

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

Capitalism is international. One and the same firm and company owns capital and enterprises in various different countries. Also wage slaves, the creators of all the wealth, are international. One who today slaves and creates riches for the lords of France and England, after a few weeks may be seen bending his back for the benefit of the American parasites.

In the days of the Paris Commune the Bismark troops, i.e., the German troops, stood in readiness like cattle in order to crush the Paris Commune and to draw into a sea of blood the revolution of France if the Versailles alone were unable to cope with the situation.

The proletariat of Russia, single handed, crushed Czarism, knocked to the ground its bourgeoisie, and began to realize their future plans. Then the international bourgeoisie from all lands stretched out their hands and began to throw a loop around the neck of new Russia. They would have succeeded in choking her had it not been for the international proletariat, who raised their strong hands of toil and challenged "Enough. Hands off Russia."

Following the above, though brief reasoning, we see plainly that the class struggle can only be international, and therefore it is necessary to have strong international labor organization. Such a form of organization is the Third, or Communist International. There is no heavier crime than to ignore it and not be affiliated with it.

As to losing our legality and feeling reaction, we will get that some time anyhow. Our legality and charters have any meaning only so long as we slumber and are harmless to capitalism. As soon as we began to be active the police smashed our headquarters with all its charters and put our speakers and more active comrades behind the bars. Do you remember the sad happenings during the Winnipeg strike?

Long live the Third International

Let us, Canadians, be a part of it.

Local Lac du Bonnet,

(per J. Beckman).

Comrade Editor, —In discussing the affiliation with the Third International, one can not fail to see that this question is touching upon all human activity in every land and clime. And to confine one's thoughts on this question to our own national boundary or "continent" would hardly be doing justice to the question under discussion. All things within our objective—bearing on this question—must be considered, weighed justly. The creditable record we have made in the past shall continue in the future.

Stating the case in favor of affiliation, consideration for its growth, and its usefulness, must be taken into account, which to a great extent is contingent upon its future development.

The object of the Third International is to harmonize and supervise through a centralized agency, composed of representatives from all affiliated organizations, to better protect and facilitate the work of the world proletariat. Seeking to divert the strength of the whole to bear upon any given situation deemed warrantable by the executive as in the best interest of the proletariat. When the proletariat of any country rebel against oppression they are not confronted with capitalism of their own country alone, but with world capitalism. So it is obligatory with them, in order to wage the struggle more intelligently and with greater effectiveness, to create an International Union that will function on the same basis as world capitalism, in the interest of the proletariat. The vulnerable point in the proletariat defence has been lack of co-ordination. Its fragmentary makeup renders them an easy prey to their masters.

Now, some comrades seem to think that if we were affiliated with the Third International we would have to indulge in tactics that are futile. This I think is unsound, unless these comrades can point out where such terms have been imposed on any body affiliated with the Third International, or a case in point where no deviation from a course found

untenable has been held inviolable, or show cause for doubting the professed object of the Third International, or the intelligence of its makeup. For clause 16 in the "Theses" states specifically "that a programme in conformity with special condition of their own country" must be drawn up. Otherwise the interpretation of the clause in question is a supposition derived from straight-jacketing that clause, without considering its relative position to other points in the "Theses," made to meet world conditions, which must necessarily contain a certain amount of flexibility. If our propaganda is founded on the class struggle, and applied intelligently and directly to conditions arising from time to time, we may safely assume the other phases of this propaganda to be free to adapt itself to local needs.

Objection to clause 2 is taken on the grounds that "it would immediately involve us in a series of bitter struggles." Is not the class struggle a series of bitter struggles in all its phases? And unless we elect to become non-combatants by committing suicide, we have to put up with it till it is ended. And while educational work is of the utmost importance, it will not relieve us from having to change the system of production and distribution from private into collective ownership, which involves getting administrative powers, if our educational work shall bear us fruit in the way it is intended. The bitterness of the struggle will be accelerated as we approach the final downfall of capitalism. And if the observance of clause 2 (removing from responsible posts in the labor movement—reformist and partisans of the centre), would as stated "involve us in a series of bitter struggles," that presupposes the shady makeup of the party as at present constituted, which is doubtful unless a very narrow construction, as to the fitness of its intellectual makeup, is to be considered.

But if such be the case, the rupture would eventually have to come, if we are to carry the class struggle to its logical conclusion. The extension of time to better prepare for it is neither augmented nor diminished by joining with the Third International. For surely we hold no power up our sleeve that is capable of promoting the cause of the proletariat that we do not wield.

