

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. (Prolonged applause.)

Chairman Neurath: While the translation is being made, I wish to announce that there will be no session to-night. But the Presidium will meet at 6 p.m. There will be other conferences as follows:

The Versailles Peace Commission at 5 p.m.

The Small Italian Commission at 6.45 p.m.

The French Commission at 7 p.m.

The Agrarian Commission at 6.30 p.m.

The Czecho-Slovakian Commission at 8 p.m., and the Negro Commission at 12 p.m.

The Latvian, Rumanian, Bulgarian and Czecho-Slovakian delegates are requested to attend the Agrarian Commission without fail.

Next session will be opened tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. The session is now adjourned.

(Session closed at 4 p.m.)

BULLETIN

OF THE IV CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Moscow.

December 1 st 1922.

№ 19.

Nineteenth Session.

November 22nd 1922.

Chairman: Comrades Kolaroff, Carr.

Appointment of commission on Comrade Muenzenberg's Report. Report on the Eastern Question. Resolution by Japanese and Chinese delegations condemning the occupation of Saghalin by Japan. Telegram to the Factory Councils Congress—Berlin.

Speakers: Van Ravenstein, Van Overstraeten, Roy, Katayama, Tahar Boudengha.

Chairman: Yesterday evening the Presidium decided to propose that a commission be formed to examine the report of Comrade Muenzenberg and to put the resolution submitted by him in final form for presentation to the Congress. This commission should be composed of one comrade from each of the following countries: France, Germany, Czecho-Slovakia, Holland, England, Russia, the Balkans, Scandanavia, America, Canada, and representatives of the Profintern, the Co-operative Section and the Young Communist International. Comrade Muenzenberg shall also be a member of the commission and shall convene it.

Is there anyone opposed to this?... There is no opposition. The proposal of the Presidium is accepted.

The Presidium has also decided, in view of the fact that on the Eastern question which is on to-day's agenda there are four reporters, the time of each speaker shall be limited; that Comrades Roy and Ravenstein shall have three-quarters of an hour each, and Comrades Boudengha and Katayama, half an hour each.

Comrade Ravenstein now has the floor on a point of order.

Van Ravenstein (Holland): Comrades, I cannot declare myself in agreement with this proposal of the Presidium. So far the speakers on important questions

have had—I will not say unlimited time—but at least a good deal longer than three-quarters of an hour (hear, hear!). It is not our fault, comrades and also not my fault that a good deal of time has been wasted, while we have sat here and done nothing. It is simply impossible for me, in the short time you propose to allow me, to deal with this question as I have intended. I was specially invited by the Executive to deal with this question, so that if the Congress votes for the Presidium's proposal, I shall be forced to cut short my address at a given point, before its completion, and to beg you to include the remainder of my address in the minutes of the Congress.

Kolaroff: I must insist upon the proposal of the Presidium. I understand Comrade Ravenstein's objection quite well. He has been called upon by us for this purpose; he has prepared his report, having in view the possibility that he would speak for a longer time; but the Congress must take into account our general programme of work. If every reporter and speaker is allowed the liberty of speaking for all the time necessary for him to express all his thoughts, we would have to prolong the sitting of this Congress for another three weeks. I am sure that should not be allowed. We must remember that the Congress has not yet accomplished

the half of its work. Whose fault is that? This is not the moment to decide that. In any case we must finish all the work on the Congress Agenda, and naturally, we must finish it as soon as possible.

This is why time has been limited. The Eastern question has been studied sufficiently in the Commission where there was a possibility of discussing all its aspects, and the majority of the interested delegations have taken part in it and have had the opportunity to express themselves. I do not believe it would greatly harm the Congress to reduce the time allowed these reporters and all those comrades who will speak in further debates.

If the Congress decides to continue for another three weeks, it has, of course, absolute liberty to do so, keeping in mind the hospitality of our Russian comrades, and so satisfy the requirements of Comrade Ravenstein and of all those other requirements which will, of course, be made known in the same sense.

