this question now. The Factory Council movement in Germany represents at present a tremendous mass movement. We shall not take up this question now, however, as it will be dealt with in the theses on the general tactics of the Comintern.

Further, when should the national organizations declare their affiliation with the Profintern? This is a question of tactics. When we find in some countries that the general Trade Union centre is on our side, we tell them: "You must now join the Profintern" I should like, for the sake of clarifying this question, to cite an example. We proposed to the Italian Confederation of Labour through its official representatives to join the Profintern. These representatives signed with us a formal agreement which they later renounced. But whether the official organization is for us or against us, we are against a split. One thing is clear, we must carry on revolutionary work within the Trade Unions. We must arouse the reformist organizations to action. In every country forms and methods should be devised for ideologically attracting to our side the broad working masses and thus preserve the unity of the Trade Union movement.

Some Trade Union organizations, however, put a wrong construction upon our cautions tactics in the question of affiliation with the Profintern. Thus, in Norway, 80% of the organized workers are sympathetic towards us. Twice the central organization of the Norway Trade Unions adopted a resolution calling for affiliation with us, but it still hesitates to take actual steps towards affiliation on account of the 20% of the membership who cling to Amsterdam. Will there be a split, if a Trade Union organization in whose ranks we find only 10% or 20% of reformist members wishes to formally affiliate with us? Undoubtedly not. We declare: the minority should remain and submit to the majority and we apply this principle when we are in the minority, but the majority should by no means submit to the minority. When our adherents constitute a majority in a given Trade Union organization, it is their duty to bring about a formal affiliation with the Profintern.

Now we shall consider the question of the International Federations. No-one will deny to the International Propaganda Committee the right to conduct propaganda on a National or International scale. Any Trade Union, joining a propaganda organization still remains a member of a corresponding International Federation. It continues its work in the International Federation, endeavouring to alienate as large as possible a number of organizations from its ideological influence and to imbue them with our political views. We have no desire to split the International Federations. When the Russian and Bulgarian Trade Unions asked to be admitted to the International Federations, they were shown the door. They returned and were driven out once more. They returned for the sake of avoiding a split. However, when the Amsterdamers represent only the Trade Union officialdom and the working masses are solidly behind us, we shall not abstain from creating our own international organizations.

The last question we shall deal with is the question of Czecho-Slovakia. In Czecho-Slovakia we have at the present time two types of Trade Union organizations. The split in Czecho-Slovakia occurred approximately in the same manner as in France. Here too, mass expulsions of revolutionary workers were used, and then the minority organized and convened a congress for the restoration of unity.

At the present time we are confronted with an accomplished fact. We have there two parallel organizations. I shall emphasize one characteristic feature of the activity of our comrades in Czecho-Slovakia. About 10 months ago the communists had the opportunity to elect a majority for the Congress of the central trade union organizations in Czecho-Slovakia. What happened? In Czecho-Slovakia, though less than in France, there is a considerable number of communists who want to be independent of the Party. There is in Czecho-Slovakia a large federation of agricultural workers; it is headed by comrade Bolin. Shortly before the Congress this federation suspended the payment of membership dues to the Amsterdam International, and continued so for six months, with the result that its representatives were not admitted to the Congress. What did the Party do? Nothing. It should be emphasised that comrade Bolin, head of the Federation of Agricultural Workers, is also a member of the Central Executive of the Communist Party. The Communists would have had as strong a delegation as the reformists, if 50 of our comrades would not have remained outside the Congress, as a result of the refusal to pay membership dues. But at the time the Communist Party of Czecho-Slovakia was afraid to obtain a majority at the Congress, for it would have been faced with many difficulties. What was the final result? The reformists expelled the revolutionary unions and brought about a split in the Trade Union movement under conditions much less favourable for our comrades than would have existed before.

On my way back from St. Etienne I had a consultation with the Comrades of Czecho-Slovakia and we worked out certain ways and means to forestall this split. We adopted a number of methods and clearly stated that we did not want a split.

There is still one question which I want to dwell upon. At their Congress, our Czecho-Slovakian comrades decided to create a united organisation i. e., to do away with separate federations (similar to what has been done in France in the department of Moselle; different industrial federations were to become sections of a united trade union organisation of the entire country). When the comrades set out this plan to us, we said to them: "Be careful, this is your future organisation, and not the present". At the present time we still find among the communistically inclined workers many who are imbued with craft prejudices which are hard to overcome, and the attempt to create at once a completely unified organisation will undoubtedly arouse opposition within our own ranks.

We shall discuss this question at greater length at the Congress of the Profintern where the organisation questions and the questions of the inter-relationship between the local sections and the centre will be dealt with most exhaustively. We should state, however, that the Comintern and the Profintern warned the comrades to be careful, for they will encounter many difficulties, because resistance will be met even in their own ranks.

My conclusion will be extraordinarily simple. International communism at the present time represents a very great force. It is the only revolutionary power in the world. We discuss questions pertaining to a single country in such detail, only because incorrect tactics in one country affect other countries. The vacillations of our ranks in one country weaken our united communist front and retard the movement of International communism. We want to have our work organized in all countries in such a manner as to assure the growth of our influence from day to day. We do not care to have a French communism, a Dutch or German communism, as was the case in the Second International, where socialism has a national character. We differ from the other Internationals in that the Comintern and the Profintern are real world organisations in which international interests supercede national interests.

By mutual criticism and by collective work and collective deliberation upon our lines of policy in each country we shall enable the Comintern to grow stronger and lead the struggle for the overthrow of capitalism forward to final victory.

Chairman Neurath:

We will now proceed to elect a commission charged with the final edition of the trade union theses before they are put to the vote of the Congress. The Presidium proposes the following comrades for this commission:

Lozovsky—Russia.
Rosmer—France.
Heckert—Germany.
Lansing—America.
Tasca—Italy.
Pavlik—Czecho-Slovakia.
Kolarov—Bulgaria.

Does anyone wish to speak on this question?

Murphy:

(Gt. Britain.)

I propose that comrade Clark represent Gt. Britain on this Commission.

Chairman Neurath:

It has been proposed that in addition to the other comrades, Comrade Clark be added to the Commission as the representative of Gt. Britain. Is anyone against this proposal? As this is not the case, and as there was no objection to the other names, the Commission stands elected.

Comrades, we shall now revert to the programme question, and I call on comrade Bucharin to address you on behalf of the Russian Delegation.

Bucharin:

I have, on behalf of the Russian Delegation, to make the following statement:

"In view of the fact that the dispute about the programme created the wrong impression that the divergence of opinion was on a matter of principle, the Russian Delegation lays down unanimously that the inclusion of the transition demands into the programmes of the national sections, and their theoretical formulation in the general part of the programme cannot be considered as opportunism.

Signed by the representatives of the Russian Delegation. Lenin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Bukharin."

Chairman Neurath:

The Presidium has made a careful study of the subject and has elaborated a proposal on which comrade Zinoviev will address you now.

Zinoviev:

I will simply read to you this proposal, which as we were informed, has the support of a number of those delegations that had the opportunity of acquainting themselves with it, viz, the German, Russian, Czecho-Slovakian, Polish, Bulgarian, and a number of other delegations.

The proposal is as follows:

1. All programme proposals are to be handed in to the Executive of the Communist International or to a Commission appointed by the latter, for detailed study and elaboration. The Executive of the Communist International is to publish with the least possible delay all programme proposals submitted to it.

2. The Congress endorses the decision that all the national sections of the Communist International, which are as yet without a national programme, must at once take in hand the elaboration of such a programme which must be submitted to the Executive not later than three months before the V Congress for endorsement by the next Congress.

3. The necessity of the struggle for the transition demands must be emphasised in the programmes of the national sections, with the reservation that such demands are dependent on the concrete conditions of time and place.

4. The theoretic basis for all transition and partial demands must be definitely laid down in the general programme, the IV Congress strongly condemning all attempts to represent the inclusion of the transition demands into the programme as opportunism, and also all attempts to gloss over or to replace the basic revolutionary task by partial demands.

5. The basis historic types of the transition demands of the national sections must be clearly embodied in the general programme, due account being taken of the basic differences in the economic and political structure of the various countries, as for instance, Great Britain on the one hand, India on the other.

Chairman Neurath:

Does any other delegation wish to make a statement? This is not the case. Is anyone against the proposal of the Presidium? This not being the case I declare the proposal of the Presidium unanimously accepted.

This matter being disposed of, we are coming now to the next item on the agenda: Workers' Relief, on which Comrade Müllzenberg will address the Congress.

Report on Workers' Relief

(By Münzenberg)

Comrades, I have divided my report into two parts. I will devote a few minutes to our past Famine Relief, and take up the rest of the time with the second part of my report, with the Economic Relief.

Naturally, I will not spend any time on the causes, the magnitude, and the course of the famine. These facts are only too well known to most of the Delegates. Every organ of public opinion reported on last year's famine in Russia which Lenin characterised as the greatest hardship in the reconstruction of Soviet Russia. It suffices to say that 40 million people were directly affected by the famine and that about 3 million of these died of starvation.

It is very important to know that the famine was vanquished and finally overcome not so much by foreign relief, nor by the bourgeois or workers' organisations, but by Soviet Russia. I had promised myself to quote no figures, but I will give two figures in this matter because public opinion is absolutely uninformed of the actual work of relief done to overcome the hunger. All the foreign governmental, Red Cross, A.R.A., Nansen, Quaker and Workers' Relief sent 33 million poods of grain to Russia until August 1922; during the same time Russia herself gathered 165 million poods of food and 31 million of sowing seeds; altogether 196 millions. All the foreign countries, all foreign relief did not accomplish one sixth of what famished Russia herself did to combat the famine. The famine on the Volga gave birth to a manifestation of labour solidarity such as we had never seen in the history of the Socialist movement before. The action began spontaneously, before any organisation, any Party, had made direct appeal to the workers. German, Austrian and Dutch workers responded to the first call for help with large collections. The campaign spread to all countries, to Japan as well as to India, to North and South America, to every European country; all responded to the call for relief.

The campaign lasted undiminished for a year. It gave rise to a great many touching manifestations of solidarity towards the Russian working class. In England and especially in Holland a great number of working class women gave up their last jewels, even their wedding rings, for the starving Russians; children emptied their saving boxes, sold their pencils and their copy books, prisoners gave up their miserly pay for the relief of the starving Russians.

No action in the past decade has been so popular, or affected such large masses of the proletariat as the campaign for famine relief. I will not bore you with figures; only allow me to read to you these few lines from the report from Bulgaria:

"Whenever any one celebrated a marriage, or child-birth, whenever anyone was buried, or whenever any other event happened, the starving Russians were remembered. Many cases have been recorded when women gave up religious observances and used the money thereby saved, for the Russian relief. Many gave up smoking for weeks, others did not shave, it even happened that comrades sacrificed several meals a month to come to the help of their Russian brothers."

These are small individual manifestations. I quote them as a proof that this action affected the broadest, non-communist masses and awakened and increased the interest in and solidarity with Soviet Russia.

Comrade Zinoviev in his report said that this action was one of the most remarkable campaigns in the past years. It is indisputably true that almost all Communist Parties and groups with very few exceptions took part in this action and helped to make it a success. At the same time it must be stated in this connection that many comrades took quite a different attitude towards the campaign. In Germany, there were groups who saw in this campaign nothing but a philanthropic charitable action and acted accordingly. I believe that nothing could be more false than to see in the past campaign and the pending economic action, nothing but a charitable collection, an action of a purely philanthropic character. Its primary importance is political not charitable.

The past relief campaign had a great political task to accomplish, which was only partly done because the Communists first began to carry on the campaign on the necessary scale only when they were forced to it by the masses. What were the immediate results when the famine broke out? The immediate results were that a great number of bourgeois governments attempted to increase their attacks against Soviet Russia. In September and October 1920 the world rang with the sword rattling of Polish and French militarism. And just as the English workers were able to prevent the English government from pursuing the Anglo-Polish-Russian war and put a stop to

England's military support of the Russian interventionists, the famine campaign of the Comintern and the partial support of the Trade Union International and the large masses of unorganised workers created such a sentiment which forced France to give up some of her plans against Soviet Russia. As is well known, at the first news of the famine, France had prepared an extensive plan for armed intervention in Russia. The pressure of the masses and the change of public opinion in favour of the famished forced even such reactionary governments as France to vote funds for the relief of the famine.

Our second political task in this campaign was brought about by our differences with the Second and Two and a Half Internationals and their affiliated unions. Forced by spontaneous mass manifestations, the official leaders of the Second and Two and a Half Internationals, the adherent Trade Unions and the affiliated Parties declared themselves in favour of a large relief campaign for the benefit of the starving Russians. A few months later when the pressure from the masses became less urgent the leaders changed their course and attempted to use the famine catastrophe as propaganda against Soviet Russia. A savage campaign began in all Social Democratic newspapers whose dominant tone was: "Now you can see where Communism, where Bolshevism lead to! It is a return to barbarism! I only wish to recall the words of Wells at the last Congress of the Social Democracy. He declared; 'What is Bolshevism? It is the return to capitalism through cannibalism'". This was the propaganda of the Social Democratic papers for months. This made necessary a counter campaign on the part of the Communist Party to show the true causes of the famine. Those responsible for the catastrophe were not the Bolsheviks, but those who had prevented the lifting of the blockade and given their support to military interventions against Russia. Our press only partly came up to this task. (Quite true) The Social Democratic press conducted a much wider and more intensive campaign against Russia than the Communists for Russia.

Comrades, this was the great political significance of the famine relief campaign. To this campaign which awakened the interest of the large masses of the working classes in Soviet Russia by mean of public discussion of the famine on the Volga we should have added a political propaganda explaining the course of the Russian Revolution and showing that the present famine was one link in the long chain of sufferings which the Russian proletariat had to undergo in the interest of its revolution. Everywhere where our committees and Parties have done this, we scored many political successes. I only wish to recall the case of America and Japan, two very typical countries. The campaign for the famine relief enabled us for the first time to conduct Communist propaganda among the Trade Union workers of North America, and to unite these workers in a relief action under the control of the Communist Party. The same thing happened, in Japan. There large associations were created, consisting primarily of workers' organisations, Trade Unions, and even of a bourgeois Womens' League which acted together and were controlled secretly by the Communist Party. In this way we were able to bring for the first time before the masses the questions of Soviet Russia, proletarian revolution, etc.

I will be brief, but I would like to mention another political fact of importance in this connection, and that is the question of the famine campaign in Russia herself. The bourgeois organisations attempted to use the catastrophe against Soviet Russia not only abroad, but they also attempted to incite the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia against the Soviet government and plotted for its overthrow. Together with every plate of soup the A.R.A. distributed a leaflet which read: "We the American bourgeoisie are helping you after the Bolshevik regime has thrown you into this frightful situation." For several months the Trade Union International sent several delegates to the famine districts where they attempted to win the peasants and workers over to the Amsterdam International. This is why we gave over our distribution apparatus and especially our hospital stations in Samara, in Saratov, in Orenbourg, in the Ural, and in the Crimea, to the Soviet government in order to put a stop to this exploitation of Russia's misery against the Bolshevik regime, and we gave the piece of bread or meat which we could afford to bring to the suffering peasants and workers in the name of the Communist International. These Russian peasants and workers naturally do not stand on the same cultural plane, as for instance, the members of this Fourth World Congress of the Comintern. This thing took a very simple form in their mind. Till then they had heard of the Comintern only through the Congress reports in the form of

resolutions of the Western workers in favour of Soviet Russia. For the first time they felt the presence of the Comintern in flesh and blood. They saw practical action in their support. In this way the famine relief produced positive political results for the Comintern in Russian also. Comrades allow me a few more words on the relief work itself. This is also known to most of the delegates here through our constant reports. Under advice of the Executive, we attempted to form a United Front of the workers on the famine relief. We entered into negotiations with leaders of the Second and Two and a Half and Trade Union Internationals, we had two common conferences in Berlin, which had no positive results. Only in Italy and Czecho-Slovakia were we able to create a temporary committee of representatives from various parties, Trade Unions and cooperatives. However, a few months later the committee broke up when it came to the question of the disposal of the collected funds. The Czecho-Slovak Social Democrats wanted to give those funds over to Amsterdam.

