



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. 1

JULY—AUGUST, 1917

No. 2

Socialists and War

A DEBATE

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

LOUIS C. FRAINA

J'accuse !

Friedrich Adler's Speech in Court

Socialist Policy in Peace and War

By L. B. BOUDIN

A War Legislature

By Assemblyman JOS. A. WHITEHORN

PUBLISHED BY

THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, 115 WORTH ST., NEW YORK CITY



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. I

JULY—AUGUST, 1917

No. 2

Socialists and War

A DEBATE

ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

LOUIS C. FRAINA

J'accuse!

Friedrich Adler's Speech in Court

Socialist Policy in Peace and War

By L. B. BOUDIN

A War Legislature

By Assemblyman JOS. A. WHITEHORN

PUBLISHED BY

THE SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY, 115 WORTH ST., NEW YORK CITY

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. I JULY—AUGUST, 1917 No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
To Make the World Safe for Democracy. By Ludwig Lore	1— 8
War and Public Opinion. By Austin Lewis	9— 16
Socialist Policy in Peace and War. By L. B. Boudin	16— 35
A War Legislature. By Joseph A. Whitehorn	36— 46
Political Majorities and Industrial Minorities. By Eric Niel	46— 59
Socialists and War. 1) By Robert Rives La Monte	59— 75
2) By Louis C. Fraina	75— 99
Philipp Scheidemann. A Pen Picture	100—101
J'accuse! Friedrich Adler's Address in Court	102—114
Current Affairs	115
Peace with Victory, 115; Lost a Peace Demand, 117; "Automobile Patriots," 118; Mr. Wilson and Child Labor, 119; The War and American Unionism, 120; The Russian Revolution and the War, 123; On the Road to the New International, 126; Friedrich Adler, 129; The Socialist Party and Stockholm, 132; Spargo & Co., 135; The Attitude of Lenin, 138.	
Documents for Future Socialist History	142
Majority Resolution on War and Militarism, 142; Minority Resolution on War and Militarism, 147; Minority Report on War, 148; To the Socialists of the Belligerent Countries, 151.	



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Published by The Socialist Publication Society, 115 Worth St., N. Y. City

Issued Every Two Months—25¢ a Copy; \$1.50 a Year

Editors: LOUIS B. BOUDIN, LOUIS C. FRAINA, LUDWIG LORE

Vol. I JULY-AUGUST, 1917 No. 2

TO MAKE THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

By LUDWIG LORE

If one could sit on the moon, and gaze upon the events of this mundane sphere from the bird's-eye perspective of a disinterested spectator—one can hardly conceive of a more amusing pastime. Unfortunately, we cannot live high up in the rare atmosphere of other worlds, but are condemned to stand, as more or less active participants, in the midst of the turmoil and carnelaval called life.

Consider, for instance, how ludicrously funny it must seem to the man in the moon to watch the masters of the most progressive nations instilling into the hearts of their subjects a deadly hatred against their fellow men, whom they have never seen; a hatred that is so general, and, at the same time so intense that it makes whole nations blind to the insanity of killing and maiming men with whom they have no quarrel, of sacrificing the flower of their own manhood in its cause.

To be sure, each nation has its "very sufficient" reasons. They are all pathetically eager to offer excuse upon excuse to palliate their role in the horrible business of war. And still it has never been so unmistakably apparent as in this world war, that the figleaf with which rulers and subjects both strive to cover up their bestiality, is the product of a policy of bare-faced romancing and infamous hypocrisy. The boldness with which new and more attractive "justifications" are substituted

for old, worn out or unattractive war slogans would do credit to an experienced shell game promoter.

Look at Germany, for instance. When the war-fanfare sounded in August, 1914, the German people were called upon the war-path to defend German "Kultur" against Russian barbarism. In order to make the fairy tale a little more realistic, lying reports were spread of invasion by "Russian hordes" into German territory. The lurid picture of the knout-swinging Cossack was held before the eyes of a horror-stricken people. Russian conditions were described in the darkest colors. Until the purpose, the capturing of the Social Democratic Party and the working class in general for the war, had been accomplished. Then, with a suddenness that does credit to the credulity of the German people, Russia vanished behind the scenes and England appeared upon the boards, as the real foe of the German nation. "Perfidus Albion" was threatening German greatness, its political and economic independence. Great Britain was the cause and the instigator of the war. And now the whole of Germany, and particularly the middle class, for whose benefit this new bag of tricks was being displayed, damned the perfidy of England as thoroughly as it had cursed Russia a few months before.

But why go so far afield? Have we not witnessed a parallel case right here in our own country? Why did the United States—read: Congress terrorized by the Wilson Administration—sent a declaration of war to Germany? Because—according to the official declaration—the ruthless submarine warfare announced by the German government threatened the life and property of American citizens and the famous national honor of this country. But the people refused to betray the necessary enthusiasm for a war that was begun palpably in the interest of large capitalist profiteers, and quite as evidently for the purpose of protecting the exceedingly lucrative trans-Atlantic trade with the Entente. The present administration, which has always been peculiarly adept in feeling the pulse of public opinion, soon recognized the hopelessness of this appeal and simply changed the watchword. Our national interests were relegated to the background, and the United States forgot its

profits, forgot its trans-Atlantic trade, and proclaimed that henceforward it had but one aim: "To make the world safe for Democracy." It cannot be denied that the professorial schoolmaster in the White House on this occasion once more proved himself to be an exceedingly adroit politician.

At any rate, according to the official version, we are conducting this war in the interest of democracy. The wicked U-Boat Campaign is but rarely mentioned in passing. Wall Street, the Steel, Powder and Copper Trusts, the ammunition industry and the meat packers, the food speculators, down to the meanest corner grocer who thoroughly utilizes the "situation" for his own purposes—they all have but one aim: to make the world safe for Democracy. . . .