Van Overstraeter. Comrades, comrade Zinoviev, in his report on the work of the Executive, has himself emphasised that in the future work of the International two essential points must be taken into consideration: Firstly, organisation and the class struggle in the West; secondly, the support of the liberation movement of the colonial and semi-colonial peoples. I believe that, until now, the comrades in this Congress have shown by their attitude, on several occasions, that the Eastern question has not been sufficiently appreciated. Now, in the agenda of the Congress, there is only one item dealing with the question of the East. Therefore, we should give it our closest attention.

Up to now, we have discussed all the other questions at great length. It seems to me obvious that a sufficiently long time should be permitted to those comrades who are to report on the Eastern question.

I propose that the two first reporters, Roy and Van Ravenstein be allowed an hour and a half each.

Chairman: We now take the vote; all those who are in favour of the Presidium's proposal, will hold up their hand.

The proposal is accepted and the time

allotted will be three quarters of an hour.

The Presidium further proposes that one English comrade, one Chinese comrade, and one Egyptian comrade shall also take part in the discussion and that comrade Radek should make the concluding address. Is there any opposition to this? There is no opposition.

Friedlander: The final word should also be limited to half an hour.

Carr: This is understood. Comrade Ravenstein now has the floor.

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 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 a statesman as Lloyd George, a demagogue and puritanical hypocrite, and the representative of the English middle classes, have the audacity to characterise 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 civilisation. 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 villaneous 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 wished 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 knottiest 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 Constantinople 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 colonists 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 powers of Russia.

During the century England earned many a victory. British mercantile capital secured 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 contained 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 little 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 encountered yet the Eastern European conquerors, now saw for the first time the peoples of the Urals and Trans-Caucasia who had conquered French ca-

pitalism, 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 Greek-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 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 phases which preceded the world war. How was this? It was because, in her 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 reap 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 the 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 rivarly 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 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 Ports. 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

stungently 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 theoretic 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 (I need not waste much time on this matter) 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 radical 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 to press 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 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 of 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 the West European capitalism also in Russia, 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 abolition 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 abject subjections 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 haze 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 Ovigle) in the 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, and 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 40 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 Levant, particularly of the Balkans. The Balkan Socialists had based their program upon these principles already before the Balkan war. But the infamous and double-faced policy of Czarism, 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 brandish 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 racial 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 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 indicated also 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 these Christian priests after due investigation on the spot and after thorough 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, and it is really impossible to speak of orthodox christianity otherwise than in negative form. 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 against 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 dish 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 Heleno-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, with-

out 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 respiration or extension of 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 Turks 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 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 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 infidiles 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 review 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 Aegean 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 as 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 Danudian monarchy and two years later of that of Italy. Thus they were compelled to take 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 beleaguered 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 non-payment 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 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 victors. 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 forever 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 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 Internat-

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 non-payment 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 shed their blood for eight years to provide fat profits for European Capital and 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 been 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 victors. 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 25th, 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 forever 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 itself. 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 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 Internat-

ional 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 Turks and the same is also true of a powerful onslaught against Western imperialism and its lackey in their own country. 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 Serbia 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 the 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 a Pacific note. A Facta and a Nitti denounced 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 had. 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 Asiatic, 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, has done, where such may lead to an expansion. 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 struggles 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 organisation 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 seed, no agricultural implements and 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 hireling 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 a healthy selfishness 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 them. 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 as much as possible 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 conciliating part that militarist and imperialist France, the France of M. Poincaré, has played recently in the Eastern crisis. There are reasons of 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 historic 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 to establish 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 Harington, 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 adviser and banner-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 irretrievably and ungenomiously 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 does not certainly 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, 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 demilitarisation 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 programme 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 Greek.

It would be premature at the present juncture to say anything about these demands. However, we miss one thing, namely, the demand of the annulment of 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 the 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-Hammed, in which the Turkish soldiers had to perform police duties. Thus, the new Turkey is now in a position when 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 the British imperialism. Permanent occupation would cost enormous sums of money, which would be in direct opposition to the efforts to decrease expenditure, which at present is the chief solution in all the capitalists 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 gives permits to 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 mandatory power in Irak, and is considered to be the first important step towards the establishment of an autonomous administration in the 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 strategical 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.

