

# The Labour Party Problem in Norway

John Pepper

**A**T present the Norwegian Labour movement is experiencing fundamental changes. Its political parties were founded recently, both on the basis of the organisational principles of a Labour Party, based not on individual membership but on the collective affiliation of the trade unions. One of the parties arose from the amalgamation of Tranmael's Norwegian Workers' Party with the Social Democratic Party, the other was formed through the amalgamation of the Left trade unions and the Communist Party. The entire policy and even the very existence of the Communist Party of Norway were involved in the struggle for the establishment of these two parties. It is therefore very important to be absolutely clear about the Labour Party question in Norway.

Of course it is not a matter of chance that in some countries the political Labour movement has developed on the basis of individual membership (Germany, France, Italy), while in other countries the political mass movement of the working class has developed on the basis of affiliated membership of the trade unions (Great Britain, Australia, Canada, tendencies in the United States). Closer investigation shows that the Labour Party form of political development for the Labour movement is primarily connected with the untimely division of the working class into a Labour aristocracy and the real working class. In imperialist countries (or colonies where the white population plays an imperialist role with respect to the natives) trade unions came first in history, and much later, on the initiative of the trade unions, a political party was founded. But development was in the reverse order in countries where imperialist development set in comparatively late, where political parties had already been formed prior to the split in the working class; there the political party took the initiative in the establishment of trade unions.

(Contd. from p. 98.)

contingents are, as it were, "transferred," and it is upon these "transferred divisions" that the capitalists depend for the realisation of some of their plans. Some of these transferred divisions are made up of workers in uniform, of soldiers; some of them are formed by transport workers engaged in carrying soldiers and arms; some of them, again, consist of workers in munition factories, and army supply shops. If May Day is, above all, to be devoted to a protest against imperialist wars, then it is imperative that all these workers who are now being used by the imperialist governments for the prosecution of war should play a special part in the demonstration.

"War still rules mankind even to-day—though under a mask." These words appeared in the manifesto issued by the Fifth Congress of the Communist International on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the Great War. But, dissemble as it may, war is becoming more and more obvious, and it behoves us to utilise the May Day demonstrations in order to deal it a powerful blow.

But there are also a few countries (Sweden, Norway, Hungary) where, in spite of the fact that those countries are not imperialist, the political parties of the workers, insofar as they are mass parties, are based directly on the trade unions. Peculiar historical circumstances, which have not yet been sufficiently investigated, are the explanation of this unusual development.

## An Historical Explanation

In these countries the political party was the first to appear in the Labour movement, and founded the trade unions; but the workers did not constitute a real proletariat from the point of view of large-scale industry, they were rather a section of artisans with very strongly developed trade differences and a guild spirit, much stronger than the political class associations. This peculiar transitional stage between the artisans and the proletarians explains the fact that the political mass party is based on the trade unions in these countries.

It would be erroneous and historically untrue if the affiliated membership of the political parties in Norway, Sweden or Hungary were to be treated in the same manner as the affiliated membership of the Labour Party in Great Britain. What is termed the "Anglo-Saxon" type of Labour Party is closely connected with imperialist development, and the Norwegian development—if we mean to get a correct idea of it—must under no circumstances whatever be thrown into the same pot. In spite of outward similarities we cannot call the development of the political party in Norway, which is based on collective membership, a real growth of a Labour Party in the true historical sense of the word. To understand the present development of the Norwegian Labour movement we must take into consideration the following fundamental factors:

1. The Norwegian working class is not yet a working class of big industry in the British, American or German sense of the word. Much of the artisan character still permeates it; it is still to a great extent animated by the old guild spirit.
2. The Norwegian workers constitute a relatively big political force in the country, not at all commensurate either with their numerical strength or their importance in the process of production.
3. The Norwegian workers are relatively very radical, much more radical than the revolutionary development of the country would imply.

