

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint

# - INTERNATIONAL -

# PRESS

# CORRESPONDENCE

Vol 6 No. 90

23<sup>rd</sup> December 1926

Editorial Offices and Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 66, Schleichgasse 213, Vienna IX. Telegraphic Address: Inprekorr, Vienna.

## CONTENTS

J. Stalin: The Prospects of the Revolution in China.

For the Unity of the C. P. S. U.

Either one Thing or the Other.

### Politics.

P. R. Dietrich: The Political Situation in Germany.

M. Tanin: The Fight for Albania.

Gerhard: The New German Imperialism.

For the Unity of the Trade Union Movement.

A. Bittelmann and Earl Browder: A Reactionary Manoeuvre to Split the American Unions

## The Prospects of the Revolution in China.

(Speech delivered in the Chinese Commission of the Enlarged E. C. C. I. on November 30th 1926.)

By J. Stalin.

Before I enter into the question, I consider it necessary to say that I have not had at my disposal exhaustive material on the Chinese question such as would be necessary to unfold a complete picture of the Chinese revolution. I am therefore compelled to confine myself to a few general remarks of a fundamental nature which are directly connected with the question as to the main trend of the Chinese revolution. The theses of Comrade Petrov, the theses of Comrade Mif, two reports of Comrade Tang Ping Shan and the remarks of Comrade Rafes on the Chinese question are in my possession. In spite of their excellence, all these documents have in my opinion, the great defect that they evade a number of the fundamental questions of the revolution in China. I think that our attention should be above all directed to these defects, and for this reason my remarks will at the same time be of a polemical character.

### I. The Character of the Revolution in China.

Lenin said that the Chinese would soon have their 1905. Some comrades took this as meaning that exactly what took place with us in Russia in 1905 would necessarily repeat itself in China. This is wrong. Lenin certainly did not say that the Chinese revolution would be a copy of the Russian revolution in 1905; he merely said that the Chinese would have their 1905. This means that, apart from the features which the Chinese revolution would have in common with the revolution in 1905, it would have its own specific peculiarities, which would stamp its special features on the whole revolution in China.

What are these peculiarities?

The first peculiarity is that the Chinese revolution as a bourgeois-democratic one is also a revolution for national freedom directed against the rule of foreign imperialism in China. This is the chief feature which distinguishes it from the revo-

lution in Russia in 1905. The position is that the rule of imperialism in China expresses itself not only in military power but above all in that the imperialists have the power of disposal over the main threads of industry in China, the railways, the factories, the mines, the banks etc. The result is that the questions of the struggle against foreign imperialism and its Chinese agents play a predominant part in the Chinese revolution. This is exactly what links the Chinese revolution directly with the revolutions of the proletarians of all countries against imperialism.

Another peculiarity of the Chinese revolution arises out of this peculiarity and that is that the national large bourgeoisie in China is extremely weak, much weaker than was the Russian bourgeoisie at the time of 1905. This is easy to understand. If the main threads of industry are gathered in the hands of foreign imperialists, the national large bourgeoisie of China cannot be weak and backward. In this respect Comrade Mif is quite in the right when he remarks that the weakness of the national bourgeoisie in China is a characteristic symptom of the Chinese revolution. From this results that the part of initiator and guide of the Chinese revolution, the part of leader of the Chinese peasantry must inevitably get into the hands of the Chinese proletariat, which is better organised and more active than the Chinese bourgeoisie.

Neither should the third peculiarity of the Chinese revolution be overlooked; it is that, in addition to China, the Soviet Union exists and is developing, the revolutionary experience and help of which cannot but facilitate the fight of the Chinese proletariat against imperialism and against the feudal-mediaeval remains in China.

These are the fundamental peculiarities of the Chinese revolution which determine its character and its trend.

## II. Imperialism and Imperialist Intervention in China.

The first defect of the theses before us is that they avoid or underestimate the question of imperialist intervention in China. If we read the theses correctly, we might imagine that there is at present in China no actual imperialist intervention, that there is nothing but a struggle of the North against the South or of one group of generals against another group of generals. We are apt to understand under intervention a condition in which foreign troops march into Chinese territory and, if this does not take place, then there is no intervention. This is a serious error, comrades, intervention is by no means exhausted by the entry of troops, and the entry of troops is by no means an essential characteristic of intervention. In the present circumstances of the revolutionary movement in capitalist countries, where the direct entry of foreign troops might rouse a number of protests and stir up conflict, intervention has assumed a more elastic character and a more masked form. In the present circumstances, imperialism prefers to intervene against the revolution by organising civil war within the dependent country, by financing the counter-revolutionary forces against the revolution, by moral and financial support of its Chinese agents. The imperialists tried to represent the fights of Denekin and Kolschak, Yudenitsch and Wrangel against the revolution in Russia as an exclusively internal struggle. But we all knew, and not we alone but the whole world knew, that these counter-revolutionary generals were backed by the imperialists of England and America, France and Japan, without whose support a serious civil war would have been quite impossible in Russia. The same applies to China. The fight of Wu Pei-Fu and Sun Tehuang-Fang, Chang Tso Lin and Chang Tsun Chan against the revolution in China would be quite impossible were it not that the imperialists of all countries had inspired these counter-revolutionary generals and had supplied them with money, arms, instructors, "advisers" etc. How is the power of the Canton troops to be explained? By their having an ideal, a passionate enthusiasm, by their being inspired in their fight for liberation from imperialism, by their wanting to give China her freedom. How is the power of the revolutionary generals in China to be explained? In that they are backed by the imperialists of all countries, the owners of all possible railways, concessions, factories, banks and business houses in China. For this reason it does not depend alone, it does not even depend to any large extent on whether foreign troops enter the country, but on the support given by the imperialists of all countries to the Chinese counter-revolution. Intervention by using other people — that is the kernel of imperialist intervention at present.

For these reasons imperialist intervention in China is an undoubted fact against which the point of the Chinese revolution is directed.

Anyone who eludes or undervalues imperialist intervention in China eludes or undervalues that which is most important and most essential.