Criticism on formulae for building up the Third International is not, I think, well founded, for nowhere is it proposed to amalgamate all freak organizations, and affiliate them with the Third International. When signing "articles of faith" as laid down in the "Theses," they will have to comply with these articles, by practically living up to them to the extent demanded by the "Theses," before admittance to the Third International can be obtained (having here regards to conditions indigenous to any country, and as such applied). The eliminating and replacement process which most organizations will have to subject themselves to in order to qualify will prove a strong guarantee against being swamped by freak organizations wishing to affiliate.

Notwithstanding the fact that heterogeneous elements were represented at the last congress of the Third International, that congress should be considered largely as being of a defensive character, obtaining support from as many sources as they were varied in divergent views, in order to better safeguard the revolution in Russia. Therefore the makeup of the last congress cannot be considered an infraction of principles, but the inclusion was made to serve a tense and trying situation. The uncompromising tone in the terms of affiliation cannot be doubted, and though it may be said that we have "freaks and faddists" in the S. P. of C., the stringent terms imposed upon them in the constitution excludes the possibility of them becoming a menace to the party. If the qualities of the terms imposed are scientifically correct, they command the respect and obedience of its members. The conditions for affiliation with the Third International can at least be compared favorably with the conditions for affiliation with the S. P. of C., when aim of objective and means whereby this is to be attained are considered.

When one of the comrades contends that "Herd-

ing them (the proletariat) into a freak organization and giving them revolutionary names will not unite them," we agree with him. But the inference cannot escape us, that reference is here made to the the Third International as a freak organization, which is, I think, a far-fetched assumption. If all workers must be in possession of a scientific Socialist education before they can affiliate with each other, when will we have Socialism upon this basis? Or to what extent should we co-operate and affiliate with our fellow workers meantime? An augmented aggressiveness in carrying forward our work as proletarians (which the conditions for affiliation demands) cannot be interpreted as a departure from scientific Socialism.

The comrades of Local Winnipeg No. 3 in their reasons for non-affiliation state that "The proletarian dictatorship should not be advocated on account of its probable short duration." Comrades, the advocacy of the proletarian dictatorship, determines to a large extent the mettle of the comrades within our ranks. Upon the proletarian dictatorship is contingent the success or failure, when at the juncture of setting up a proletarian state, and the proletarian dictatorship is our only logical weapon of defence against those forces and elements seeking to frustrate and destroy us. It therefore should be advocated in the sense that its power be invoked at the point of necessity. Regardless of the temporary opposition we will meet with, its ultimate usefulness is indispensable to the revolutionary proletariat.

There is plenty of breadth and latitude in the terms of affiliation to meet all varying conditions, providing that we earnestly seek to carry on the class struggle intelligently and in the most effective way, as peculiarly adaptable to any country.

The overthrow of capitalism, whether by the majority or the minority, by peaceful means or by force, cannot be determined and worked out according to prescribed rule. But as varying conditions arise from time to time, these will have to be met with a corresponding change in tactics, such as the situation demands. Our propaganda must be directed to that end. Therefore an educational policy capable of intellectual attainment only, is fallacious.

The rapidly moving events exclude the probability of workers studying the class struggle out of books. They rather will attain to that understanding through contact with practical class conscious forces operating in their midst. From this position springs the obvious reason for clauses one to seven. Hence the necessity for the rigid weeding out process embodied in the "Theses." "Freaks and faddists" will not be an asset, but a liability which must be eliminated from our organization, and must not be allowed to hold responsible position in our movement. Their mischievous and insidious propaganda and tactics will have enough influence from without, to say nothing about giving official sanction to it within our movement.

In conclusion I wish to say that to admire ourselves for the wisdom we have exhibited in the past may be allowed its deserved recognition. But that is hardly sufficient to base the decision on whether to join with the Third International or not. If we are the metal we profess to be, we will step in and help to build up—both physically and morally—what our comrades in Russia made possible: A genuine proletarian international.

H. H. HANSON.

Undoubtedly the recognition by the Party of the pressing needs of the day is reflected in its proposed referendum, and naturally the consequent discussions will be of immense value as a means for measuring the revolutionary value of its teachings and propaganda in the past.

An analysis of the points laid down for acceptance by parties applying for affiliation, usually brings forth from the older comrades in the movement the cry that "this is precisely what the party has been doing for years." This being so, it should undoubtedly lead to affiliation, especially if the reasons of the party for refusing to affiliate with the Third International on the grounds "that this com-