

Marx and National Liberation

Jack Woddis

This is the second of two articles based on the Marx Memorial lecture delivered this year by the author under the auspices of the Marx Memorial Library.

IN all his work, Marx showed an immense interest in the struggles of the colonial people to end their exploitation by foreign capitalism and to win their national independence. He followed closely the struggles of the colonial peoples in many parts of the world, and never hesitated to show where his sympathies lay.

Marx looked forward to the coming revolutions in China and India and showed great sympathy and active support for all their struggles, writing constantly in the 1850's to condemn the atrocities of the British forces in these two countries, to expose the injustice of the British actions, and to uphold with passion the patriotic struggles of the Indian and Chinese people.

When the so-called "Indian mutiny" broke out in India in 1857, Marx and Engels immediately recognised its true character as an uprising of the people, as a national struggle. In his first article on this question, dealing specifically with the revolts in the Indian Army (*New York Daily Tribune*, July 15th, 1857), Marx, after noting how Britain, for 150 years, had "contrived to retain the tenure of her Indian Empire" by the principle of divide and rule, pointed out how the army of 200,000 Indians, created by Britain to maintain its rule, had become simultaneously "the first general centre of resistance which the Indian people ever possessed". He remarked that in the 1857 army mutinies, the Mussulmans and Hindus "have combined against their common masters".

Almost ninety years later, it was again the unity of the Hindus and Muslims, this time united with the Indian Communist Party, and expressed in the triple flags of the Congress, Muslim League and Communist Party, which exploded in the great naval mutiny of 1946, thus forcing British imperialism to concede to India its national independence.

The 1857 mutiny, noted Marx, "has not been confined to a few localities", but has "coincided with a general disaffection exhibited against English supremacy on the part of the great Asiatic nations". Marx and Engels noted carefully the process of the uprising, analysing its successes and its inevitable defeat.

Exposing Atrocities

In words of fire Marx exposed the atrocities of the British forces in India. The letters of the British

officers in India, he noted, were "redolent of malignity". When a spy reported to Sir John Lawrence that three Indian chiefs were plotting, Sir John sent a short message: "Hang them". The chiefs were hanged, Marx notes. Another officer wrote: "Not a day passes but we string up from ten to fifteen of them". One exulting officer wrote: "Holmes is hanging them by the score, like a 'brick'".

Another, in reference to the summary hangings of a large body of Indians, wrote: "Then our fun commenced". "We hold court-martials on horseback" boasted an officer, explaining that every Indian they met "we either string up or shoot".

So indignant was Marx about these atrocities, and so incensed at the attempt of the British press and establishment generally to shout about the alleged "atrocities" committed by the mutinous sepoy, that he was moved to write a special article for the *New York Daily Tribune*, published September 17th, 1857, entitled "Investigation of Tortures in India", and a further article published on May 25th, 1858, in which he exposed the appalling massacres and looting which accompanied the sack of Lucknow.

Support For China

Similarly, when the British rulers in 1857 launched the Second Opium War against China, Marx and Engels immediately sided with the Chinese people.

As early as 1853, Marx had noted with relish the complaints of the German missionary, Gutzlaff. On returning to Europe after twenty years in China, where he witnessed the beginnings of the great Taiping Uprising, Gutzlaff was surprised to find people in Europe discussing socialism, and asked what it was. When it was explained to him he asked in alarm: "Is there anywhere that I can escape that pernicious teaching? The very same thing has been preached for some time by many people of the mob in China."

This mob, explains Marx, were people of "the rebellious plebs", who "point to the poverty of some and the wealth of others, who demand a different distribution of property—and even the complete abolition of private property". (*First International Review*).

The launching of the Second Opium War by the British was a blow not only against Chinese sov-

ereignty, but equally against the social revolution of the Chinese people against their own Imperial Court and feudal system. Marx and Engels, in a number of articles, explained that the war of the Chinese people against the British invaders was "a popular war for the maintenance of Chinese nationality".

In an article on "The Coming Election in England" (*New York Daily Tribune*, March 31st, 1857) Marx attacked Palmerston and the "smooth-faced gentlemen", who supported him. "Along with the holy bishops" he wrote, "and the unholy opium-smugglers, there go the large tea-dealers, for the greater part directly or indirectly engaged in the opium traffic, and, therefore interested in over-setting the present treaties with China."