Two great organisations took part in the workers' relief for the Russian famine, the Trade Union International and the Communist International. Allow me a word on the work of the Amsterdam International. The work of the Trade Union International found support in all the Social-Democratic parties and the still existing independent centrist parties. Under pressure of the spontaneous manifestation of the will of the masses to come to the help of Soviet Russia, the Amsterdam Bureau used very pointed and wise language.

Manifestoes were published in the papers saying "Workers, help Soviet Russia; if Soviet Russia falls misfortune will fall upon all Europe!" These manifestoes were ignored by the Centrist and other social democratic organs. As the agitation in the Press continued, the Amsterdam Trade Union International took the matter up, and now, after a year and a half, we can regard the work as established. The trade unions and the social democrats have contributed according to the audit of April 1922, altogether 1,400,000 Dutch gulden. With this sum 40,000 children have been fed for several months and about 50,000 railway workers have received rations.

The aid of the International Co-operators has not been so great, as only the Czecho-Slovakian and Italian co-operatives have sent substantial shipments of clothing etc.

Now a few words with regard to the action of the Communist International. After the plan to form a powerful united front of working class unions and parties against the Russian Famine was wrecked, the Communist Party endeavoured to win support from as large a number as possible of the workers in the factories and the unions. This has been done in many countries with great success. For example, in Switzerland, in Holland, in Scandinavia, and also, to some extent in America. Large groups of sympathisers and considerable numbers of independent workers, were won over to the cause of famine relief through the activity of the Communist committees and parties.

The material results of this work were unexpectedly good. When we initiated the campaign, none of us would have thought it possible to amass such great sums as those which have been collected. You have heard, in the report of comrade Eberlein, how weak from an organisation point of view, the parties in the Western countries still are. To this we must add severe unemployment in America, England, Switzerland, and Norway, which materially hampered our activities, while in Austria and Germany, as a result of the continually rising cost of living, the position of the workers was thereby so impoverished that it was difficult even for the best of communists, to request further sacrifices of these comrades.

Altogether, the activity of the communist relief committees in goods, money, and valuables, realised over 2½ million dollars.

To illustrate the magnitude of this result, I would like to make a comparison. In Switzerland 250,000 trade unionists and social democrats, who organised a special campaign of their own, collected only 80,000 Swiss francs. On the other hand, the Swiss relief committee of the Communist Party, which had only a few thousand members, collected 540,000 Swiss francs (Applause). These are figures which tell us distinctly that the Communist committees have been able to penetrate into many sections of the masses which were hitherto indifferent, and to obtain from them financial support.

I said just now that the Amsterdam International, with over twenty million members, collected 1,400,000 Dutch gulden. The Relief Committees of the little Communist Party of Holland, up till about a fortnight ago, collected half a million Dutch gulden. I believe that the Dutch Party has only four or five thousand members. And these have raised about half a million gulden, while the Amsterdam International with its 22 million members, up to the 15th March, had only raised

1,400,000 gulden. I believe that these figures show that it was possible to obtain good results when the Communist Parties conducted a skilful agitation. These figures also show the goodwill and self-sacrificing spirit of large sections of the working class.

With the 2½ million dollars, about 30,000 tons of food-stuffs and other relief material were sent to Russia. The relief work started in Russia in November. In December the first relief trains arrived in Kazan and other parts of the famine area. I will not detain you with figures especially as some of our comrades, working in the famine area, have not compiled exact statistics, as they forgot to include in their reports to whom relief was accorded. But it is better to forget to enter some one in one's statistical report, than to forget to aid him, as has been the case, I believe, by certain bourgeois organisations. During the famine months, we gave full relief to about from 200,000 to 220,000 people, and also supplied certain rations to railway workers and other workers in different necessary factories. At present the famine relief continues still in the form of aid to the children. We have taken over some Children's Homes in the different famine districts, in which at present 14,000 children are completely supported by us. We have also equipped a number of these homes.

That which distinguished the relief work of the C. I. from that of the bourgeois philanthropic societies, is that we have, from the beginning, united the famine relief—that is, the actual feeding of the hungry—with aid towards the reconstruction of Russian agriculture and industry which were destroyed in the famine area.

I now come to the second part of my report: the economic help campaign. I must now take a brief glance at the past. The will of the West European and American workers to render to Russia, not only political aid through their Communist Parties, but also practical economic aid, has shown itself for several years. Already in the autumn of 1919, and still more markedly in the Spring of 1920, American, Swedish, Norwegian and German workers groups emigrated to Russia and there, with much idealism and little skill, endeavoured to restore Russian industry. Most of these experiments have ended in a complete fiasco. I am reminded now of the Kolomna affair, so well remembered in Germany. About a year ago, and mainly as a result of the famine relief campaign, an increased determination to extend economic aid to Russia has shown itself among the West European, and particularly among the American workers. In Germany a number of machines have been sent to Russia, besides tools and agricultural machinery. In Italy the co-operative societies played the most important part in economic aid. They intend to undertake the cultivation of 100,000 hectares of land. In England, in Switzerland, and Czecho-Slovakia groups are being formed, for example construction groups, who wish to emigrate to Russia with tools and a small capital. This tendency is also found in South Africa and is particularly strong in America. There are several large groups in that country adhering to the enterprise of the Dutch engineer Rutgers, who have established several thousand construction and other workers in the Cuznetz Basin, and have taken over mines and land sites for development.

In America there is the Friends of Soviet Russia, which is closely connected with the Communist International, and which has already supplied considerable economic help for instance, the 20 tractors which are now at work in the Perm district. In the United States there is also the Society for Technical Aid to Soviet Russia which also sent several tractors to Russia; this organisation has several branches and several thousand members. Then we have Comrade Hillman's plan which proposes to raise a loan of one million dollars for Russia and which has arranged with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers to found large-scale clothing factories in Russia.

In the last few days the Russian Government has established a special commission, under the control of Comrades Eiduck and Tartens, which will bring over 8,000 American workers to Russia next Spring.

I believe it is the duty of the Communist International to define its position with regard to these matters. In America there are at least 20,000 people who are interested in these enterprises; in Europe perhaps an equal number. We must know how to deal with these things. Perhaps they are not good—then they must be changed into large-scale campaigns for economic help. Among most of the workers in Europe and America who are inclined to emigrate to Russia, the desire to aid Russia is mingled with the desire to aid themselves. They have the idea that within the next few years there will be great political crises in America or Europe. Russia, however, is at present in a state of improvement. Therefore, think they, let us shoulder our bundles and start for there. So far, the Communist

International has refused to take up a position with regard to this; but it must now assume a very definite attitude. In the face of such a plan, the bringing of eight to ten thousand emigrants to Russia, we of the Communist International are in duty bound to tell our Russian comrades that we have given our best thought to this subject, not only to the work which these emigrants will do here, but to the consequent weakening of the revolutionary movement in the countries which they leave, through their withdrawal. There is no reason why we should mitigate the tremendous economic crises in France and Czechoslovakia by bringing a great mass of unemployed to Soviet Russia. I believe that we should unconditionally take up the attitude that, as a Communist Party, we are strictly opposed to any mass emigration of European and American workers to Russia. Such emigration implies no further support for Russia but only a relieving of the crisis in the Western capitalist countries.

It is quite different, however, when for certain factories, certain skilled specialists are needed who cannot be found in Russia. In such cases the bringing over of European or American workers, under the control and with the consent of the Russian trade unions, might be advisable.

Comrades, whatever position we take with regard to this, it must at least be definite. Either the immigration of foreign workers is a good thing or it is a bad thing, and our attitude must be governed accordingly.

I am of the opinion that the question of economic help is a matter which deserves the support of the Communist International to the fullest extent. Only we must be absolutely clear as to the character of this help. We must finally break with such fantastic conceptions as that the economic help is a new campaign to solve the world problem, that it is the struggle of the classes to introduce new production as some comrades seem to think. Here a distinct division must be drawn.

There are a number of comrades who have great doubts with regard to economic help. They see in it the danger of the opportunistic petty bourgeoisie, they fear economic experiments which will have deteriorating effects on political propaganda. They remind us of Kolonna and other similar cases.

It is true that Famine Relief, and even more so economic help, is a very ticklish problem, especially when the Communist International supports it. It brings with it many great dangers. But there are no tactics which do not contain within themselves certain dangerous factors. We discussed the United Front for nearly a year, and the whole Congress was of the opinion that it implied dangers both from the Right and from the Left. Yet it was unanimously accepted. Because certain tactics may involve certain dangers is not an argument that they should not be introduced, if they be possible, useful, and productive of good results. One must take precautions, on a national and on an international scale, to reduce this danger to a minimum.

Comrades, I believe that the problem of economic help is above all a problem of expediency and practicability. The principal thing is that we should ask ourselves whether the expenditure of effort is justified by the results. There should be no doubt left in this Congress that the Communist International should agree that the first and best support of Russian economic reconstruction lies in the pressure exerted by the Communist and other working class parties upon the governments of their respective countries, so that they may recognise Soviet Russia and conclude advantageous trade agreements with her, and that, in these countries, the revolution be accomplished also. Therefore those comrades who are at present occupied with this work have no doubt but that the economic aid for Russia, just as the political aid, should not be in the least diminished or enfeebled. We stand absolutely upon the ground that the political revolutionary struggle in each country is the best and most necessary support for Soviet Russia.

The only question which we have to settle in this Congress is: Is the political struggle the only method which the proletariats and the Communist International may use under the present political and economic reconstruction.

We are all united as to the importance of Soviet Russia. Through the addresses of Lenin, Trotzky, and Zinoviev, the Congress has once more affirmed, what is really the A. B. C. to every comrade, that without Soviet Russia a continuation of the present proletarian revolution is impossible. A new immediate release of proletarian power would be impossible. And the higher the waves of fascism rise in other countries, the more must Soviet Russia be supported as the only line of retreat for the proletarian armies of the world. Therefore we ask, has the world proletariat to support Soviet Russia only by its political power? I say, No! It has yet a minimum of economic power. It is true we have no machines, no factories,—they belong to the capitalists—but we have technical knowledge, professional knowledge, and knowledge of organisation. This minimum of

economic power should be mobilised through the economic help and placed to the credit of Soviet Russia in its economic war with the imperialists.

And now, comrades, let us take up a few of the tactical objections, which have been made by certain comrades. They say, this is perhaps all very well, but we can do no more to-day. We are exhausted. The Famine Relief, which has lasted a whole year, has so tired us, that we cannot continue it.

Comrades, this is a reason which, among all the objections is the most to be considered. It is true that some of the proletariat—especially the workers of Central Europe—have exhausted all their strength through the length of the campaign. And there is no doubt that we must cease our collections, in the form in which they were made previously.

The means we adopted in the past can no longer serve the purpose. But it is a different question, how we are to carry out the action from the standpoint of technical organisation after we have decided that it is necessary on principle and properly conceived. The collections in their present form should be discontinued. Other means could be devised for the purpose of mobilising the maximum of financial support for Soviet Russia.

Another objection was raised, that the financial resources of Party officials have been exhausted. All the appeals in the world will be in vain, since these people cannot give any money. This objection does not reflect upon the action itself, but rather upon those comrades who raised the objection. We have never demanded from the Communist International, nor from any Communist Party, to so tax the financial resources of its officials and workers that they should not be able to pay their Party dues. Our demand was that every Communist Party should make use of its officials to arouse the interest in those quarters that are passive but sympathetic to Soviet Russia, and we find that wherever this proposition was properly understood, it gave good results.

One of the important objections is that the appeal for economic aid is likely to be detrimental to the political revolutionary struggle of the Parties, taking away the best comrades. That is not true. Such parties like the German Party, with a membership of 200,000, do not consist entirely of political workers. As soon as we organise the Communist Party as an open Party which anyone can join on becoming converted by our agitation, we get a good many elements which could not eventually devote themselves to daily political activity. Here we have thousands of workers and comrades unoccupied by Party work, and every Communist Party could—by a proper selection of forces in the same manner as is done for activity among the youth, for Party work and for educational work—get together many forces everywhere for the special work of economic aid.

But we are told that the political character of the Party would become tainted with petty-bourgeois philanthropy. This only goes to show that these Parties do not make the best use of the tactics. It would be similar to saying that we ought to reject the United Front because some Party group might be likely to apply it wrongly. It is economic aid activity that furnishes a hundred points of contact with the masses to arouse universal interest for the Russian question and the general revolutionary questions associated therewith, to bring influence to bear upon the large masses in the daily political struggle and to lead on the proletarian revolution.

Finally let me deal with the principal objection. The comrades ask, what is the use of it all? We mobilise hundreds of Party members, we give half a column in our press week by week, and what is the success obtained? In my concluding words I will deal with the material success, but for the present let me speak of the political success.

Comrades, we are well aware that as workers and as the Communist International we could not hope to build up Soviet Russia by our own financial resources. If that were possible, our Executive would long ago have carried out this book-keeping transaction. Unfortunately that cannot be done. As against the few cases of overestimation of partial successes there are a majority of comrades inclined to underestimate the financial support which we are able to render. Most of the comrades have no idea of the vast amount of good that could be done by the international proletariat, if a wide mobilisation of forces for financial aid were to be carried out. In the famine relief campaign five million dollars were directly or indirectly collected by the proletariat. That amounts to ten million gold roubles. Comrades, you will recollect the speech of Comrade Lenin in which he said, that the greatest achievements of the economic policy of last year consisted in the saving of twenty million gold roubles for the reconstruction of the heavy industries. The entire State machine effected a saving of twenty million gold roubles, yet the proletariat got together ten million gold roubles for famine relief without exhausting the resources of a single Communist Party, nor of the trade unions, the co-

operatives and other labour parties. If all our Party forces would put their shoulder to the wheel, there is no doubt that the results would be doubled. I can easily imagine occasions when economic aid by workers would be ridiculous irony, but under the present economic situation of Soviet Russia the financial force of the proletariat is an important factor.

There is another objection, that the workers' relief organization already has a number of its own enterprises in Russia: fisheries, farms, shoe factories etc. There were times when 30,000 workers were directly employed in the industrial enterprises maintained by the workers' relief organisation. Think of the words of Comrade Trotzky who said: One million workers in the State industries, and 40,000 in the capitalist industries!

Comrades, with a slight increase in our activity it would be possible to increase the number of workers employed in our industries and enterprises to 50,000 and more, perhaps to one tenth of the number of workers employed by the State in its industries, and at least as many as are employed in the petty capitalist enterprises.

I repeat that the main purpose of our economic relief activity for Soviet Russia is to give the world proletariat an opportunity of rendering practical aid without in any way retarding the progress of the political revolutionary movement.

As I have already said during the last nine months, we successfully conducted various enterprises in Russia. We maintain three farms in the vicinity of Kazan which have yielded sufficient produce to feed over 100 children. We have established a successful fishery in Astrakhan, where we caught large quantities of fish which we are now distributing in the famine regions. At the present moment we are negotiating with the Russian Government for the realisation of a million dollar loan. We may use that fund partly in reorganising the leather industry. Just now we are asked to arrange for the supply of millions of railway sleepers on a five year contract. Thus we see that all our experiences so far demonstrate the possibility of practical aid in the reconstruction of Soviet Russia.

As I said, we have floated a million dollar loan in order to get more money for our enterprises in Russia. It is interesting to recall the reception that was accorded to this loan. Not only

the workers and the Communists, but even among the bourgeoisie there were liberal subscriptions to this loan. The Deutsche Bank of Berlin and the State Bank of Brussels were among the subscribers to the loan, as well as great numbers of the middle class. The Dutch workers subscription cards brought in the sum of 75,000 florins. I therefore have no reason to doubt that by the coming spring the one million dollar loan will be fully subscribed, furnishing us with new resources for our enterprises in Russia.

