

Amter (U. S. A.)

Criticized the attitude of the Scandinavian Parties on the question of centralization. He attributed it partly to the fact that they had been free from the attacks of capital which the

rest of Europe had experienced. International discipline and centralization were necessary because there were big tasks before the party. Their complaint that centralization destroyed the initiative of the local organizations was unjustified. Their plea of peculiar national conditions was the one usually advanced in such cases. The International had not exerted its authority sufficiently as was the case in America. It had proved its capacity for giving advice and of using a strong hand when necessary.

Criticizing the Italian party he said, that for the Communists to have put up the barrier against the Socialists when they were prepared to fuse with the Communist Party was a crime against the Italian movement and against the International.

He was of the opinion that the question of religion had not been sufficiently agitated, especially as regards America.

There the Church was openly used as a tool of the capitalists against all advanced movements of the workers. Should the American party remain silent when atheism is being discussed even in the colleges? He did not agree with Newbold that this was a campaign that could be handed over to subsidiary organizations. A similar stand against religion must be made in England.

He believed that in America, the slogan of the Workers' and Farmers' Government was necessary, but in common with the British comrades, he was of the opinion that it should be so framed that the poor and working farmer would be got to understand, that there was a cleavage between him and the exploiting farmer. To secure such a cleavage would be a victory for us. There was no danger that the peasant farmer would be a danger to the proletarian dictatorship.