Only a complete understanding of the direction of historical development of Norway will give an explanation for the relatively big political power and the radicalism of the Norwegian workers. The Norwegian bourgeoisie is relatively very weak. Capitalist development in Norway set in rather late. Capital in Norway is to great extent foreign. Marx declared that the Norwegian small peasants had already made themselves quite independent of the towns. For a long time Norway was not an independent country, but was tied either to Denmark or Sweden. Not the bourgeoisie, but certain sections of intellectuals dominated in politics. These

**Labour Party Problem in Norway—continued**

intellectuals, however, did not come from the bourgeoisie, but either from the peasantry or traditional intellectual families. The peasantry was always a relatively big force. Numerically, it is the most important section of the population, and through its intellectuals it had at least an indirect influence on the State. In fact the constitution of Norway contains a clause according to which no less than two-thirds of the members of parliament must always come from rural circles.

The power of the government in Norway was always relatively very weak, and even to-day we find considerable relics of self-government. The long struggle of decades for the national independence of the country led to the further weakening of centralised State power. Many sections of the peasantry, the intellectuals, and particularly of the working class became very much radicalised in the struggle against union with Sweden. Leadership in the struggle for national independence was not in the hands of the bourgeoisie, and the struggle was directed both against the Swedish dynasty and against the State machine. These historical circumstances make it clear why the bourgeoisie in Norway is weaker than it should normally be, and why on the other hand the working class gives evidence of a relative political strength and a relative radicalism greater than the present ripeness of the revolutionary situation in Norway.

4. There is an extremely stubborn and deeply-rooted tradition of the Norwegian Labour movement, according to which the political party is organisationally connected with the trade unions.

**An Abnormal Position**

5. Up to the establishment of the two political parties mentioned above, Norway presented the spectacle of a remarkable tripartite division of the political Labour movement: on the Right a weak Social Democratic party, on the Left a Communist Party, not very strong, and in the centre the Tranmael party as the only big mass party. Unlike the Tranmael party, which was built up on collective membership, the Social Democratic and the Communist Parties had abandoned the tradition of collective membership, and this was surely one of the reasons why neither of the two parties has become a real mass party.

Thus compared with the general situation in Europe the Norwegian Labour movement presents an "abnormal" picture. Since the fusion of the Two-and-a-Half International with the Second International the "normal" situation in the European Labour movement is a bipartite division of the political movement—a polarisation: on the Right the Social Democratic party, on the Left of the Communist Party. The proportions between these two parties vary considerably in the various countries, but the bipartite division exists everywhere. Norway was the last European country where the "abnormality" of tripartite division of the political Labour movement existed.

**Capitalist Attack**

6. Another reason is the regime of the conservative government and a vigorous capitalist offensive. The government is trying to restrict the rights of the trade

unions, to secure the "right to work" of strike-breakers by sentences of imprisonment, to force the introduction of secret ballot in the trade unions during strikes. Employers' associations are endeavouring to enforce considerable wage reductions (25 to 50 per cent.) all along the line.

The above-mentioned facts and factors have called forth during the last few years a strong and ever-growing desire for unity among the Norwegian workers. The Communist Party endeavoured to utilise this "rally desire" (to use the Norwegian expression) for various united front campaigns. An attempt was made to give this desire the form of a Labour Party, but without any result worth mentioning. Then the "rally idea" was taken up by Tranmael, and a big "rally congress" was convened by the Tranmaelites, the Social Democrats and the trade union executive. The three organisations formed a so-called Committee of Twelve which was to give a lead in rallying the workers. They talked about a class rally, but what they actually aimed at was of course only a party rally. The Tranmaelites wanted only to unite with the Social Democrats, leaving the Communists out of the rally. The big political stake of the rally campaign was those trade unions which had been hitherto outside the Tranmael party, and organisationally outside any political movement whatsoever.

From the organisational viewpoint the Tranmael party had only captured a minority of the trade union movement. The majority of the trade unions were politically "neutral," in other words, they had no organisational connection with any of the political parties, although some of them were under the influence of the Social Democrats and others again under the influence of the Communists.