My answer to the question of the effectiveness of this financial activity can only be in the affirmative. The experiences as well as the prospects indicate the assurance of mobilising a sufficient amount of money for doing practical work in Russia.

The purely material side of this loan is a secondary consideration in our economic aid. The main purpose of our economic activities is to influence the large masses to whose primitive way of thinking our ordinary communist propaganda can hardly make effective appeal. This economic action affords us the opportunity of approaching the indifferent masses by means of moving pictures and through the newspapers, and this constitutes the great propaganda value of this work. On these grounds we expect that the Congress will decide in favour of continuing the work of famine relief in the shape of economic aid.

The next step is the attempt to centralise all the existing groups. We have made a beginning by uniting with the Dutch engineer Rutgers. The tendency of all the organs of economic aid is mainly in the direction of uniting all the active groups and forces.

I think it of importance in a few words to indicate the political tendency of this work once more. It is a question of recognising that there has been a good deal of exaggeration, which I readily admit, but it cannot be gainsaid on the other hand, that our economic aid will be a useful practical supplement to our political activity. This activity will not be necessary of course if the revolution should triumph tomorrow in Germany or France; but in the present political situation of the world, and in view of the circumstances in Russia, the economic aid activity will be a useful and direct adjunct to our political action, and will mean the practical assistance of Soviet Russia.

Report on the Eastern Question

Van Ravenstein:

(Holland.)

Comrades, it was during the days of the Mudania Conference that a telegram from New York stated that at a banquet given by American Bank directors in New York, Mr. Morgenthau—(former United States Ambassador in Constantinople)—expressed himself as follows with regard to the intervention of England in the Near Eastern crisis. He paid homage to England for her attitude in this crisis and claimed that, in the last two weeks England has saved civilisation. He said that only those who were in a position to glance behind the scenes could appreciate the splendid work done by England in this connection.

This representative of American financial capital declared that England had thus once again been the defender of civilisation and played the part of a saviour.

At about the same time, on October 6th, Mr. Bonar Law who was then only ex-minister and leader in the House, declared, in a letter to the "Times" that he approves of the main lines of the Near Eastern policy of the British Government. He said that had the Turks not received such a definite warning they would have become intoxicated with their victory and endeavoured to invade Constantinople and Thrace. The fact that great massacres in Constantinople and in the Balkans were prevented was not merely in the interests of the British but was in the interests of all humanity.

Mr. Bonar Law even threatened French imperialism; he would not aid them, he said, in their efforts to obtain the substantial sums which were to be delivered to them by the German people in accordance with the Versailles Treaty. And Mr. Bonar Law, who during Mr. Lloyd George's Government was the latter's staunch co-worker and assistant, and who shared his responsibility for all the acts of the Coalition Government, expressed himself exactly as had the American Morgenthau, and as Lloyd George had done. In other words, he said that England had fought, and was fighting, not only for its own interests but for all humanity.

Comrades, when we glance for a moment upon the present crisis in the Near East, a deep abyss of hypocrisy opens itself before us. After the experiences of eight years of world war and

world chaos such statesmen as Lloyd George, a demagogue and puritanical hypocrite, and Bonar Law, have the audacity to characterize the misdeeds of the English government—which brought Europe to the brink of a hideous wholesale slaughter—as a struggle for order and justice, culture and civilization. This would be unbelievable if we did not know that Anglo-Saxon hypocrisy, as expressed by these gentlemen, is specifically bourgeois and is at the same time the most disgusting and villainous that has ever existed.

On the occasion of the Genoa Conference, one of the writers in your paper "Izvestia" wrote: "England is the country of Shakespeare and Lloyd George, the first as a creator of celebrated historical dramas, the other wishing to become one. The first produced "Much Ado About Nothing" so did the second. The first asked the question: To be or not to be? The second also. The only difference between the one and the other is that the first by his genius and thoroughly peaceful means won for himself a place in history and the second stole his by force." This proletarian journal was indeed right. In the parallel between the spirits of Shakespeare and that of the present-day bourgeois hypocrisy of the British as represented by a Bonar Law or a Lloyd George—the gulf between the bourgeois culture of the Renaissance before the dawn of proletarian culture, and the decay of this culture in the period of the decadence of imperialism becomes manifest. It is like descending from a mountain peak into a stinking morass of putrefaction.

Comrades, there is perhaps no such historical example as the Oriental question to demonstrate the destructive methods of imperialism.

During a whole century the Oriental question involved the fate of the Turkish Empire and of the countries and peoples situated between Southern Europe and Asia. With the development of modern imperialism the fate of these countries became an imperialist problem of first magnitude and one of the knot-tiest points in imperialistic conflicts.

Comrades, allow me to take a backward glance at history so that we may grasp the great problem of the Near East in which the working class of the world and particularly the Russian proletariat are so vitally interested.

At the beginning of the 19th century, Napoleon could state with some amount of correctness that whoever ruled Constanti-

nopole ruled the world, that is the then existing world of pre-imperialistic capitalism.

The whole of the 18th century was occupied by the struggle of French and British mercantile capital for commercial supremacy in America and India.

The Seven Years War appeared to award the advantage to British capital. However, the uprising of the American colonies again rendered British rule doubtful. Thus began England's great struggle in 1793 against the bourgeois French revolution and for the attainment of absolute control of the seas. This struggle accompanied the great bourgeois revolution. Napoleon was nothing more than the agent of French commercial capital which, in the 18th century, mastered all of Western and Central Europe by armed force. The advance on Moscow—(You could have celebrated the 110th anniversary of this event a short while ago, comrades; Moscow was burned on the 15th and 16th of September, and the retreat of the Napoleonic army started on October 19th)—was the last move in this tremendous historical game. It was a move to bring the comparatively young Tsarist despotism into the service of the world-embracing plans of Napoleon. Napoleon planned to conquer Constantinople through Moscow and, via Stamboul to wound England fatally in her Indian dominions. The Near East was merely a pawn in this gigantic game. We all know that Napoleon lost the game. The far flung schemes of this world plunderer, the greatest since the time of Alexander the Great, were shattered against the then young power of Russia.

During the century England earned many a victory. British mercantile capital secured its victory on all oceans of the world with the aid of Tsarist despotism, and from that time on it was enabled to continue its development to a higher phase of modern industrial capitalism. The stage was set for the greatest power, the world has so far seen, the British Empire, which comprised a fifth part of the world and reached from the North to the South Poles. The Seven Seas had come to life under British domination.

Comrades, no longer is it true that he who rules Stamboul rules the world; although only a century has passed since this city was really the key to world dominion. The capitalist world has grown; the problems of world politics have expanded, just as modern capitalism has expanded. A hundred years ago, the Far East was not a centre of world political importance. Africa was still to a large extent unexplored. It would be well, however, if we would just glance at the various phases through which the Oriental Question has passed in the 19th century.

In 1822 a new phase began with the uprising of the Greek population in the neighbourhood of the Aegean Sea. This uprising was a manifestation of the collapse of the Ottoman Empire which became threatening in the 18th century and particularly in the 19th. At the same time the despotic power of Tsarism began to appear as an ever menacing shadow upon the Near East.

Russia, which in the 18th century was still only a semi-European power, with but a small share in European events, and not yet recognised during the 17th century by the Great Western capitalist powers as an equal, was now drawn by history into all European and world conflicts. Napoleon's march on Moscow was of prime historical importance, especially as it resulted in the march of Moscow upon Paris. The countries on the shores of the North Sea, which had not yet encountered the Eastern European conquerors, now saw for the first time the peoples of the Urals and Trans-Caucasia who had conquered French capitalism, to the advantage of British commerce.

From 1812 on, Russia was not merely a power, but a world power, the greatest world power next to England.

And from 1815 on, the Oriental Question was above all a Russian question, and this, in a double sense. For Russia, it was a matter of her expansion to the Mediterranean, which became as important a feature of her foreign policy as was the securing of an outlet to the Baltic Sea in the days of Peter the Great. For the Western Powers, the question was whether Russia should become the successor to the Byzantine Sultan, whether St. Sophia should become the seat of the Greco-Russian Orthodox Church and Russia should become a Mediterranean power. The Greek uprising and their war for liberation was supported by Russia in spite of the fact that they were rebelling against the legitimate authority of the Sultan; and at the same time they were supported by all those forces which, in the Europe of that day, were called "liberal". This revolt contained the germs of the later phases of the Oriental problem in the 19th century, even the imperialistic phase which preceded the world war. How was this? It was because, in relation to this revolt, Russia assumed the position of a Mediterranean power. In this Russian demand, as also in the demand for the free passage through the Straits, lay the historical results of the conflict with the British Empire, which already in the beginning of the 19th century, had endeavoured

to convert the Mediterranean into a strategic sea-route to India.

After the Crimean War, during the 19th century, this conflict did not come to any definite outbreak. In the last quarter of the 19th century it was relegated to the background by the fact that, after the Congress of Berlin, Prussia and Berlin rapidly became factors of considerable importance in Turkish affairs.

As soon as Germany ceased to be a factor in this conflict of forces, the Russian-British antagonism was to reappear in full force.

As soon as German imperialism was overthrown in the world war—the war in which Tsarism fought side by side with British imperialism in the hope of securing Constantinople, just as in 1812 they fought together with England in order to beat France—the antagonism between the interests of British imperialism and those of Russia came up again. Now, however, Russia is interested in the real freedom of the Straits. The interest of proletarian Russia in the freedom of the Straits is at the same time the interest of the proletariat of the world. The freedom of the Straits means that this important international gateway shall not be controlled by British Imperialism.

The interests of present proletarian Russia is in this respect not only identical with those of all the other peoples living on the shores of the Black Sea, but also, and to the same extent with the interests of the proletariat of the Western countries.

Comrades, this rivalry and the entire Eastern question which since 1822 became the crux of West European diplomacy and a peril for all the peoples, has its origin in the historic fact that the Ottoman Empire began to disintegrate in the beginning of the 19th century and seemed to be reduced suddenly to complete impotence.

It is necessary to recapitulate quite briefly the phases of this disintegration. The Ottoman Empire in reality became utterly impotent since the first decades of the 19th century. The big provincial pashas actually became independent setraps. But after the defeat of the Greeks a period of reform set in. The country was reorganised by Reshid Pasha. Under him, as well as under Ali and Fuad Pasha a strong bureaucracy was established which made use of the new means presented by young capitalism in subduing the provincial setraps. From being independent rulers, the Provincial Governors, most of them being of low origin, became creatures of the Porte. This system led finally to the establishment of Abdul Hamid's despotism, which rested principally on espionage and was controlled by court parasites. In 1909 this system collapsed. The bureaucracy which had made the establishment of a higher form of despotism possible, became itself a victim of the latter, and finally destroyed it at the time of the so-called Turkish revolution. Brailsford, one of the bourgeois historians who described it best, represented it pungently as bankrupt anarchy. However, European capitalism was clever enough to draw a considerable revenue from this bankrupt anarchy.

Comrades, our incomparable pioneer and theorist, Rosa Luxemburg, has proved in her greatest and best theoretical work that the process of the accumulation of capital is impossible without non-capitalist surroundings on which it has destructive influence, to put it differently, without older pre-capitalist forms of production which are destroyed by it.

However, apart from any theoretical deductions, it is a well established fact that, historically, capitalist accumulation in all its phases, including the last phase, cannot possibly take place without non-capitalist surroundings. Apart from the brilliant examples, contained in Rosa Luxemburg's book, the history of the Ottoman Empire is one of the most lucid examples of this fact. Rosa Luxemburg has also shown how the accumulation in all the historic phases is incomprehensible and cannot historically take place without the application of brute force. The entire colonial policy of capitalism from the 15th to the 20th century is a long series of proofs. The forms of force are manifold. The destruction of primitive economy, as well as of all pre-capitalist forms of economy is one of the principle forms. Capitalism is using various ways and means, and the ever increasing taxation is everywhere one of the most important of these means. Just as in British India, in the Dutch Indies, in the French North African possessions and in all the new colonial countries, this development has also taken place in the Turkish empire. Comrades, the well known British writer Brailsford, whom I already quoted, in his excellent work of "Macedonia" came to a Marxian conclusion. He described the struggles of the revolutionary Slav nationalities in Turkey under Abdul Hamid. He says for instance:

"In so far as European influence succeeded since the Crimean war in pressing on the Turks an illusory semblance of culture, it has only furthered weakness and disintegration."

And he adds:

"An even greater influence was perhaps exercised by the so-called capitulations, which created for the subjects of the so-called cultured Powers a State within the State."

Comrades, the capitulations, the historic origin of which was the power of the Ottoman rule and the weakness of the foreign capitalist western merchants, became in the course of historic development, one of the chief causes of the weakness of the East and especially of Turkey.

Comrades, the juridical and economic situation of the foreign attitude of capitalism to the powerless Eastern peoples which looks upon them as objects of relentless exploitation. The position of these foreign capitalists does not differ in the least from the privileged condition of the nobility in the old aristocratic monarchies previous to the bourgeois revolution. The nobility was also exempt from all taxation, and among other rights, had also the right to crush the common people underfoot. The only difference is that this modern capitalist aristocracy in Turkey, as well as in the other Eastern countries consists of elements alien to that country. This state of affairs would have been introduced after the war by Western European capitalism in Russia also, if it had succeeded in crushing the proletarian revolution. In fact, the capitulations are so to speak the crux of the domination of foreign capitalism over the East, which it not only exploits but also debases.

Comrades, it is self-evident that the new Turkey, which with the support of the peasant masses has won a victory over the hirelings of European capitalism, will demand at the peace negotiations the annulment of the capitulations, making the fulfilment of this demand so to speak a condition sine qua non.

Comrades, these few historic remarks show that the question of the annulment of the capitulations is a fundamental question for Turkey, as well as for all Eastern peoples. As long as they are not annulled, the state of brutal subjection to European capitalism remains.

Moreover, one can only understand the consequences of the Ottoman empire if one pays attention to the geographical, ethnographical and historic conditions of the Balkan Peninsula. They are important, as from them can be drawn an important deduction for the future, namely, the deduction that neither in ancient nor modern history was it a mere accident that the Balkans and Anatolia represented a political entity. The chief cause of all the historic problems of the Balkan Peninsula are to be found (as shown by the great Serbian geographer Ovigic) in its geographical position. While the two other South European peninsulas developed on the whole an equal nationality and culture, such as was never the case in the Balkan Peninsula. It brings about the widest separation between the races and nationalities inhabiting it. On the other hand, the Aegean Sea, as in times of yore, is still an element of union, not of separation. The geographical conditions are the direct cause of the great variety of ethnographical, anthropological and cultural relations on the peninsula. Geographers have distinguished no less than 4 different cultures with at least 6 languages. These geographical facts (which, as shown by our great masters Marx and Engels in their studies of the Crimean War with regard to Russia, are the determining factors in the history of nations) should have even prior to the Balkan War, served as the basis for the solution of the Balkan problem through the unity of the Balkans and the East. The Balkan Socialists had based their program upon these principles already before the Balkan war. But the infamous and double-faced policy of Tsarism, in conjunction with the other imperialist Great Powers, had done everything to prevent this unity. What was the position in the Balkans at the close of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th? As early as 1903 Brailsford wrote: "There is not a place on the face of the earth where the national idea has caused so much ruin, or has led to such irrational and irrelevant conclusions, as in Macedonia." He goes on to brandmark the misdeeds of English diplomacy in 1877, which hesitated to grant Macedonia her freedom for fear that she might unite with Greater Bulgaria, and this Greater Bulgaria would become a mighty ally of Russia. For Macedonia, the part of the peninsula where the radical war was assuming ever increasing acuteness since the close of the 19th century, it was indeed a puzzling question whether the Macedonian population was to belong to one or another of the Balkan States. All the bloodshed and cruelties, all the violence and outrages of the terrible years of the Macedonian revolts should be laid entirely at the door of the capitalist governments existing prior to the Turkish revolution. All the terrible experiences which make our blood boil even after the horrors of the world war, should equally be blamed on capitalism, as all the blood that had been shed in the Turko-Greek war. It is one long chain of cruel blood-shed.