Three months have passed since we first went into the war, and have given us an opportunity to examine it a little more closely. But, peculiarly, no matter how carefully we search, this war for and through democracy—at least as far as its effects at home are concerned—looks to us confoundedly like that of the autocracies of Germany and Austria-Hungary and the democracies of Great Britain and France. Reaction here, reaction there; everywhere curtailment and complete annulment of the rights of the people in every belligerent nation. Constitutional guarantees are overthrown, governmental anarchy and despotism reign unchecked, aggravated, in this country, by the arbitrary rulings and acts of subordinate officials and courts.

The first gift that this great war brought us was conscription, selective conscription. The conviction that we expressed in the first number of THE CLASS STRUGGLE, that graft, nepotism and corruption of all kinds would find a fertile field in the proposed conscription act, has already proven to be but too true. Each of the two large parties, wherever it holds the power in the state, has packed the Exemption Boards with its own men, and will see to it, in the words of the Democratic ex-Congressman Palmer of Pennsylvania, that the sons of their political opponents are sent to the front, while their own sons, and those of their party friends, stay at home. That

the Socialists will suffer most under this system need not be emphasized. But this is merely by the way. Much more dangerous is the step-wise militarization of the United States, of which the present conscription act is but the beginning. When our masters took this step, they were determined that it should never be retraced, that compulsory military service shall become a permanent institution in times of peace as well as in times of war. Politicians like Roosevelt and Taft, the Hearst papers, the *Times*, *Evening Mail*, *Sun*, *Globe*, and many of the influential papers all over the country, have given expression openly to this demand, and will accomplish their purpose unless a strong movement to crush this militaristic element sets in at once.

The fight against the conscription bill, and against the law, after the bill was passed, in street, hall and mass demonstrations, has been the task of the hour.

It is regrettable that the Socialist Party locals, as such, in Greater New York, for instance, arranged no anti-conscription meetings whatsoever. A number of districts, on the contrary, did splendid work. But even these few demonstrations were disturbed and disrupted by civil and military authorities to the best of their ability. They sent soldiers who played the role of provocateurs, made arrests and arrogated to themselves other police rights. The police of the Mitchel "Reform" Administration, not to be outdone, called meetings of hallkeepers and warned them of renting out their establishments for such purposes. It has become almost impossible to carry on propaganda for the recall of this shameful law. Freedom of assemblage has been practically annihilated by our war for democracy. New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland are examples.

Almost immediately those other tried and proven friends of our capitalist social order, the courts, became active. Young people whose only crime lay in the distribution of handbills advertising an anti-conscription meeting, were sentenced to two years in prison and a fine of \$10,000. It was openly admitted that the defendants brought this severe judgment

upon themselves because they proudly declared that they were anarchists, and refused to say *pater peccavi* in order to escape punishment. Similar punishments were meted out almost daily. A veritable reign of terror swept the country. Whoever took prominent part in the movement for the repeal of the conscription law was blacklisted, arrested on the slightest provocation, and haled before the courts.

One of the most flagrant of these cases was the arrest and trial of the two anarchist leaders, Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman. Their fearless agitation had become an eyesore to the authorities. Their meetings were packed; tens of thousands stood upon the streets. The frantic efforts of police and militia to quell them notwithstanding. No means were too low and too despicable; and still the meetings were held, and the attendance increased from week to week. As a last resort Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were arrested, placed under an outrageous bail of \$25,000, convicted, and sentenced to two years in prison and a fine of \$10,000, although not the slightest proof of the existence of a conspiracy to make the registration law ineffectual could be brought against them. The judge who sat in these cases found himself, like so many prominent German- and Austro-Americans, when America entered the war, in a sorry predicament. Their vociferous German patriotism has placed them under the painful necessity of proving their true-blue Americanism to the world—and that as conspicuously as possible. This same Federal judge also showed by the exceedingly mild punishment meted out to two young college students who had repudiated their bold anti-militaristic position, that his intention was rather to intimidate and terrorize than to punish, a conception foreign to our law.

That the fight to make the United States safe for democracy is very necessary, the well known case of Harry Aurin shows. On July 4th, Aurin distributed a circular containing simply paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Declaration of Independence and the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution, followed by the question: "Does our government live up to these principles?" For this crime he was sentenced by a New York

police court to ninety days in the workhouse. In his pleading Assistant District Attorney Hatting stated that the intent of the defendant in distributing this circular seemed to be to incite revolution. He insisted that, while the circular ostensibly contained only quotations from the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the distributor had but used this document to cloak his own thoughts, but that his purpose had been to incite to treason and to revolution. That the sentence was later reversed does not rob the first trial of any of its beauty.

The news that Socialists all over the country, the Sadlers in Washington, Ruthenberg, Wagenknecht and others in Ohio, Coldwell in Rhode Island, Jaeger, Graubard, Nessin, Levine and many others in New York, Tom Hickey and fifty-two more Socialists in Texas, and National Secretary Germer, as well as a large number of comrades in Detroit, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Grand Rapids and elsewhere, have been arrested for agitation against conscription and agitation, shows that our comrades all over the country have been up and doing. And here, too, most of them have been arrested on trumped up charges, with false statements and lying witnesses.

This art of interpretation and false construction, as it is being practiced by the courts of justice with increasing frequency, has gradually assumed such alarming proportions that a number of more unprejudiced judges have been moved to object. So, for instance, Federal Judge Rose, of Baltimore, has rendered a decision that has been widely commented upon, in which he says, "Every man has a right, if he so chooses, to criticise adversely any system of society, or any law, so long as he obeys that law while it remains a law."