It is said that the Japanese imperialists show a certain amount of "good-will" towards the Cantonese and towards the Chinese revolution as a whole. It is said that in this respect the American imperialists are in no way behind the Japanese. This is self-deception, comrades. We must know how to discern the true nature of the policy of the imperialists, including the Japanese and American imperialists behind their mask. Lenin used to say that it was difficult to win over revolutionaries with a stick, with fists, but that at times it is very easy to win them by kindness. This truth, spoken by Lenin, should never be forgotten, comrades. In any case it is clear that the Japanese-American imperialists have pretty well understood the significance of this truth. For this reason we must make a definite distinction between friendliness and compliments addressed to the Canton people, and the fact that the imperialists, who distribute their friendliness most liberally, cling most desperately to "their" concessions and railways in China, from which they do not wish to be "liberated" at any price.

## III. The Revolutionary Army in China.

The second remark in connection with the theses before us concerns the question of the revolutionary armies in China. The point is that the question of the army is evaded or undervalued in the theses. This is their second defect. The advance of the Cantonese towards the North is generally regarded not as the growth of the Chinese revolution but as a fight of the Canton generals against Wu Pei Fu and Sun Chuan Fang, as a fight

for supremacy of one group of generals against another group of generals. This is a great mistake, comrades. The revolutionary armies in China are the most important factor in the fight of the Chinese workers and peasants for their liberation. Is it then a mere coincidence that until May or June of this year the situation in China was regarded as the rule of the reaction which had set in after the defeat of Feng Yu Hsiang's army, but that in the summer of this year it was only necessary for the victorious Canton troops to advance northwards and occupy Hupeh in order to change the picture fundamentally in favour of the revolution? No, it was not a coincidence; for the advance of the Canton troops meant a blow aimed at imperialism, a blow aimed at its agents in China, it meant the freedom of assembly, freedom to strike, freedom of the Press, freedom of coalition for all the revolutionary elements in China in general and for the workers in particular. In this lies the peculiarity and the greatest importance of the revolutionary army in China.

In former times, in the 18th and 19th century, revolutions began in such a way that usually the people rose, for the greater part unarmed or badly armed, and encountered the army of the old regime. They made every effort to break up this army or at least to win it over as far as possible to their side. This was the typical form of the revolutionary explosions of the past. The same thing occurred with us in Russia in 1905. In China things developed on different lines. In China, it is not the unarmed people against the troops of their own government, but the armed people in the form of its revolutionary army. In China, armed revolution is fighting against armed counter-revolution. This is one of the peculiarities and one of the advantages of the Chinese revolution. This also explains the special significance of the revolutionary army in China.

It is therefore a reprehensible defect of the theses before us that they underestimate the revolutionary armies.

In consequence of this however, the Chinese communists ought to devote special attention to work in the army.

First of all the Chinese communists must use every means in their power to intensify political work in the army and must succeed in making the army a real and model support of the ideas of the Chinese revolution. This is particularly necessary at the present moment because the Canton troops are being joined by all kinds of generals who have nothing in common with the Kuomintang who join it as a force which overthrows the enemies of the Chinese people and who, by joining the Canton troops, introduce disintegration into the army. It is only possible to neutralise such "allies" or to turn them into genuine adherents of the Kuomintang by intensifying the political work and by organising revolutionary control over them. Unless this is done, the army may get into a most difficult position.

Secondly, the Chinese revolutionaries, including the communists, must make a special study of things military, they must not regard military questions as something of secondary importance, for military questions in China are at present the most important factor in the Chinese revolution. The Chinese revolutionaries, of course including the communists, must, with this object in view, study militarism in order to advance gradually and to be able to occupy some leading post or other in the revolutionary army. This will guarantee that the revolutionary army of China will follow the right path, will keep its eye steadily fixed on its aim. Unless this is carried out, it is inevitable that there should be vacillations in the army.

These are the tasks which Chinese Communist Party has to fulfil with regard to the question of the revolutionary army.

## IV. The Character of the Future Power in China.

The third remark concerns the fact that, in the theses, the question as to the character of the future revolutionary power in China is hardly dealt with at all or altogether disregarded. Comrade Mif, to his credit, has closely approached this question in his theses. But, when he was on the threshold of it, he failed to carry it out to the end, as though he had been frightened and did not dare to go further. Comrade Mif believes that the future revolutionary power in China will be a power of the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie under the leadership of the proletariat. What does this mean? At the time of the February revolution in 1917, the Menshevik and social revolutionaries were all petty bourgeois parties and to a certain extent revolutionary

Does this mean that the future revolutionary power in China will be a social revolutionary Menshevik power? No, it does not mean this. Why? Because the social-revolutionary Menshevik power was an imperialist power, whilst the future revolutionary power in China must be an anti-imperialist power. This is the fundamental difference. The MacDonald Government was actually a "Labour" power but it was at the same time imperialist for it was based on the maintenance of England's imperialist power, for instance in India and Egypt. As compared with the MacDonald Government, the future revolutionary power in China will have the advantage that it will be an anti-imperialist power. What is important is not the bourgeois-democratic character of the Canton Government which forms the nucleus of the future pan-Chinese revolutionary power; the most important thing is that this power is an anti-militarist power and can be nothing else, that every advance of this power is a blow aimed at world-imperialism and is therefore a stroke in favour of the revolutionary world movement. Lenin was right when he said that, if in former times, before the beginning of the epoch of the world revolution, national movements for freedom were part of the general democratic movement, now, after the victory of the Soviet revolution in Russia and since the beginning of the epoch of world revolutions, national movements for freedom are part of the proletarian world revolution.

This peculiarity was not taken into consideration by Comrade Mif.

I believe that the future revolutionary power in China will, in its character, resemble the power which was spoken of in our country in 1905, i. e. a dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, but with the distinguishing feature that it will be predominantly an anti-imperialist power. It will be a power of transition to a non-capitalist, or, to be more exact, to a socialist development of China.

This is the direction in which the revolution in China is likely to develop. This path of development which the revolution will follow, will be facilitated by three circumstances; firstly in that the point of the revolution in China, as a national revolution for freedom will be directed against imperialism and its agents in China, secondly in that the large bourgeoisie in China is weak, weaker than the national bourgeoisie was in Russia in 1905, which facilitates the hegemony of the proletariat, the leadership of the proletarian party as against the Chinese peasantry; thirdly, in that the revolution in China will develop in circumstances which make it possible to make use of the experience and the aid of the victorious revolution in the Soviet Union.

