

not be in a position to take arms against the proletariat. Thus the Marxian conception of a proletarian dictatorship as an unavoidable stage on the road to Socialism either is an antiquated conception or his dictatorship is as much justified in Russia as in any other country." (Emphasis mine.)

Here we have the dictatorship defined as unnecessary in the advanced countries, and by such a prominent Bolshevik official of the Third International as Radek. If they mean simply that the working class (as Marx puts it, in the "Communist Manifesto") must win the battle of democracy, acquire political supremacy and become the ruling class during the transition, why don't they say so? Why make as your object and insist upon propagating a condition which must in the very nature of emancipation, be a brief transitional stage?

What the Third International means should be clearly understood before joining, and their reply to the application of the Socialist Party of America is very informing on several points (see "Communist, U. S. A., Dec. 15, 1920).

Comrade Kaplan and others sentimentally appeal for Socialists to join because Russia is "engaged in the struggle against all force and fraud of the whole capitalist world." In their reply to S. P. of A. the Third International executive ridicule this reason. "It is of course very gratifying to have the sympathy of the American Socialist Party because the Communist International 'is threatened by the combined capitalist forces of the world.' This is, however, hardly a valid reason for a party's wishing to join the Communist International, or for the Communist International to accept such a party."

They further state: "The Communist International is no defensive organization. It is an organ of aggression, the General Staff of the World Revolution for the forcible overthrow of the capitalist state everywhere, and the setting up of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Again they say: "The Communist International is an army in war time; volunteers who join the army of revolution must adopt its principles and obey its orders, submit to its discipline. None but revolutionary Communist organizations are accepted in the Communist International. They must adopt as their program the program of the Communist International — open revolutionary mass struggle for Communism, through the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, by means of Workers Soviets—accepting as binding all resolutions of the Congresses and Executive Committee of the Communist International." ("Communist," U. S. A., Dec. 15, 1920).

This insistence upon "open revolutionary mass struggle" is again emphasized in the "Theses on Parliamentarism, Trade Unionism and the Communist International," adopted at Second Congress last August. This states:

9. "The fundamental method of the struggle of the proletariat against the rule of the bourgeoisie is, first of all, the method of mass action."

10. "The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalist order of government."

Such "mass action" means to rely upon the spontaneous instinctive uprising of bodies of people, and not the activity of informed organized workers. It has led to tragedies recently in the U. S. A., and the easy suppression of the workers by armed force. Yet one of the affiliated Communist bodies in Canada in their official organ the "Communist Bulletin," says of the Winnipeg strike movement:

"From a strike to raise wages the strike had developed so that the next logical step would have been a political strike against the capitalist state. But the strike committee refused to take that step, urged the workers to be peaceful, and indignantly denied trying to supplant "constituted authority" with a workers' council. The step towards a political strike was not taken because of the "constitutional" prejudices of the strike committee, the absence of a revolutionary party willing to take the leadership into its own hands, the absence of illegal organs of propaganda which could have explained the situation to the workers. . . ."

They are putting the Theses into practice. But that way is surely the nemesis of propaganda, and leading the workers on to the shambles.

In the above reply to S. P. of A., the Third insists that acceptance of Workers Soviets is necessary as

the means of dictatorship. In the Theses just quoted they say: "The only form of proletarian dictatorship is a republic of Soviets." This is worth discussion, but their writings offer little information. The whole question of the superiority of Soviets is given small attention. The Bolsheviks themselves had to set up higher bodies such as the Supreme Council of Economy, etc. The visitors from Russia give little knowledge on the matter. Mensheviks started the Soviets in 1905, and Scheideman captured the Soviets in 1919 in Germany, because there is nothing in their form which makes them immune from reaction any more than other organs.

Sometimes we are told that the phrase Dictatorship is used to denote the denial of franchise to the bourgeoisie. But Lenin tells us in his "Proletarian Revolution," (p. 56), "the disfranchisement of the bourgeoisie does not constitute a necessary element of the dictatorship of the proletariat."

In reply to the S. P. of America, the Third International states: "The centrist parties, the German Independents and the French Socialists are not yet acceptable for entrance into the Communist International. Yet they accept the program of mass action and dictatorship of the proletariat based on the Soviets. Any party which still advocates political democracy is a thousand times worse than these parties, it is a counter-revolutionary, a Scheideman party."

Whether or not the S. P. of C. position is opposed to political democracy I leave to the general knowledge of your members, but this statement is not in harmony with Radek's quoted before. Further, this attitude of hostility to political democracy is backed up by reference to the failure of parliamentary action, which up till now has not been Socialist parliamentary action, but the action of workers supporting their enemies.

True to the double attitudes adopted on various questions by the Third International, this denunciation of political democracy is in contrast with their support of the Labor Party. They now tell the working class to get control of parliament by means of the Labor Party. The "Theses on the Fundamental Tasks of the Third International," adopted at second Congress, states the "Second Congress of the Third International must declare itself in favor of the Communist Party, and the groups and organizations, sympathizing with Communism in England, joining the Labor Party, notwithstanding the circumstances that this party is a member of the Second International." The purpose stated is "to accelerate the transfer of political power from the direct representatives of the bourgeoisie to the 'Labor lieutenants of the capitalist class,' so that the masses may be more rapidly cured of all illusions on this subject." Yet the Third International has told us that during the war "affiliation with the Labor Party then, meant an alliance with opportunism and in nowise a struggle against it." (Reply to I. L. P.) Curing workers of illusions by another illusion!