As was to be expected, our authorities did not content themselves with the inhibition of the rights of free speech and free assemblage. The attack upon the press that followed was a foregone conclusion. To be sure, our National Congress showed more backbone in this matter of press censorship than in any other war measure called for by the administration. It refused absolutely to pass the espionage bill with the censorship clause demanded by the President, and adopted the former

only after a free and untrammelled press had been assured. And yet! the *Socialist News* (Cleveland), the *Michigan Socialist*, *The Rebel* of Texas, *The International Socialist Review*, the *St. Louis Labor*, the *St. Louis Arbeiterzeitung*, and *The Social Revolution* (*Rip-Saw*) of St. Louis, *The Appeal to Reason*, *The Masses*, *The American Socialist*, the official Party paper, *The People's Press* (Philadelphia) and *The New International* have been suppressed by the postal authorities. In a conference between a committee of the National Executive Committee of the Party and prominent officials of the Postal Department and the Department of Justice in Washington, the latter expressly stated that they were determined to pursue this policy of suppression with increased severity. According to Comrade Engdahl, the editor of *The American Socialist*, W. H. Lamar, solicitor of the Postal Department at Washington, is the real press censor of the country, and has power of life and death over all publications.

The blows that have already been struck against the anti-militarist and radical labor movement, heavy as they have been, are but a promise of what is to come. In West Virginia and Maryland the legislatures have already passed laws that put even Germany's civil conscription measure to shame. In Minnesota a commission of seven men, appointed by the governor, has been endowed with powers more autocratic and more far-reaching than those of the late lamented Czar of Russia, or of the more lamented German Kaiser. And it uses its immense powers more arbitrarily than either. In the State of New York the Stivers and the state registration laws pave the way for the same kind of despotism. Other state legislatures are preparing to follow in their footsteps.

What has been done for the states by the various legislatures, the food law will accomplish nationally—if possible, on a still greater scale. Section 4 of this bill, which at the time of writing has not yet been definitely adopted by Congress, reads:

"Section 4. That it is hereby made unlawful for any person . . . to conspire, combine, agree or arrange with any other

person (a) to limit the facilities for transporting, producing, manufacturing, supplying, storing or dealing in any necessities; (b) to restrict the supply of any necessary; (d) to prevent, limit or lessen the manufacture or production of any necessities, or to enhance the price thereof; or (e) to exact excessive prices for any necessities, or to aid or abet the doing of any act made unlawful by this act."

Should this paragraph still need comment or interpretation, such is amply furnished by the defeat, with 162 against 45 votes, of the motion of Congressman Keating, Colorado, providing that nothing in this bill be regarded as repealing the (alleged) strike rights provided for in the Clayton anti-Trust act.

Thus, hand in hand with the political suppression of the working class, will come the economic enslavement of the masses. Their last weapons will be wrested from them, weapons that are indispensable in their struggle for better conditions. A fitting reward, forsooth, for the treachery of Samuel Gompers and the A. F. of L. machine.

Two years ago, at the banquet of the Intercollegiate Socialist Society, John Spargo answered a preparedness speech of Charles Edward Russell in sentiment that should not so soon be forgotten. Democracy is not a thing that can be brought from without. It is inherent in the life and thoughts of the masses, and can be brought only by and through the action of these masses. Democracy and preparedness, democracy and war, are incompatible. The two cannot exist side by side, in the same social fabric. War and preparedness inevitably mean reaction. We have but one choice—war and reaction, or peace and democracy. . . .

Make the world safe for democracy. There is but one way. Democracy will come only where the working-class, by the strength of its numbers and its convictions, succeeds in forcing the capitalist class to the wall. Not war, but revolution, will bring democracy, in Russia, in Germany—and in the United States.

War and Public Opinion

By AUSTIN LEWIS

The recent demand for a referendum prior to a declaration of war is apparently based upon the notion that public opinion is averse to war. This has lately received some support from the vote of Australia against conscription. This fact is, however, offset by the equally important one that Australia has furnished her quota to the war by voluntary enlistment. It seems to be fairly certain that all the governments are supported by the public opinion of the respective countries and this is true even if we allow for the censorship and the restrictions on public meetings.

Of course there is no question that some wars have been unpopular, but their unpopularity has not hindered their prosecution. There have also been intensely popular wars. As far as the British possessions are involved it may be truthfully said that this war is one of them. The zeal of the public has appeared not only in the enlistments and monetary contributions but even more in the violence of the social disapproval which has marked any unwillingness to serve.

Where the means of subsistence are threatened even indirectly the group is a unit in the struggle to maintain them. Even where the "maintenance mores," the system of customs at the foundation of the group prosperity appear to be in danger, the same vehemence of public opinion in their defense is manifested. The raids of barbarian tribes upon their neighbors for the purpose of stealing cattle, and thus increasing the food supply or forays with the idea of annexation and thus broadening the opportunities for making a living have always met with the approval of the public. For under such conditions the appeal to the emotions of the crowd meets with a ready response and public opinion is easily developed.

At the beginning of the war the German government was wonderfully well placed for an appeal to public opinion. The statement that the country was threatened by a Russian in-

vasion was sufficient, as the most obvious instinct of self-preservation was thereby called into play, but there were also other self-regarding sentiments which aided the war appeal. As Liebknecht charged in the May Day speech for which he is now suffering imprisonment, there is little doubt that the German working class considered that it would profit economically by the war. The government, it was argued, would have more funds at its disposal and this would be an advantage to the entire community. In particular, state aid measures for the benefit of the working class would be greatly enlarged.

In Great Britain, however, the same fundamental appeal was not possible, and public opinion was not so rapidly developed. But when the Zeppelin raids and the coast bombardments brought to the people an actual realization of danger, public opinion in favor of the war arose forthwith and the partial indifference which had marked the initial stages disappeared. The British colonies, also, which had grown up in economic reliance upon the mother country, though almost independent political units, regarded themselves as threatened by a common attack. To them also the war appeared to threaten the means of subsistence.