Whether this method will with certainty lead to victory, depends on many circumstances. One thing is clear, that it is the chief duty of the Chinese communists to fight to prepare the way for the development of the Chinese revolution.

From this we may conclude what is the chief task of the Chinese communists in the question of their relations to the Kuo Min Tang and to the future revolutionary power in China. It is said that the Chinese communists ought to secede from the Kuo Min Tang. This is pure folly, comrades. It would be the greatest mistake for the Chinese communists to leave the Kuo Min Tang. The whole course of the Chinese revolution, its character, its prospects, undoubtedly indicate that the Chinese communists ought to remain in the Kuo Min Tang and intensify their work in it. But can the Chinese Communist Party take part in the future revolutionary government? It not only can, it must. The course of the revolution in China, its character, its prospects, speak eloquently in favour of the Chinese Communist Party taking part in the future revolutionary government of China. This is one of the necessary guarantees for the hegemony of the Chinese proletariat becoming a concrete reality.

#### V. The Peasant Question in China.

The fourth remark concerns the question of the peasantry in China. Comrade Mif believes that we ought at once to issue the slogan of the formation of soviets, of peasant soviets, in the open country. I believe that this is a mistake. Comrade Mif is in too great a hurry. It is out of the question to form soviets in the country and to leave out the industrial centres in China. The question of organising soviets in the Chinese industrial centres, however, has not yet been raised. Furthermore, we must not forget that the soviets cannot be considered independently of

their connection with the whole situation. It would only be possible to organise soviets, let us say peasant soviets, if China were passing through a period of a flourishing peasant movement which would break down the old power and create a new one, under the assumption that the industrial centres of China had already broken down the barrier and entered on the phase of forming a soviet power. Can it be said that the Chinese peasantry or the Chinese revolution as a whole has already entered on this phase? No, it cannot be said. It is therefore trying to outpace evolution to speak of soviets at the present time. At the present moment, we must not raise the question of soviets, but of the formation of peasant committees; I mean committees, elected by the peasants, which are capable of formulating the fundamental demands of the peasantry and of taking all the necessary measures for realising these demands by revolutionary methods. These peasant committees should form the axis round which the revolution in the village can unfold.

I know that there are people amongst the adherents of the Kuo Min Tang and even among the Chinese communists who do not consider it possible to let loose the revolution in the village lest the enlistment of the peasantry in the revolution should disrupt the united front against imperialism. This is the greatest error. The anti-imperialist front in China will be all the stronger and more powerful the more quickly and thoroughly the Chinese peasantry is persuaded to join in the revolution. The authors of the theses, especially Comrades Fan Ping Shan and Rafee are perfectly right when they maintain that the immediate satisfaction of a number of the most urgent demands of the peasantry is an essential preliminary for the victory of the Chinese revolution. In my opinion, it is high time to do away with the indifference and "neutrality" towards the peasantry which is noticeable in the activity of certain elements of the Kuo Min Tang. I think that both the Communist Party of China and the Kuo Min Tang, including the Canton Government ought, without delay, to pass from words to deeds and immediately to raise the question of satisfying the most vital demands of the peasantry. What prospects open up in this respect and up to what limits an advance can and should be made — that depends on the course of the revolution. I think that it should finally be carried as far as the nationalisation of the land. In any case we cannot dispense with the slogan of the nationalisation of the land.

What path should be pursued by the Chinese revolutionaries in order to mobilise for the revolution the peasantry of China which numbers many millions?

I think that in present circumstances there are only three alternatives.

The first way is that of forming peasant committees and of introducing Chinese revolutionaries into them in order to influence the peasantry. (Interjection: "And the peasant leagues?") I believe that the peasant leagues will group themselves round the peasant committees or that the peasant leagues will turn into peasant committees possessing this or that competence which is necessary in order to carry through the demands of the peasants. This way has already been discussed, but this way is not enough. It would be ridiculous to suppose that the number of revolutionaries is sufficient to carry this out. The population of China is roughly 400 millions. Of these 350 millions are Chinese, and more than nine tenths of them are peasants. It is a great mistake to assume that a few tens of thousands of Chinese revolutionaries are enough to permeate this ocean of the peasantry. Well then, we must seek other ways.

The second way is that of influencing the peasantry through the apparatus of the new national revolutionary power. It cannot be doubted that in the newly liberated provinces a new power will arise after the pattern of the Canton Government. It cannot be doubted that this power and the apparatus of this power will have to satisfy the most urgent demands of the peasantry if it wishes to advance the revolution. The task of the communists and of the revolutionaries in China altogether is to penetrate into the apparatus of this new power, to bring this apparatus nearer to the masses of peasants and to help the peasant masses to satisfy their most urgent demands by means of this apparatus, whether it be by expropriating the landowners of their land, or by reducing taxation and rents — whatever the circumstances demand.

The third way is that of influencing the peasantry through the revolutionary army. I have already spoken of the extraordinary importance of the revolutionary army in the Chinese revolution. The revolutionary army of China is the force which first penetrates into the new provinces, which first becomes known

amongst the bulk of the peasantry, and by which the peasant forms his opinion of the new power, of its good or bad qualities. The attitude of the peasantry towards the new power, towards the Kuo Min Tang and towards the revolution in China as a whole, depends in the first place on the behaviour of the revolutionary army, on its behaviour towards the peasantry and towards the landowners, on its readiness to help the peasants. If we bear in mind that there are doubtful elements in plenty which have joined the revolutionary army in China, that these elements may alter the aspect of the army for the worse, we shall understand the great importance of the political aspect of the army and, so to speak, of its peasant policy in the eyes of the peasants. For this reason the communists and the Chinese revolutionaries as a whole must take all possible measures to neutralise the elements in the army which are hostile to the peasants, to preserve the revolutionary spirit in the army and to direct things in such a way that the army helps the peasants and mobilises them for the revolution. It is said that the revolutionary army in China is welcomed with open arms, but that later, after it has established itself, there is a certain disillusionment. The same thing happened with us in the Soviet Union during the civil war. This is explained by the fact that the army, when it has liberated new provinces and established itself in them, is compelled to maintain itself in some way or other at the expense of the population of the district. We Soviet revolutionaries, usually succeeded in making up for these disadvantages by endeavouring to help the peasants against the landowners by means of the army. It is essential that the Chinese revolutionaries should also learn to make up for these disadvantages by carrying out a correct peasant policy with the help of the army.