It was in the interests of these capitalists that the war was launched against China.

Atrocities in China

Marx was outraged by the brutalities of the British forces, and whole-heartedly with the Chinese people. He exposed Palmerston's role in the bombardment of Canton in 1856, and rejoiced in the vote of censure passed against Palmerston in the House of Commons on March 3rd, 1857. A few weeks later he wrote a special article for the *New York Daily Tribune* on the "English Ferocity in China", in which he exposed British responsibility for the outbreak of what he termed "this most unrighteous war".

He protested strongly against "the slaughter of the unoffending citizens and peaceful tradesmen of Canton", who, he declared, "have been slaughtered, their habitations battered to the ground, and the claims of humanity violated, on the flimsy pretence that 'English life and property are endangered by the aggressive acts of the Chinese!'"

How often have we heard such pretexts since!

Engels, in an article in the same paper, April 17th, 1857, similarly exposed what he called "the most horrible excesses" of the British troops, whose "spirit of brutal ferocity" in China was, he considered, "a fitting counter-part to the spirit of smuggling cupidity" in which the war had originated.

Again and again, Marx and Engels returned to this question, explaining the origins of the war in China, and the responsibility of the British rulers, exposing the atrocities carried out against the Chinese people, flaying in article after article the monstrous traffic in opium which was degrading the Chinese people in the interests of a handful of British profiteers.

These articles by Marx and Engels, and their exposures of the atrocities committed by the troops sent out to China by what Marx termed "the Christianity-canting and civilisation-mongering

British Government" (article in *New York Daily Tribune*, September 20th, 1858), were real acts of solidarity as were their parallel articles on the Indian Uprising of 1857.

One cannot read these articles of Marx exposing the atrocities of the British troops in India and China without thinking about the similar grim stories that have been told of the massacres in the Congo.

Here is one such account by a mercenary who fought in the Congo:

"It was just before dusk when we came. Unsuspecting women were hustling around, carrying water and going about the last of their day's chores. Children were playing in the dust, laughing and shouting to one another."

"We paused for a few minutes, and then came the order to fire. There was a great crackle of shots from machine guns and our deadly new Belgian rifles. Women screamed and fell. Little children just stood there, dazed, or cartwheeled hideously as bullets slammed into them.

"Then, as usual, we raced into the place, still firing as we went. Some of us pitched cans of petrol on to the homes before putting a match to them. Others threw phosphorous hand grenades, which turned human beings into blazing inextinguishable torches of fire". (*News of the World*, November 22nd, 1964).

One can be certain that if Marx were alive today his anger would be directed against those who are responsible for such appalling massacres as have been committed by Western imperialist forces in the Congo and Vietnam.

Chinese National Struggle

But, as with India, Marx and Engels were not concerned solely to expose. They also showed great interest in the course of the struggle of the Chinese people.

Marx, in an article in the *New York Daily Tribune*, June 5th, 1857, noted the difference between the mood of the people in 1857 as compared with the time of the First Opium war fifteen years earlier. "Then", he wrote, "the people were quiet; they left the Emperor's soldiers to fight the invaders . . . But now . . . the mass of the people take an active, nay a fanatical part in the struggle against the invaders."

He goes on to give a most vivid description of this truly "national war", in which "the very coolies emigrating to foreign countries rise in mutiny, and as if by concert, on board every emigrant ship, and fight for its possession, and, rather than surrender, go down to the bottom with it, or perish in its flames. Even out of China, the Chinese colonists, the most meek and submissive of subjects hitherto, conspire and suddenly rise in nightly insurrection, as at Sarawak."

Marx fully understood the full significance of the struggle of the Chinese people. The death of the Old China was inevitable. Not only had British capitalism weakened the old society, but the Chinese people had now risen in revolt against the invader. Britain had been but the "unconscious tool of history". It would be the Chinese people who would put an end to the Old China and so usher in "the opening day of a new era for all Asia".

Revolution in East and West

Marx, after the 1848 revolutions in Europe had failed to develop directly into proletarian revolutions and into the victory of socialism, increasingly turned his attention to the development of capitalism as a world force, and looked within that context for the mainsprings of revolutionary change.

