

clumsy and bungling disregard of the task of developing the exchange of goods between town and country. These decisions reduce the amounts of products to be sold to the State, and enable collective agricultural trade to strengthen and improve the provision of additional sources of supply of agricultural products to the towns, so that the conditions for increasing the exchange of goods between town and country may be facilitated and may afford, in combination with the development of Soviet trade, the possibility of dispensing with the card system.

That the trade of the collective farms and collective peasants is at market prices does not contradict the above in any way.

The experience already gained in the development of collective farming trade, though too short and otherwise inadequate at the present time, shows that considerable quantities of goods are offered on a number of markets, and that in consequence a certain fall in the exaggeratedly high market prices is observable. In the future it will have to be taken into account that even when the amounts of products to be delivered to the State are lessened, great reserves of grain and meat products will still remain in the hands of the State, which reserves have been supplied by the Soviet and collective farms at the standard prices set by the State; that, there is an ever increasing reserve of articles of mass consumption in the hands of the State, and this reserve is the most efficient means of regulating collective agricultural trade, and the best method of making it one of the main arteries of Soviet trade. (To be concluded.)

OUR PROBLEMS

Urgent Questions of the Work of the C.P. of South Africa.

By Johns.
(Conclusion.)

This is due to the lack of constant and persistent work among the masses and the failure to take up various forms of defence of their interests. Besides the strike, which is the highest form of the economic struggle, there are dozens of various functions of the trade unions. For example there is legal aid to the members of the trade unions, which can also be carried on in a lawyer like manner or in a revolutionary manner. Bunting won "authority" because as a lawyer he defended workers. The opportunism of Bunting consisted not only of the fact that he went to the courts and various offices to "defend" the workers as a lawyer, but chiefly that he limited the trade union activity of the Party to this. In the practical life of the Red trade unions it sometimes happens that workers who come to the trade unions for legal help are practically called opportunists because they do not want to declare a strike at once. This is merely a distortion of the Party line. The Party will fight against distortions in trade union activity.

Communists draw the conclusion: 1. the united front of white and native workers, 2. the extension and strengthening of oppositional work in the trade unions, 3. a change in the practice of the Red trade unions in the direction of defending and serving all the needs of the workers, combining all forms of struggle and activity in the interest of improving the life of the working class and its struggle with capitalism.

The Struggle Against White Chauvinism and National Reformism and Particularly the Struggle against Bunting.

White chauvinism helps national-reformism. Without betraying the interests of the white and the black workers and the toiling masses, we cannot carry on any activity in South Africa if we do not expose white chauvinism. We cannot rouse the masses to the struggle without overcoming national-reformism. But this must be done in a capable manner. And here our Party has made many gross mistakes. In the Party there was the opportunist group of Bunting. But in practice in the Party there was a distortion of the struggle against opportunism and the renegacy of Bunting. Frequently in practice this struggle was carried on by administrative and organisational measures: The Party must show in practice its ability to lead the masses in a revolutionary way and not an opportunist way. However, the Party transferred the discussion with

Bunting into the trade unions, in which it was carried on the same as in the Party. And not only in the trade unions but also in the I.R.A., the Friends of the Soviet Union.

Was it necessary to expose the opportunism of the Bunting group both in the trade unions and in the I.R.A. and in the Friends of the Soviet Union? Of course, but it should have been exposed while adapting ourselves to the peculiarities of each organisation. For example, how can Bunting in the Friends of the Soviet Union be accused of not wanting to carry out the directives of the Comintern? For the Friends of the Soviet Union, this is no reason why Bunting should not be in the organisation. People can be friends of the U.S.S.R. if they not only do not agree with the tactics of the Comintern but in general do not share the views and programme of the Comintern. But this is almost literally how Bunting was exposed. In the Society of Friends of the U.S.S.R., Bunting should have been exposed for his defence of the white guards, for the assistance given by Bunting as a lawyer to various emigrants.

The Communists did not understand the manoeuvres of Bunting who was trying to distract the attention of the Party from the class struggle, for work, in the direction of discussions in these organisations. Also in these discussions, the Communists frequently did not take into account where they were taking place and how to expose them.

Many of the supporters of the Bunting group, including a large number of genuinely mistaken workers, remained under the influence of this group, partly because we were unable to develop our mass work, while some comrades thought that all those comrades who were wavering to the side of Bunting must immediately be put out of the Party. Some of us in South Africa did not understand that the proletarian vanguard is built up in the struggle against petty bourgeois vacillations and the necessity of explaining to the class-conscious and semi-class-conscious representatives of the working masses the harm of these vacillations from the point of view of the interests of the toiling masses. This can be explained from every example of the struggle—strikes, demonstrations, etc. Patiently, stubbornly, not sparing our strength, not fearing failure at first, we must carry on this work of explanation, fighting for every vacillating worker. It is one thing to explain the harm of vacillations to the vanguard, the Communists, and another thing to explain it to the members of trade unions which do not fully share the programme and tactics of the Party but which are a school of the class struggle, a school of solidarity, a school of Communism. In addition we must take into account the fact that the active supporters of Bunting occupied a masked deviating position, with the aim of strengthening their influence over a certain part of the workers who sympathised with us but who did not sufficiently understand the aims and tasks of our Party.

It is one thing to have a supporter of some anti-Party views which have grown up, and another thing to have a worker who is only beginning to take part in Party life, a worker whose views are only being formed and who at first cannot be clear on all questions. We must distinguish between opportunists and workers who make mistakes because of their lack of political experience. In South Africa we did not draw this line and thus deservingly increased the number of supporters of Bunting. The Party will rectify this mistake by fighting against manifestations of white chauvinism and national reformism in its ranks, opening the doors for those worker comrades who made mistakes in the past owing to lack of experience and unconsciously, but who now wish once more to fight in the ranks of the militant Communist Party for the interests of the toiling masses of South Africa, both white and native.

Mr. Bunting and his patrons may say: "We told you so. We said that the path was not right." The renegades in this case also carry out their role of lackeys of imperialism. What did they warn us against? Against the danger of "a revolutionary struggle against imperialism". What did they tell us? About the necessity of "agreements with the white bourgeoisie on the subject of joint oppression of the toiling masses, subordination to the slave laws".

The Communists made mistakes as revolutionaries heroically struggling ahead of the masses.

Anyone who fears mistakes on such a difficult path as the organisation of the revolutionary mass activity of the toiling masses of South Africa and calls for the rejection of mass revolutionary activity, is not a revolutionary. Communists learn by their mistakes.