These are the methods and the points of contact through which it will be possible to carry out a correct peasant policy in China.

#### VI. The Proletariat and the Hegemony of the Proletariat in China.

The fifth remark concerns the question of the Chinese proletariat. It seems to me that in the theses sufficient emphasis has not been laid on the role of the Chinese working class and its importance. Comrade Rafes asks: Towards whom should the Chinese communists orientate—towards the Left or the Centre of the Kuo Min Tang? A strange question. I believe that the Chinese communists should orientate themselves according to the proletariat and to those who are active in the freedom movement in China and in the end according to the revolution. Only then will the question be put in the right way. I know that among the Chinese communists there are comrades who do not approve of strikes of workers for improving their material and legal position, and who dissuade the workers from striking (Interruption: That happened in Canton and Shanghai). This was a great mistake, comrades; it was a serious underestimate of the role and of the specific gravity of the proletariat in China. This should be recorded in the theses as a decidedly negative phenomenon. It would be a great mistake should the Chinese communists not take advantage of the present favourable situation to help the workers to improve their material and legal position, even though it be through strikes. Why in all conscience, have we a revolution in China?! A proletariat which allows its members to be beaten and illtreated by the agents of imperialism when they are on strike, cannot be a leader. This mediaeval abuse must be abolished so that the sense of power and the sense of its own dignity may be strengthened amongst the Chinese proletariat and that it may thus be made fit to hold the hegemony in the revolution. Unless this takes place, a victory of the revolution in China is not to be thought of. For this reason the economic and legal demands of the working class in China, which aim at a serious improvement of its situation, must be given the place they deserve in the theses. (Comrade Mif: they are spoken of in the theses.) Yes indeed, they are spoken of in the theses, but unfortunately these demands are not sufficiently emphasised.

#### VII. The Question of the Young People in China.

The sixth remark concerns the question of the young people in China. Strange that this question is not considered in the theses, for the question of the young people in China is of extreme importance. This question is, it is true, referred to in Comrade Tan Ping Shan's report, but unfortunately it is not

sufficiently emphasised. The question of the young people is at present of first-class importance in China. The young people at the universities (revolutionary students), the young workers, the young peasants—all of them form a force which might drive the revolution forward with giant strides, if the young people were brought under the ideological and political influence of the Kuo Min Tang. It must be borne in mind that there are none who experience the oppression of imperialism so deeply and so vividly, none who feel so sharply and so painfully the necessity of fighting against oppression, as the young people in China. This circumstance should be taken into consideration in every respect by the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese revolutionaries in order to bring about an intensification of work among the young people throughout the country. Youth must also have its place in the theses on the Chinese question.

#### VIII. A Few Final Conclusions.

I should like to draw two final conclusions — with regard to the fight against imperialism in China and with regard to the peasant question.

There can be no doubt that the Chinese communists will now no longer confine themselves to demanding the abolition of the unequal treaties. Even a counter-revolutionary like Chan Suen Lyan now advocates this demand. It is obvious that the Chinese Communist Party must go further. It must make the question of the nationalisation of the railways its aim. This is necessary, and things must be directed towards that end. A further aim must be that of the nationalisation of the most important factories. This raises above all the question of the nationalisation of those undertakings whose owners have distinguished themselves by special hostility and special aggressiveness towards the Chinese people.

Further, the peasant question must be promoted by combining it with the prospect of the revolution in China. In my opinion, the final aim of the whole matter must be the nationalisation of the land.

Everything else is a matter of course.

## POLITICS

### The Political Situation in Germany.

By P. R. Dietrich (Berlin).

It is part of the tradition of the Ebert-Hindenburg Republic to close the calendar year with a Government crisis. In the middle of December 1924 the second Marx Cabinet resigned. It was followed in January 1925 by the Luther Cabinet which remained in office until December 1925, at first with the German nationalists and later without them. Marx then again took over the government and formed a minority Cabinet of the Centre, which fell at the end of last week. It is the fourteenth government crisis which has been recorded in the history of the German Republic since the betrayal of the November revolution by the Kaiser socialists.

The immediate cause of the fall of the Marx-Stresemann-Külz-Gessler Government was the carrying of the social democratic vote of non-confidence which was passed by 240 votes of the Communists, Social Democrats, German Nationalists and People's Party against 171 votes of the Government Parties. The German Nationalists voted for the Social Democratic motion of non-confidence after "Chancellor Marx" had refused the guarantees demanded by the German Nationalists as the price of their support against the Social Democrats", i. e., the extension of the Government towards the Right by including the German Nationalists in the Government. The Social Democrats proposed the motion of non-confidence against the Marx Government not because they were on principle opposed to it, not because they were concerned to proclaim war against the anti-labour policy of the Government, but in order to clear the way for the big Coalition by the overthrow of the Government. The Social Democrats have given sufficient evidence, even in the last few days, that what they want is not a demonstrative change in the course taken by the Government. They abstained from voting in the vote of non-confidence proposed by the Communists against Külz, the author of the law against impure literature; they were prepared, if only they could get into the Government, to keep Gessler, in spite of their violent criticism of the Gessler system in the Reichswehr

Stampfer the chief editor of the "Vorwärts", expressly declared that a social democratic vote of non-confidence against a Government was far from being an expression of actual distrust, and Hermann Müller, in his speech in the Reichstag also emphasised that the S. P. of Germany has on the whole no fault to find with the policy of the Marx-Stresemann-Külz-Gessler Government.

The Communist Party alone fought for the overthrow of the Marx-Stresemann Government because it was opposed to it on principle, and at the same time declared that it was the duty of the working population to mobilise all its forces in the fight against the rule of trust capital, against the Coalition policy of the S. P. of Germany, to bring about the dissolution of the Reichstag, to guarantee a minimum standard of living for all workers and to establish a worker and peasant government.

As we have said, the parliamentary party manoeuvres of the Social Democrats and the German Nationalists were only the immediate cause of the fall of the Government. It is clearly evident from the Press of the Social Democrats and the German Nationalists that the party manoeuvre of these parties was not a voluntary one but was determined by a definite development and influence of class forces. The indirect causes of the present Government crisis are to be sought in this development, in the shifting of class forces which is becoming more and more evident, in the development towards the Left which is constantly affecting wider circles of the working people, and in the growing will to fight of the proletariat connected with this development.