Irak 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 strategical 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 not led it) they would have beaten the young Red Armies and would have threatened 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 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 domination over the Asiatic peoples, unless they can continue to exploit the Mohamedans, the Hindus, 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 sense 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 his 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 "Tain" 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 of interfered with our sovereignty. They practiced vivisection on our quivering flesh, cutting large pieces away. On our sides, 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.

Stoddard 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 millions of orientals, Think only how were drawn from the remote and neglected Asia and America to serve as labourers and soldiers in the white men's wars. 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 men, 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, standing face to face with a West rent asunder by fierce enmities and sick unto death in consequence of its mad follies. 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 Western 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 XIth 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 long-

table 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 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 Beduin 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 foe 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 Hindustan 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 Eu-

ropean and to the world proletariat. The 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 emancipation 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.

Ro y:—Comrades, the Eastern question ought to have been dealt with several times in the Congress already. It ought to have been dealt with in connection with the question of the offensive of capitalism because though you talk about the offensive of capitalism you should not overlook the reserves on which this offensive is based, or on which it can be based in the future. But it was not so. And when this question at last comes up for discussion the time limit has been so shortened that it is practically impossible to deal with the question with any degree of clear comprehensiveness. Therefore, I am pessimistic about giving you a broad or detailed view of the situation in the Eastern countries which, I think and believe is very essential for the development and ultimate victory of the movement in the Western countries. But I will do the best I can in the limited time at my disposal.

At the Second Congress of the Communist International the general principles concerning the struggle for national liberation in the colonial and semi-colonial countries were laid down. The general principles were formulated by which the relations of the proletarian revolution and the proletarian movement of the industrially and economically advanced countries to the national struggle of the backward

peoples, should be determined and the experience that we had in 1920, that is, at the time of the Second Congress of the Communist International, did not permit us to develop those principles to any great extent. But since those days, during the last two years, the movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries has gone through a long period of development, and in spite of all that has been left undone, and in spite of all that ought to have been done by the Communist International and particularly by the Communist Parties of the Western countries to establish closer relations with these movements, and to develop them, we are to-day in a position to speak with more knowledge and more experience and understanding of these movements, in the colonial and semi-colonial countries.

The Theses adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International stated that the nationalist movement in the colonial and semi-colonial countries was objectively, fundamentally a revolutionary struggle, and as such it formed a part of the struggle for world revolution. Therefore it was determined that the Communist Parties in the Western countries and particularly those of the imperialist countries, should do everything in their power to develop these movements. But we did not know in those days how this instruction, this resolution of the Second Congress could be carried out; because in those days it was understood by a few that in the broad term "colonial and semi-colonial countries" various regions and various peoples were included, which limits all kinds of social development, all kinds of political and industrial backwardness. And we laid down the lines that simply because they were politically, economically, and socially backward they could all be bundled together in one bunch and the problem could be solved as a general problem. But that was a mistaken view. We know to-day that Eastern countries cannot be taken as a homogeneous whole either politically, economically or socially. Therefore this Eastern question is for the Communist International, provided the Communist International wants to take it seriously, a question of much more complexity than that of the struggle in the West. The

social character of the movement in the Western countries is uniform in the struggle. But in the East it is not so.

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 heading 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 these 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 co-operation 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 imperialist 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 the 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 who had 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 trades capital, feudal bureaucracy and the 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

the social economies of that particular people are bound up with the feudal patriarchal system. Unless the bourgeoisie come into existence and become leaders of 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 had 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 clique 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 had 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 the 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 to the imperialist thus constituting itself a positive obstruction to the revolutionary nationalist weak social background, did 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 Turkey, freed by the efforts of a revolutionary workers and peasants, brutally persecuting the latter. Hence it is proved that although the bourgeoisie and the feudal military clique in one of these countries can assume the leadership of the nationalist revolutionary struggle, there comes a time when the people are bound to betray the movement and become a counter-revolutionary force. Unless we are prepared to treat 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 at 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 nationalities 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 historical 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 of 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 not can go so far and no farther. Therefore the nationalist revolutionary movement in these countries where millions and millions must have national liberation

most 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 the workers and peasants, 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 to-day 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 lenthened 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 of 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 use and utilise 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 organisation of this front, the experience of the last two year 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 united proletarian front leads to accumulation of organisational strength in the Western countries and unmasks and discloses the treachery and compromising ractics of the Social-Democratic Party by bringing them into active conflict, so will the campaign of