**A "Rally" Congress**

The convocation of the "rally" Congress was enthusiastically greeted by the workers. For a time it really seemed as if the fusion of the Tranmael party with the Social Democrats was looked upon by considerable sections of the proletariat as a real unification of the working class. The desire for political unity among the working class was so strong that not only did it begin to affect the hitherto neutral trade unions, but proved also to be of magnetic attraction to certain sections of the C.P. of Norway. In these sections of the Communist Party, the "rally" idea assumed the form of an idea that the Party should be dissolved. A dangerous liquidation tendency raised its head.

Several leaders of the Communist Party developed approximately the following views: "The Communist Party has a right to exist in countries with a revolutionary situation, but not in Norway. We do not of course want to go against the Communist International; we are against the Second International; but we must say that the tactics of the Comintern, no matter how appropriate in other countries, are not appropriate in Norway. The Communist Party in Norway is nothing but an artificial formation; its further continuance would be a policy of face-saving pure and simple. In the present situation the Communist Party of Norway must remain a hopeless sect. The only correct tactics would be for the Communists, in the interests of the working class, to unite with the "rally" party of Tranmaelites and Social Democrats, perhaps to organise there a Left

**Labour Party Problem in Norway**—continued

fraction and probably in the course of many years to capture this new powerful mass party for the ideas of Communism and for the Third International." These liquidatory ideas crystallised in all consciousness only in the heads of certain not unimportant leaders of the Communist Party. But the liquidatory mood went much deeper and dominated, although unconsciously, many sections of the Party membership. It assumed the form of a dangerous passivity and apathy. Some Communists said: "Why struggle? It is really not worth while; the enemy is all powerful; the unification of the Tranmaels with the Social Democrats will prevent any successful Communist work." To use for once the silly terminology of Freudism: a remarkable "inferiority complex" made itself felt in many sections of the Party.

At the same time a reaction of another kind to the "rally" idea made its appearance in the Communist Party: an ultra-Left resistance which met the desire for unity of the masses with a curt refusal. The liquidators, throwing their principles to the winds, wanted to jump right into the mighty stream of the desire for unity of the masses; but the ultra-Left wanted to remain on the bank of the stream of unity, fearing to wet the Sunday clothes of their principles. The Communist International endeavoured to divert the desire for unity of the masses into the channels of a Labour Party, in other words, it wanted to give it the form of a united front organisation which would make possible the participation of Communists without giving up the identity of the Communist Party. But the ultra-Left declared themselves on principle against the Labour Party policy

which—as they said—was perhaps good in countries such as Great Britain and America, where the Labour movement is backward, but would be incorrect in Norway where the working class has a revolutionary tradition. The ultra-Left favoured a boycott pure and simple of the "rally" congress, as it saw in this the only salvation for the independence of the Communist Party; and it wanted to give the trade unions the advice to remain neutral.

**Fatal Proposals.**

Both policies would have been fatal to the Communist Party. The liquidatory policy would have led the Party to direct dissolution, whereas the ultra-Left policy would have caused the dissolution and disintegration of the Party in an indirect way, as it could not have prevented through its negative attitude the adherence of large sections of the Party membership to the new Tranmaelite Social Democratic party.

On the strength of thorough deliberations with the Executive of the Communist International, the Executive of the Communist Party of Norway was able to adopt correct tactical lines in this dangerous situation, when the fate of the Party was at stake. These tactics were as follows: No boycott of the "rally" congress, but active participation in it. The Communist Party and the Left trade unions to elect everywhere delegates to the "rally" congress, but on a special political platform. The "rally" congress is to be denounced as a Social Democratic undertaking, which instead of a class rally is to be made an opportunist party rally. The Communist Party is on no account to be liquidated, nor must it sever connection with the Third International under any circumstances whatever. Therefore the backbone of the special political platform must be rejection of the con-

# The Future of Indian Politics

**M. N. ROY**

PRICE 1s. 6d.  
Post free for 1s. 8d.