The case is very clear in the matter of the invaded countries but in that of Russia it is more difficult. Perhaps the explanation is that public opinion does not exist in Russia. There have been and still are numerous and embarrassing differences of opinion in the Russian dominant groups with respect to the war, the Liberals favoring the war in the hope of gaining political advantages from the very beginning.

Professor A. C. Coolidge in a lecture delivered October 14, 1914, (quoted by Professor Keller in "Societal Evolution"—MacMillan) said "International relations are based ultimately upon conditions involving self-maintenance interests. For example, a noted student of such relations has stated that it is normal for a great war, such as the one now in progress in Europe to start suddenly. If there is time for deliberation the commercial and financial interests have an opportunity to assert themselves and to endeavor to secure some form of peaceful adaptation. They will assert themselves later on in

any case and the final settlement must include the satisfaction of the basic interests of the dominant groups."

Revenge for defeat also acts as a stimulus to public opinion. In recent history a war to avenge the defeat of the British by the Boers at Majuba Hill would have been exceedingly popular, as was shown by the undeniable popularity of the last Boer war, at least in its initial stages, before its duration and the consequent losses caused a revulsion in popular sentiment. Since the Franco-Prussian war also French politics have been largely determined by the popular desire for revenge. McDougall mentions both of these cases in his "Social Psychology." He regards revenge as a "collective emotion" within "the system of that most widely extended form of the self-regarding sentiment which we call the patriotic sentiment."

But spontaneous as public opinion may appear to be in certain circumstances the development of its expression is a matter of deep concern and requires much art. The dominant class has the influencing of public opinion in its own hands, for that class alone has the control of the instruments by which public opinion is moved. It has been pointed out that the dominant class can even make a change in established mores by enforcing a rational selection. Its organs of expression can gradually deflect the course of opinion so as to cause it to take a line other than the usual, and by means of the power which they possess for a time at least produce the public opinion which they want. Hence governments devote to the formation of public opinion the same care and ability as they expend upon the assembling of armies and the provision for their maintenance in the field. As circumstances arise, the government is desirous that stress should be laid upon certain facts or that certain catchwords should become popular. Highly specialized skill and energy are directed to that end and experts who are adepts in mob psychology are engaged upon the task. Under such conditions, what is called public opinion is in reality the product of the advertising efforts of the governmental agencies and the mind of the public is thus made up without any conscious effort on its own part.

The censorship kills off all facts and counter-catchwords

capable of producing a psychological effect antagonistic to that desired by the government. Even in its extreme use this does not necessarily imply that all criticisms of the government are forbidden, as we can see in the notable case of Maximilian Harden, nor that a peace-propaganda is obviously penalized. On the other hand, criticism may be encouraged if it is so made as to appeal to a small select intellectual class and provided that it is not of a nature to affect the mind of the masses. The possessing hand of the government on public opinion therefore brings it about that the only live existent opinion is governmental opinion, for the masses have no power of expression and they are deprived by the exigencies of war of all opportunities for debate and are thus shut off from that liberty whence alone can arise public opinion in any real sense.

Catchwords with which the history of the group has made the masses familiar and which form part of the "prosperity mores" of the group are the favorites. The governmental advertisers play on them continually as they have already channelled themselves into the consciousness of the masses and their use provokes an almost automatic response. Thus around the phrase "rights of small nations" a whole mass of sentiment clusters, and the Greece of Byron, Bulgaria, Poland, and the American Colonies arise at once in the minds of Britons as soon as the expression is employed. On the other hand Ireland, the Transvaal and Egypt do not occur so readily. For in the former cases the "rights of small nations" were associated with the interest of the governing class, the dominant economic group, while in the latter case they were not so associated.

So that catchwords vary with the passing of time and the consequent changes in the structure of the dominant group. A semi-feudal class like the German Junker cannot use the same catchwords as a dominant bourgeoisie. The fact that the British government was in Liberal hands at the outbreak of the war gave it a great advantage, for there is a notion that the Liberals are closer to the people than the Conservatives and so can use popular shibboleths more effectively. The term "freedom of the individual" so frequently employed to

show the superiority of the British as compared with the German system is a product of the long struggle between the English Agrarians and the Industrialists. The people in the industrial towns having grown used to the phrase by long usage applaud it automatically and its very employment by the apologists for the government is itself a justification. The unqualified term "freedom" is used indiscriminately by the publicists of all governments, as a negative catchword. It implies that the country is in danger and produces in the mind of the average man the conviction that his means of livelihood are threatened. It therefore makes a universal appeal. "I died for freedom for they told me so" is the explanation made by the dead of each of the conflicting countries. No other catchword is so powerful, for no other is so general in its appeal or makes response so certain, and no other has been so universally advertised.

The "country" is associated immediately with the means of livelihood, particularly in the minds of the dominant class. During the great railroad strike of 1893 a rumor spread in California that the soldiers in Chicago had refused to fire upon the strikers. On hearing this a well-known official of the Southern Pacific Railroad is said to have exclaimed, "We have no country." To him "country" meant the opportunity to conduct his business backed by all the resources of the government. By virtue of the shaping of public opinion by the dominant class the word has come to mean the same thing even to those who have nothing and who could not conceivably be worse off even in the event of defeat.

By the use of the word "Kultur" the German possessing and dominant classes give a name to the system under which their prosperity has grown up. The greatness, the dignity and the prosperity of the Germans are all bound up in the term. It is the catchword which embraces the "prosperity mores" of the country and hence has all the power of a religious affirmation. It is a mere secularization of "Gott mit uns" which expresses gratitude for an existing society and a determination to fight for its maintenance.