Workers.	Men.	Minors.	Women.	Total.
Government Employees .	133.000	—	43.000	176.000
Factory employing 10 or more	706.000	—	314.000	1.520.000
Miners	353.000	—	112.000	465.000
Forestry	564.000	—	147.000	716.000
Fishery	617.000	20.000	170.000	808.000
Railway Workers	2.373.000	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

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.

K a t a y a m a (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 capitalist. 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 it has. 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 tead what I presented in my report on Japan and Japanese conditions. I want to give you a few facts. They are facts which will 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:

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 proletariat are organised: in 1920 there were 838 unions with a membership of 369,000 and in 1921 — 671 unions with a membership of 246,000 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 yens.

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 while 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 organised 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 organised about eleven years ago. I wish to show you how the Japanese labour movement has been making progress. The Yuai Kai (Japan Federation of Labour) union was started eleven years ago with a 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 organisation, 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 radi

cal 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 destruction 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, I 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 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 complaining of the anti-Japanese movement in those countries,

and they have found out that they can do this work. The Japanese workers are fighting and protesting against the exploitation of the Chinese labourer, and the Japanese unions are fighting the capitalists who cruelly exploit Korean labour. The Korean labour organisations 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. In this movement 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 organised 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 utilising 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 becoming the stronger, and although it was not known recently, they are now organising for the final work. They found out that in order to carry on a successful fight for Korean independence they had to co-operate with the workers of Japan.

The 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 Vladivostock, 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: Comrade Boudengha now has the floor.

Tahar Boudengha (Tunisia and the French colonies). Comrades, I do not think that it is necessary to read to you my report, as each of the various language groups have received a copy, I will therefore limit myself to elaborating certain points of my report.

French imperialism has colonies not far distant from the Homeland, which enables it easily to recruit its forces either for future wars or for stifling the proletarian revolution in France.

At the same time there is an insurgent in North Africa. The Communist nucleus which was formed in Tunisia after the Conference has taken advantage of this movement. Owing to the seriousness of the situation which may arise in the event of a proletarian revolution, it is doing its utmost to prevent French capitalism from getting the native population of North Africa entirely into its power. In order to accomplish this task, we have approached the workers and peasants either through our Arabian dailies

or through public meetings. We were so successful that the government became alarmed and made domiciliary visits and arrests. It even proclaimed our Party illegal which forced us to carry on underground work. I must admit that this act of the government as well as the suspension of our Arabian papers has done us great harm, for our activities were not limited to Tunisia, but extended through out the whole of North Africa. I must also state that Comrade Loezon approached the French Party several times for a subsidy for our press. At last, owing to the good services of some influential comrades, he received a loan of 10,000 francs from "Humanite". Moreover Comrade Vaillant-Couturier paid a visit to Algiers and Tunis and could judge for himself of the spirit which animated the natives. He came to the conclusion that there were very good elements in the city as well as in the rural districts for a purely Communist proletarian movement.

What was the attitude of the Managing Committee, however, after Vaillant-Couturier's tour? It is not enough to make propoganda. One must organise continual activity not only in Tunis, but also in all the colonies where there is any discontent.

In order to do this, the Party must have a well defined programme of colonial action, for the colonial policy of French capitalism consists in inciting the peoples which are under its domination against each other. Thus it happened that in Tunis, owing to the attitude of the Tunis sharpshooters during the events of April 5th. last, French militarism established there two bridges of black troops.