Obtainable from the  
Communist Bookshop  
16 King Street  
London WC2

*An application of Marxist methods to the analysis of India to day. The first section is devoted to the "New Economic Policy of Imperialism"—the policy of alliance between the British exploiters and the Indian industrial capitalists. The second section is "The Politics of Compromise." The third might be said to deal with the question that is stirring now in the minds of all real Nationalists in India—CAN INDIA FOLLOW CHINA?*

**Labour Party Problem in Norway—continued**

ditions of the "Committee of Twelve." Delegates are to be elected on a "free" basis.

**Correct Tactics**

This policy meant the adoption of correct tactics by the Party. The great task consisted of welding together the Party, which had been weakened by prolonged fractional struggles and by liquidatory and ultra-Left tendencies, in a manner to enable it to carry out those correct tactics with the necessary energy. The first task was to make the Party active. This was done through a conference of the Party Committee, through district conferences and through putting into motion the entire Party apparatus for the campaign. The second step was the mobilisation of the trade unions. The question whether delegates were to be elected on the basis of the conditions of the Committee of Twelve, or on a "free" basis was to be raised in all trade unions—and this was done, for the question was placed before every local trade union and every trades council. The campaign assumed such dimensions, the interest of the masses in the "rally question" was so enormous, that the contentious questions were thoroughly and passionately discussed even in the most remote parts of the country, in all Labour organisations and in all trade unions. The arguments used in the Communist campaign were:

"No Party rally, but a real class rally, which cannot be complete without the participation of the Left Wing and without the Communists.

"For proletarian democracy; for the right of workers' and Labour organisations to self-determination—against the dictatorship of the 'Committee of Twelve.'

"Not every 'class rally' serves the interests of the proletariat—only a rally which leads to struggle against the bourgeoisie and not to capitulation to it (setting the example of the class rally in November, 1917, in Russia against the example of the class rally in August, 1914, in Germany)."

**Not a Manœuvre**

The Communist Party of Norway did not want—as the Social Democrats accused it—the establishment of a Labour Party only as a "manœuvre," it wanted its establishment honestly and sincerely. In other words it wanted a political unification of all workers' parties and trade unions, provided the liquidation of the Communist Party was not to be a condition of this. But there was no possibility of forming a big all-embracing Labour party, as the Social Democrats would on no account work together with the Communists, and also because the "Left Wing" of the Tranmael party made such formation conditional on Communists accepting the "sovereignty" of the "rally" congress—in other words that Communists must submit to a majority decision demanding the dissolution of the Communist Party and the severance of its connections with the Third International.

The Communist Party found itself in a difficult position. Its campaign made progress every day and produced unexpectedly favourable results. No less than

four hundred delegates were elected on a "free" basis: 200 delegates from 160 trade unions, 60 delegates from labour organisations, agricultural labourers and foresters' unions, sport organisations and proletarian women's leagues, and 140 delegates from the Communist Party and the Young Communist League. Through the election of these 400 delegates, participation in the "rally" congress became a central tactical question. It was impossible to say anything against participation, as the 400 delegates had been elected on the basis of the platform of active participation in the Congress, although this was accompanied by the rejection of the dictatorial conditions of the "Committee of Twelve." But participation in the Congress was fraught with great perils. If a majority decision of the Congress—and a big opportunist majority existed, as Tranmaelites and Social Democrats and the trade unions influenced by them had elected 870 delegates—had decreed the dissolution of the Communist Party, the latter would have been compelled to advise the "free" delegates to infringe the "sovereignty" of the Congress and to leave it. Then the whole odium of a dramatic breach with the majority, of an open split, would have rested on the Communists. There was also the risk of part of the "free" delegates refusing to have anything to do with such a split.

**A Difficult Problem**

The situation was difficult: on the one hand it was impossible for Communists to recognise the "sovereignty" of a Congress dominated by opportunists, and on the other hand it was impossible to take upon themselves the odium of an open breach. On the one hand they had to carry out the election of the "free" delegates with the slogan of participation in the Congress, but on the other hand it was impossible to bring about this participation unconditionally. On the one hand they had to avoid a split before the Congress, under any circumstances whatever, whereas on the other hand it was essential somehow or other to co-ordinate organisationally the four hundred delegates.

