

# The S. P. of C. and the Third International

## "LET US MARCH."

To the "Western Clarion,"

Dear Comrade,—Just a few words in regard to the Third International.

One comrade gave his reason against joining that the capitalist had failed in their Internationalism. I would refer this comrade to the Marxian and Darwinian theory. Then think a bit, and analyze the question, and try and find out where we now stand in the progress of evolution.

It was in the ninth century that there were at least seven kingdoms in England. But for greater protection they ultimately became one nation. Rome fell only to be replaced by a greater power—Spain.

Napoleon with his wars caused an international union of nations to be formed to resist him, and so on down through the times to the present day, we have great empires and international unions of capitalist powers organized for economic supremacy, which were one time thousands of feudal nations. There is now being formed a capitalist international. We must form a counterpart to this. The workers first formed their shop councils. In the advance of economic evolution, these shop units became town and city units, which are now national federations. But Marx's Socialism is "Workers of the World Unite" (Internationalism.)

I notice that most of us agree on this point, that Comrade Lenin is a true Marxian Socialist, and is putting the Marxian theories into practice as fast as conditions will allow or that is humanly possible.

Thus; if the Third International is Marxism, we will be keeping to the paths of social evolution by joining it. E'en though it fails.

Morally; put ourselves in the Russian's place. Do you not see, dear comrades, the moral effect it would have on our weak and ununderstanding brothers (and as in Russia unlearned) to know that the workers of the world were rallying to our cause?

And let us not be so narrow-minded as to turn the Third International down just because it's Russian and foreign, but to remember that they are comrades, and not aliens.

ALBERT RENN.

## AGAINST

By G. Ross ("R")

Editor's Note.—This article is too long to be included in one issue. The concluding part will be published in next issue.

"And aye the o'ercome o' the sang"—is organise—for the overthrow of capital. A most desirable object, but a most impossible organization—as yet. However, there is the cry, neither new, nor less difficult, strong with its almost unconquerable philosophy of the ideal. Still, sweet exhortations on what we must do to accomplish this laudable end do not advance us one whit towards emancipation from political dominion. Only clear appreciation of reality can do that. And how many colored is that appreciation is abundantly manifested in the various views presented in this present discussion.

Suppose we leave general principles for a moment and come to concrete cases. It is not the question of affiliation itself, that matters, but affiliation, plus the "reasons annexed." Affiliation without conditions would probably be easy—as probably meaningless. But with conditions the question turns on its practicability. Can the conditions be fulfilled?

For instance, who is to determine the "reliable communist?" Who remove the opportunist and elect the revolutionary? Who determines "loyalty?" And what loyalty? Who turn the great class of "moderates" from their extreme moderation? Who turn the idolaters from the stocks of ancient error to the living revolution? Who convince the Canadian pseudo-peasant—a prospective capitalist—that spud-growing on his ranch of bush and thistle-down is not his true interest? What, indeed, but the growth of economic antagonisms, forwarded as best we may, by the unflagging effort of social understanding?

Again, by what means are we to infect, directly, the army or navy with proletarian doctrines? How are we to turn them to our way of thinking? And how far would we traverse that way before being challenged by a most hostile and virile state? How are we to turn the masses from "patriotism" and "loyalty," in the face of capitalist organizations of propaganda, co-ordinated with an almost perfect contrivance of cunning and resource? Not only against the crafty interests of self and trade, but also against the moving ideals of peace the passionate traditions of war, and the glossy oratory of Chateaubriand, playing on the deep-rooted emotions inherited from a distant past? If we turn our attention to "Home Rule" and "Colonial freedom," etc., would we not disappear in the swamps of labor party reactionaries, and Liberal decadence and impotency? To aid and abet the "expediencies" of Laborism on the American continent would be, in effect, to strive for the supremacy of a Liberalism that is all but dead; would be to oppose the march of the social forces; would be suicide with a vengeance. These, and other similar questions, are for the "pros" to answer, and if they are analytically inclined, the "18 points" will furnish them with exercise aplenty.

There is no parallel between the conditions of Canada and Russia. There is no social tie between their peoples, but a sentiment—as lax as it is dangerous. In Canada, labor has practically no political representation; it has not even an apparent voice in "its own" affairs. There is not even a political party we could associate with in the interests of the workers, in order to hamstring another—even were we so minded. The imperialist is completely in the saddle, and he drives with a strong hand. But with Russia the case is totally different. Bolshevik Russia is not, in reality, a Socialist confederacy, but a political state. It is true, it is not a capitalist State, but it is, nevertheless, in conflict and rivalry with all capitalist States, for the same object—world supremacy. Certainly, the ultimate objective of Bolshevik supremacy is the emancipation of the proletariat, but its immediate necessity is preservation of its own organization. Hence, it uses—and must use—every possible weapon and device of the political State for its preservation. Controlling the powers of the State, it can command and execute. It can oppose force to force; circumvent diplomacy with diplomacy; pit opportunism against opportunism; checkmate the reformist with his own devices.