The French Communist Party has not yet grasped the usefulness of a realist and effective colonial policy.

On the contrary it has been influenced by the pseudo-communists of Algeria, and adjourned the discussion of the colonial question at the Paris Congress for electoral reasons.

I must read you the letter addressed by the Managing Committee to the colonial study group on the eve of the Congress. It is as follows:

"The Managing Committee adheres to its decision to adjourn the examination of the colonial question, until the National

Council, which will be held after the World Congress.

It is of the opinion that the Cantonal elections in Algeria are of greater importance for the comrades of the overseas Federations than the colonial study committee seems to imagine. In view of the fact that the elections will not take place until the 15th. of October next, and that the most trusted militants of these Federations must participate in them, it is out of the question that the colonial policy of the Party can be definitely fixed during their absence."

Comrades, it seems that the colonial policy of the Party depends only on the citizens of Algeria. These same citizens whom the Party holds of such importance for its colonial policy, have dared to draw up theses which are contrary to the 8th. condition of Moscow. I am going to read you certain passages of the theses on the Sidi-Bel-Abes question in Algeria.

"For these reasons, the communist section of Sidi-Bel-Abes is of the opinion that the liberation of the native proletariat of North Africa can only result from the revolution in the mother country, and that the best means of assisting every kind of liberation movement in our colony, is not to abandon this colony,—as it is said in the 8th. of the 21 conditions of the admission to the III International—but on the contrary that the colonial section remain under the aegis of the Communist Party of France which must extend its propoganda for adhesion to Trade Unionism and to Communism... that it cannot honestly accede to the demands of Moscow etc."

Consequently, the International is dishonest. Such is the spirit of these so-called Communists which the French Communist Party is still tolerating in its ranks. I will also read to you the Algiers thesis:

"The two first series of articles answer to the needs of the propoganda in Algeria. They were unanimously appreciated, and we had not a greater wish than that many more of the same kind should be published.

As to the third series, without finding fault with the contents of these articles, as they are inspired by a purely communist spirit and deal with the methods of the application of the 8th. condition,

we should have preferred to see them published in the Communist Bulletin, rather than in the "Humanite" for the former is meant only for a restricted number of militants capable of understanding the ideology and the immediate possibilities expounded in these articles.

The "Humanite" especially since Vaillant-Couturier's tour, reaches the big public, and is read by European and native elements who have not yet acquired communist ideas, but who have shown themselves sympathetic and whom we hoped to bring over to our side. The imperialist bourgeois press has cleverly used these articles against us. They were frightened by what they imagined to be our plan of propoganda in Algeria, and have turned away from us. The imperialist bourgeois press has made clever use of these articles to our detriment, and the inadequacy of our local press and of our organisations prevented us from explaining the position by entering into sustained polemics.

So it is dangerous for them to publish purely communist articles! And those are the people who pretend to be wanting to make propoganda amongst the native masses.

Such is the mentality of these so-called Communists.

Elsewhere they say:

"The emancipation of the Algerian native population will only come as a result of the revolution in France.

The backward native masses, kept in semi-slavery for centuries past, fanatic and fatalist, patient resigned and docile and full of religious prejudices, does not actually conceive their own liberation, and only aspires to a betterment of their conditions by means of reforms and by obtaining certain political rights.

To obtain any results, it is not necessary to carry on open communist propoganda in Algeria. There is no need to publish in our press—calls for revolt, nor distribute leaflets in Arabic as some recommend.

"The publication of the manifesto of the Communist International for the liberation of Algeria and Tunis was an error, and the best proof that we are right in saying so, is the fact—that it was reproduced by the bourgeois colonial press with the

object of discrediting us in the opinion of the public, which was partly achieved.

These comrades are evidently anxious not to lose favour with the bourgeoisie, Lauridan: Who wrote this?

This is the thesis of the communist section of Algeria.

Without wanting to be too insistent I am of the opinion that the French Communist Party must not tolerate within its ranks this type of citizen. I consider that they must be expelled.