In the German bourgeoisie, two groups are wrestling for the lead, the bourgeois Block and the Silverberg Block of the Great Coalition. For these two groups, everything centres on the question of power. The bourgeois Block puts the question of power frankly and brutally. For it, "the questions of regulations concerning the military and concerning industry, the questions of power are those of immediate urgency" (Berlin, "Börsen-Courier"). The Silverberg Block wishes to achieve the same by the way of the Big Coalition with the active support of the S. P. of Germany and of the trade union bureaucracy; the decision lies with the Centre. If to-day Marx, as the leader of the Centre Party, is resisting the formation of a government of the Bourgeois Block, it is only out of consideration for the workers of the Centre who are becoming radicalised as a consequence of capitalist rationalisation and who are beginning to join the ranks of the fighting front against capitalist rationalisation.

Since the overthrow of the Marx Government, the Social Democratic Party has once more confirmed its unconditional readiness to form into line with the ranks of the Silverberg Bloc. In return it only demands a few seats in the Ministry. The "Vorwärts" states with shameless frankness that Social Democracy is of the opinion that with the fall of the Government the last obstacles to the Big Coalition have been cleared out of the way. If it cannot be managed otherwise, Social Democracy is prepared to dispense with seats in the Ministry for the time being and to support a new minority government of the bourgeois Centre. These are the conclusions we can draw when the "Vorwärts" writes that it would be wrong to deduce from the fate of the Government that minority governments as such are impossible. This minority Government, continues the "Vorwärts", has after all been in power for seven months and might have continued to hold sway for years, had it possessed a united will and a firm leadership. In another place, the "Vorwärts" declares that men such as Wirth and Koch should not be missing in a Cabinet of the Centre.

The attitude of the Social Democratic leaders makes the Big Coalition an acute danger. The Government of the Big Coalition will continue the course taken by the Marx-Stresemann Government with regard to foreign and home politics. This course means for the German working class an intensified continuation of capitalist rationalisation and in consequence increased unemployment and still greater wholesale distress, new customs and taxation extortion, severe police terror against the working population, especially against the Communist Party, the continuation of the foreign policy of the German bourgeoisie which aims at incorporating Germany as an active participant in the ring of the groups of imperialist Powers against Soviet Russia.

The social democratic workers are opposed to the policy of the Coalition. The social democratic provincial Press has to take this attitude of the social democratic workers into consideration. At the same time it is trying to deceive the social democratic workers by representing the overthrow of the Marx Government as an open veering to the Left of the party leaders. "The way is clear, everyone is sighing with relief", writes the "Leip-

ziger Volkszeitung" and "at last, at last, Social Democracy has taken the place which history has assigned to it", chimes in the "Frankfurter Volksstimme". The task by which the Communist Party of Germany is faced is to expose this manoeuvre of deception, to lead the social democratic workers out of their position of opposition in the party into the fighting front against the Coalition policy, and consequently against capitalist rationalisation and its effects, against increased exploitation, against the reduction of wages and longer hours of work; to lead them into the fighting front for adequate wages and for the eight hours' day, for the demands of the unemployed, for a guarantee of a minimum standard of living for the working people — in accordance with the resolutions of the National Conference of Unemployed and of the Congress of the Workers.

## The Fight for Albania.

By M. Tanin (Moscow).

An insurrection has broken out in Albania; Italy has concluded a defensive treaty with Albania and has sent warships to the Albanian frontiers; confusion reigns in Athens; the semi-official French "Temps" is raising an alarm about the Italo-Albanian treaty . . .

It is only necessary to report these events in order to realise at once that great international complications slumber in the bosom of the alarming Albanian events. As a matter of fact, little Albania is the button in the Balkans which need only be gently pressed for the whole of Europe to ring with alarming signals which call attention to the danger of a military conflagration. The geographical situation of this unprotected country alone makes it the object of the greed of the large imperialist States of Europe and of the neighbouring small Balkan States (Jugoslavia, Greece); those who possess Albania, especially its northern port of Skutari and its southern port of Valona, rule over the commanding heights of the Balkan peninsula and have in their possession the key to the Adriatic and to the naval bases which facilitate the control of the great waterway — the Mediterranean. Albania is all the more a tempting morsel for the imperialists because it possesses naphtha-wells and great possibilities for the cultivation of cotton.

Moreover, the internal condition of the country is such as always to give a suitable excuse for intervention; the peasantry, groaning in semi-serfdom under the yoke of the great feudal boys often resorts to revolts which are further intensified by religious contradictions (three quarters of the population numbering 850,000 is Mohammedan, the rest Orthodox and Catholic).

One of these insurrections was the rebellion of the tribe of the Mirdites. A number of factors indicate that independently of the agrarian character of the movement, certain threads link it with Rome. In this respect it is indicative that at the head of the revolt is an Italian priest, Don Lora-Ciccca, who entertains connections with the Albanian circles with an Italian bias, and with Fan-Noli, the former chief of Albania, who fled to Italy after Achmed Zoga Bey, the present President, had seized the power. Judging by the events which followed, the object of the secret intervention of Italy was to force Achmed by blackmail to sign the "treaty of friendship" on November 27th, which has just been made public. This treaty contains a clause according to which Albania pledges itself to sign no political or military treaty which is directed against Italy. It is quite clear that, in view of the existing relation of forces between the two parties, Italy can interpret this point in so elastic a way as to establish a protectorate over Albania.

In recent times the economic and political penetration of Albania by Italian imperialism has proceeded at so rapid a pace that the country would actually seem to be an Italian colony. The Italian company "Selenida" has received a naphtha concession, other companies — a railway concession, a group of banks headed by the "Credito Italiano" has founded the Albanian National Bank — only in name, the Italian company "Svea" has spun a network of various undertakings over the whole country. At the same time the Italian diplomatic and military missions have supplemented the economic exploitation by political and military penetration. The present "treaty of friendship" is the crowning point of this policy of Fascist expansion in Albania. Fascist diplomacy has taken its revenge, it has almost achieved that which the other, imperialist States were compelled at one time to promise Italy at the Council of Embassadors (November 1921) — the protectorate over Albania.