These catchwords are all advertised and kept before the

public by the instruments of publicity, all of which are in the hands of the government group. These have heretofore been the press, the pulpit and the speeches of statesmen and politicians. To them the British government at least has added during the course of the war, a systematic campaign by means of kinemas, newspaper advertising, and billboards, calling to its aid all the devices of commercial advertising and placing at the head of the advertising department a recognized expert in such matters. All of these instruments are bound up with the dominant mores and they all repeat formulae familiar to the popular mind by constant repetition, they are in fact the formulae upon which the dominant class psychologically depends and constitute the prosperity basis of that class. So that in any controversy the government group has a practically insuperable advantage. It can undertake its campaign of developing public opinion with full control of those instruments which are the approved and most effective manipulators and educators of public opinion.

If, in addition to the sentimental use of the catchwords, it can be made to appear that as a matter of fact the means of livelihood of the masses is at stake the response is natural, immediate and almost automatic. Thus the reiterated statement that defeat would necessitate the adoption of the German system of a strong centralized control over labor does not fail of a profound influence upon British organized labor which is accustomed to greater freedom of action and to gaining ground by its own exertions. Since the war itself necessitates regulation by the government, which is resented by organized labor, the government declares that such regulation is due solely to the war and will cease at the victorious termination of hostilities. The masses of organized labor see in the war therefore an interference with their "maintenance mores." They are thus all the more eager to terminate the conflict and are ready to assist the dominant class to that end. The very losses and suffering of the working class thus tend to the strengthening of public opinion in favor of the continuance of the war to the victory point, even though such victory should in its essence make only for the advantage of the governing class.

The failure of the Australians to endorse conscription is perhaps due to the fact that the Australian working people could not discover any real gain to them in the measure. There is no doubt that essentially the Australian people is in favor of the prosecution of the war and is a unit with the mother land in desiring victory for the British arms. Hence in response to a sentimental appeal the Australians have been ready enough to enlist voluntarily but they do not appear to have been sufficiently impressed with the urgency of the situation to abandon a system which allowed them to boast that they were "no damned conscripts."

As militarism is promoted by catchwords and the manipulation of public opinion, its prevention must be sought ultimately in the development of a public opinion opposed to war and not in the placing of mere artificial legal obstacles in the path of war. No legal fence can be made to stand between a dominant class and its aim to extend its wealth and power. Such a fence will either be climbed or broken down. A tribe disadvantageously placed will take any risk to extend its hunting grounds or pasturage. Modern transportation abolishes the restrictions of tribal life but the dominant class in a national group may, as we have seen in the recent case of Germany, consider its opportunities to be restricted. By virtue of its control of the instruments for moving public opinion, it will persuade the masses that their opportunities are likewise restricted and that war is therefore necessary.

The mere fact of the suffering entailed upon such large masses by the present war may in itself tend to produce a reaction against the old catchwords, and even their abuse in recent months may destroy their validity. A desire for internationalism may take the place of the present restricted patriotism which lends itself so readily to exploitation by the governmental group. But this tendency toward internationalism and this groping for a wider and deeper human association must rise among the masses themselves for it will never spring from those who control and manipulate politics. But against it all the manipulations of public opinion and skilful advertising of catchwords would be vain.

Such ideas cannot be formulated by the dominant classes, for they are not in accordance with their interests. The new catchwords must of necessity be democratic. Among them the word "solidarity," whose significance was only beginning to be learned when the war broke out, may be conspicuously effective.

War will never be ended by the devices of diplomats. The firm will of the people to peace is the only effective barrier against war, the only shield against the effects of the war propaganda upon public opinion.

Socialist Policy in Peace and War

By L. B. BOUDIN

Since the outbreak of the great European conflict, which has now turned into a world war, the atmosphere of the Socialist movement has been surcharged with all kinds of recriminations and accusations. These have centered particularly around the action of the German Socialists in supporting their government during the war and concluding a truce with the other political parties of Germany for the duration of the war commonly known as the "Burgfrieden"—civic or internal peace.

This policy—usually referred to as "The Policy of August 4," because the first overt act thereunder was the voting of the war-credits on August 4, 1914, has been charged with being the direct, some even say *sole*, cause of the downfall of the Second International, and the German Socialists have been roundly denounced as "traitors" for adopting it. It is assumed that this action was not only a departure from well-settled policies, but in utter contravention of clearly defined principles of the International Socialist and Labor movement.

On the other hand, it has been claimed that this action of the German Socialists—and the action of Socialists in other countries who have followed in their footsteps—was ethically justifiable and tactically correct, because "war times" require different policies than "peace times." This is the well-known doc-

trine of the "suspension of the class-struggle" which has been assiduously preached in our thoroughfares since August, 1914, with the assistance of such beautiful and alluring picture-similes as "saving the ship," "house on fire," etc., etc.

The accusation and the defense both proceed upon the assumption that the German Socialists acted from nationalistic motives in adopting the policy of August 4—that they suddenly discovered that "blood was thicker than water," that they were "Germans first" and Socialists afterwards. And the controversy raged over the question whether or not such a point of view is permissible in a Socialist.

This controversy is an important one, indeed a fundamental one. But it does not by any means exhaust the great questions raised by the Policy of August 4. The question of nationalism in its "blood is thicker than water" form—you may call it the "cultural entity" form, if you prefer that high-falutin' expression—may be settled to our satisfaction without necessarily disposing of the Policy of August 4. The trouble with the identification of the two lies in the basic assumption that on August 4, 1914, the German Socialists suddenly became nationalists. But such an assumption is contrary to all human experience. It is also contrary to the known facts. I bear no particular love for the authors of the Policy of August 4. But of this charge of having suddenly become nationalists *en gros*, or of having suddenly made the wholesale discovery that they had all along been "blood is thicker than water" or "cultural" nationalists, I must acquit them. A windbag like Scheidemann may, of course, have discovered under the stimulus of the great "patriotic" outburst and the beating of martial drums which followed the outbreak of the war, that he was a German first and a Socialist afterwards. And honest bourgeois radicals of somewhat heroic mould like Ludwig Franck, who strayed into our ranks because the sordidness of German post-Bismarckian bourgeois politics had no room for men of his type—may have made a somewhat similar discovery on a higher plane, amidst the great exaltation of spirit which undoubtedly seized certain elements of the German population

during the first days of mobilization. But on the whole such instances must have been rather exceptional among the German Socialists. On the whole, the German Socialists could not have been much different in their make-up and ideas after August 4 than before that fateful day.

