

## THE S. P. OF C. AND THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

(Continued from page 1)

tional, we will find our actions will be used by master class hirelings to master class purposes."

Are we to infer from this that the taking of a referendum vote is a tactical blunder? Or might not his statement be misconstrued as placing party members who favor affiliation in a rather peculiar position?

First point of Theses: "The daily propaganda must bear a truly Communist character." This is a very important point, and no doubt requires considerable elucidation. A long dissertation on the economics of the slave systems of antiquity may, or may not constitute Communist propaganda. Under certain circumstances it might constitute capitalist propaganda, e.g., as a contrast between free democracy and chattel slavery. Liberal bourgeois publications frequently carry articles of this description.

Point eight of the Theses may prove a formidable obstacle in the minds of many comrades, against affiliation. Would the loss of Algiers, with its resources and man-power, be a mere trifle to French Imperialism? This is a subject that cannot be disposed of by a gesture.

The removal systematically and regularly from all responsible positions in the labor movement (party organizations, labor unions, etc.) of all reformists and partisans of the Centre, and to replace them by Communists, would no doubt involve us in bitter struggles.

However, considering the activities of some of our suspended comrades in the labor unions, directed against party members who refuse to pay tribute to certain "recognized" unions, those struggles would not altogether be a detriment to the party.

As to the matter of Right, Left and Centre groups in the S. P. of C., the present discussion may possibly bring them to the surface.

That the S. P. of C. has never wavered in its support of the Russian Revolution, is an admitted fact. There are also many groups of liberals who have also supported the Russian Revolution; the New York "Nation," "New Republic," and others too numerous to mention. To ask them to endorse the Third International, however, puts a different complexion on their support.

To quote Comrade Harrington: "I do not consider rejection of these terms implies any disagreement with the methods and purposes of the Bolsheviks."

This is tantamount to stating that the way to agree with a proposition, is to disagree with it. Which reminds us of President Harding's reply, when asked if he believed that two and two made four. "That as a general proposition, he was in sympathy with the equation—but that time and circumstances might alter the sum," a reply which is not without some dialectical merit.

The sum of objections against affiliation resolves itself into a question of "political expediency." On this ground, and on it alone, is rejection admissible. If some Comrades will not admit that the question of possible suppression of the Party bears any weight with them, then, Kautsky-like, they will be forced to take up a theoretic position, to justify themselves. Their only possible position is in opposition to the interpretation of Marxism by the Russian Communists; which leads directly to the camp of Kautsky and Co.

To such elements in the party, now is the time to let us hear from them, so that we will be able to understand each other.

The attempts of Henderson, MacDonald, Thomas and Co. on the one hand, and Longuet, Kautsky, Berger on the other, to form Internationals, in opposition to Moscow, show the depths to which these people will descend.

The Proletarian Dictatorship in Russia, and the Third International, have been a thorn in the side of these social compromisers and manufacturers of democratic formula. The overthrow of the Soviet Government would be a consummation devoutly to be wished, in the eyes of these gentry, and prove a possible halt to the decay of their influence amongst the progressive elements of the working class.

The attitude of the Socialist organizations towards the Third International has, to a great ex-

tent, become the acid test of their understanding the slogan of the authors of the Communist Manifesto: "Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains."

Has this rallying cry no more significance to us than its usefulness in rounding off a peroration; or shall we in the "sight of all the world erect boundary stones by which the extent of the party movement will be measured?"

F CLARKE.

Editor, Western Clarion.

Comrade,—In an article in your paper of recent date entitled the S. P. of C. and the Third International, Comrade Harrington states that the objections which Comrade Kaplan dealt with re affiliation with the Third International are of no importance, and can not justify rejection of terms imposed. He however tells us that Comrade Kaplan has far from exhausted the objections to affiliation, and goes on to outline the objections which he thinks are of importance. Right from the outset let me state that the "important objections" that Comrade Harrington outlines I find, like those of Kaplan, to be of no importance, and likewise do not justify any revolutionary organization from joining the Third International. In dealing with the first point, "the daily propaganda must bear a truly communist character," he states we are not informed what this is, but we are told we must denounce not only the bourgeois, but its assistants, the reformers, etc.

Comrade Harrington although contending that denunciation rarely convinces admits the value of same when he states: "They have their uses and we don't overlook them." But is it true that the Communists do not tell us what they mean by "the daily propaganda must bear a truly Communist character?" I wonder if Comrade Harrington read the latest "Theses" of the Third International. He will find there 21 conditions for admission, and not 18 as he states. The "Theses" makes it very plain what is meant by communist propaganda. Com. Trotsky in his book "Terrorismus und Kommunismus-Anti-Kautzky," states the actual teaching of Marx is the theoretical formula of action, of aggression, of development of revolutionary energy, of the most complete conduct of the class struggle. By communist propaganda is meant more than merely explaining phenomena and justifying them, it is meant to direct them to action and overthrow. In spite of Comrade Kaplan's statement that the "joining of the Third International would involve submission to dictation from Moscow, as to tactics to be adopted locally, which only local knowledge and observation could properly determine and dictate," we find the class struggle is the same every where, and generally speaking the same tactics, action is necessary. The Third International does allow different tactics to be employed, but they must not in any way conflict with the general principles of Communism.

