

spoken reformist leaders in the party, the trade unions and associations, has not been shown, although six months of discussion in the Italian Party of the political acts of these elements has clearly demonstrated their reformist character.

6) Even now the leaders of the Serrati Group are in opposition to the C. I. on decisive, fundamental questions:

a) On the question of the relations of the party to the trade unions the Serrati Group represents the same position as that taken by the Turati Reformists, the French Reformists and Centrists, namely: the autonomy of the trade unions and their independence of the party.

b) While the Italian bourgeoisie carries on, in fact, the civil war against the proletariat, for which it has organized and is still organizing, the Serrati Group sabotages, in practice, the organization and political preparation of the working class for the waging of the civil war and for defense against the counter-revolution.

c) On the agrarian question, the Serrati Group refuses, in practice, to support the most important and openly revolutionary acts of the farm workers, small peasants, and tenant farmers, which have culminated in the actual seizing of the warehouses. The Serrati Group is opposed to the partitioning of the large estates among the small farmers and peasants, which Italian experiences themselves have shown is historically inevitable in the transitional period.

d) To this day the Serrati Group has not taken a clear-cut position on the National Question.

e) The Serrati Group holds firmly to so-called autonomy in the practical application of the principles and decisions of the Communist International which means the adherence to the basis of an opportunist policy under the shield of the Communist International.

7) All attempts on the part of the representative of the E. C. of the C. I. and of the Italian Communists, to reach an agreement with the Serrati Group on these decisive questions of communist tactics have been shattered. The concessions which the Serrati Group were prepared to make were always only apparent and purely formal.

There are still revolutionary working masses in the Serrati Group who are possessed of the most sincere and honest desire to place themselves upon the foundation of the principles and discipline of

the Communist International. To these revolutionary workers the United Communist Party of Germany announces clearly and definitely, that the Communist Party of Italy (Group of Bordiga, Gen-nari, Missiano) has conclusively decided to place itself upon the basis of the C. I. and that accordingly it is the only party in Italy which is to be considered as the Italian Section of the Communist International and must be powerfully supported by all affiliated parties in the C. I. The creation of a strong, centralized, powerful Italian section of the C. I. is only possible by a determined struggle against the opportunist leaders of the Serrati Group.

The Central (General) Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany, therefore approves of the procedure of the representative of the E. C. of the C. I. at the Congress in Leghorn. Nothing else was possible but a determined rupture with the leaders of the Serrati Group.

who, by all their activities show that they have no understanding of the essence and fundamental tactics of the C. I.

The Central (General) Committee of the U. C. P. of Germany, therefore declares that the winning over of the proletarian masses still under the influence of the Serrati Group to a clearer communist policy, can be brought about only by the Communist International making it impossible for the Serrati Group to hide their opportunism behind the sign-board of the C. I. That the C. I. adopt an attitude of sharpest antagonism to the leaders of the Serrati Group, and in every case where action arises, to put the question of joining the C. I. practically before them in the shape of definitely recognizing and joining the Communist Party of Italy as the only section of the C. I. in Italy, and that the C. I. shall give this Party unlimited support.

Communist Practices in Japan.

By SEN KATAYAMA

WE read in the history of Japan that the rulers—when the people still lived in a primitive way—again and again abolished and prohibited private ownership of land. Almost periodically they confiscated land and property of the rich. Then, the entire land practically and in reality belonged to the people. Legally, however, it belonged to the rulers.

During the feudal regime which lasted about three hundred years, the idea of land ownership took precedence. The right of tenancy was sold and bought by the farmers, although the real owners of the land were the feudal chiefs. There were three kinds of land in Japan distinguished by the nature of ownership: first, cultivated land and forest practically owned by the common people; second, common land which we still possess; third, government land. The cultivated land of the people was fixed quite heavily by the feudal chiefs, but the tax on forest was insignificant. Common land which belonged to a particular village or group of groups of villages was not taxed. This common land played a great part in the village life of the people during the feudal regime. The villagers, under certain regulations, would get as much as they could, such as opening common land, cutting grass or shrub in the spring for fertilization, and otherwise the land was used perfectly free by all. In some places even during the feudal period, we find that the entire land of a village was owned in common and divided for the purpose of cultivation according to the ability of the families. Of course, there were many

incidents of cultivating land and harvesting crops in common which, I am sure, still exist.

Land Tenure in Loo Choo Islands (Okinawa-ken)

Okinawa-ken consists of a group of Islands in the southern part of Kinoshino originally belonging to China but for several centuries governed by the Japanese feudal chiefs. Until very recently these islands were kept on a communist basis by the villagers living on them. Each villager owned land as a unit and was responsible for the taxes and rent on the land. The land was equally divided among the male of the village for a certain period, and at the end of the period the land was redistributed. The division was executed by lots. There seemed to be no difficulty in that. The people of the island took good care of the land, for they looked upon it as something sacred. The duration of tenure ranges from 7 to 13 years; this differs in each island. Under the communal land system there were no very poor people nor were there any very rich ones. The land was neither salable, transferable nor sublettable. Each island owned a banana orchard as common property, the proceeds of which were set aside for famine. The common ownership of land in villages was abolished only after the Russo-Japanese War, for the government wanted to introduce capitalism into the islands. However, so far as I know, on account of long years of custom to hold land as sacred property of the villages, hardly any farmer would sell his land to an outsider.