How, then, did the somersault of August 4 happen? How account for the complete reversal of policy upon the outbreak of the war?

But deeper than these questions lies the question: Was there such a "complete reversal" as is generally assumed?

There is, of course, no doubt of the fact that there was a radical departure from theretofore accepted policies. But did this departure involve a change of principles—the adoption of a new and different point of view—or was it merely an adjustment of the old principles to new conditions?

We of the radical wing of the Socialist movement are naturally biased in favor of the former view. For many years we have lived in the fond belief that our views are *the* views of the Socialist movement. This belief was fostered by our own hopes, as well as by the homage paid to our views by the opportunists who did share them, either because of the natural proclivity of opportunists to compromise—which leads them sometimes to compromise even with radicals, particularly when it involves only words instead of actions—or because of the "constitutional" aversion of opportunists to all "mere theorizing," which often leads them to accept our theories unthinkingly, until some crisis awakens them to the practical consequences of our theories, when they discard them as "mere formulae." It is therefore natural that we should regard those who have forsaken us in the time of crisis as renegades who became untrue to their own faith. In addition this way of looking at the matter places us tactically in a very strong position in our present fight for our principles. Your being able to call your opponent a "traitor" naturally puts him at a disadvantage. And even the mere fact that *he* changed his position gives you an advantage over him. The assumption, therefore, that there was a "complete reversal"—an abandon-

ment of principle as well as a change of policy—gives us a convenient handle in our onslaughts on the authors of the Policy of August 4.

At first glance the assumption is a justifiable one—for it is clearly in opposition to the professed and proclaimed principles of ante bellum days. And it gathers strength when we consider the new alignment which the Policy of August 4th has brought about in the international movement as well as in Germany herself. This alignment seems to have completely broken up the old alignment of opportunism versus radicalism. Hence, a practically universal consensus of opinion that there is no *continuity* of policy in any part of the Socialist and labor movement from ante bellum days. The war has brought about a complete soltus which affected the entire movement. Amidst the great divergencies of present-day opinion in the ranks of Socialists, one thing seems to be agreed upon: that the differences of opinion now existing in the movement on the questions of peace and war have nothing in common with the differences which existed prior to the war.

Furthermore, it is generally assumed that the lines of demarkation along which Socialists divided prior to the great war have become totally obliterated at its outbreak, and that the lines of cleavage brought about by the war are of such a character as to make a return to the old ones almost impossible. Not as long as the war lasts, at any rate.

At first blush this seems to be an undeniable fact. With the "opportunist" Independent Labor Party upholding the banner of "internationalism" in England against the "radical" Hyndman group of the Socialist movement of that country; with Edward Bernstein, the father of "revisionism," joining with his great antagonist, Karl Kautsky, to form the German minority party, while Cunow and Lensch, two of Kautsky's great supports in the past, desert him to lead the pro-war majority, it would seem a piece of inexcusable hardihood to insist that there was any relation in the sense of continuity between the old-line divisions and the new ones.

Nevertheless, the relation exists. And it is only by un-

derstanding that relation that we can get anywhere in any re-orientation within the Socialist movement.

Von Clausewitz, the great authority on war, has said that war is merely a continuation of "politics" by the use of different means—using the word "politics" in the sense of state policies. This is contrary to the view of "the man in the street," to whom war and peace are things so utterly opposed to each other as to be quite unrelated and therefore discontinuous. But all students of the problem now admit that there is a close relation, and therefore continuity and logical sequence between a nation's so-called "peace-policies" and its "war-policies," "Home affairs" and "foreign relations" are merely two aspects of the same state policy. It would therefore be strange if groups of people who divide along certain well-defined lines in matters of "home affairs" should suddenly cross lines when "foreign policies" come into question. To assume such a thing can only lead to confusion. In our case it *has* led to infinite confusion. It is due largely to this way of looking at the question of war and peace as if it were wholly detached from and independent of the great questions which troubled and divided us in times of peace that many a man in the movement has lost his mooring and his bearings, landing finally in a camp to which he does not belong.

In the following pages I shall, therefore, attempt to analyze the "peace policies" upon which the Socialist and Labor Movement divided before the war—the different *modes of thought* current in the movement, and the policies based thereon—and correlate them to the problems which the outbreak of the war put before us and the manner of their solution, without attempting, however, to "fit in" groups or individuals into the "scheme of things" as I see it.

Leaving out minor differences of opinion, the stream of thought which runs through the labor movement may be divided into three main currents—resulting in three well-differentiated courses of action or "policies." These may be called for want of more exact descriptive terms: the trade-

union policy, the Socialist policy and the anarchist policy respectively.

The underlying thought of what I call the "trade union" policy is that society consists of a great number of groups, large and small, united according to different principles, and that the same individuals fit into many of these groups according to the point of view from which we regard them from time to time—social, economic, political, etc., etc.