Now as to removing from all responsible posts in the labor movement, etc., all reformists, and to replace them by Communists, Comrade Harrington states that the ultimate utility of same is doubtful and such activity would involve us in a series of bitter struggles that would hamper and in the end nullify our educational work. Comrade Harrington admits he does not know the ultimate utility of removing reformists, etc., from responsible labor posts and replacing them by Communists, so the only thing he can do is to find out from those that do know. The Russian comrades know the ultimate utility of same, and as being an imperative necessity in the struggle against the overthrow of the bourgeois state. Of course it would involve you in a series of bitter struggles, and I am afraid it is precisely that, that Comrade Harrington objects to; as to nullifying the educational work, that sounds very much like a joke.

Regarding "Colonial Liberation," he states he can not see how colonies can be liberated, and to what advantage if capitalism still rules. Colonies can be liberated in spite of the fact that Comrade Harrington can not see they can, because they have been, and the advantage we know. I would only have to mention Ozerbijan, Georgia, Armenia, Persia; there liberation is a fact, and the advantages are well known. Comrade Harrington wants it clearly understood that he does not consider rejection of these terms implies any disagreement with the methods and purposes of the Bolsheviks. Of

course he does not state he does agree; you can take that just as you like. He concludes by assuring the Bolsheviks that so far as any assistance we can give them is concerned we will contribute a hundred-fold to their security by informing the working class of the Marxian philosophy in contrast to the feeble support of our joining the International. That is just what all Centrists say. It is true, comrade, that you offer revolutionary phrases, but since you admit that all you can give is "feeble" support by joining the Third International, your assistance you offer, I am very much afraid, will go begging.

What the International demands is strong support; this you can give by less talk and more action.

Your comrade,

SAM BLUMENBERG.

IN presenting a few objections against affiliation, I expressed the hope that whatever conclusion we came to, we would endeavor to face the facts. I know of many situations where some facts may be ignored to advantage, and I also know that under any conditions, there are some facts which cannot be ignored, without disaster to those who ignore them. We can struggle with some degree of success against the guile of an adversary, charm he never so wisely, but where we undertake to fool ourselves we are lost,—hopelessly. Of course we never are so foolish as to elect the latter folly consciously, but, what amounts to the same thing ultimately, we unconsciously permit our desires to cloud the real issue, and select only those facts which best suit our purpose.

Take Comrade Fillmore's article for affiliation; he entirely overlooks the real issue which is, not affiliation, but affiliation under certain specific conditions. These conditions he ignores entirely. I would not take issue with him in any of his points. I don't care whether we are dictated to or not, providing the dictating is in line with what I conceive to be in harmony with reality. If it be not, I am equally careless as to the dictator, whether Marx or Lenin, Moscow or Pumpkin Centre. The question is, can we accept the terms laid down, can we accept them without entirely changing our tactics, and is there any warrant for so doing? Dead men's bones, old party workers, "Dictatorship from Moscow," Right, Left and Centre, Red or Yellow, courage or cowardice, have nothing whatever to do with it. Let us forget them.

Comrade Kavanagh is in little better case, although he does discuss the terms. In the first place he argues:

"Objection has been raised against acceptance of the terms of affiliation because some terms apply to conditions not yet developed in this country.

"It should be obvious that terms laid down to cover all countries cannot be expected to apply in every detail to each and every country, but are applicable according to the different prevailing conditions."

I am certain this argument would go a long way toward having our application rejected, should we apply.

He says: "Clause 17 mentions this qualification."

Now clause 17 does nothing of the kind. Clause 17 covers resolutions, and the "Theses" we are discussing are decrees, which, while not unalterable, must nevertheless be accepted and lived up to, "not in words, but in deeds," as the E. C. says in reply to the British I. L. P.

If any one cares to read the foreword accompanying the "Theses," he will find just why these "most precise conditions" were laid down, and if he cares to take words at their proper value, he will realize that the principle object was to prevent anyone from joining and then saying: "Oh, this and that clause does not apply to us," go their old way serenely.

One thing is obvious, that no amount of self-deception can alter the intent and purpose of these 18 points, nor the fact that they must be accepted and lived up to.

Concerning the position and tactics of the Party in the past, Comrade Kavanagh says: "... it does not follow that the position taken in the past would be in line with Marxism, theoretical and practical, in the period we are not entering upon." Neither does it follow that it would not. Still, as a matter of actual fact Marxism, as we interpret and expound it, is a method of understanding social institutions,