

Comrade Pepper (United States) :

I am afraid that the Enlarged Executive is showing too little attention for the problems which the CI must solve. We must remember that here we have completely new parts of the globe and thus completely new problems which the CI and Marxism have not yet mastered.

The first period of the CI might be characterised as a **Central European period**. The second period was characterised by the fact that the CI succeeded in drawing the **Far East** into its sphere of interest. Since the Fifth World Congress (and for some of us even before then) it was clear that we must draw a new region into our sphere of interest, and **this region I want to call the Far West**. I believe that the policy of the CI will be dominated more and more powerfully by Great Britain, by the United States of America and by Latin America. That is the new element of our period.

The dominating problem in this Far West is the problem of the labour party, just as social democracy was the specific problem for our parties in Central Europe and the revolutionary national movement for our movement in the Far East.

Already at the Fifth World Congress I tried to bring the problem of the Labour Party into the forefront of the debate, evidently not with any great success. Still we have something new in Great Britain, two phenomena in fact; 1) the **minority movement**, which since the Fifth World Congress has become a mass movement, and 2) the crystallisation of a **left wing** within the Labour Party. There was no discussion with regard to the Minority Movement. The crystallisation of a **left wing** in the LP, however, encountered the resistance of a certain section of our British comrades. Developments showed, however, that the CI, which had energetically advocated it, was right. The Left Wing of the LP is already of great importance. It is, of course, not a Communist Wing, it is very vague; nevertheless it is already strongly antagonistic to the Mac-Donald-Snowden Wing and in the most important questions is even conducting an independent policy (Vote on the travelling expenses of the Prince of Wales, on air defense, etc.). One after the other, various sections of the Left Wing are being organised. It is becoming evident that ideologically, politically and even organisationally, the Left Wing is beginning to break away from the Right.

How shall our Communist Party work under these conditions? We said that it ought to affiliate with the Labour Party. The leaders of the LP wanted to throw the communists out, but this decision, in consequence of the good fight put up by our comrades, remained merely on paper. The organisation and mass character of the Minority Movement is perhaps a still greater victory of the ideas and the policy of the CI in Great Britain. The most important problem,

however, is: **How can the Communist Party seize the leadership of all these movements?** A Party with four or five thousand members cannot equal to so great a task. I therefore believe that the next and most important task for the British Party consists in finding the **specific British methods** which make it possible for our British Party — in spite of all the contrary traditions of the British labour movement — to become a mass party. So much the more is it a pity that Comrade Gallacher failed to touch on the specific concrete British problem in his report. Our British Party understands very well how to utilise the **trade union problems** energetically, but in the exploitation of **political problems** it is still not sufficiently energetic. For instance, it did not take sufficient advantage of the fight against the monarchy, although the debates in the Labour Party show that this question is a popular one and that this question — even though in a limited form — draws the attention of the workers to the **question of power**.

The second great country which must wrestle with the problem of the Labour Party, is the **United States of America**. The US is politically still more backward than Great Britain in the sense that in spite of the existence of a powerful industrial working class, it still has no organised political mass party of the proletariat. **Today the principal problem of the american working class is to make it politically and organisationally independent of the great parties of the bourgeoisie and of the petty bourgeois party of La Follette.** That is politically the most elementary class task of the proletariat. The CPA is faced by the task of transforming itself into a mass communist party. It is evident that in practice there is today a **great chasm** between these two tasks, which must be overcome by some sort of bridge. **This bridge is the Labour Party.** It is clear that parties built up on individual membership are a much more advanced, conscious, active form of labour party, than the collective form of labour party. Historical circumstances, however, determined that the development of the labour movement in Great Britain, America, Canada, South Africa, Australia and Belgium assumed the form of a labour party and not the form of social democratic parties. I explained the fundamental reason for this development at the Fifth Congress. They are certainly not due to the Anglo-Saxon character of these countries, but to the fact that the early imperialist industrial monopolistic development very early split the proletariat of these countries into the labour aristocracy and the oppressed, unskilled masses of workers, which led to the development of the labour party type. Not until after the smashing of the British industrial monopoly, when the bourgeoisie could no longer divide fat super-profits with the labour aristocracy, and when on the other hand, a process of organisation and of partially successful fights for a higher standard of living had begun in the deep masses of the unskilled proletariat, and when the two sections of the proletariat thus came nearer to each other to some extent, for the first time the possibility arose of organising a political mass party in Great Britain.