On the economic field the workers of a certain trade or industry have a common group interest to improve their conditions of employment. This interest is opposed to that of the employers of that trade or industry, and his conflict of interests leads to a struggle between these two groups taking the form of strikes, lockouts, etc. This conflict of interests is confined to certain matters, and the resulting struggle must therefore be limited accordingly. The employers and employees, say, of the woolen or cotton industry have conflicting interests with respect to the apportionment of the product of that industry: The employers would like the workers to receive as little as possible in the form of wages, so that they may receive as much as possible in the form of profits. The interest of the workers is exactly the reverse. This does not mean, however, that the workers and their masters may not have other interests in common, including economic interests. On the contrary, the struggle within the industry must be regarded as a sort of family affair, which must not be carried too far or permitted to affect injuriously the common interests of the family as a whole—"the industry" as such. Whatever the antagonisms between employers and employees, they have this much in common: their joint welfare depends upon the condition of "the industry." It is therefore to their common advantage that "the industry" should be in a flourishing condition. For this common interest they must all fight any "common enemy" who may want to harm it. Whenever such a fight is on "in the face of the common enemy"—the industrial "family" must show a united front; the erstwhile antagonists must forget their petty, "internal" dissensions and make

common cause for the defence of the common interest. They need not necessarily settle their quarrels—in fact, it would be impossible to do so, in the nature of things—but they must patch up a truce, forget their differences for the time being in so far as they may injuriously affect their common fight for the common good.

As “politics” usually involve “national” questions, i. e., matters which extend beyond the scope of the things usually involved in the struggle between employers and employees in any particular trade or industry, the proper policy for a trade union to pursue is that of “no politics,” so as not to involve the organization in fights which are not properly its own. That does not mean that the workers are not interested in political questions even as workers. On the contrary, very often “politics” involve matters of the greatest importance to the workers. Such, for instance, is the case whenever the question of protection versus free trade is involved, and in this country at least it is involved in almost every national election. But in this fight the interest of the workers and their industrial masters are the same. Under protection “the (woolen) industry” will flourish, under free trade it will languish. When the industry flourishes the workers stand a good chance of getting a larger portion of the product in the form of wages because the masters will still have enough left to give them “a fair profit.” And even if they should not get a larger share of the product as wages the workers will still be better off, as even the same proportionate share will amount to more in dollars and cents than a much larger portion of a much smaller product. Also, whatever the wages, a flourishing industry is at least sure of giving the workers sufficient employment, while a languishing one will throw many of them out of work. Therefore, must the mill workers of New England be Republicans in politics, like their masters, in order to secure a high tariff which is in the interest of “the industry” as such. The same is true of other industries. Whatever, for instance, the differences between railroad workers and railroad magnates, they have one common interest—high transportation rates. Whenever, therefore, there is a fight

on for higher rates, the workers must be found in the same camp with the railroad magnates.

Opposed to the “trade” or “industry” point of view of the trade-unionist, is the *class* point of view of the Socialist, which is also shared by the anarchist. The main idea involved in this point of view is that, whatever other groupings there may be in society, the great division is that into social classes, and that this division is so fundamental as to overshadow all the others for all really practical purposes. The interests of the different social classes are so opposed to each other as to involve and require constant warfare and antagonism—antagonism which does not disappear beyond the “industry” line. Workers and capitalists cannot, therefore, engage in common enterprises in the interests of their common “industry” for the reason that the community of interest which unites the workers of the different industries on the one hand and the capitalists of the different industries on the other is such as to make a cross-class section along “industrial” lines injurious to the interests of the workers. Instead of regarding the struggle between employers and employees within the industry as a mere family quarrel which ought to disappear in the face of the “common” industrial enemy, it regards the “industrial” divisions among capitalists and the consequent “industrial” struggles of the different groups of capitalists among themselves for “industrial” interests as in the nature of family quarrels within the capitalist family. These quarrels are composed by the capitalists whenever there is a class fight on with the workers; and should therefore not divide the workers, who, as the subject class, find their main reliance in their struggle for betterment and emancipation in the cultivation of the class-consciousness of the members of their own class. The class-character of our social system is such that whatever benefits there may accrue to any *industry* as such redounds to the advantage of the masters of that industry, the capitalists, and to them alone. The workers have, therefore, nothing to gain from such an “industrial” fight. On the other hand, they stand to lose through it very much, as every such fight weakens the inter-industrial bonds

of the workers which is their only hope of emancipation. The workers cannot, therefore, make common cause with "their" own capitalists in any such industrial struggle, and must not participate in the same.

So much for the class struggle point of view in so far as it is shared by Socialists and anarchists. But here a cleavage ensues.

The anarchists, in diverging from the Socialists, proceed to elaborate the class struggle theory as follows: The present social system, say they, is based on class divisions, with the working class as the subject class. The present state is merely the political expression of our industrial force of organization, with the capitalist class as the industrial master. The state is in fact an instrument of the industrial mastery of the capitalist class. Present-day political struggles cannot, therefore, be anything but a struggle between different groups of capitalists for the division of the spoils of their common exploitation of the working class. And the working class cannot possibly have any *interest* whatever in these struggles. The capitalist world is not our world, and we do not care what becomes of it. It cannot become any better while it remains capitalist; nor can it become any worse. We are therefore utterly *indifferent* as to what transpires therein. The only interest we take in it is our unceasing effort to destroy it root and branch.

The anarchist comes therefore to the same practical policy as the pure-and-simple trade unionist—that of "no politics." Theoretically, at least, there is, however, a vast difference between the two: The pure-and-simple trade unionist wants no independent, inter-industrial, class line political action, so that the workers may be free to divide along "industrial" or other lines and make common cause on the political field with their employers along such non-class lines of division. While the anarchist does not want the working class to "participate" in the "political game" at all. Believing all "politics" to be a capitalist game, he does not want the workers to "sit in" at it, even to the extent of playing an independent hand.

The Socialist looks upon society from a somewhat different angle than the anarchist, and his conception of the class struggle is therefore a much wider one. The class struggle is not merely a fight between present-day classes for the division of the social product. Not yet merely a struggle for the mastery of society. It is all that—and vastly more besides. It is an engine of social progress—the world being continually transformed by and through the struggle, so that each rising class in defeating its predecessor does not merely succeed to the mastery of the world, but to the mastery of a different and *better* world from that which its predecessor's predecessor left behind. Each succeeding class makes its contribution not only to the transformation but also to the improvement of the world. And, what's more important, each succeeding class improves the world *while fighting for its mastery*, and not only when it has won the fight and succeeded to the control of the social system. The struggle is, therefore, a very complicated one, and not one of mere brute force merely. Nor yet is it a purely mechanical one, in which certain economic factors work automatically and with fatal precision.