Already in 1903, while pointing out the tragic role of the Great Powers, Brailsford also indicated another factor of annihilation and destruction, which continues to be active even today, namely, the power exercised by the Christian priests. Brailsford described the work of the Christian priests after due investigation on the spot and after thoroughgoing study of the influence of the bishops over the simple peasants. It was not for nothing that he used the expression: "They make a business of intolerance, and propaganda is their trade." The cross has become in the East the very emblem of war. He testifies that there is no trace of humanitarian sentiments left among the orthodox clergy. He demonstrates the depth of depravity to which the Greek Church has sunk. These servants of Christ are at loggerheads with each other; and in their mutual fights they constantly urge their followers to murder and assault, not only ministers of the same creed, but also of the same Church, for the Bulgarian Separatist Church differs in nothing from the Greek orthodox Church except in the fact of having a different administration. These fellows did nothing else but preach hatred and murder, with no other motives than those of the dishonest tradesmen trying to crush his rival.

These are historic facts that have to be borne in mind when one wants to have a thorough grasp of the situation and of the part played by the Greek clergy in the recent Greco-Turkish conflict, in which they displayed the same brutal characteristics. Since the Middle Ages, the Greek Church in the Near East has been a purely secular instrument of violence, without any spiritual aims, a mere machine for the exploitation of ignorance, of poverty, of superstition of the intimidated and terrorized peasant population.

Comrades, the era of the imperialist war was definitely opened for the Ottoman Empire by the Italian adventure in Tripoli in 1911. One is safe in asserting that there has never been a more brutal manifestation of imperialism. For the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria in 1918, there was at least the excuse of the actual occupation for some time previously, with certain definite results. The Italian onslaught lacked even the shadow of an excuse, except the thirst of the brute for blood. In looking back at the details of the case, I can only observe that the war was forced upon poor Italy by some big banks who did not make any secret of their brutal schemes. Italy started the war because it was dictated by the Banco di Roma. This murderous adventure was a striking example of imperialism in its most unadorned brutality.

The Italo-Turkish war, as you know, was localized, it did not lead to an international war. The reason was because Italy wished wisely to refrain from its "natural" appetites for expansion in Albania, preferring to make the latter its "ally" in the fight against Austria-Hungary.

Even after the Peace Treaty of Lausanne in 1912, the Italo-Turkish war has remained as the symptom of the appetites of the Great Powers, who did not wish to settle the problem of the Near East, because they already contemplated a world conflagration. That war was the direct cause of the second phase of the Imperialist conflict in the Balkans, because it has given the four Balkan States the opportunity to make their joint demands upon the Turkish Porte. It was thus the prelude to the terrible trilogy of war which was to lead to the world conflagration. The war brought to light for the first time the strong and weak points of the new Turkey of the 1908 revolution, which after the deposition of Abdul Hamid, was trying to remedy the consequences of the fatal past.

The Italo-Turkish war was of particular importance for the reason that it gave the strongest impulse to the awakening Islam. In this respect its significance is world wide. For the first time in that fatal year, 1911, which was also the year of the crisis in Morocco, Islam became conscious of its own importance, and manifested itself in the fullness of its power. A mighty shock went through out the Moslem World from the Straits of Gibraltar to the Moslem settlements in the Far East. What was the cause of this revival? It was naturally caused by a chain of circumstances, some of which we have already described. Incidentally those events furnished a new proof of the maxim that imperialism itself forges the weapons whereby it will ultimately be destroyed. A striking instance was that of the origin of the Tripolitan adventure. There is hardly any doubt that the French Colonial Imperialists, who at that time had the upper hand of the French Government, were primarily responsible for that adventure. Their principle motive was fear of the penetration or extension of the Turkish influence through Tripoli, through the remote regions beyond, down to the hinterland of Fexan, forming a continuous chain down to the Mediterranean at Bled-es-Sudan, in other words, to Central Africa. It was only recently that the young Turis had established

their influence in Tripoli. Their ambition was to restore the old influence of Stamboul all the way down to the Black Continent, where Islam is still a victorious and powerful religion. France and England concluded a treaty between themselves in 1899, limiting the borders of Tripoli to the desert, and taking away the populous and cultivated lands to the south of the desert. As late as in 1911 the French were still trying to extend their influence over the independent Moslem states in those regions. For instance, in 1910, they sustained a serious defeat in their fight against the Sultan of Wadai. The French Colonials saw a great menace in the policy of the young Turks. Because it hit them in the very heart, namely in the extension and consolidation of the French Colonial Empire, which was to cover the entire northwest of the black continent. It was for this reason that they were ready to go to war with Germany in 1911, i. e., to start a world war if necessary. This decided the attitude of France towards Turkey at that time. As long as Turkey retained a solid footing on the African continent she was dangerous, and the colonial imperialists of the Quay d'Orsay (The French Foreign Ministry) made use of the Italian peasants and workers as cannon food to beat the young Turks.

Thus we see that the Italian adventure in Tripoli was the outcome of the Turkish desire to regain at least part of its influence lost through the British occupation of Egypt with the consequent loss of the Sudan and the equatorial provinces, and to restore the mighty power of Islam. The Italian attack was the direct cause of a strong revival of the so-called Islamic fanaticism, of which the capitalist press made such an outcry at the time, in Egypt, in Tunis, in the whole of French North Africa, where the authority of the infidels was considered by the Mohammedan population as an unbearable burden. And no less an authority on Islam than the French Professor Le Chatelier, Editor of the "Revue du Monde Muselman", warned of the tremendous consequences that were to come to Europe from a reunion of Islam in all fields including the economic. Pan-Islamism became a first rank political factor as the direct result of the Italian piracy. It was only thanks to the short duration of the Italo-Turkish war that the movement of Islam did not spread even deeper around the shores of the Mediterranean. There came the opportunity to the African kingdom of Abyssinia, the only one which retained its independence, to renew its sea connection which had been severed by a previous Italian adventure in 1894.

Comrades, the Turko-Italian war was succeeded by the so-called war of the Allies the real Balkan war which was a direct consequence of the former. War engenders war. Imperialist violence engenders new and worse violence.

Czarism brought about the temporary reconciliation of the aspirations of the principal rivals, the Serbs, the Bulgars and the Greeks. However, this war did not bring a single one of the Balkan problems a step nearer to solution. On the contrary: it made the divergencies more acute, fanned the hatred of the national bourgeoisies to a greater heat, roused nationalist passion to the point of madness and finally brought all the Balkan peoples, even more than hitherto, under the domination of European imperialism and high finance. In this respect, it was a prelude to the world war, which was its counter-part on a gigantic scale. All these questions could have been clearly proved, at that time.

An especially clear example of these difficulties was the question of the future of the Aegean islands, the strategical and political value of which was known to the cabinets of all the European Powers, since the battle of Tchesme in 1700 when the Russian fleet destroyed the Turkish fleet. Stampalia, for instance, the most western of the islands of the Anatolian continent, was long ago known to the British Admiralty as a splendid maritime base. The islands to the East of Stampalia could not become Greek, because geographically they belonged to Asia Minor. The only satisfactory solution for the islands, as well as for all the parts of the Balkans, lay in a liberal measure of autonomy and in the federation of these parts. This applied equally to Asiatic Turkey, as well as to the remainder of the European Ottoman Empire. The war of 1912 taught the doctrinaire Young Turks that an empire like the Ottoman Empire with so many diverse nationalities and such varying cultural and other development could be ruled only from the centre through a sanguinary absolutism as that of Abdul Hamid.

Their attempts to extend the system of centralisation failed completely, and could not have done otherwise. Their parliamentarism was a caricature and absolute madness in a country which, for example, comprised Kurds and Albanians who still lived in their primitive tribal unions. The revolutionary Macedonian Committee as far back as 1903 brought forward the idea of the federation with autonomy to some parts of the Empire as the only means towards peaceful cultural development.

Although the Young Turks, in spite of being doctrinaire, did not conceive this idea, it must be said for them that every attempt at reform was frustrated by the policy of exploitation of the European capitalists. In the so-called Ottoman Debt European capitalism possessed a regular suction pump, a peculiar feature of which was—that the longer it was in operation, the more rapid and stronger was its suction. The Ottoman Debt became to be a completely independent State department within the Turkish State. Already in 1911 it controlled a revenue of over 5 million Turkish pounds, viz. about 5½ million pounds sterling while the Turkish budget amounted to 26 millions revenue and 33 millions expenditure. This deficit naturally necessitated continuous new loans, and the Ottoman Debt had at its disposal a large part of the most oppressive taxes. Thus, already in those days the poor Turkish peasants had to pay enormous yearly sums to the European financiers in the shape of taxes on sheep, salt, etc., and in tithes. These tithes alone amounted to at least 12½ % of the land revenue, and every Turkish peasant had thus to work on the land without pay for a whole month or longer for this part of the Ottoman Debt. On their accession to power, the Young Turks found the finances in a state of hopeless confusion and were almost immediately compelled to make great military preparations owing to the attack of the Danubian monarchy and two years later of that of Italy. Thus they were compelled to have recourse to new oppressive taxation. At the same time it was impossible to balance the budget. Neither was there a desire to do so, the tribute had to increase. The financiers had to be put in a position to pocket enormous new gains by means of new loans. The Balkan wars at least served this purpose. The belligerent State was burdened with over 1600 million francs in the shape of new loans. In spite of all this, the Young Turks were compelled to introduce measures which, had they been properly carried out, could have given a revolutionary character to the war. After the early and heavy defeats in the Autumn, peace negotiations and an armistice were brought about, while the creatures of Hamid again had power in their hands and were willing to accede to all the demands of the victors protected by the European diplomats. At that moment on January 23, 1913 the Young Turks carried out a coup d'Etat under the leadership of Enver Pasha, took power again into their hands and broke off the negotiations. This coup d'Etat presented at least an opportunity to rebel against the European imperialism. The action of Enver and his associates was certainly a clear demonstration of the growing fury of the entire Islamic world against the brutal policy of violence of the European Christian capitalists, and already at that time protests were received from all parts of the Islamic world against the policy to drive Turkey out of Europe. Thus, the Lucknow Congress of the Moslems of British India protested against the policy of the British government owing to Great Britain's desire to impose humiliating peace conditions on Constantinople. In Egypt too, the sympathy for imperilled Turkey grew from day to day and became more and more evident. At that time the European press began to realise the peril that the Young Turk's coup d'Etat represented for European big finance, if they were to make Anatolia the centre for national defence, and if, without ignoring the European financiers they were to utilise all the financial means at their disposal for the defence of the imperilled motherland. Comrades, should not this be also a lesson which the Turks of to-day, should take to heart? Unfortunately, the payment of dividends on the Turkish debt has again begun. In April 1921 a new part payment of dividends took place. Another payment took place on July 17, 1922. Thus it seems that the financiers of the Ottoman Debt not only intend to resume regular payment of dividends, but also to compensate the European bond holders for the losses incurred owing to the nonpayment of dividends during the years when Young Turkey was fighting for its existence. The European and imperialist Shylock wants to exact his pound of flesh, and the friendship displayed by the French bond-holders is explained by the fact that they were more hopeful than in the case of Soviet Russia to get compensation for their losses.

Comrades, it is necessary to reiterate that, if Turkey cannot extricate herself from under the burden of this indebtedness, as Russia has done, she will never be able to free herself from the yoke of European Imperialism. If the Angora Government refuses to take this view on the matter, the Turkish peasants and workers should struggle on and not give up the fight till they have secured their liberation. These peasants and workers have not shed their blood for eight years to provide fat profits for European Capital out of their toil and suffering. The Balkan War of 1912-13 had shown the strength as well as the weakness of the Turkish situation. At that time the weakness of the Young Turks lay especially in their fear of using revolutionary weapons against Imperialism, namely, by annulling the Ottoman Debt.

Its strength had then already shown itself in a most brilliant fashion in armed battle. Their position was even stronger at that time than in 1878. The Bulgarian forces were broken up on the Chatalja line, and, while the Allies were flying at each other's throats like madmen, it was easy for the Turks once more to seize East Thrace and Adrianople. Through their own shortsightedness it became impossible for the Christian Balkan States to drive the Turk out of Europe. The real historical and geographical reason for this, however, was that Constantinople is a point of contact and not a line of separation; that it reaches a hand to the West as much as to the East, and that the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles are not impassable mountain ranges as are, for instance, the Pindus, but are channels for traffic. From this point of view the Balkan struggle, which had been a direct prelude to the World War, also served as a foreboding of what is taking place to-day. Once again an effort was made to seize the Straits, and once again it has failed. The fratricidal slaughter which ended the Balkan struggle in 1913 was just as symptomatic. The Bulgarian rulers, having brought the nationalist struggle against Turkish despotism to its highest pitch in the first years of the twentieth century, and having extended their nationalist demands to the fullest degree, exceeding by far their geographical borders, had, through their victory, aroused the rivalry and the greed for power in their victims. The Bulgarians were the most merciless oppressors of their national enemies, and now Bulgaria must so humble herself that in this very humbleness she lays the germs of a new war.

In the summer of 1913 when Bucharest, after two years of exhaustive struggle, dictated peace terms to Bulgaria on July 28th, the only victor was European Imperialism, in spite of the fact that the Great Powers could not intervene. A whole year of the most frightful mass murder in Europe since 1870 brought the world not one step nearer any permanent solution of the Balkan problem. The Bucharest Peace brought about a situation which contained the greatest discontent and the probability of fatal results for the Allied Powers. Bulgaria was brought into a situation like that of France in 1871 after the loss of Alsace-Lorraine. The Bulgarian "revanche" then became the dominating factor among the Bulgarian bourgeoisie. Besides the strong desire for revenge over their three allied enemies a new source of disturbance came into being. The Albanians secured their independence and from then on were on a war footing with Serbia. With almost mathematical certainty one could have stated that from this war a new Balkan struggle was bound to emerge if a much greater catastrophe had not appeared on August 1st, 1914. And now, eight years after the world was first set on fire, and after the Balkans have suffered all the agonies of those years from 1914/18, the situation is potentially the same as in 1913. Once again they have suffered the hazards of war. The Turks, who, according to the English statesman Asquith, had been for ever banned from the European paradise, are now returned. The national rivalries in the Balkans are as bloody and as terrifying as ever. Once again Bulgaria has been overthrown and humiliated, the slave of European capitalism. And when one considers the situation of the other Balkan peoples, one notices only one apparent difference between now and 1913—their position is much worse and far more insecure. Greece has been once again crushed to death by her latest war against the Turks which her bourgeoisie forced upon her.