This forging ahead of Mussolini's is creating a very tense situation in the Balkans and outside their borders. The most recent telegrams from Yugoslavia, which makes pretensions to Northern Albania, reveal great excitement in the political circles of Belgrade. The Albanian "excursion" of Fascist imperialism will have a similar effect on Greece. And yet, only a short time ago, there was talk of the "cordial friendship" which Mussolini had established between Italy on the one hand and Yugoslavia and Greece on the other hand.

France has been seized by no less excitement than have Italy's Balkan neighbours. The semi-official "Temps", in commenting on the Italo-Albanian treaty, remarks with indignation, that it signifies the subjugation of Albania by Italy. In view of the generally increasing tension in Italo-French relations and in view of the French support of Yugoslavia, which at the present time is being hard pressed by Italian imperialism, this circumstance will necessarily cause the greatest alarm in Paris and lead to further intensification of the relations between the latter and Rome.

The question naturally arises as to what is the attitude of England, the third participant in the former Entente, towards the attack of Fascist diplomacy. This question is all the more important because, apart from general political interests, English imperialism has considerable material interests in Albania. The Anglo-Persian Oil Company has a naphtha concession of 200,000 hectares in the district of Valona; other English companies are financing the construction of roads; furthermore English capital is showing an interest in the possibilities of cultivating cotton in Albania. At the same time England has succeeded in ensuring her political influence in Albania by taking over the "civilising" task of organising the gendarmerie for Achmed Zoga, which is to make it easier for him to suppress the peasant revolts.

This makes it clear that English and Italian interests must clash. In contrast to the French Press, however, we have up to the present seen no hostile commentary in the English Press with regard to the Italian assault on Albania. On the contrary, in April of this year, the English conservative journal "The Nineteenth Century" actually published an article by Colonel Sterling, the very officer who is organising the gendarmerie for the President of the Albanian beys and who speaks in a sympathetic tenor of Italy's interference, remarking that "commissioned by Europe, it will pacify this district of eternal unrest which is threatened by Bolshevik propaganda". This is undoubtedly a consequence of an Anglo-Italian agreement which was concluded in Livorno and which is directed against the Balkan peoples, Turkey and the U.S.S.R.

In view of all these events, we are involuntarily reminded of the forced departure of Comrade Krakoviecki, the Soviet representative in Albania at the end of 1924.

As is well known, the representatives of England and Italy in Tirana had exercised heavy pressure on Fan-Noli and demanded that he should dismiss the representative of the U.S.S.R. on the pretext that he was "a threat to the safety of Albania". The same gentlemen are now concluding an agreement which amounts to handing over the Albanian people to the bankers of Rome (and possibly also of London) and to destroying the independent Albania, a fully privileged member of the League of Nations — that protector of the small peoples!

Even more important than this self-revelation of the imperialists is the fact that the Fascist advance against Albania intensifies the danger of war in the Balkans and in Europe altogether; for, if, according to the traditional saying, the Balkans are the powder magazine of Europe, Albania is one of the slow-matches which lead to it. And the Fascist imperialists are now setting light to this slow-match.

## The New German Imperialism.

By Gerhard.

In the course of the last few years the German bourgeoisie has succeeded in stabilising capitalism to a certain degree. Mighty trusts in connection with the large banks (financial capital) have held brutal sway over the whole mass of workers and have held the command with unlimited power under the mask of the bourgeois republic.

The German bourgeoisie has achieved this stabilisation of German capitalism at the expense of the broad masses (rationali-

sation). The permanent and increasing pauperisation of the working masses is a necessary condition for the maintenance and further development of German capitalism.

In doing this, however, the German bourgeoisie has only fulfilled one side of its "tasks". It has still another "task" to fulfil. The German bourgeoisie must carry on an embittered fight for markets, for raw materials, for an increasing influence in the politics of the concert of Powers. For these reasons, German financial capital is trying with all the means and every method at its disposal to restore the old power of German imperialism.

What methods does the German bourgeoisie apply to this task?

1. The German bourgeoisie is taking a leading part in the formation of international cartels etc. The enormous development of the monopolies of German financial capital facilitates this policy.

2. It is beginning a systematic search for spheres of influence in colonial and semi-colonial countries (export of capital).

3. It is pursuing an intensive colonial propaganda and trying to carry through its demand for colonies in the "Council of Nations".

4. It is seeking alliances with other imperialist States.

5. It is systematically building up the "Reichswehr", not only into an army to be used in case of civil war but also into a cadre from which to develop a regular army.

6. In its chemical industry it is producing arms in preparation for the next war.

7. Under cover of the Reformists, it is attempting to mask its true imperialist intentions and to confuse the masses by such phrases as "a fight for the freedom of Germany".

### What Is the Significance of the Formation of International Cartels?

An "iron", an "electric" peace? Of course not. These international cartels do not mean any smoothing down of the imperialist contradictions; on the contrary, even before they are again disrupted, they mean an intensified imperialist fight between powerful groups.

The great war was a fight between the imperialist groups for the redistribution of the world. At Versailles, the victors divided things up at the expense of the defeated nations. German financial capital is now trying to prepare for a new distribution in its favour. So far it has of course only taken the first steps, but in this respect a whole number of facts already exist. German banks in alliance with Krupp are negotiating with Persia and Turkey as to the building and construction of railways. German colonial associations are beginning systematically, in connection with English finance, to buy back the former colonial possessions of Germany. (A short time ago, an association of this kind acquired large plantations in Cameroon.) In China, the control of the whole antimony trade is in the hands of German financial capital. A few months ago, the German Government gave the so-called Morocco credits to the Mannesmann Works which have large possessions in Morocco. As we have said, this is only a modest beginning, but the development is clear. German financial capital is making obstinate efforts to get its share in the business of exploiting the colonial peoples.

Seeking for New Allies, the German bourgeoisie has joined the League of Nations. The League of Nations is the organisation of the imperialists in which new alliances, intervention against Soviet Russia and new wars are being prepared. The German bourgeoisie has steered its course towards the "West". It is hoping that the alliance with other imperialist States will help it to advance more quickly towards the restoration of an active German imperialism. The English bourgeoisie is organising the campaign against Soviet Russia. The German bourgeoisie is prepared actively to support this fight in return for suitable concessions.