In America the social split of the working class is still more evidenced by national differences. The labour aristocracy lived on about the same scale as the bourgeoisie of the capitalist countries of Europe, the real proletariat, however, lived in much worse circumstances than the industrial worker of Germany or of other countries. **The war, however, changed all this.** America at last obtained a centralised, militarised, bureaucratised government. Besides **free land** and the **social split of the working class**, the absence of such a centralised national government was the third reason why no socialist movement developed in the United States. With the aid of this government, the bourgeoisie considerably shook the privileges of the labour aristocracy. Thus the labour aristocracy was compelled at first to concern itself with political questions. But now within the great masses of unskilled workers a new process is also manifest.

During the war, when war industry enormously expanded and no new masses of workers could be imported from Europe, the value of unskilled labour power and the standard of life of the unskilled masses increased tremendously. The war led for the first time to the organisation of millions of unskilled workers into trade unions. By this rapprochement between the labour aristocracy and the unskilled workers, the possibility of a political mass party of the proletariat arose for the **first time in the history** of the United States.

Now as to the role of the small conscious political group within the Labour Party. We have various groups in America

trying to organise a labour party under their leadership (such as the Socialist Party, the Fitzpatrick group in Chicago, the Lafolette group and the Workers' Party of America). Whether or not this will be useful for the proletariat is a matter of opinion. But it is a fact that it is not one group alone which wishes to organise a Labour Party, but that several groups wish to play the role of the British Independent Labour Party. And the Communist Party must take this into account.

The historical task of the CP in the USA can be nothing else in this period than **to transform itself into a mass communist party**. This means that it must take the initiative in organising a labour party, must join with every movement for a labour party, must drive this movement ahead, and get as much as possible out of this movement for itself. We had a discussion on this question in America. One group opposed this labour party policy, and the other group — our group — said that **we must exploit this historical course of development**. I will not go into detail on these fights. But it is necessary that the theses on Bolshevisation contain this important task of the American Party. We hope that this will happen.

This problem is not restricted to America alone but affects other great districts, as mentioned above. It would be anti-Marxist, injurious and impossible to solve these specific problems by ready-made means of solution imported from Central Europe. When the French, Czech, or German Party issue the slogan: "We are the only class party of the proletariat", it would be wrong to issue it for Great Britain and still worse for the United States of America.

Of course the Labour party is not a revolutionary class party of the proletariat. In spite of this fact we must not only join it in America, but must take the initiative in organising it. The CP cannot become a mass party so long as the proletariat is organised in the camp of the bourgeoisie. Development might skip certain stages, but to skip in America the whole history of the labour movement is impossible.

It is certain that development in America will be much shorter than development in Germany from the 'sixties to the world war. We must not see **only the backwardness** of America, but we must **also** see that America today is the dominating nation of the imperialist world, that today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow it may have conflicts, that at any moment it may be drawn into war and that America has the **greatest proletariat** and the mightiest industry.

In America one must not forget that on account of special historical circumstances, we are in a much better situation than the CP. GB. There is a possibility that the CPA can play the role of the ILP of Great Britain, the role of the organiser the ideologist, the pioneer, the leader of a Labour Party. In this way, the CP can actually gain contact with the proletarian masses of America, secondly, it can become a real mass party, and thirdly, by the awakening of the class-consciousness of the proletariat, it can give an unexampled impetus to the whole development.

I believe that the correct solution of this problem can only be found when not only the British and American comrades engage in this work, but when all the leading parties of the Comintern and especially the trained parties, the Russian and German Parties, assist in solving this new problem of the Far West.

Comrade Cannon:

The problem of Bolshevisation in America has certain concrete aspects: The problem is concurrent with the problem of organising the party, for we are **at the beginning of the task of forming a communist party in America**, and the situation is different from the countries of Europe. We never had a revolutionary mass movement in America and have few traditions and experiences to draw upon. We have a large proletariat in America, but the party has only 20,000 members, of which only 2,000 are in the English speaking organisations. The American proletariat is politically very backward and the most elementary tasks are necessary in the attempt to set it in motion.

We must develop the propaganda of Marxist-Leninist theory. In this sense I agree with Comrade Bela Kun's report. The Party developed from two sources — the Socialist Party which never had any Marxian theory, and from the syndicalist