Comrade Radek has recently given us a description of the contemporary financial and economic situation of that country, which gave us a clear view of its present ailment. One may obtain a clear historical view of the situation by comparing the present condition of Greece with its condition previous to the Balkan war. In 1890 Greece had borrowed 570 million francs of which she only received 413 million. Every inhabitant of this small and poverty-stricken land was burdened with a share of this debt amounting to 260 gold francs. This debt necessitated in 1893 a fund of 58 million per year in gold francs, and as the total national income was much lower, bankruptcy appeared to be inevitable. A new war, that unhappy war which in 1897 Greece declared against Turkey, and which burdened the country yet more heavily, gave an opportunity to international finance once more to fasten upon Greece the financial shackles from which she had previously freed herself. An International Financial Commission was formed with full control over the fixing and imposition of taxes which had become necessary for the payment of the national debt, as well as for the payment of war indemnity to Turkey. Thus the Greek people were once more flung into indebtedness. But in this case it was not a question of the Turkish people or of any other Oriental people. The financial condition inaugurated new loans, of which high finance naturally took advantage. The Commission took over the disposition of the revenue from the various State monopolies as well as that of

some of the most important taxes. Greece had to pay about 40 million gold francs yearly as interest on this debt. This unhappy people paid in the form of salt, petroleum, matches, and other monopolies. As a result of this rigorous financial policy, international capitalism, during the Balkan war, extorted so much from this country that the national debt amounted to 824 million gold francs. In consequence of an improvement in the economic position, it became possible to balance the expenses and receipts of the State. It is true that this was only possible as the result of an unusually oppressive system of taxation, which, to an unbearable extent, increased the cost of living for all consumers and particularly for the workers. A result of this was emigration on a large scale, although the country was already thinly populated; and this hindered all progress in agriculture. But, on the eve of the Balkan war, through the greatest exertions, the country had been able at last to free itself from the control of the International Finance Commission and was in a condition to administer its own affairs so long as it could continue to pay its tribute. The Balkan war destroyed immediately the equilibrium which had just barely been attained with so much sacrifice and suffering. In 1904 the army and navy required an appropriation of 20 and a quarter million francs. In the year 1912-13 this appropriation rose to 450 million as a result of the war. They looked forward, however, to a normal budget of 130 million francs for army and navy in 1914. The country had now arrived at the stage of imperialistic expansion, in the service of European imperialism. Their conquests in the Balkan War gave them an increase in territorial area of 56,000 sq. kilometres and an increase of population amounting to 2,000,000. But the debts with which the old and the newer Greece were burdened, were much higher. The new provinces, and especially the large commercial city of Salonika, found themselves in dire economic straits, isolated from their natural hinterland and ruined through war and economic mismanagement. In short, the Balkan war condemned Greece again to a position which was in many ways far worse than that of the first years of the 20th century. Since then the world war and the war with Turkey intensified the process. Nowadays Greece has a shattered economic life, is financially helpless, is burdened with an atrocious indebtedness, and with a population of ragged refugees from Anatolia and Thrace. In fact, the country is now in a state far worse than any in which it found itself since the War of Independence. Such are the results of imperialism and the war for one of the victors of 1912-13. There is one thing alone that can aid the Balkan states and that is a powerful onslaught against Western imperialism and its lackey in their own countries. Above all they must get rid of the suffering burden which finance capital has laid upon the land and this would imply the cancellation of the Greek national debt. The condition of the greatly expanded kingdom of Serbia—now ironically termed "the Kingdom of the Serbs and the Croats"—is no better, and perhaps even worse, than that of Greece. For, besides its economic misfortunes which are just as great as those of Greece, Serbia has just been made the vassal of America. There now appears in Serbo-Croatia a furious political struggle. The Government can only fight the workers, and also the Croats, through terrorism and the suspension of constitutional guarantees. The unfortunate land has been for eight years ground to pieces between the millstones of history, and nothing remains of it now but chaff. Massacre and devastation have been its fate, and unless we take into account the courage and power of the communist workers, we may say that nothing has been improved. Even bourgeois observers are united in the opinion that the Kingdom of the Serbs and Croats is insecurely held together and that it will one day fall apart, even if the rulers in Belgrade are not forced on their own account to liquidate their centralised control and to grant considerable autonomy to the various national sections of the kingdom.

Comrades, the parallel with the conditions prevailing before the world war can be still more extended. At that time it was Italian imperialism that made the first attack in 1911 starting the conflagration in the Near East which is still continuing. Now, Italian imperialism, although belonging to the victors, so to speak, has become so powerless owing to its own exhaustion and to the growing power of the revolution in Italy, that it dare not any longer intervene in Near Eastern questions. It still occupies Dodecanese, which in fact still involves the peril of its intervention in the affairs of the Balkans and the Near East. However, it seemed to have given up its claims in Anatolia. The Italian bourgeois statesmen even sounded the imperialism of others. They themselves are innocent lambs. However, a new and menacing power has in the meantime risen out of the ruins of the pre-war imperialism. I refer to Fascism which is carrying nationalism to the same extreme as the Balkans did. The Fascists are now the power holding Italy's fate in their hands, and

Signor Mussolini has already said: "Once we have Italy, expansion will begin." There is no other outlet for expansion except beyond the Adriatic, which to the Italian nationalists has become a sea of their very own. The adventure of the poet D'Annunzio has shown, just as the world war, where such adventures lead to. It may lead to a collision with the Serbs, which would set aflame the peninsula on that side, owing to the fact that the Albanians would immediately become the allies of the Italian expansionists against the Serbs.

Comrades, the growing power of Fascism in Italy, this revival in a new form of the imperialist ideas, constitutes again a great danger not only for Italy itself, but also for the Balkans and consequently also for the Near East. It is the duty of the international proletariat to do its utmost to enable our Italian comrades to remove this new danger.

Comrades, the only Balkan country, the only Near Eastern State that has participated in the mighty struggle of 1911 to 1922 and issued from them stronger than before, is Turkey—an Islamic State.

The revival of Turkey, after the terrible events and awful losses of the Italo-Turkish war, of the Balkan wars, of the world war and finally of the Greco-Turkish war, was bound to appear like a miracle in the eyes of western Europe.

What the Anatolian peasants have achieved on the field of battle during these eleven years must seem to bourgeois Europe even a greater miracle, perhaps, than what Russia has done in that respect. Only recently a Dutch expert wrote as follows on this subject in the "Handelsblad":

"The surprising change in the Near East, which amazed even the best informed and most enthusiastic friends of Turkey raises the question of how it could happen that Turkey, which seemed altogether played out and doomed to death, a country whose material and moral strength seemed to have been quite exhausted by the four years world war, in which it demonstrated no particular capacity, should now amaze the whole world, exhibiting, in its complete isolation, such great abilities for organization and such a tremendous enthusiasm."

This is characteristic of the impression which the Turkish victories have produced on Europe during the last few months. The same author goes on as follows: "Plain Turkish generals and politicians showed a better understanding of the psychology of the Asiatic peoples than all the Mahomedan departments in the Ministries of the great western States, in Downing Street and elsewhere. It was quite definitely stated in London that Mustapha had come to the end of his tether with his national movement, and that his isolation in the midst of the Anatolian Plateau would lead the entire movement sooner or later to a complete fiasco. It is said that already during the world war Anatolia was bled white, and was a country of widows and orphans. The land was uncultivated; there was no labour power. The country was bound to lose its patience some time, and would turn against the nationalist leaders. Thus it was said in London. That Anatolia is actually a country of orphans and widows is correct. That after, having sacrificed millions of human beings, after four years of continuous war, it was able to deal such blows with its mailed fist as to drive the hiring of Great Britain into the sea, was only possible because of its faith in the national idea.

"A wait and see" policy does not suffice any longer. From the height of our European wisdom of obtuseness we must endeavour to grasp the ideas of Islam, not only in order to widen our knowledge, but simply out of an enlightened egotism and regard for our future. Otherwise, we might wake up one fine morning to find that the mighty gates of Asia have been closed to us forever."

Comrades, this gives you an idea of the deep impression made by the Turkish victories on the minds of more far-seeing observers. These victories found a still greater echo throughout the Islamic world. From the Pillars of Hercules to the Pacific islands has the Muezzin proclaimed anew the praise of the Anatolian soldiers and of their hero, the Ghaxi Kemal. Even a man so closely connected with the European rulers as the Grand Vizier of Morocco said in an interview in Geneva: "The Turkish victory has been a source of great joy to him as well, and aroused great enthusiasm in Morocco. For even though our country has no special relations with Turkey, our heart is with it. It is right that France should look after Turkish interests in the East. All Muslims must be grateful to France for this."

In this wide Mahomedan world, which is at present under the domination of France, with its millions of yellow, white, brown, and black Mahomedans of all races and tongues, it is only possible to manage them by bestowing, at least on the

ruling classes of Islam, as many favours and as much flattery as possible.

The French ruling classes have left nothing undone in this direction as far as this can be reconciled with their domination. The policy of assimilation has been carried out as far as possible. Moreover, France has secured its booty from the Turkish Empire. It has firmly established itself in Syria, where it certainly had old "claims", to use the diplomatic jargon, but had no hopes of getting a firm footing.

Comrades, it is not very difficult to explain the conciliatory part that militarist and imperialist France, the France of M. Poincaré, has played recently in the Eastern crisis. There are reasons of a general political character to which may be added more direct economic and financial reasons (of which we shall speak later). But the part played by Great Britain since the Turkish advance under the aegis of Mr. Lloyd George, is much more difficult to understand. One is even inclined to say that at first sight this part is hardly comprehensible. Mr. Lloyd George has taken up an attitude towards the Turks and towards Islam which seemed to be opposed to the real interests of the British Empire. One section of the British imperialist press was ready with a very simple explanation for the revival of the Turkish power which became apparent in September. This explanation was somewhat in the nature of magic, of something from the Arabian Nights, and bore the title of "The Hand of Moscow". Thus the "Times" wrote on October 6th: "A strange mixture of hisotric power seems to be congregating around the fatal city of Constantinople. In the foreground are the Turks, in the background—the power which rules Russia, an alien and sinister power with aims which do not harmonise with the Turkish national aspirations and which differ very definitely and strongly from everything for which the Allies went into the war".

The paper continues as follows:

"The Kemalists are allied with the Bolsheviks by a number of public and secret agreements and arrangements. The long period during which they were severed from the West through the war with Greece, did not leave them any other choice but an alliance with the Bolsheviks who came to their assistance with money and munitions, and who penetrated into all the secrets of their politics. Turkey was given a new lease of life through the support of Soviet Russia, not to prolong the life of Turkey, but to attack again Western culture in its weakest place, the Balkans, and to renew, by means of new disorders, revolutionary action in exhausted Europe."

"The Bolsheviks (the paper goes on), are endeavouring to make use of the Turkish national aims in order to get access to South Eastern Europe where unrest is ripe". The "Times" points to the chances which Bolshevism has at present of establishing itself in the Balkan countries, and says that it is the duty of the Allies to prevent the Bolsheviks from achieving these aims. Such arguments have probably also influenced the Party of Mr. Lloyd George.

Another, and a little more far-sighted section of the capitalist press has represented Mr. Lloyd George as the real war monger, just as he was during the world war. The reviewer of the liberal weekly, "The Nation", pointed out that, if peace was not disturbed already in the beginning of October, it was due only to the action of the moderate General Harrington, while Messrs. Lloyd George, Winston Churchill and Lord Birkenhead played the part of war mongers. The "New Statesman" also denounced the war party within the Cabinet to which Messrs. Lloyd George and Churchill belonged, and which decided, on its own accord, to drive the Turks by armed force out of the so-called neutral zone.

Perhaps the most characteristic and most biting criticism of the policy of the Lloyd George Cabinet in the recent Eastern crisis came from the pen of Mr. Garvin of the "Observer", the former admirer and standard-bearer of Mr. Lloyd George. He wrote as follows: "We must look a brutal fact straight into the face. The British Government, after a four years struggle, has irrevocably and ignominiously lost the great war in the East. The diplomatic Sevres porcelain is broken to bits, and the government was not clever enough to find support in the East through Russia, like Gladstone, or through Turkey, like Beaconsfield. The present Cabinet Ministers could do nothing but combine all the mistakes of all the former political orientations. It is absolutely necessary to cease once for all to throw out the baby with the bath water, and to go from one evil to greater evils. Instead of provoking Turkey and Russia together, and instead of repelling France and Italy and in addition undermining the foundations of our empire by making the whole of Islam our enemy, we must put an end to our tragic errors and infatuations. We must only discard the methods and the spirit which inspired

this policy, but we must retrace our steps, for, if we continue much longer in the same direction, the empire will be faced with greater perils than ever before".

A number of sensible bourgeois politicians have already come to the conclusion that, from the viewpoint of the British world Empire, Mr. Lloyd George's policy towards Turkey was a mad, not to say, criminal policy.

And if one lets facts speak for themselves, one must come to the same conclusion.

It is easy to find very simple material reasons for the anti-Turkish and pro-Greek attitude of Lloyd George, as Comrade Rosenberg has shown in his article in the "Inprecorr." Mr. Lloyd George has belonged for some time to a certain clique of big financiers connected with Greek business men. These Jewish Greek financiers have no doubt a great influence on him. This plutocratic influence was also alluded to from another direction, for instance, by the well known catholic writer, Chesterton. There is no doubt whatever that Lloyd George was also swayed by ideological influences, by his narrow and bigotted Christianity which makes him see in every Christian, be he even only a Greek or a Byzantine, a chosen being as compared with the cursed Turk.

At any rate it is a well established fact that Lloyd George's policy has done great harm to British prestige in the Near East and in the New Turkey. This became evident at the Conference of Mudania which resulted in the return of the Turks to Thrace, and consequently to Turkish domination over the Straits.

A big Dutch capitalist paper wrote as follows on October 11th when the chief results of the Conference became known: "The only thing which the British still have is the satisfaction that they remain for the present in Chanak, in order to secure the freedom of the Straits. But what is meant by the freedom of the Straits? The fourth paragraph of the National Pact of Angora reads as follows: "The security of the city of Constantinople, the residence of the Caliph, as well as the Sea of Marmora, against any attack. Regardless of this principle the Bosphorus and the Straits are to be free for the commercial fleets of all countries. This defines the meaning of the freedom of the Straits, and certainly does not mean that, after the return of both sides of the coast to the Turks, British warships can go freely backwards and forwards through the Straits. One can infer what Lloyd George meant by this freedom from his solemn declaration that it must never happen again. Should the Straits be closed in the event of war, as was the case in 1914 when Russia was confined to the Black Sea, and the allied fleets were prevented from getting into touch with its ally and the enemy was able to occupy Rumania up to the Black Sea. Thus, Lloyd George wishes that never again shall a cannon be fired at a British warship nor a torpedo be launched in the Dardanelles against the hulk of a British Man-of-War. This is an impossible desire. The League of Nations could obtain a kind of supervision over the demilitarization of the territory around the Straits. But, in the event of war, fortifications or no fortifications, Russia and Turkey would take measures against any enemy entering the Straits. Defensive work can be easily improvised. Obstructions consisting of mines can be easily constructed. In time of war the Straits will be again closed, because the Allies themselves admitted the Turks to both sides of the Straits. Thus, the solution of the freedom of the Straits for which the British Empire was ready to fight, is a hollow solution without any meaning."

This is a statement coming from a neutral capitalist side which makes it quite clear that in September Mr. Lloyd George wanted to fight for a position which he had already given up. The program of the New Turkey, which was once more formulated by Mustapha Kemal in Smyrna, has to a great extent already been realised by the Mudania Conference. At that time the Turks said that they demanded Asia Minor, Thrace up to the Maritza and Constantinople. We are willing to give every possible guarantee for free passage through the Dardanelles and we will undertake not to fortify them. It would be only right if the great Powers consented to the fortification of the coast of the Sea of Marmora for the protection of Constantinople against any surprise attacks.

This shows that what the Dutch paper wrote is perfectly correct. The freedom of the Straits becomes a solution without any meaning as soon as Turkey is again in complete possession of both shores of the Straits. Even if the so-called League of Nations were to guarantee this freedom, and Turkey were a member of this League, this formula would only have a meaning in time of peace, and peace in the Balkans depends on European imperialism and on whether the Balkan peoples will free themselves from the yoke of this imperialism, as well as from its aiders and abettors in their own countries.

In this same interview, Kemal enumerated among other peace conditions:

1. The annulment of the capitulations, which he rightly termed an infringement on Turkish independence,
2. the surrender of the Greek fleet, which otherwise would be a menace to the Anatolian coast,
3. damages for the devastations caused by the Greeks.