The Party found the right solution of this dilemma by co-ordinating the four hundred delegates precisely on the platform of "Joint and organised struggle" for admission to the "rally" Congress, for recognition of the "free" mandates as such. The Party did not oppose on principle, nor did it take up a non-possumus attitude to the "sovereignty" of the "rally" Congress. It declared: We will recognise the "sovereignty" of a Congress of the entire working class provided the conditions of proletarian democracy are observed in connection with the convocation organisation, preparation and conduct of the Congress. The present "rally" Congress, however, is the outcome of gross infringements of proletarian democracy, and therefore cannot claim to make final and binding decisions on behalf of the working class.

These correct tactics of the Communist Party of Norway were thereupon rapidly put into practice by means of the following measures:

An invitation committee was formed consisting of well-known trade unionists, which invited the four hundred delegates elected on a "free" basis to a conference in Oslo.

On the eve of the opening of the "rally" Congress, the big conference of the 400 took place.

**Labour Party Problem in Norway—continued**

The conference elected a deputation and addressed a letter to the "rally" Congress asking it to recognise the "free" mandates.

The "rally" Congress received the deputation of the 400 and listened to it, perfectly perfidiously, however, only after the voting had taken place which rejected the recognition of the "free" mandates (800 votes against 19).

Thereupon the Conference of the four hundred adopted a declaration in which it protested against the splitting of the forces of the working class, laying the responsibility for it at the door of the leaders of the "United Social Democratic party" and constituting itself a "class rally congress."

**Two New Parties**

The Congress of the four hundred sat three days and adopted the resolutions on a general programme of action, on unemployment, the peasant question, the military question, international trade union unity and international relations of the Norwegian trade unions (Russo-Norwegian-Finnish trade union committee), the building up of Socialism in Soviet Russia and the struggle against the intervention peril, a declaration of solidarity with the Chinese revolution, and on youth and sport questions.

After the Social Democratic-Tranmaelite "rally" Congress had constituted the new "united" party, the Congress of the four hundred decided also on the establishment of a new party "The Rallying Party of the Working Class."

An organisational campaign on broad lines was initiated after the Congress which began to organise the new "Rallying Party of the Working Class" locally and regionally.

Thus the result of the big "rally" campaign, which lasted several months, was the establishment of two new parties: on the one hand the fusion of the Tranmaelites with the Social Democrats and the establishment of the "United Workers' Party" and on the other hand the formation of the "Rallying Party of the Working Class" with Communist participation. Both parties belong organisationally to the Labour Party type; they have no individual membership, but are built up throughout on the collective membership of the trade unions.

Spiritual hegemony in the first party rests with the Social Democrats; the second party is under Communist ideological leadership. The formation of these two parties has put an end to the political tripartite division of the Norwegian Labour movement and has thereby established the present "normal" European bipartite division of the political Labour movement.

The establishment of the "Rallying Party of the Working Class," or in other words, the formation of a "Left" Labour Party, of a Minority Labour Party is an innovation in the international Labour movement (in the United States of America we had in some respect similar tendencies in 1923), an innovation which certainly deserves careful study on our part and raises justifiably

the question whether this new tactic is correct and successful and to what extent.

**Support for the "Left"**

Naturally the establishment of the new "Left" Labour Party was only justifiable if there was sufficient mass support on the part of the trade unions. Facts show that among the 400 delegates there were no less than 200 trade union delegates, and 60 others sent by non-Communist Labour organisations. The majority of the hitherto "neutral" trade unions, not connected organisationally with any political party, were represented at the Congress of the "free" delegates and participated in the establishment of the new party. Although the Tranmaelites succeeded at Oslo in bringing over to their side a considerable part of the hitherto "neutral" trade unions the contrary is the case in all the other parts of the country. The Communist campaign met with unqualified success in most of the hitherto "neutral" trade unions.