Thus it makes its trade agreements and peace treaties: it allies itself alike with communist and nationalist: with commerce and revolution; with national ambition and hero worshipping idealism. That is "practical politics," the checker game played with the nations as pawns. Thus Bolshevism counterfoils imperialism. By stimulating national antagonisms it disintegrates the unity of imperialisms. By cutting off the feeders of empire, it hampers the co-relation of imperialist force. By striking at the co-ordination of empire, it augments the conditions of revolution in the camp of the enemy; compels the central authority to devote its attention to its domestic affairs, thus lessening the possibility of defeat. Consequently, the only effective aid which the revolutionary can render to the forces of proletarian emancipation is to understand the "game" that is being played, is to understand its conditions and limitations, to understand that what may be west, here and now, may be east, there and then: in a word, to know—as clearly as possible amidst such a babel of tongues and cross purposes—where to push, and when to "ca' canny." The wheels in a factory—all driven from the same processes of proletarian revolution are exactly like motive source, but with all manner of variety of velocity and direction.

It does not follow that what Russia can do, we can, or their tactics prove goodly for us. Russia can and does follow the most tortuous ways to-

wards its final aim; we can only pursue the road—we can. The very devices which Russia is compelled to adopt, if adopted by us, would lead, not to freedom, but to reformism, to card playing with imperialism, to confusion and probably tragic reprisals. A revolution is no jester's game, and it is no disgrace to avoid reprisals not in the line of march. The idea of affiliation seems to be to centralize authority and action, to bring, Napoleon-like, our united strength against a particular opposition. But that is not the root of the matter,—if it could be accomplished, the task of the Socialist would be done. How is this centralized authority to act? How control diverse organizations, holding diverse views on interest and necessity? How bring dissentients to unanimity? How assert authority over conflicting opinion? How realize action through the antagonisms of sectional struggle? These are all pertinent questions, demanding answers, but which the "pros" leave very severely alone.

(Continued in next issue)

## HERE AND NOW

Some attention has been drawn to the financial position of the "Clarion" by our distress signal in last issue. Since then a sum over a hundred and thirty dollars has rushed in and the hungry printer is appeased for the time. There are rocks ahead still. "Clarion" readers must keep the course clear. Previously we had been able to rely to some extent on returns from literature sales. Literature sales are low, however, when overalls pockets are empty, and most of the literature going out now seems to be on long term credit—some longer than that. We are full of confidence, optimism and good cheer, the only thing about it is that the treasury contains little but an echo, and we can't cash in on that.

The substance of all of which is that your attention is now drawn to the "Clarion's" need for subs. Without subs. it cannot survive. Our "Here and Now" item indicates that some comrades have realized that, and have made the effort. Go thou and do likewise. Amen!

Following one dollar each—J. Treter, D. S. Smith, W. B. Durham, J. Gröder, J. R. Donnenworth, H. Myers, John Wilson, J. D. McKay, Tom Mace, H. Hill, A. Barnes, J. M. Sanderson, J. D. McCaughey, Sid Earp, E. Kernode, M. Halminen, Wm. Stokes, Malcolm Bruce F. Evans, W. H. Kirby, O. Erickson, E. T. Palmer, A. A. Cronk, K. Smith, A. Lefman, M. Sanford, Dick Burge, H. G. Ross, Jas. Bone Miss E. Hartley, "Pat."

Following \$2 each—J. Dennis, G. Wallack, Katherine Love, A. R. Sinclair, W. M. Scott, A. Mofridge, J. R. Shiel, W. S. Matthews, Frank Cassidy, J. A. La Fleche.

M. W. Smith, \$9; Geo. Aplin, \$1.50; R. G. Pringle, \$1.12; Geo. Gilbert (Millerton Public Library, New Zealand), \$2.10; T. Allsopp, \$12.63; H. Campbell (W.S.S.S., Auckland, N. Z.), \$4.50; B. Foltz (Marxian School, 'Frisco), \$7.20; Harry Williams, \$17.50; R. Inglis, \$10; C. R. Morrison, \$4; A. S. Wells, \$1.50; W. Ridout, \$5; J. V. Cullen, \$4; H. M. Bartholomew, \$3.

Above Clarion subscriptions received from 27th May to 13th June, inclusive—total, \$134.05.

Error in "Here and Now" May 2. R. C. Match should be \$4, instead of \$1. Also Dave Watt, \$3.

## MANIFESTO

— of the —  
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA  
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy ..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies ..... \$3

Post Paid