It would be premature at the present juncture to say anything about these demands. However, we miss one thing, namely, the demand for the annulment of the Ottoman Debt. If the Turkish people mean to be really free, it must insist on this demand.

During the interview, Kemal dwelt on a great factor which caused the new Turkey to be much stronger than the Turkey of old. At present it is almost a national entity. It does not comprise any longer the Arabian territories which gave so much trouble under the despotic reign of Abdul-Hammedan in which the Turkish soldiers had to perform police duties. Thus, the new Turkey is now in a position where it need not spend its strength in destructive nationalist struggles. At present these provinces do not any longer constitute an integral part of Turkey, and have become the prey of West European imperialism. For the present, Syria is under French domination. Palestine and Mesopotamia, which in name are mandatory countries of the League of Nations, are in reality under British domination. However it cannot be said that imperialism and especially British imperialism, has hitherto derived much satisfaction from these new conquests.

The story of the mandates over Palestine and Mesopotamia is a tale of prolonged misery, and the conditions are far from being settled.

The two predominating elements in Palestine, the Jews and the Arabs, are equally dissatisfied. If it is impossible to unravel the complicated history of this country during the last few years, even on general lines, one can at least safely say that British rule has not been able to bring about peaceful cooperation between the nationalities in the new Palestine. At present the country is on the eve of an election for some sort of a representative body. However, the Arabs have declared a boycott of this election. Moreover, the Pan-Islamic movement, with which we will deal more fully later on, is growing rapidly.

It can be said that in Irak the situation is even more complicated, and still more unfavourable for British imperialism. Permanent occupation would cost enormous sums of money, which would be in direct opposition to the efforts to decrease expenditures, which at present is the chief solution in all the capitalist countries for the crisis.

The occupation of Mesopotamia, which was the inevitable consequence of the war, has created for the British Empire a situation against which Brailsford uttered a warning even during the war in his book "A League of Nations", in which he said: "The occupation of Mesopotamia would weaken Great Britain strategically and politically."

Great Britain even now permits a kind of autonomous administration for Irak as well as for those parts of Arabian Continent which are in the British sphere of influence. Nay, this autonomous administration under British supremacy is even a dire necessity for Great Britain. However, it is precisely this autonomous administration which just in Egypt leads to the growth of the movement for the abolition of British supremacy.

According to the latest reports, a kind of agreement was arrived at in October in the city of Bagdad between the British High Commissioner, Sir Percy Cox, and the Premier of Irak. This agreement defines the position of Great Britain as a mandatory power in Irak, and is considered to be the first important step towards the establishment of an autonomous administration in Irak.

Moreover, Great Britain undertakes to bring about the admission of Irak into the League of Nations, by which act the British mandate would cease automatically.

News was also received that the British Government will do its utmost to regulate the frontiers of Irak. It is said that after the ratification of the agreement, the establishment of a stable government in conformity with the organic laws and the final definition of the frontiers, the British Government definitely expects that the Irak government will apply for admission into the League of Nations.

Comrades, there is still another example of the hypocritical policy of British imperialism. Just as in the case of the seemingly independent kingdom of Feisal, Great Britain is endeavouring to create yet another so-called independent Arabian State as an ally for itself. This ally is even to be allowed to

become a member of the League of Nations. Egypt, however, which is a Mohamedan state, and is supposed to be independent, must not be a part of this League—the tool of the Great Powers. There is every reason to believe that Great Britain is endeavouring to establish at all costs its supremacy on the mighty Arabian Continent. A well-known explorer, Mrs. Rosita Forbes, who is in the service of the British Government, left recently for the Arabian desert, carrying secret instructions. Probably, her business will be to bribe the Bedouin chiefs into a renewed alliance with Great Britain by means of gold and costly presents. In the Arabian Continent, nothing less than the route with India will be at stake during the next few years for Great Britain. If during the next few years the Arabian tribes and the Arabs in general desired to get rid of the British guardianship, the strategic bridge, which took Great Britain two hundred years to build, would collapse.

Such mighty questions are now at stake in the Near East. One might almost say: the orientation of the Arabs in the next few months or years will influence the orientation of world history in the Near East.

Comrades, Great Britain is endeavouring by all means to retain its supremacy in these countries, by cunning or by violence, according to circumstances.

The interests of the world proletariat, as well as those of Eastern Peoples, demand that this supremacy should be overthrown.

Iraq is probably the weakest and, strategically the most unfavourable position in the connecting link of the British Empire. Strategically, its position is much more unfavourable than that of Palestine or Egypt, and much more difficult to reach and to occupy than the two latter. Its population still consists mostly of nomadic tribes, which are not willing to submit to the British yoke. It is impossible to draw a regular frontier line with open desert on either side of it. Bribery and corruption are the only means by which something can be achieved with the free Bedouin tribes.

Comrades, you will realise the difficult position of British imperialism in the near East if you take into consideration this position in connection with the mighty extension of the strategic line in the Near East. For this entire Eastern world, from the frontiers of Beluchistan to the Mediterranean, from the British imperialist viewpoint, is nothing but a glacis of the fortress—India, traversed by a moat which is to constitute the connection between the two big seas on which the Empire is and must remain the master, namely the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean.

In 1918—19 British imperialism was still conducting an offensive throughout this mighty territory.

If one wishes to obtain a clear idea of the British offensive for this mighty front, which was a phase of the later stages of the world war, a front which extended over thousands of miles from Central Asia to the Black Sea, one could not do better than read the book of the British military officer who, on this matter, has perhaps told some tales out of school, and said more than was absolutely necessary. I mean the book of Captain L. V. S. Blacker of the Corps of Guides, entitled: "On Secret Patrol in Upper Asia"

In the preface of this highly interesting work, the well known British imperialist politician and strategist, Sir George Young-Husband says that a small number of British Indian Mohamedan troops annihilated 10,000 Bolsheviks and spread the fear of God and of the Indian soldiers under British leadership through thousands of kilometres of Asian territory.

One could not wish for a clearer statement of the world historic fact than that made by these military officers namely, that the world war, which was fought out in 1918 on the mighty field which stretches from the Pamir Plateau and Chinese Turkestan to the Black Sea, became automatically a struggle between proletarian Russia and the imperialism of Great Britain. The two irreconcilable enemies came into collision in this enormous mountain range which stretches over thousands of miles and in these immeasurable deserts, at the moment when the Proletarian Republic came into being and when the British Empire had reached the zenith of its power.

Since then British imperialism declined rapidly, while the power of the proletarian Republic ascended. And now, after the lapse of four years, the proud British Empire is already compelled to negotiate on equal terms with the new, dreaded and despised proletarian Power.

And what is worse still, it had to give in to the Islamic Power, which it imagined to have completely destroyed.

Comrades, this is a case which reminds one of the mighty changes of destiny which Shakespeare, the greatest British dramatist, has represented in his historical dramas, especially in Henry V.

However, what is most important is perhaps the fact that Captain Blacker boasts that Moslems from British India and Punjab under British leadership carried out the dirty work which they were told to do, and that (if London had willed it) they would have beaten the young Red Armies and would have throttled the Red Republic.

I will leave it to military experts to decide in how far this is correct from the military viewpoint. However, we know that at present the British officers and British militarism cannot dispose any longer of the Moslems of British India to the same extent as this was possible at that time and during the world war. Owing to the British policy, Moslem sentiment in India has become such, that Indian troops cannot again be used against the Soviet Republic. And if it were possible to use them again on such an errand, this would apply only to a very small section of them. However, it is our duty, comrades, to see to it that no Islamic soldier be used again as a mercenary against proletarian freedom.

We have again reached the main point of interest which the events in the Near East have furnished for the struggle of the world proletariat, for our Communist International, and for the overthrow of capitalism.

These events constitute a new phase in the huge and ever-developing fight which the Eastern world as a whole, and the Islamic world in particular, as the most pugnacious element, is waging against the dominion of European capital.

This revolt is of so great a significance for the history of the world that the proletarian International must pay more attention to the East than ever in the past, and must give all the support possible to the movement.

The Mussulman peoples do not merely comprise the greater part of the population of Asia and Asia Minor. Islam grows increasingly powerful in Africa, and has spread southward as far as the Zambesi. The independence of the oriental world and of the Moslems would imply the overthrow of western imperialism, and above all of British imperialism.

Imperialism cannot endure unless the imperialists retain their political dominion over the Asiatic peoples, unless they can continue to exploit the Mohamedans, the Hindoos, the Chinese and the other nations of the Far East. Why is this? Because the liberation of the Mohamedan and other Oriental peoples, will imply the cessation of the tribute they pay to European capitalism and without this tribute the accumulation of capital cannot continue.

Now an arrest of accumulation is the most deadly wound that can be inflicted on capital. It cuts off the blood supply, as we have been taught once more by the happenings of the last two years.

The movement, the revolution, which is now affecting the whole of the East, both near and far, and which will bring complete political independence to these regions, is irresistible.

The Mohamedan peoples aspire towards economic as well as towards political emancipation. That is why the movement among them is such a menace to western capitalism.

For some decades there has been in progress a powerful movement throughout the Mohamedan world. From time to time it has been so extensive as to bridge material and racial differences. I refer to the Pan-Islamic movement.

Stoddard, one of the most recent historians of Islam, has pointed out how greatly the events of the years immediately preceding the world war increased the spirit of solidarity among the Mohamedans and stimulated their hatred for Europeans. Just before the war, an influential Mohamedan statesman wrote as follows in the "Revue du Monde Muselman": "The events of the last ten years and the blows which have befallen the Mohamedan world, have aroused in Mohamedan bosoms hitherto unknown feelings of loyalty and devotion. Today the whole of Mohamedan world is inspired with hatred of all oppressors."

Stoddard specially emphasises the fact that this antipathy against the West is not confined to journalists and politicians but is shared by all strata of the population. Each class has its own particular reasons for hating European political dominance. All hate together; and this provides a common standard which may, when circumstances prove favourable, overrule every other feeling. The world war was greeted by the broad masses of the Mussulman people as a well-merited nemesis for western greed and western pride. The "Tanin" wrote on October 24, 1914: "They could not see the evils in their own lands or elsewhere, but they

made the most trifling incident an occasion for meddling in our affairs. Every day, on some pretext or other, they curtailed some of our rights or interfered with our sovereignty. They practiced vivisection on our quivering flesh, cutting large pieces away. On our side, we had forcibly to repress the feelings of revolt in our hearts. Impotently we clenched our fists. We preserved an agonised silence. But the fire burned within, and we said to ourselves: "If they would only attack one another, and hew one another to pieces. Lo! now they hew one another in pieces precisely as the Turks longed for them to do!"

To many far-sighted Mohamedans therefore, the world war brought food for rejoicing.

Stoddart maintains that the only reason why the great war was not promptly followed by a great Mohamedan rising was that the leaders of Islam did not think the time ripe for such a rising, and because speaking generally they condemned the action of the Young Turks in taking a side in the imperialist war. The true intellectual leaders of Pan-Islamism, the men at the head of the great Islamic brotherhoods (the Senusia) thought the moment inopportune. Materially, too, they were unprepared. They had no suitable arrangements made, and the Caliph's summons to the holy war bore too plainly the stamp "made in Germany". The far-seeing Mussulmans had no desire to throw themselves into the World War for the sake of one group of the contending imperialists. Although there were risings everywhere in Mohamedan countries under British and French rule, these were spontaneous outbursts, and were not supported by the great leaders. The view of the leaders was correct. All that happened during and after the war tended most powerfully to promote the energies of the Pan-Islamic movement.

Above all it became plain that the capitalist powers had learned nothing from the war. Everyone knows from the disclosures of the secret treaties that even while the war was in progress, the Powers were pursuing their policy of annexation and conquest. But what happened when peace came? Stoddard is no revolutionary, and we will leave to him the description of the effect which the Versailles Peace Conference had upon the Mohamedan peoples. He says that the doings of the European Imperialist Powers, the secret treaties dividing up the Mohamedan world, filled them with wrath and with an unprecedented sense of injustice. There was a surge of passion, heralding a yet greater storm. Since 1919 the tide of wrath has been rising ever higher.

"We must not," writes Stoddard, "allow ourselves to be misled by the fact that the revolts of the Mohamedan peoples of the Near East during the years from 1918 onwards have at first sight a nationalist aspect. Mohamedan Nationalism and Pan-Islamism, however different they may be, are identical in their aspiration towards the complete freeing of Islam from European political control. Islam is capable of constituting a sort of unity as against the capitalist world; for the bond which unites all the Mohamedans is something more than a religious bond. Islam is more than a religion: it is a complete social system: it is a civilisation with its own philosophy, culture and art. In the course of many centuries of struggle with the rival civilisation of Christianity it has become an organic and self-conscious whole."

After the Italian attack on Tripoli, Arminius Vambery, who is one of the greatest authorities on the Moslem world, wrote: "The more notable the increase in the power and authority of the West in the old world, the more intimate becomes the bond of unity and common interest among the various sections of the Asiatic population, and the fiercer burns their fanatical hatred for Europe."

Let me quote Stoddard once more, to give his description of the effects of the World War on the East in general and Islam in particular. "The war has ruined European prestige in the East and has opened the orientals' eyes to the weaknesses of the West. For the East the war was a liberal education. Think only how many millions of orientals and negroes were drawn from the remote forests of Asia and Africa to serve as labourers and soldiers in the white men's war. Although most of the accessory troops were engaged in colonial military operations, a million and more were transferred to European soil. In Europe they slaughtered white men, raped white women, fed on white men's dainties, became acquainted with white men's weaknesses, and returned to tell the tale among their own folks. Asia and Africa know Europe to-day as they never knew it before, and we may be certain that they will turn their knowledge to account. To-day, then, the situation is this: an East torn by conflicts between old and new, stands face to face with a West rent asunder by fierce enmities and sick unto death in consequence of its mad

folly. Never before were the possibilities in the relationship between the two worlds so incalculable and so threatening."

This bourgeois student of Islam is at one with the most noted Mohamedan men of learning in his conclusion, "The relationship between Western capitalism and the Eastern world, which for a century has been passing through its age of renaissance (a renaissance which may be said to have begun in Arabia at the opening of the XIXth century of our era)—the relationship between a capitalist world which is exhausted and undermined by the excess of its labours and the deepness of its wounds, which is profoundly disintegrated and has an enemy within its own household the revolutionary proletariat, and a Mohamedan world which in every respect, alike religious, cultural, political, and economic is rising out of the abyss of decay into which it has sunk during the eighteenth century—this relationship is once again as greatly strained as it was in the days of the Crusades when, after the appearance of the Turks in the Moslem world of the XIIIth century, one hundred years' war ensued between East and West."

In the century of warfare during the middle ages, the West bore off the palm of victory, and gathered strength from the struggle; even though deep and incurable wounds were inflicted on world civilisation.

Now the relationship has been reversed. Decadent Western capitalism is faced by the menace of the young and increasingly vigorous world of the East and of Islam, where countless millions have for decades been debased, misused, and exploited by imperialism, until at length they turn in revolt.

The West is weakened in energy and diminished in greatness. It has a foe within its own household, the revolutionary working class, which would have overthrown the whole structure long ago but for the support given to the tottering edifice by the socialist traitors. Nevertheless, the contrast with the years before the war is notable. Prior to the war, Czarism was quite as dangerous as Western imperialism to oriental freedom, to the freedom of the Mohamedan peoples. But Czarism has been destroyed, and Proletarian Russia has taken its place; Proletarian Russia, the friend of genuine self-determination, of the freedom of oriental nations.