The "Reichswehr" is not only an army for civil war — it is fathered by the leaders of the S. P. of Germany — but it is the organisation which forms the framework for the future imperialist army of the German bourgeoisie. It is built up and drilled in such a way, it has in the question of organisation, such connection with the various Fascist leagues, that in the

case of a war this army, 100,000 strong, could in a short time be turned into an army of millions, especially if the German bourgeoisie takes part in imperialist adventures in alliance with other imperialist powers and if such alliances allow of a rapid transformation of the army.

In such a case, "disarmed" Germany can relatively easily prepare modern weapons. There is no doubt that the powerful chemical industry of Germany is already preparing for future war (gas etc.). In the same way the powerful heavy industry of Germany, which has only too much experience, can quickly be transformed for the production of war material.

For this reason, the bourgeoisie and the social democrats nowadays speak nothing but the language of the "angel of peace". Everything is based on the "Reconciliation of the People" and on the Republic.

The masses, however, must not and will not let themselves be deceived. They are beginning to rebel against their misery. It must be made clear to them that they are threatened with still greater distress by the next imperialist war with the active participation of the German bourgeoisie.

Just as the working masses can only completely overcome their misery if they substitute their rule for the rule of the bourgeoisie, they can only prevent the next imperialist war if they finally and decisively defeat the bourgeoisie.

## FOR THE UNITY OF THE C. P. S. U.

**Either one Thing or the Other.**

(Leading Article of "Pravda".)

Moscow, December 15th 1926.

The political significance of the appearance of the opposition is the struggle against the Party, against Leninism and against the range of the opposition was a fractional appeal against the party, cannot be concealed. The violation of the declaration of October 16th can be cloaked by no sophism. One must not be blind and overlook the fact that the opposition supports the Ultra-Left and Ultra-Right groupings and those counter-revolutionaries who have been expelled from the Comintern. One must realise that the opposition holds itself at the plenum like a group apart from the party, like "the nucleus of a new party". The meaning of the ideological struggle carried on by the opposition at the Plenum, is the struggle against the party, against Leninism and against the fundamental principles of Lenin. Naturally, the opposition remained also this time true to its usual strategy, the camouflage strategy. However, no camouflage can cloak the main fact of the discussion in the Comintern: The opposition revised the basic principles of Bolshevism under the flag of its hypocritical defence.

The furious struggle of the opposition against the Party can only be understood in two cases. Either the opposition believes that the party has "unconsciously" abandoned the path of Leninism, but to recognise this would be to recognise that the Bolshevik party is no Leninist party. Such an extraordinary "idea" means the greatest calumny of the party and shows the greatest self-superiority of the leaders of the opposition with regard to the advance guard of the proletariat. Or the opposition believes that it is opposed to the ideological attitude of the party, that the boundaries of the Leninist party "limit" it, that it considers it necessary to build a bridge between Leninism and Trotzkyism and Otto Bauer. The whole party can see that the opposition is making for this aim, that it is defending Trotzkyism under the mask of "true" Leninism. In questions of principle the party will make no compromise with the opposition, it will give way for no one and for no price in regard to the principles of Leninism.

The party sees that the opposition is going farther and farther away from it, that the opposition is going farther and farther to the Right, although it does this to the accompaniment of "Left" phrases. The party sees exactly that the opposition has gone too far. The party is prepared to raise its voice once again and to demand once again from the opposition a definite categorical answer to the following question: **Does the opposition consider the party competent to decide all questions of the revolution and all questions of Leninism finally? Does it regard all the decisions of the party as absolutely binding for it or not? Is the opposition prepared to subordinate itself to the decisions of the party or not? What does the opposition stand for: For a victorious building up of socialism or for a capitulation in face**

of the difficulties? For Leninism or Trotzkyism? Does it wish to regard Trotzkyism as a legal ideological "tendency" in the party and does it wish the struggle against Trotzkyism to be stopped or is it in favour of the fight against, and the liquidation of Trotzkyism? Is it in favour of finishing with the social democratic deviations in our ranks and carrying out the decisions of the 15th party conference or does it want to continue in its deviations? Is it in favour of a merciless struggle of the party against the supporters of Souvarine and Korsch or is it in favour of re-admitting incorrigible counter-revolutionaries into the Comintern? Is it in favour of consolidating the unity of the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and the Comintern or the discription and weakening of this unity?

Lenin or Otto Bauer? The opposition must chose. One or the other. Upon its part the party will study the lessons of the Comintern discussion upon the question of the opposition in the C. P. of the U. S. S. R. and draw its conclusions from the fact that the opposition has opposed the decisions of the party and broken its promises.

## FOR THE UNITY OF THE TRADE UNION MOVEMENT

**A Reactionary Manoeuvre to Split the American Unions.**

By A. Bittelmann and Earl Browder.

News is brought by Tass under New York date line, December 10, of a new manoeuvre by the trade union reactionaries to engineer splits in several unions in order to rid themselves from the "annoying" activities of the left wing. The coming of this move was "in the air" for quite some time, inasmuch as the growing power and prestige of the left wing was becoming really dangerous to the continued rule of the reactionaries in several unions.

The news dispatch reports a meeting of officials of the A. F. of L. and also of independent unions, among them representatives of the **Amalgamated Clothing Workers**, at which meeting a committee was formed to fight the communists. This meeting also provided for the calling of a conference on December 21, to "discuss a plan for the complete removal of communists from the United States labour movement".

It is also reported that several days prior to the above meeting another conference took place at which were present the first vice-president of the A. F. of L., **Mathew Woll**; the president of the **United Mine Workers**, **Lewis**; the president of the **United Textile Workers**, **MacMahon**; and several other reactionary trade union officials, at which was discussed the same question of removing the communists and left wing militants from the trade unions. Simultaneously with these developments the right-wing in the **International Ladies Garment Workers Union**, which was ousted from office by the left wing in 1925, is making an attempt to regain control of the union, disregarding the fact that 15,000 cloakmakers are still on strike. These developments expose a well-planned campaign by the reactionary bureaucracy to expell the communists and left wing militants from the trade unions even at the expense of splitting those unions where the communists have gained or are about to gain leadership.