In a letter to Engels, October 8th, 1858, Marx commented that the colonisation of Australia and California, and the opening up of China and Japan had meant, for capitalism, a second sixteenth century, a new lease of life—and that as long as this enabled capitalism to expand and grow, there was a danger of imminent social revolution in Europe being "crushed in this little corner".

But, dialectician as he was, he saw that the expansion of capitalism was only a temporary phase, whose "death-knell" would eventually sound, since the very expansion would create new points of revolt against the whole, expanded system. "Can mankind fulfil its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia?" he asked in 1853. (*New York Daily Tribune*, "British Rule in India", June 25th, 1853).

In an article in the same paper, June 14th, 1853, significantly entitled "Revolution in China and in Europe" he pondered over the "effect the Chinese revolution seems likely to exercise upon the civilised world," and wrote:

"It may seem a very strange, and a very paradoxical assertion that the next uprising of the people of Europe, and their next movement for republican freedom and economy of Government, may depend more probably on what is now passing in the Celestial Empire—the very opposite of Europe—than on any other political cause that now exists".

In China, he noted, the "chronic rebellions" had now "gathered together in one formidable revolution". The question, he said, is "how that revolution will in time react on England, and through England on Europe".

Writing to Engels, in January, 1858, at the time of the great India revolt, Marx declared "India is now our best ally".

In a letter to Kautsky, September 12th, 1882, in which he discussed the British workers' attitude towards questions of colonial policy, Engels com-

mented that the British workers think the same as the bourgeoisie.

But he then went on to make the significant remark that "India will perhaps, indeed very probably, make a revolution. . . . The same might also take place elsewhere, e.g. in Algeria and Egypt, and would certainly be the best thing *for us*."

In these pronouncements, Marx and Engels showed how well they understood the relation between the struggle against colonialism with the struggle for socialism in the metropolitan countries. "India is our best ally." Revolutions in India, Algeria and Egypt—"the best thing *for us*". "The next uprising in Europe" dependent on "what is now passing in China".

Ireland—Exploitation

These ideas, of the common nature of the struggle were developed by Marx and Engels in relation to Ireland, for whom they had both battled so long and so well. Engels himself visited Ireland twice—in 1855 and 1869. He studied the conditions of the Irish immigrant workers in Manchester. He learnt Gaelic in order to make a closer study of Ireland.

His first wife, Mary Burns, and his second wife, Lizzie, were both Fenians, and there is evidence that Fenian fugitives hid in their house in Manchester, though Engels, with the correct reticence of a true revolutionary, never mentioned it.

Engels' description of Ireland in 1855 is a classic and terrible one. In a letter to Marx (May 23rd, 1856) he wrote:

"Gendarmes, priests, lawyers, bureaucrats, country squires in pleasing profusion and a total absence of any industry at all, so that it would be difficult to understand what all these parasitic growths live on if the distress of the peasants did not supply the other half of the picture".

"Ireland", he wrote:

"may be regarded as the first English colony . . . one can already notice here that the so-called liberty of English citizens is based on the oppression of the colonies. I have never seen so many gendarmes in any country, and the sodden look of the bibulous Prussian gendarme is developed to its highest perfection here among the constabulary, who are armed with carbines, bayonets and handcuffs."

Ireland, he found, was in ruins. Ruined churches, ruined castles, and, more recently, ruined peasant huts. "The land is an utter desert," he wrote, the consequence of the English wars of conquest from 1100 to 1850. Added to the destruction of war was the economic destruction—the turning of Ireland from a land of small-holdings into a land of large-holdings, the great famine of 1846-47, the mass evictions, and consequent mass emigrations. In 1841 the population of Ireland was 8¼ million. Twenty-

five years later it had shrunk to 5½ million—a loss of more than a third of its people.

The famine killed about a million. Emigration took millions more, then and in successive years. The Corn Laws of 1846 broke Ireland's corn monopoly. The Irish landlord and wretched peasant could not compete any longer with the great feudal states of Central Europe and the young capitalist farms of the U.S. The landlords turned from tillage to pasture—from corn to wool and meat. Thus Ireland became England's largest pasture, fulfilling her destiny, as Marx put it, "of an English sheep-walk and cattle pasture".