The "Left" Labour Party is in fact nothing but a peculiar and original form of the united front between the Communist Party and non-political Labour organisations. It is only through the establishment of this Labour Party that Communists were able to attract the Left trade unions to themselves, for one should bear in mind that the new united Social Democratic Party is also built up on a trade union basis. The "rally" of all Labour organisations in one party has and still possesses great powers of attraction. That was the reason the liquidation danger made its appearance in the Communist Party. For this reason Communists could not issue the slogan of a boycott of the "rally" Congress. The "free" delegates were elected not on the platform of boycott, but of participation in the "rally." The Left trade unions were won for joint action with the Communists precisely as a basis for active political unification of the forces of the working class. After a campaign for participation in a political rally Communists could not possibly say to the delegates of the Left trade unions: "Now you can go home; we have not been admitted to the 'rally' Congress; we are now unable to do anything."

**Risk of Isolation**

The retort could be made against this: the Left trade unions could have been linked up with us through the formation of ordinary united front committees. This argument is not correct, it does not take into account the actual situation and the deeply-rooted tradition of the Norwegian Labour movement. This was a question of political rally of trade unions in the form of a political party, according to the traditions of the Norwegian Labour movement.

If the Communist Party had not attached to itself the Left trade unions through the new "Rallying Party" it would have run the risk of the united Social Democratic Party detaching these trade unions slowly and one by one from us and incorporating them into its ranks. Against the powerful idea of rallying the workers—for this was the only political capital of the United Social Democrats—Communists could only set

**Labour Party Problem in Norway—continued**

the sterile slogan of political neutrality in the trade unions, and this would certainly have led to defeat.

The Left trade unions and most of the hitherto "neutral" trade unions made common cause with the Communist Party in this campaign, and expressed themselves in favour of political activity. If no permanent political form had been given to this new and powerful desire for political activity through the establishment of the new Party, the result would have been not only a permanent but also an increased process of detachment, whenever the political situation took a favourable turn. Increased political activity on the part of the workers does certainly not lead the trade unions to political neutrality, but rather to participation in politics. Thus an improved political situation would not have benefited the Communists, but the Tranmaelites.

The establishment of the "Left" Labour Party created a favourable atmosphere for Communist work as a whole. The Tranmaelite Party has always been built up on the collective membership of the trade unions, whereas the Communist Party was based on individual membership. If the Communist Party wanted to prevent organisational connection between the trade unions and the Tranmael Party it had only the slogan of neutrality at its disposal. But now it is possible to raise in every trade union the question: "Which way are you going: to the Second International and Amsterdam, to coalition with the bourgeoisie, or to relentless class

struggle, to opposition to reformism, to alliance with the Russian trade unions?" We can now place the choice before every trade union of "Affiliation to the Social Democratic Rallying Party or to the Class Struggle Rallying Party?"

**Communist Gains**

The formation of a "Left" Labour Party in Norway was necessary and correct.

The correct application of the tactic of active participation in the rally campaign on the basis of a special political platform has had important and favourable results for the Communist Party of Norway.

It is only through the application of these tactics that the Party was able to liquidate the liquidators, to carry out the unification with the "Mot Dag" group, to fight against the ultra-Left peril in Oslo, and to weld together the Party for energetic activity.

In spite of the great desire for political unity the Tranmaelites and Social Democrats were unable to liquidate the Communist Party or to sap its mass influence; on the contrary, the mass influence of the Communists has grown, it is now firmly established and co-ordinated organisationally.

The disappearance of the Tranmaelite Party as an independent party has removed the greatest obstacle in the way of the growth of the Communist Party. The Tranmaelite Party as a real demagogic centrist party advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat, the Soviets and armed rising, and opposed—at least in words—the

OUT IN APRIL

TWO BOOKS BY

**R. PALME DUTT**

(Editor of the "Labour Monthly")

**Modern India** (168 pages, 2s. 6d.)

"A clarion call, both to British Socialists and to the Indian Politicians . . . the forerunner of a new political literature on British Imperialism . . ."

S. SAKLATVALA, M.P.

**Socialism and the Living Wage**

The first scientific analysis of the I.L.P. plans for "Socialism in Our Time." Starting from facts and not from vague hopes and "modern ethics," Dutt shows that capitalism cannot pay a living wage, and that what is needed in the struggle for Socialism is certainly not an unworkable plan to make the capitalist class prosperous and the working class contented.