Down to 1914, Germany was to all appearance, the friend of the Mohamedan peoples, but in reality she was just as savage and perfidious a foe. Germany has vanished as an imperialist power, and the Danubian monarchy, Germany's ally, has been destroyed. Down to 1914, Italy was one of the enemies of the independence of the Mohamedan States. Italy, however, has been so greatly weakened by the war that she seems to have renounced all her claims in the Balkans and Anatolia. She is merely able to maintain a pseudo-dominance in Libya, and her rule there will unquestionably be overthrown. The Italian proletariat need merely take a step forward after the many steps backward taken since 1920, and the desire to retain Lybia will no longer exist among the Italian imperialists.

Of the six great foes of Islam, but two remain, in addition to one lesser foe, Dutch capitalism, which during the war, had fed its full and which now acts as auxiliary in the wake of the British man-of-war. Two instead of six. British imperialism, seems to be acting somewhat more sanely towards the Islamic world. It seemed otherwise directly after the war. The bestial acts of the French troops under Couraud in the Near East are not yet forgotten.

At the end of 1921, Stoddard wrote in his book (After having described how serious was the situation in the Near East). "The most hopeful omen recently, is that the British Government is aware of the ever-increasing danger and has consequently begun to change its attitude. On the other hand the gloomiest omen in the Near East is France's irreconcilable stand. It would appear that the French policy has fallen a prey to its own traditions, and is fearful of looking reality in the face. If it ends in an explosion—and an explosion is bound to occur unless France alters her attitude—some day or other the scanty French forces will be swept away by a whirlwind of Arabian wrath rising out of the recesses of the desert. Should this happen, the judgment of all well acquainted with the Eastern question will certainly be that French policy has been cooked in broth of its own stewing."

It is clear that the well-informed author felt how extremely dangerous the situation in Syria was but a little while ago. He saw the simoon of Beduin fury sweeping over the French troops and with one blast clearing them all away. Since then French policy towards Islam has changed. Under what influence? The root of the matter lies in the general situation of French imperialism, to which I referred above, and one may assume that oil capital plays an important part. This is a very special kind of capital,

and I only allude to it in passing. It is more important to note that the hope (which Mr. Stoddard ventured to express in the year 1921) that British policy in regard to Islam would change, has suffered complete shipwreck. Lord Milner's attempts at reconciliation in Egypt have come to nought. All the observers who have recently been in Egypt are agreed that the Egyptian masses are openly in revolt against British capitalism and against the pseudo-constitution which Britain, under the protection of British bayonets has introduced. We may gather too, from recent reports how perilous is Britain's situation in Mesopotamia. We are in a position to affirm that British dominion in the border areas of Arabia, in Palestine, in the Sinai peninsula, in Irak and in Oman, depends upon a factor which is quite ignored in Europe. Its continuance depends upon the mood of the Bedouin sheiks in independent Arabia. One thing is clear, that the imperialist powers of the West are not only fighting one another over their various interests in the question of German reparations, but that in their Eastern policy they are likewise at one another's throats. Far from being friends they are all intriguing against one another.

The Pan-Islamic movement, however, has at its command such statesmen as the chief of the Senusia, whose spiritual influence among millions of Mohamedans is continually increasing, and who will certainly not refrain from turning to full advantage these clashes between the only two great enemies that still confront Islam. The intellectual leaders of Islam, are in no hurry, they will await a favourable moment and then (we may rest assured) they will deal a shrewd blow to one for or the other.

In this historical struggle for the political freeing of Islam, it is the duty of the revolutionary proletariat to watch closely, and to give the Mohamedans all possible moral and political support. The proletariat throughout the world has but one enemy—imperialism. But imperialism is not an integral whole and the proletariat is not its only irreconcilable foe. The chief enemy of the proletariat and also of the oriental and in especial of the Mussulman peoples is the British empire, whose world-embracing imperialism is founded upon (among other things) the hegemony of India and naval dominance in the Mediterranean and the Indian Ocean. It lies within the power of the Mohamedan peoples to break down the bridge that sustains British imperialism. Should this bridge fall, the whole structure will collapse, and its overthrow will have such mighty repercussions throughout the Orient and the Mahomedan world, that French imperialism, too, will fall in ruins. The liberation of the world of Islam especially the Near East from any kind of European political dominance, is not merely of interest to the dwellers in these lands, to the peasants and workers in those oriental regions which have not yet come under the yoke of capitalism—it is of enormous importance likewise to the Western European and to the world proletariat. This liberation would inevitably entail the collapse of western imperialism, the cancellation of the scandalous imperialist peace treaties, the success of the revolution in Europe, the addition of Western European Soviet Republics to the Central European and Eastern European States, the liberation and federation of the Balkan nationalities, and their integration to form a great Balkan league of the liberated Balkan republics.

The international proletariat therefore acclaims the political aspiration of the Mohamedan nations towards complete economic, financial, and political enfranchisement from the influence and dominance of the imperialist States; acclaims it as an aspiration which, even though it may not aim at the abolition of wage slavery and at private ownership of the means of production in Mohammedan lands, none the less menaces the foundations of European capitalism.

Roy:

(India)

The countries in the East can be divided into three categories. First, those countries which are nearing to most highly developed capitalism. Countries where not only the import of capital from the metropolis has developed industry, but a native capitalism has grown, leading to the rise of a bourgeoisie with a developed class consciousness, and its counterpart, the proletariat, which is also developing its class consciousness, and is engaged in an economic struggle which is gradually coming into its political stage. Second, those countries in which capitalist development has taken place but is still at the lower level, and in which feudalism is still the backbone of society. Then we have the third grade, where primitive conditions still prevail, where feudal patriarchy is the social order. How, then, for the countries under the leading of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, which can be divided into groups so apart from each other, a general program or a general line of tactics can be determined in order to help the development of the revolutionary

movement in those countries? The task before us to-day in this Fourth Congress is to elaborate those fundamental principles that were laid down by the Second Congress of the Communist International. We are faced to-day with a concrete problem of how best we can develop the movement in those countries; we have the revolutionary movement in each. But since the social structure of those countries is different, naturally the character of the revolutionary movement in those countries is also different. In so far as the social character is different the program for those movements must be different, and the tactics must also be different.

With this in view all the Eastern delegations present at this Congress in cooperation with the Eastern section of the Communist International, have prepared a thesis which has been submitted to the Congress. In this thesis the general situation in the East has been laid down and the development in the movement since the Second Congress has been pointed out and the general line which should determine the development of the movement in those countries has also been formulated.

At the time of the Second Congress, that is on the morrow of the Great Imperialist war, we found a general upheaval of the colonial people. This upheaval was brought about by the intensified economic exploitation during the war.

This great revolutionary upheaval attracted the attention of the whole world. We had a revolt in Egypt in 1919, and one of the Korean people in the same year. In the countries lying between these two extreme points there was to be noticed a revolutionary upheaval of more or less intensity and extensiveness. But at that time these movements were nothing but big spontaneous upheavals and since those days the various elements and social factors which went to the composition of these movements have clarified in so far as the social economic basis has gone on developing. Consequently we find to-day that the elements which were active participants in those movements two years ago are gradually leaving them if they have not already left them. For example, in the countries which are more developed capitalistically the upper level of the bourgeoisie, that is, that part of the bourgeoisie which has already what may be called a stake in the country, which has a large amount of capital invested, and which has built up an industry, is finding that to-day it is more convenient for its development to have imperialist protection. Because, when the great social upheaval that took place at the end of the war, developed into its revolutionary sweep it was not only the foreign imperialists but the native bourgeoisie as well who were terrified by its possibilities. The bourgeoisie in none of those countries is developed enough as yet to have the confidence of being able to take the place of foreign imperialism and to preserve law and order after the overthrow of imperialism. They are now really afraid that in case foreign rule is overthrown as a consequence of the development of this revolutionary upheaval, a period of anarchy, chaos and disturbance, of civil war will follow that will not be conducive to the promotion of their own interests. That is to say the industrial development of the bourgeoisie needs peace and order which was given to most of these countries by foreign imperialism. The threat to this peace and order, the possibility of disturbance and revolutionary upheaval, has made it more convenient for the native bourgeoisie to compromise with the imperial overlord.

This naturally has weakened the movement in some of the countries but at the same time this temporary compromise does not fundamentally weaken the movement. In order to maintain its hold in those countries, imperialism must look for some local help, must have some social basis, must have the support of one or other of the classes of native society. To-day it has found it necessary to repudiate the old methods of imperialist exploitation and it has given the native bourgeoisie or a certain part of the native bourgeoisie certain concessions in the political or economic sphere. These concessions have reconciled the native bourgeoisie temporarily, but they have opened a bigger vision before it. They have permitted a test of economic development and brought into existence a capitalist rivalry, because, in so far as industry grows in the colonial countries it undermines the basis of the monopoly of imperial capital.

Therefore, the temporary compromise between native and imperial bourgeoisie cannot be everlasting. In this compromise we can find the development of a future conflict.

Then, in that second group of countries where usury and trade capital, feudal bureaucracy and feudal militarism are the leading social element and the leaders of the national movement, this compromising imperial policy has been introduced, but it has not given such satisfactory results as in the other countries because the interest of the feudal bureaucracy and the colonial feudal lords are not so easily comparable as is the case between the imperial and the native bourgeoisie. Therefore we find that in the last year the struggle in Turkey, the nationalist struggle in Turkey, took the forefront of all the colonial struggles.

But the latest events in Turkey show us the weakness of this as well, because we know that a national struggle cannot develop consciousness of political nationhood, cannot grow in a people, so long as the social economics of that particular people are bound up with the feudal patriarchal system. Unless the bourgeoisie come into existence and become leaders of the society the national struggle cannot take place with all its revolutionary possibilities. So in all these countries, in proportion as the bourgeoisie is developing, the national struggle has become intensified. From this point of view, although we know there is danger of the colonial bourgeoisie always compromising with the imperial bourgeoisie, we must always on principle stand for them; that a bourgeois national movement in the colonial countries is objectively revolutionary, therefore it should be given support; but we should not overlook the fact that this objective force cannot be accepted as unconditional, and that particular historical reasons should be taken into consideration. The bourgeoisie becomes a revolutionary factor when it raises the standard of revolt against backward, antiquated forms of society—that is, when the struggle is fundamentally against the feudal order, the bourgeoisie leading the people. Then the bourgeoisie is the vanguard of the revolution.

But this cannot be said about the new bourgeoisie in the Eastern countries, or most of them. Although the bourgeoisie is leading the struggle there, it is at the same time not leading it against feudalism. It is leading the struggle against capitalism. Therefore it is a struggle of the weak and suppressed and undeveloped bourgeoisie against a stronger and more developed bourgeoisie. Instead of being a class war it is an internecine war so to say, and as such contains the elements of compromise.

So, the nationalist struggle in the colonies, the revolutionary movement for national development in the colonies, cannot be based purely and simply on a movement inspired by bourgeois ideology and led by the bourgeoisie. And we see how that in every country all these leading factors—the liberal bourgeoisie in the most advanced countries, and the feudal military cliques in the second group of these countries—are gradually trying to make some compromise with the imperial overlord and imperial capitalism.

This position brings us face to face with a problem as to whether there is a possibility of another social factor going into this struggle and wresting the leadership from the hands of those who are leading the struggle so far.

We find in these countries where capitalism is sufficiently developed that such a social factor is already coming into existence. We find in these countries the creation of a proletarian class, and where the penetration of capitalism has undermined the peasantry, bringing into existence a vast mass of poor and landless agrarian toilers. This mass is being gradually drawn into the struggle which is no longer purely economic, but which assumes every day a more and more political character. So also in the countries where feudalism and the feudal military cliques are still holding leadership, we find the development and growth of an agrarian movement. In every conflict, in every struggle, we find that the interests of imperial capital are identical with the native landowning and feudal class, and that therefore when the masses of the people rise, when the national movement assumes revolutionary proportions, it threatens not only the imperial capital and foreign overlordship, but it finds also the native upper class allied with foreign exploiters.

Hence we see in the colonial countries a triangular fight developing, a fight which is directed at the same time against foreign imperialism and the native upper class which directly or indirectly strengthens and gives support to foreign imperialism.

And this is the fundamental issue of the thing that we have to find out—How the native bourgeoisie and the native upper class, whose interest conflicts with imperialism or whose economic development is obstructed by imperial domination, can be encouraged and helped to undertake a fight? We have to find out how the objective revolutionary significance of these factors can be utilised. At the same time we must keep it definitely in mind that these factors can operate only so far and no further. We must know that they will go to a certain extent and then they try to stop the revolution. We have already seen this in practical experience in almost all the countries. A review of the movement in all Eastern countries in the last few years would have helped us to develop our point, but the time at our disposal will not permit that. However, I believe most of you are fairly well acquainted with the development of the movement in those countries. You know how the movement in Egypt and India has been brought to a standstill by the timidity, the hesitation of the bourgeoisie, how a great revolutionary movement which involved the wide masses of the peasantry and the working class and which constituted a serious menace to imperialism, could not produce any very serious damage to imperialism simply because

th leadership of this movement was in the hands of the bourgeoisie.

The bourgeoisie was divided into two parts—the upper layer, which was developed industrially and owning big industrial and commercial interests interlinked with imperial capital, found it dangerous for their extension, and therefore went over to the imperials thus constituting itself a positive obstruction to the revolutionary nationalist movement weak social background. Did it not have the determination, the courage, to put itself at the head of this big revolutionary movement to lead it forward, and the movement consequently, betrayed and misled by these elements has come to its present period of depression.

Then, on the other hand, we have the example of the Turkish struggle. This struggle is contemporary and you know how the imminent victory of the Turkish people had not been carried on to its logical consequences by the feudal military clique which stands at its head to-day. The ultimate victory of the Turkish people, the complete political and economic liberation of the Turkish nation, has been and is going to be compromised in order to safeguard the interests of the small feudal military clique which has found it convenient to sell itself to one group of imperialists as against another group. That clique found it convenient to ally with one group of imperialists against another. This might lead to the aggrandisement of this group and to the enthronement of Mustapha Kemal Pasha in place of the Sultan who was largely in the hands of British Imperialism, but it does not solve the Turkish national problem in any way. And we know that while two or three months ago the revolutionary elements all over the world were hailing the victories of Mustapha Kemal Pasha, we now have the news that Kemal in a free Turkey, freed by the efforts of the revolutionary workers and peasants, is brutally persecuting the latter. Hence it is proved that although the bourgeoisie and the feudal military clique in one or other of these countries can assume the leadership of the nationalist revolutionary struggle, there comes a time when these people are bound to betray the movement and become a counter-revolutionary force. Unless we are prepared to train politically the other social element which is objectively more revolutionary to step into their places and assume the leadership, the ultimate victory of the nationalist struggle becomes problematical for the time being. Although two years ago we did not think of this problem so clearly, this tendency remained there as an objective tendency, and to-day, as a result of that, we have in almost all Eastern countries communist parties, political parties of the masses. We know that these communist parties in most of these countries cannot be called communist parties in the Western sense, but their existence prove that social factors are there, demanding political parties, not bourgeois political parties, but political parties which will express and reflect the demands, interests aspirations of the masses of the people, peasants and workers, as against that kind of nationalism which merely stands for the economic development and the political aggrandisement of the native bourgeoisie. The existence of these communist parties in these Eastern countries and their historic rôle becomes more significant when we look at the matter from the other point of view, when we look at it from the point of view, that on account of the misfortune that the bourgeoisie came into the field in the colonial and semi-colonial countries a little too late (150 years later), they are not going to play the rôle of liberators, because they will and can go so far and no farther. Therefore the nationalist revolutionary movement in these countries where millions and millions must have national liberation—must free themselves economically and politically from Imperialism before they can progress further—is not going to be successful under the leadership of the bourgeoisie.

Therefore we find the necessity of these communist parties, which at the present moment cannot be called more than nuclei, are destined to play a big rôle in so far as they will assume the leadership of the national revolutionary struggle when it is deserted and betrayed by the bourgeoisie. They will be able to carry on the struggle for liberation against Imperialism. They alone will be in a position to lead the colonial peoples and oppressed nationalities to the conquest of complete political and economic independence.