Is the opportunism any the less now? While parties in Third are allowed to belong to the Labor Parties it obviously cannot be a sound Socialist body to join.

The division amongst parties today into "Communist" and other fractions has not been caused by a grasp of Socialist principle, but by the activities of Moscow delegates, together with enthusiasm for Russia. Up till yesterday the membership of French and German parties were outside Third, but after a discussion on Soviets, dictatorship, etc., the delegates declared for it.

Sylvia Pankhurst told us that there are reformers in both Communist Parties in England. Serrati, the Italian delegate, who was highly praised as a Bolshevik by the Third International, asks: "How is it that the Russian Government, if it is so intolerant of opportunism—could offer some months ago £75,000 to the "Daily Herald," which upholds in England the policy of opportunist Socialism?" (London "Communist," Jan. 13, 1921).

He also objects to the agrarian theses as not revolutionary enough, and "does not share Lenin's belief that objectively, conditions are ripe for revolution, and that only leaders are in the way." The Communist Labor Party of Germany in their "Open Letter to Lenin," say: "The Third International believes that the revolution in Western Europe will be able to follow a compromise and alliance with

petty peasant, petty bourgeois, and even with bourgeois parties. The Communist Labor Party believes this to be impossible." ("Workers Dreadnought," Jan. 29, 1921).

J. S. Clarke, the Bolshevik Workers' Committee's editor, says, in "The Worker," Jan. 29, 1921 on his return from Russia: "We have the most cunning, most powerful and most politically and economically wide-awake ruling class on earth to combat. We have a proletariat as different to the Russian proletariat as chalk differs from cheese. Our proletariat can read and write, they are doped and have been doped for centuries; they are cursed with traditional ideas of freedom and superiority; they have to be uneducated. Our insularity, our dependence on other countries, and the relatively well entrenched power of our Menshevik opponents and trade union bureaucracy are other factors to consider."

Zinoviev at the Third International Congress in August, "expressed the fear that it might be dissolved by the petit-bourgeois elements which the irresistible sweep of the working class movement was bringing in without ridding them of their prejudices." (Communist, London, report of Third International). That this is possible can be seen by the reformers of yesterday "becoming" the Bolsheviks of today.

I hold that a real Third International must be based upon a recognition of the class struggle, thereby keeping out reformers, nationalist liberation movements and Labor Parties. Upon a recognition of the necessity of educating the mass of the workers, and political organization for the conquest of political power for Socialism.

Serrati, whom Zinoviev refers to as "your glorious leader," interviewed by Brailsford ("Daily Herald," Jan. 25, 1921), "complained of the impenetrable ignorance which even the ablest Russians display in judging Western politics. One may admire their driving force and their tremendous achievement but this ignorance seems to me to make affiliation under the 21 points too grave a risk." Space prevents showing the character of some organizations in the Third International, but we have the Unione Sindicale Italiana, and parties like the Communist Party in England, whose secretary (Whitehead) writes that it stands for: "Shorter working week for heavy and skilled labor," "Equal pay for men and women," etc. ("Workers' Dreadnought," Sept. 11th, 1920). The Communist Party in England have as their editor a well known Roman Catholic publicist, and we even have Bombacci of Italy (the extremist Communist) demanding "an energetic revision of the membership of parties in the Third" at the Second Congress. John Maclean, M.A., whom the Third called the leader of Bolsheviks in England, has a street named after him in Petrograd, but we find one of the planks in his Scottish Communist Party is "Home Rule for Scotland!"

Obviously there is much in the Third International of the material that ruined the Second.

I notice that these articles on Russia and also on the Third International contain several "kind" references to the S. P. of G. B. Faulkner asks if the Bolsheviks should have wired the S. P. of G. B., and Fillmore jokes about their small numbers. A writer signing himself F. Clark lumps them in with the holy-rollers and Billy Sunday. I would suggest that if these writers object to the S. P. of G. B. they should attempt to deal with their position and propaganda and not descend to sneering at them in an ignorant manner.

The writer belonged to the S. P. of G. B. for over 12 years, and knows their struggle against the appalling mass of confusion in Britain. Working against the Second International when Lenin and the mass of present Communists still believed in it, and attacking Kautsky while Lenin still called him a Marxist, the S. P. of G. B. carried on an unpopular crusade against reformism and syndicalism of every color, and with entirely voluntary work of its members has an influence far beyond its small membership. It has never shirked discussion and stands today for the position it laid down in 1904 because it still holds that its Marxian attitude is unshaken.

As I close this letter, I see by the organ of the Canadian section of United Communist Party of America ("The Communist Bulletin") that the S. P. of C. is told that in order to join it must make