PRICE 1/6.

LOOK OUT FOR THESE BOOKS THIS MONTH



# Labour Party Problem in Norway —continued

Second International and Amsterdam. Tranmael has now dropped all these old items from his programme and is on the road to the Second International and Amsterdam.

The slogan of unity is now incontestably in the hands of the Communist Party. For the first time in the history of the Communist movement of Norway our comrades are able successfully to place the odium of the split at the door of the opponents.

The deflation crisis, the growing unemployment, the brutal capitalist offensive and at the same time the complete legality of the Communist Party create a favourable atmosphere for the progress of our movement.

## Complicated Position

Of course, the establishment of a "Left" Labour Party rather complicates the position of the Communist Party in many respects. Only careful study and experience will teach the Norwegian comrades to establish in every respect correct relations between the Communist Party and the "Left" Labour Party. In spite of the slanderous assertions of the German ultra-Left, one thing is already perfectly clear: the Communist Party preserves its full organisational and ideological identity and will on no account become merged in the new Party.

The new party must primarily become the party of the trade unions, but Communist leadership must be secured in it. The "Left" Labour Party will not become a rival of the Communist Party, being built up on collective membership, whereas the basis of the Communist Party is individual membership. Our slogan is: "Every worker should join the Communist Party and every worker should induce his trade union to affiliate to the 'Rallying Party of the Working Class.'"

The programme of the Rallying Party is not a Communist programme, but it is on our lines, and can at the same time serve as the programme of action of the Communist Party. The new party has no press of its own—merely a bulletin, but the Communist Party places every week a whole page at the disposal of the Rallying party in its press organs, and this page is under the control of independent editorial boards of the committees of the Rallying Party. Communists who at parliamentary elections appear on the candidates' lists of the new Rallying Party must, of course, base their entire propaganda on the Communist programme and cannot limit themselves to the programme of action.

The establishment of the "Left" Labour Party in Norway has also its international sides and lessons. Norway is by no means the first country where the Communist Party is organisationally connected with another political party. Prior to its expulsion, the Communist Party of Great Britain belonged to the Labour Party.\* The British situation, however, was in many respects different from the Norwegian situation. The British Labour Party existed before the establishment of the Communist Party; no Minority or "Left" Labour

Party has been formed in Great Britain through Communist participation.

It is the Finnish and American experiences which must be compared with the Norwegian experiences, but at the same time the big differences should be taken into consideration. In America and Finland the illegal Communist Parties were connected with another legal Labour Party. But the legal party was only a camouflage party of the illegal; it was not built up on the collective membership of the trade unions, neither was it a united front organisation which linked up the Communist Party with the trade unions. It was only an instrument which enabled Communists to work legally.

The Norwegian "Left" Labour Party is in many respects analogous to the formation of a Left Labour Party (Federated Farmer Labour Party) in America 1923, where this Party was also the organisational-political link between the Communists and some of the trade unions. But the then American situation differed from the present Norwegian situation mainly in that no majority Labour Party existed in America, merely three minority Labour Parties competing with one another, which constituted the united front link between the three rival political groups (Social Democratic Party, Fitzpatrick group and Communist Party) and corresponding parts of the trade unions.

Now it will be necessary to take stock of the Norwegian practical experiences with the "Left" Labour Party, to watch and generalise them. It would be a mistake if we were to attempt to transplant the Norwegian scheme as it stands to all other countries, but on the basis of the Norwegian experiment one should endeavour to evolve new and suitable organisational and political forms of the united front in other countries also.

## BUILDING UP SOCIALISM

BY

NIKOLAI BUKHARIN

Do you know the main points of the recent discussions in the Russian Communist Party and our International? If not, get hold of this book

PRICE ONE SHILLING

(Post free 1/1½)

The Communist Bookshop

16 King Street, Covent  
Garden, W.C.2

\* The Communist Party of Great Britain was never affiliated, as a Party, to the Labour Party. It has therefore never been "expelled."—Editor, English edition.