I trust that the French comrades, regardless of any tendencies, will set to work immediately after the World Congress, in order to initiate a policy of communist action in the colonies by the establishment of a central organ and the collaboration of colonial comrades in the Managing Committee.

The French comrades must understand once and for all that a proletarian revolution in France is bound to fail as long as the French bourgeoisie will have at its disposal the colonial population. Likewise, the liberation of the latter will only be possible when there will be in France a Party of revolutionary action and not an opportunist Party.

The Communist International must also take the matter in hand by attaching to itself a permanent representative of the French colonies.

I am also of the opinion that the British Party has not done everything which should have been done. What has the British party done in order to support the revolutionary movement in India and in Egypt? Last night the Egyptian commission was looking for some party or other to take the young Egyptian Party under its patronage, and it suggested the Italian Party, while this task should be quite evidently the concern of the British Communist Party. The Communists must not limit their actions to their home territory while ignoring the thousands of people who are oppressed by their bourgeoisie and groan under the yoke of their own imperialists. I am of the opinion that to abandon peoples whose liberation and future depend on a communist Party, as is the case for the British Party, is nothing but cowardice.

On the other hand, comrade Malaka was not quite sure the other day if he should support Pan-Islamism. You must

not be as difficult as all that Pan-Islamism at the present juncture is not only a union of all the Muslims against their oppressors. Thus there is no doubt whatever that they must be supported.

On the other hand, questions of a religious nature come to oppose the development of communism. In Tunis, we had the same difficulties as you in Java. Every time people came forward to discuss with us the non-assimilation of communism with Islamism, we invited these mischievous people to meet us in public debate. We proved to them that the Muslim religion prohibits the exploitation of labour, this being the principal basis of this religion. Secondly, we told them that if they are so religious, they must begin by applying the religious principles and paying one tenth of their fortunes, including capital and interest for the benefit of those who are not able to work. I can assure you that every time they debated with us by bringing forward their religious principles, they came off second best.

I think that comrade Malaka's fears are unfounded. The progress of our ideas among the Muslims has exceeded all expectations. We have received from all parts of the Muslim world, especially when we still had our Arabic papers, numerous letters of congratulation for our methods of applying Communism in Muslim countries.

Owing to the existence of a revolutionary movement in North Africa, as well as in the other colonies it behoves the French Communist Party, in conjunction with the International and competent colonial comrades, to conduct an efficient and continuous activity in these countries, in order to bring them over to our way of thinking.

I trust that the Congress will accept the conclusions of my report, which are necessary if the communist idea is to triumph among the oppressed peoples.

A transition period will hardly be required in North and West Africa. I am quite sure that we shall go over directly from the feudal regime to the communist regime without going through the intermediary period of native capitalism.

There is already communal land in Tunis and Algeria. This is evidently a

form of patriarchal communism, but we must develop it, reform it, and substitute for it integral communism.

I conclude my statement by greeting the Congress of the International. (Applause).

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 Factory Councils Congress, Neue Welt, Berlin-Neuköln:
Dear Comrades,

We follow your movements 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 interest 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, for workers' control of production, and to oppose the organisation 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 2 1/2 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 Factory Council 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.

Loud applause greeted the reading of the telegram.

Chairman Carr: Is anyone against the sending of this telegram? No one.

Beron: There are some more announcements to be made.

The following commissions will sit today:

The American Commission at 5.30 p.m. in this hall.

The Commission on the Versailles Peace Treaty at 6 p.m. on the ground floor here.

The Education Commission at 8 p.m. in this hall.

The Enlarged Italian Commission with the representative of both parties, the Communist Party and the Maximilian Party, in the small hall on the ground floor at 8 p.m.

The Conference of the Women Members of the Congress, viz, the Enlarged Women's Commission, to which invitations have already been distributed, will take place to-morrow at 11 a.m. sharp, in one of the minor halls of the Kremlin. All the delegations are invited by the International Women's Secretariat to send their representatives.

Chairman Carr: The next session will be held to-morrow at 11 a.m. The translations will bring the session to a close.

(The session was closed soon after 4 p.m.)