These parties are historically destined for and socially capable of this task because they are based on the objectively most revolutionary factors, viz., the peasants and workers—the factor which has no interest in common with Imperialism and whose social position and economic conditions cannot be improved in any way so long as these countries are under capitalist imperialism.

It is under the leadership, therefore, of a political party representing the workers and peasants, that the national revolutionary struggle can come to final victory.

Now comrades, this necessity of organising Communist Parties in these countries brings us to the program and tactics of these Communist Parties. I should point out the necessity that while the Communist International is discussing the problem of a program it should pay serious attention to this, in view of the fact that to develop the program of the International in the Eastern countries is more complicated. It is more complicated because (unfortunately it is to be confessed) our comrades of the Communist International so far have devoted very little time to the study of these questions.

Before we can have a program on this question, develop a line of tactics which could be adopted by the Communist Parties in Eastern countries, it is necessary that the various sections of the International pay a little more attention to and study these questions a little more carefully. It should not be gratuitous work on their part, because capitalism—the power of the bourgeoisie, in their own countries is to-day very closely interlinked with the situation in the colonial countries; because imperialism today is trying to save itself by developing colonial countries industrially. During the war imperialism, particularly British imperialism, found it necessary to slacken its monopoly rights over the economic and industrial life of the backward colonial countries. So, a country like India, which was maintained as an agricultural reserve, as a source of raw material for British industries for more than 150 years, was allowed sufficient industrial development during the war. The dislocation of the capitalist equilibrium in Europe, forces Imperialism to look out for new markets by which the equilibrium of world capitalism can be re-established. They are trying to find this in the colonial countries by developing industrially countries like India and China: they are trying to find the solution of the problem that way. Depending on the resources in the colonial countries, imperialism tries to carry its offensive against the European Proletariat to a crushing victory. We must not lose sight of this tendency. We may argue this way: Well, this cannot be done because imperialism means that colonial countries should be left in a backward state economically so that the goods manufactured in the metropolitan countries can be sold there. Yes, but that is a very mechanical way of looking on these things. We must not forget that if the coat tail of the Chinaman is lengthened by a few inches the textile production of the world will have to be doubled. By industrial development the standard of living of 400 million Chinese can be raised and thus the textile production of the world doubled. Industrial development of China does not necessarily mean the contraction of production in the home countries. These countries when they are industrially developing must have machinery, etc. which they cannot produce by themselves, and so while perhaps in certain kinds of goods the colonial market can be limited and reduced, yet so far as machinery is concerned they must be extended.

Then again that part of the production of England and other countries which used to be sold in central and Western European markets must find new consumers, and this can be done in the colonial countries by developing the power of consumption.

So, you see the re-adjustment of imperial capital with the native capital in the colonial and semi-colonial countries will play a big part in the wide scheme of capitalist offensive. In order to be able to fight the capitalist offensive in European countries we must coordinate our forces with the movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The experience of the last two years in coordinating our forces with the bourgeois nationalist parties in these countries shows that through the medium of these parties we can utilize the bourgeois revolutionary parties to the greatest extent.

This leads us to the question of the united anti-imperialist front. Side by side with the United Labour Front in the Western countries we must organise the united anti-imperialist front in the colonial and semi-colonial countries. The object of this anti-imperialist United Front is to organise all the available revolutionary forces in a big United front, against imperialism. The organisations of this front, the experience of the last two years has shown us, could not be realised under the leadership of the bourgeois parties. So we have to develop our parties in these countries in order to take the lead in the organisation of this front. Just as the tactics of the united proletarian front leads to accumulation of organisational strength in the Western countries and unmasks and discloses the treachery and compromising tactics of the Social-Democratic Party by bringing them into active conflict, so will the campaign of the united anti-imperialist front in the colonial countries liberate the leadership of the movement from the timid and hesitating bourgeoisie and bring

the masses more actively in the forefront, through the most revolutionary social elements which constitute the basis of the movement, thereby securing the final victory.

Katayama:

(Japan.)

Comrades, I stand here to present the Japanese case and also the case of the Far East. Japan occupies a very important place as to the coming Socialist revolution. Japan is the only country which is really economically and politically independent in the Far East. Japan is important in the revolutionary movement of the world because in the near future the workers of Japan may rise against the capitalists. This is the reason why I want your serious attention. We all know, and I do not need to tell you that we must protect the Russian Revolution. Soviet Russia is menaced by Japanese Imperialism, and for this reason alone the Fourth Congress and the Communists of the world should pay more attention to this subject than they have. During the Congress Japan is represented here in order to make progress in the social revolution of the world. This is the reason, comrades, I want to read what I presented in my report on Japan and Japanese conditions. I want to give you a few facts. They are facts which give you some idea of what Japan is:

Population	56,000,000
Wealth estimated at	87,000,000,000 yen
Products, 1917	8,372,000,000 "
" 1918	5,608,000,000 "

Japan is the most industrial country in the Far East and I will read now the figures:

Workers	Men.	Minors	Women.	Total.
Government Employees	133,000	—	43,000	176,000
Factory employing 10 or more	706,000	—	814,000	1,520,000
Miners	353,000	—	112,000	465,000
Forestry	564,000	—	147,000	711,000
Fishery	617,000	20,000	170,000	807,000
Railway Workers	2,378,000	20,000	1,186,000	3,860,000
Agrarian Workers	1,856,000	55,000	1,402,000	3,293,000
Grammar School Teachers	173,000	—	53,000	226,000

Altogether there are 11,064,000 workers

These are wage workers, exploited in some cases very much. The work-day in the spinning factory consists of 11 and 12 hours and there are also night shifts. Women and young girls work these hours in the factory. Besides this there are 4,160,000 families of poor peasantry and combined tenantry.

Among these workers some industrial proletarians are organised: in 1920 there were 838 unions with a membership of 269,000 and in 1921—671 unions with a membership of 264,000 and 229 tenant unions with a membership of 24,000. There has, of course, been an increase since that time. The Landowners' Union which with the exception of 225, is really a peasant proprietors' union, has a membership of 1,422,000. There are also mutual aid associations. In 1920 there were 685 with a membership of 2,000,000. These unions aided 3,169,000 persons with money amounting to 1,551,000 yen.

Comrades, these are bare facts based upon a government report. Of course as to the labour unions, the government has tried to minimise their number; we have more. The Japanese workers are oppressed and exploited by the militarist government. They are suppressed whenever they start a liberal movement, but they are awakening. The Japanese workers have had to learn European technique and how to conduct European industry. It took somewhere between 40 and 50 years, and they have learned all the technique during this short time. I well remember when I was thirteen or fourteen years of age, there were no factories worth mentioning, there were only 25 miles of railroads in the whole of Japan and we had not even heard of coal or kerosine. We only used the candle for lighting purposes. We had no machines in Japan except the water wheel and the hand spinning wheel.

But to-day we have 6,000 miles of railroads, 4,000,000 tons of steamships. And I am ashamed to tell you that we have 700,000 tons of warships. So in forty or fifty years the Japanese have learned how to build steamships, and locomotives, how to build complicated machines, and the workers are finding themselves more and more oppressed. They have also been

compelled to learn the art of warfare. Japan went to war in 1894 with China, in 1904 with Russia. They sacrificed themselves and became cannon fodder, but they found out that they were only fighting for the capitalists of Japan. This is a great revelation to the Japanese workers. They have learned not only this complicated modern industrial technique, but also they have organized a labour movement. Our labour unions are very weak yet, but I tell you in Japan there is no Henderson, no Gompers. They do not care about the union fund, the union property, they are fighting for the revolutionising of Japan. They are demanding, besides the increase of wages, the shortening of hours, the control of the industry, determined to carry on their fight for a new society. Our union leaders understand the capitalist conditions and are showing the workers that the capitalist system cannot remedy the unemployment problem, and that it will never be remedied until the destruction of capitalism.

Comrades our workers are far behind in the matter of a labour movement, but I tell you we have no traditional obstructions, or reactionary labour aristocracy, therefore the Japanese workers are progressing faster than those of other countries. Most of the unions have been started recently, that is a few years ago. But one union had been organized about eleven years ago. I wish to show you how the Japanese labour movement has been making progress. The Yual Kai (Japanese Federation of Labour) was started eleven years ago for the purpose of educating workers. It was founded by a university graduate, who claimed the friendship of the prefect of police in Tokio. And although this movement was started as an educational movement at that time it caused great surprise. Suzuki was allowed to make a labour movement—being the personal friend of the Chief of the detective bureau, and he was very proud of it. The police even helped him distribute the organ of the Japanese Federation of Labour. But the workers were not satisfied with a merely educational organization, and within a short time it had grown very rapidly. Tens of thousands of workers came together under the Japanese Federation of Labour. Then it formed industrial unions, and these industrial unions gradually became strong and radical in spite of the bourgeois founder. First, it became socialistic, and last October they held a meeting and decidedly became Bolshevik. It has 120,000 workers and 63 affiliated different unions. At their annual meeting held last October, they decided among other things that they must make ready for a general strike for 24 hours on May Day. They voted for the immediate recognition of Soviet Russia, and they voted for the abolition of the labour bureau of the League of Nations. They voted to make propaganda for more radical text books. For in Japan as in America the schools are supplied with textbooks which poison the minds of the children in favour of the imperialist and capitalist classes. We must make propaganda for the elimination of militarism, and jingoism.

This shows that in ten years this union which was formed under the protection of the police, has become a strong and revolutionary union, the Left Wing of which has sent a delegate to affiliate with the Red Trade Union International. This is a fact which shows how the Japanese labour movement has been making progress. Comrades, have firm faith in the Japanese Labour movement. The Japanese workers have learnt industrial technique, they have learnt how to conduct model industry in a generation or a generation and a half which took the European workers more than a century to learn. Since the Japanese industry has been built up in such a short time by the workers, I contend that the Japanese workers will learn how to conduct the revolutionary struggle not only for Japan itself but for the entire Far East.

It is a fact that already Japanese workers and Korean workers, especially the independent revolutionaries of Korea, are cooperating in the work of revolutionising the Far East. I know the Japanese workers are somewhat despised as cheap labourers abroad, I know that is a factor in North America, Canada, and Australia, but comrades, I tell you that the Japanese revolutionary workers, in fact, the entire membership of the Trade Unions do not complain about the anti-Japanese movement of North America or Australia. They have more important work to do than to complain of the anti-Japanese movement in those countries. The Japanese workers are fighting and protesting against the exclusion of the Chinese labourer, and the Japanese unions are fighting the capitalists who cruelly exploit Korean labour. The Korean labour organizations in Japan are affiliated with the Japanese Federation of Labour. They are looking forward to the complete emancipation of the working class under the influence of the Russian Revolution. Therefore, I want to assure my comrades from those countries in which there is an anti-Japanese movement that the Japanese workers, the

advanced revolutionary workers, the fighting unions are not troubling about these anti-Japanese movements. They will look to you to create a united front against the imperialism and the capitalism of the whole world. I am glad to say the Japanese workers have already started to work for the united front in the Far East. Under the auspices of Soviet Russia and the Comintern we had a Far Eastern Conference last February and March, and we established a united front. The starting point was that the Japanese, Chinese and Korean Communists were to create a United Front against Japanese Imperialism. Comrades from the West, I want to say at this point, that though you may in your countries think little of the Japanese workers, you will agree to attempt to crush Japanese imperialism. Will you not? We are organized under this banner to fight against Japanese imperialism in the Far East.

I want to say a word now about the women's movement, because it has been somewhat neglected at this Fourth Congress. Japanese women workers are very much exploited. They are prisoners in the companies' dormitories and they work twelve hours, both in day shifts and night shifts. Formerly Japanese women were prohibited from attending political meetings and forming political associations. But these restrictions have now been abolished. Japanese women are being educated in the highest educational institutions in the country, and they are utilizing their education for the improvement of their position. They are not only taking part in the political life of the nation but many have already joined trade unions. There are several thousand women members in the Japanese Federation of Labour. When a strike occurs the women are very active. They assist the strikers in many ways. They even hold public meetings and make speeches which are so interesting and imposing that even the capitalist papers sometimes report. Thus the Japanese women workers are at last awakening. Girls have been receiving the same education as boys in Grammar schools.

Now, comrades, as to the Far East, Korea has been awakened nationally. Their independence movement has been growing stronger, and although it was not known recently, they are now organizing for the final work. They found out that in order to carry on a successful fight for Korean independence they had to cooperate with the workers of Japan.

Japanese imperialism has become very unpopular amongst the Japanese workers, but is still very strong. I will give you an instance. Formerly, when a Japanese mother wanted to frighten her child she would say that she would put him to prison, but to-day she threatens that she will make a soldier of him. The imperialists are preparing for the next war. Therefore, we in conjunction with the Chinese Delegation propose that this Fourth Congress of the Communist International should pass a resolution against the occupation by Japan of Northern Saghalin, and encourage the Japanese revolutionary workers to fight against imperialism, and to prepare for the coming revolution in Japan.

Chairman Carr: Before calling on the next speaker, I will read you a resolution sent in by the Japanese and Chinese Delegation:

"The Japanese and Chinese Delegations at the IV Congress of the III Communist International propose the following resolution on the question of the occupation of the Russian section of Saghalin by the Japanese imperialists:

"The IV World Congress of the III Communist International sends greetings to the working population of the Russian section of Saghalin and of the Far East, as well as to the working class of Japan, and strongly condemns the Japanese imperialists who during the last 4 years have tormented the workers and peasants of Siberia."

"The evacuation of the imperialists from the maritime and the Amur regions, and finally also from Vladivostok, is the result of the heroic resistance of the working class population of the Russian Far East, and especially of the proletariat of the maritime region, and also the result of the ever growing indignation of the wide working masses of Japan against the intervention and the government of the Mikado.

"While compelled to evacuate Siberia and the maritime region, the Japanese imperialists are still in occupation of Russian Saghalin, are still keeping the Russian population there in subjection, and from this position are still a menace to the young soviet social order in those territories of the Far East.

"The International proletariat is convinced that the time is not far distant when the militarist clique, which is now ruling over the Japanese workers and peasants, will stand before the tribunal of the Japanese proletariat and will be compelled to

answer for its numerous crimes, including those committed in the Russian Far East"

Chairman Carr: Before we adjourn, certain important announcements have to be made. I call on comrade Beron.

Beron: The Presidium proposes that the Congress should despatch the following telegram:

"To the Shop Stewards Congress, Neue Welt, Berlin-Neukölln:

Dear Comrades,

We follow your movement with great interest. You meet in a dark hour to show the way to the German working class to free itself from misery and destitution. The capitalist offensive grows more acute from day to day. Its chief attack is now directed against the eight hour day. The social democratic leaders and the trade union bureaucrats are supporting this attack actively and passively. They sabotage every defensive action of the proletariat, and they do not even scruple to split the trade unions in the interests of the capitalists. The most important question at present is the formation of a united proletarian fighting front for the defence of the eight-hour day, for insuring sufficient food for the workers' control of production, and to oppose the organization of German fascism by the formation of the Arbeiter Wehr. In obedience to the

demands of the hour, the IV Congress of the Comintern and the II World Congress of the Red Trade Union International will address an open letter to the 2 and 2½ Internationals, as well as to the Parties and trade unions adhering to them, inviting them to participate in common action for the above mentioned demands.

Go on with your work, persistently and energetically. The Shop Stewards movement must be the rallying ground for the defensive struggle of the workers. It must conduct this defensive struggle on the widest possible basis. If you succeed in the teeth of resistance, to establish a united front you will have created the most important condition for the defensive struggle, nay, even for the transition to the offensive.

We, the representatives of the revolutionary workers of the whole world, gathered here in Moscow, wish success to your work and send you our revolutionary fraternal greetings."

The Fourth World Congress of the Communist International.

The Second World Congress of the Red Trade Union International.

Moscow, Nov., 1922.