While hundreds of thousands emigrated to America, Australia and England, a spirit of revolt grew at home. The Fenian movement, a mass agrarian movement, directed against the land monopoly, had, as Marx noted, a socialist tendency.

He and Engels warmly supported the struggles of the Fenians, and after the formation of the First International, in 1864, were able to rally wide support for the protest movement against the treatment of the Fenian prisoners.

Perspective for England

It was in the midst of this campaign on behalf of the Irish prisoners, that Marx and Engels developed their ideas in relation to the liberation of Ireland and the perspective of the revolution in England.

Marx, not only anxious to assist the Irish people, but keenly aware, too, that the English capitalist class was using the Irish question to confuse and divide the workers, arranged for the General Council of the First International to debate the whole question around two issues—amnesty for the Fenian prisoners, and the relations between the English and Irish workers.

The Council met in public session, in an atmosphere of great excitement. Opening the debate on the amnesty, Marx spoke for an hour, amid continual applause. Only three speakers were against him—three reformist English trade union leaders, one of whom, Mottershead, in terms with which we have since often been made familiar, protested: "Ireland cannot be independent. If we relinquished our hold it would only be asking the French to step in."

Marx easily dealt with him—and the amnesty resolution was adopted unanimously. It was sent to every one of the hundreds of trade union branches affiliated to the International. Only one small branch objected. With 99.9 per cent support, most people might have stopped. But it says very much for Marx's leadership of the International—and for the thoroughness of his understanding and work—that the Council sent a special delegation to that one

small branch. They explained, they discussed, they argued—and the branch was won over.

No step was too unimportant for Marx when it came to a question of his revolutionary duty, of convincing workers, and especially in the essential task of winning English workers away from any spirit of chauvinism or narrow nationalism and feelings of nationalist arrogance.

Marx's great educational role has seldom been better expressed than in the resolution he prepared in 1869 for the Council on the relations between the Irish and English working classes, a resolution which has such great significance for us today for two specific reasons.

Firstly, because of the historic advance of the national liberation movement throughout the world, and the coming complete destruction of the old colonial system of direct colonial rule. And secondly because of the presence in our midst of 800,000 Commonwealth immigrants, whose work here is such a valuable asset to our society, but who are being made the scapegoats for all the social and economic problems which have been created by the British capitalist class.

"The English bourgeoisie" ran the resolution, "has not only exploited Irish poverty in order to worsen the condition of the working class in England, by the forced transplantation of poor Irish peasants, but it has moreover divided the proletariat into hostile camps. . . ."

Marx did not hide the fact of the feelings of hostility which the English workers had for the Irish immigrants. "In all the big industrial centres of England", ran the resolution, "a deep antagonism exists between the English and Irish workers. The average English worker hates the Irish as a competitor. . . . He feels national and religious antagonism towards him . . ."

But there was, in the words of the resolution, no basic objective reason for this hostility:

"This antagonism between the proletarians of England is artificially cultivated and maintained by the bourgeoisie. It knows that in this antagonism lies the *real secret of maintaining its power.*"

Explaining that the possession of Ireland by England was used as the excuse for maintaining a big standing army, which the capitalists can use against the English workers, the resolution then makes its historic pronouncement: "*A people which enslaves another people forges its own chains*".

From this, Marx's resolution went on, the task of the International was clear. In order to speed the social revolution in England, "the decisive blow must be struck in Ireland . . . *the essential preliminary condition of the emancipation of the English working class is the turning of the present compulsory union, that is slavery, of Ireland with England, into an*

equal and free union, if that is possible, or into *full separation*, if this is inevitable”.

In a letter to Engels in that same year, Marx wrote:

“It is in the direct and absolute interest of the English working class to get rid of their present connection with Ireland . . . The English working class will *never accomplish anything* before it has got rid of Ireland.”

Thus, in all their writings and work, Marx and Engels increasingly drew attention to the great importance of the national liberation movement for the British people. They saw that the roots of British capitalism, of British reaction, lay in the colonial system. The expansion of capitalism, the drawing of India, China and other territories into the sphere of capitalism—a process that was to be carried still further in the twentieth century, with the development of imperialism—had two epoch-making results.