In the beginning of 1925, the left wing came into leadership of the New York organisation of the **furworkers union**, after a prolonged and bitter fight with the right wing. Upon getting into office, the left wing administration, in which communists played a prominent role, immediately reorganised and strengthened the union, initiated a militant policy against the employers for the improvement of the conditions of the workers, which culminated in a great strike early this year, in which participated 13,000 furworkers. After 13 weeks of struggle, in which the defeated right-wing openly and secretly conspired together with the employers and the president of the A. F. of L., **William Green**, to defeat the workers, the furworkers union won a brilliant victory, gaining for the first time in America the five-day, 40-hour week, with substantial increases in wages. This strike was the first one of considerable magnitude to be won in the United States in the past several years. It aroused tremendous enthusiasm among the masses, increased greatly the prestige of the communists and left wing, and marked a serious defeat for the reactionaries.

The reactionaries of the A. F. of L. felt the sting of the defeat so deeply that they engineered an investigation of the conduct of the strike, carried out in "star-chamber" fashion, in hopes of finding some excuse for reorganising the union.

About 15 months ago, another big needle trades union was won by the left wing, the New York organisation of the **International Ladies Garment Workers Union**. The communists and left wing leadership of this union had carried through a number of mass organisation campaigns, which inaugurated entirely new methods of organising the unorganised masses. In August this movement culminated in a strike of 40,000 cloakmakers for the five-day, 40-hour week and other demands. Three months of struggle, in which mass picketing demonstrations were participated in by tens of thousands of workers, and in which the strikers were subjected to severe police repressions and brutalities, has already won a partial victory for 25,000 strikers, with 15,000 still continuing the struggle. Here, as in the furworkers union, the policies and leadership of the left wing greatly increased its support among the masses, which quite naturally added to the worries of the reactionaries.

Then there were the developments in **Passaic**. Here were 14,000 entirely unorganised textile workers, in a manufacturing centre which had seemingly been granted immunity from organisation by the reactionary trade union leaders. Beginning with a small strike of one mill, organised and led by communists, this quickly developed during February, this year, into a great mass strike involving all textile workers in Passaic. The story of this strike, and the police attacks by means of armoured cars, gas bombs, and all modern instruments of warfare, has become internationally famous, and the name of the communist leader, **Weisbord**, has become known throughout the world. The strategy of the strike leadership, and the strike relief organisation set up all over the country by the communists, constitute a real contribution to working class experience. The trade union bureaucracy joined in the outcry of the employers against the communist leadership and the demand for the retirement of Weisbord from the strike. In this they were successful only to the extent of forcing Weisbord out, but they could not break the ranks of the workers who continued to accept the leadership of communists and left wingers; the A. F. of L. bureaucracy were forced to accept the new union into the United Textile Workers. Under pressure of mass sentiment the reactionaries were compelled to assume responsibility for the successful continuation of the strike. The left wing has stood guard vigilantly against threatening betrayal, has maintained the strike until now, and but recently won a settlement in one Passaic mill. Next to the developments in the garment trades, this great success of the communists in Passaic was the bitterest pill which the reactionary bureaucracy had been compelled to swallow.

The latest cause for a panic of fear among the bureaucrats was the crystallisation of a broad opposition movement in the **United Mine Workers Union** elections now taking place. This opposition movement grows out of a crisis in the mining industry, and the unbelievable corruption in the union officialdom. **Farrington**, one of the big leaders of the union, has just been exposed as being on the payroll of the Peabody Coal Corporation at a salary of 25,000 dollars per year. It is generally believed that **Lewis**, president of the Union, has similar relations with the coal owners. As a result of the treacherous policy of Lewis, his reckless inner-union warfare against the left wing, and of the crisis in the industry, the Union has been shaken to its foundations and is threatened with destruction. The growing resentment among the miners, which even two years ago was crystallised into a movement by the T. U. E. L. which received the support of one-third of the membership, has now broadened into a combination of left-wingers, progressives, communists, and militant trade unionists, with a programme of ousting the Lewis machine, or-

ganising the unorganised miners, nationalisation of the mines, etc., under the general slogan of "Save the Union". The opposition ticket in the union election is headed by an ex-socialist, **John Brophy**, and includes several revolutionists of long standing, such as **Howatt**, **Tumulty**, and others. This movement, which undoubtedly has behind it a majority of the miners, is driving the Lewis machine to desperation. Lewis will not stop even before splitting the union to save himself from destruction.

The meaning of all these developments is obvious. In three important sections of the labour movement, the communists and the left wing have won leadership, in some cases including organisational control of strategic districts of the unions, due to dislocations and crises in the mining, textile, and garment industries. While this situation is not characteristic of the labour movement as a whole, it has opened up an entirely new perspective in America, and has become a serious menace to the old bureaucracy of the A. F. of L.

In view of the above, it is not surprising to find in the **Tass** reports mentioned at the beginning, that at the anti-communist conferences were in attendance **Lewis**, who is facing defeat in the Miners Union at the hands of the aroused miners led by the combined progressive-communist opposition; **MacMahon**, president of the Textile Workers Union, who was compelled to admit the new left-wing led union of the Passaic strikers, thus creating the basis for a mass opposition to his continued rule; and the old officials of the garment unions, some of them already ousted from office by the left wing, and all of them seriously threatened. Doubtless among them are **Hillman**, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, **Sigman**, president of the Garment Workers, and **Kaufman**, who was ousted from the presidency of the Furriers Union. The pressure under which these particular officials work doubtless forces them to take the initiative in organising this anti-communist movement; but at the same time it is becoming more and more a pressing requirement for the entire A. F. of L. class-collaboration programme that the growing left wing shall be exterminated.

The manoeuvre of the reactionaries which threatens to split the trade unions, in order that they may rid themselves of this growing left wing, imposes upon the American workers, particularly upon the T. U. E. L. and the communists, the task of mobilising the broadest possible mass resistance, in order to preserve the unity and the very existence of the trade unions as militant class organisations, and to continue the struggle for their complete revolutionisation.

---



---

### To our Readers!

The monthly subscription rates for the "Inprecorr" are as follows:

England . . . . .	2 sh.
America . . . . .	50 cents
Germany . . . . .	1,50 marks
Austria . . . . .	2 (Austrian) Schillings
Norway . . . . .	2 crowns
Sweden . . . . .	1,50 crowns
Denmark . . . . .	2 crowns

The subscription rate for other countries is three dollars (or equivalent in local currency) for six months.

These subscriptions include all **Special Numbers** besides the Regular Number.