First—the destruction of the former society and the impoverishment of the people in those territories.

Secondly, the birth of new class forces in these countries, and the eventual gathering of the “chronic rebellions” into one “formidable revolution” whose effects would not be confined to the frontiers of the oppressed countries, but would react back decisively on the imperialist metropolis.

Role of Russia

In their last years, Marx and Engels perceived the advance of the Russian working class and revolutionary movement to the fore of human progress. In a letter to Sorge, September 27th, 1877, Marx wrote: “This time the revolution will begin in the East”. In their 1882 preface to the Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels declared: “Russia forms the vanguard of revolutionary action in Europe”.

They did not live to see the great October Revolution of 1917. Nor could they, brilliant revolutionaries though they were, foresee all its effects. It was left to Lenin and the Bolsheviks to carry forward these ideas.

As early as 1902 (*What is to be Done?*) Lenin stressed that history had confronted the Russian working class with the task of destroying not only the main base of reaction in Europe but of Asiatic reaction too. In an article on “The Awakening of Asia”, written for *Pravda* in 1913, Lenin noted how the 1905 revolution in Russia, defeated though it was, had spurred on the democratic revolution in Turkey, Persia, China, India and the Dutch East Indies.

“World capitalism and the 1905 movement in Russia have finally awakened Asia. Hundreds of millions of the downtrodden and benighted have awakened from medieval stagnation to a new life

and are rising to fight for elementary human rights and democracy.”

New Phase

And he then made this remarkable prediction:

“The awakening of Asia and the beginning of the struggle for power by the advanced proletariat of Europe are a symbol of the new phase in world history that began early this century”.

Today we can see only too well the historic significance of the great alliance of the awakened millions of Asia, Africa and Latin America, with the socialist camp and the international working class movement.

In 1848, in the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels launched the historic slogan:

“The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!”

At the end of 1920, the Communist International, following the first Congress of Peoples of the East which it held at Baku, started a new journal, called *The Peoples of the East*. This journal carried the slogan: “Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!”

In commenting on this at a meeting of Party members in Moscow, on December 6th, 1920, Lenin recalled that at the Congress of the Communist International in Moscow he had said that the whole world was divided into oppressed and oppressing nations—the former comprising 70 per cent of the world’s population. “We are really acting now”, he said, “not only as representatives of the proletarians of all countries, but also as representatives of the oppressed peoples.” He then referred to the new journal, and drew attention to its new slogan: “Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!”

He revealed that one comrade had asked: “When did the Executive Committee decide on a change of slogans?” Lenin commented: “Indeed, I cannot remember any such decision. And, of course, from the standpoint of the *Communist Manifesto* this is wrong, but then the *Communist Manifesto* was written under totally different conditions. From the standpoint of present-day politics, this slogan is correct.” And he went on to explain how, throughout the world, hatred of the *entente* powers had become intense. Thus, he said, the result has been “to make Russia the direct spokesman of all the oppressed of the world”.

Today, we have not only Russia, not only the Soviet Union, but a mighty socialist camp stretching from Cuba to China, and embracing 1,000 million people—a third of mankind. This powerful socialist camp has become a mighty champion and supporter “of all the oppressed of the world”. This has not

only provided a massive help to the peoples struggling to be free, it has helped to defend their new-won freedom—as in Cuba, Vietnam, or the United Arab Republic.

New Paths

It has also laid a heavy imprint on the entire path of development of the sixty new national states that have appeared in Asia and Africa.

In this epoch, in which there exists a mighty socialist camp, an advancing world movement for national liberation, and a powerful international working class, and democratic and peace movement, the whole world is turning away from capitalism and towards socialism.

New states, in which pre-capitalist forms of society persist and are usually dominant, now have the opportunity to enter the mainstream of a world in transition to socialism without having to go through a long and painful path of fully developed capitalism. Now, thanks to the existence of a socialist camp, these states can limit the life of capitalism, and strike out in the direction of socialism.

It says much for the theoretical brilliance of the founders of Marxism that they foresaw such a development.

In his work *On Social Relations in Russia*, written in 1874-75, Engels argued that the common ownership of the land in Russia, even although already moving towards its disintegration, might be saved, and the form of society raised to a higher level, "without it being necessary for the Russian peasants to go through the intermediate states of bourgeois small holdings". But for this to happen, he said, not only would the peasants have to cultivate the land collectively, but a successful proletarian revolution would be needed in the West, in order to provide "the material conditions" which would enable the Russian peasant to carry through such a transition.

Eight years later, in their preface to the Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto*, in 1882, Marx and Engels posed again the question as to whether such a pre-capitalist formation as the Russian *obshchina* (or village community), based on a form of "primeval common ownership of land" could "pass directly to the higher form of communist common ownership" without going through the normal process of full capitalist development and the dissolution of pre-capitalist forms as had happened in the West.

The answer they gave then was the same as Engels had given previously:

"If the Russian Revolution becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting point for a communist development".

After Marx's death, Engels still preoccupied himself with this question. In a letter to N. F. Danielson, on October 17th, 1893, Engels wrote that it would not be possible in Russia, any more than it would be elsewhere, "to develop a higher social form out of primitive agrarian communism unless that higher form was *already in existence* in another country, so as to serve as a model".

A year later, in 1894, twenty years after he had first written *On Social Relations in Russia*, Engels wrote a Postscript to this work, which carried forward those ideas still further.

"It is not only possible but unquestionable, that, after the victory of the proletariat and the passing of the means of production into common property among the west-European peoples, those countries which have only just entered upon the path of capitalist development and have still retained clan institutions or the relics thereof, will make use of these relics of social ownership and the popular customs appropriate to them as a powerful means of considerably reducing the process of their development to Socialist society, and avoiding the greater part of those sufferings and that struggle through which we in Western Europe have to make our way. But the unavoidable condition for this is the example and active support of the West, which so far is still capitalist. Only when the capitalist economy has been overcome in its motherland and in those countries where it has reached its full flower, only when the backward countries see from this example 'how it's done', how to make the productive forces of modern industry, transformed into social property, serve the whole of society in its entirety, only then will these backward countries be able to steer a course towards such a shortened path of development. But in return their success will then be assured. And this applies not only to Russia but to all countries which are in the pre-capitalist stage of development."

As we know, the revolution came first not in the West, in the motherland of capitalism, but in backward Russia. Russia, surrounded by a hostile capitalist world, had to pull herself up by her own bootstraps. It was the Soviet Union which became industrialised, which built socialism, which created collective and state farms, and which so provided "the model", the "example of 'how it's done'", as well as the "material conditions" which can assist "all countries in the pre-capitalist stage of development" to shorten the life of capitalism, to take a less painful path to socialism, making full use of their "relics of social ownership and the popular customs appropriate to them".

Within the Soviet Union itself, the former tsarist colonies, with the aid of the more industrially developed regions, were able to take such a path and by-pass full capitalist development. In the same way, neighbouring Mongolia was assisted to travel from feudalism to socialism, without passing through

a capitalist phase. Later, China, North Vietnam and North Korea were able to avoid the stage of mature capitalism, and to press ahead to the construction of socialism.

The changes now taking place in Algeria, the U.A.R., Ghana, Mali, Burma, and other countries are a further striking confirmation of these ideas of Marx and Engels.

It is in vain, in this epoch, for the imperialists to think that they will see three score capitalist states replace the former colonies.

As Lenin pointed out at the Third Congress of the Communist International on July 5th, 1921 (*Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. 32, p. 458):

“in the coming decisive battles of the world revolution, the movement of the majority of the population of the world, first aimed at national emancipation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism, and will, perhaps, play a much greater revolutionary role than we expect”.

This prediction of Lenin's is each day becoming

more clear. The struggles of the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America can no longer be confined within the limits of a national struggle. The very needs of their own development impose on them the necessity to carry forward their struggle, from political independence to economic independence. And this requires not only a battle to dig up the very roots of imperialism, but, in the course of such a battle—and in order that it may succeed—the peoples find it necessary to place limits on the growth of their own indigenous capitalists.

Marx and Engels did not live to see these historic changes taking place. They lived before the epoch of proletarian revolutions, and the consequent breakdown of the old colonial system. But all their life's work and effort was directed to such an outcome. And, if they were alive today, they would have fully endorsed Lenin's extension of their famous slogan, and proclaimed, with him:

“Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!”