As a result of this view of the meaning and function of the class struggle, the Socialist arrives at a policy which differs from both, the "trade union" policy and the "anarchist" policy.

It differs from the "trade union" policy in that it stands squarely on the class interest point of view, which excludes the possibility of the workers going "hand in hand" with the capitalists of any group at any time, either for "industrial" or other reasons. Believing, as the Socialist does, that class divisions are fundamental in society, there cannot to his way of thinking be any possible common interest between any group of workers and any group of capitalists which should transcend the common interests of all the workers, and therefore permit the division of the workers into hostile camps. But he does not share, on the other hand, the anarchist's *indifference* to the world in which the workers live and work. The Socialist believes that the present social system may be

improved even while we are fighting for its transformation. He also believes that it may be made much worse than it is, and that the fight against its going backward is a necessary part of the endeavor to push it forward. Furthermore, he believes that the classes or groups which oppose the working class in its struggle for a better world are not one uniform reactionary mass, so that it would make no difference either to the workers' condition under capitalism or to their chances of final emancipation which of those class groups succeeds.

The Socialist, therefore, begins by taking an intelligent *interest* in everything that is going on in this world of ours. Nothing that is of *human* interest is a matter of indifference to him. His *interest* extends to the internal or family fights of the capitalist class. This interest becomes an active one whenever serious matters are at stake. And it becomes a passion whenever his great enemy, the capitalist class, is battling against the remnants of feudalism and feudal order. So much so that very often he has to drive his arch enemy, the capitalist, into the fight for the establishment of a capitalistically "free" society. Similarly, he is always ready to help politically that social element within capitalist society, or that group of capitalists, which will push society forward or prepare those materials out of which he hopes to fashion the future social system.

There is one limitation, however, which the Socialist places upon his freedom of action in this regard—a limitation which is implied in his point of view—and that is that nothing must be permitted to break the solidarity of the working class. The solidarity of the working class being the *condition of the emancipation* of that class as well as the *means* whereby it will be affected, it follows as a matter of course that no interest can be great enough from the point of view of the working class to warrant the breaking of its solidarity. From this follows as a necessary corollary the cardinal tenet of Socialist *policy*: that all activity on the part of the working class must be *independent*. The working class must organize politically as well as industrially, and must be as free and independent in its political

action as in its industrial action. An economic organization of the workers that is not absolutely free from any domination by or influence of the master class is not a truly working class organization. Nor is a political organization of workers not absolutely free and independent of any capitalist or other ruling class domination or influence a working class organization or of any real use in the struggle of the working class for its emancipation. It follows that any course of action or policy which does not leave the working class absolute freedom of action—free from interference by or "commitment" to ruling-class elements—must be rejected as inconsistent with the larger aims and purposes of the Socialist movement and the ultimate interests of the working class.

To some persons this position may seem "inconsistent," and to the "practical man" highly "impractical." But there is both logic and common sense behind it. By giving up its independence of action the workers would be giving up their solidarity, which is more important to them than any possible object which it may temporarily have in common with any other class or social group. Furthermore, in giving up their independence of action the workers would be putting it out of their power to ensure the attainment even of this temporary object. For history has proven that ruling classes are not to be trusted with leadership in any struggle for social or political reforms, particularly when these are unattainable except with the aid and assistance of subject classes partly in revolt.

In speaking of what I called the "trade union" policy, I used the subject of "protection" as an illustration. I shall now illustrate by the same subject the points of view which I called "anarchist" and "socialist" respectively.

I have said that the "trade unionist" (pure and simple) believes that this is a question in which the entire "industry," including both workers and capitalists, is interested; and that the workers and capitalists of *the industry* have here a common interest which they should protect by common action on the political field, forgetting for the moment their "internal" differences. The anarchist denies the existence of this common interest and takes the position that free trade versus protective tariff are mere family

quarrels of the capitalist class and, therefore, matters of supreme indifference to the working class. The Socialist agrees with the anarchist that the entire matter is a capitalist family quarrel. He therefore agrees with the anarchist that the workers who understand their real interest could not possibly "take sides" in this capitalist quarrel so as to help either side by lining up with either of the capitalist political parties dividing on that issue. But he does not profess any indifference on the question at issue. He frankly says that he is for free trade, because that policy is in line with a course of development most favorable to the ultimate interests of the working class. *He therefore writes free trade in his political platform. But he refuses to give up his independence of action politically in order to secure free trade.* To the charge of "impracticalness" and "dogmatism" he replies by saying that he considers it the height of folly to give up the chief means of working class emancipation in order to obtain one of the tiles which would be useful in building the edifice of the future, and by pointing to the fact that the capitalist elements and parties which have at one time insisted that the welfare of the human race depended on free trade have cast that beautiful doctrine off like a suit of old clothes when the economic wind began to blow from a different direction.

* * *

Such were the main currents of thought and the principal policies of the Labor Movement in times of peace. And the same they remain during war-times. The field of operations has changed and the old ideas received new applications. But their essential character remains the same. The same three main currents of thought are still fighting for supremacy, and the same three policies are still contending for recognition, each claiming to be *the* proper policy of the working class.

First and foremost there is the "trade union" point of view, adhered to by the great majority of the workers in each of the warring countries. It is this point of view that dictated the "Policy of August 4" to the German Socialists and makes the "majority" Socialists of Germany adhere to that policy even now, when all the deceptions of their government have been exposed

and the specious excuses of "invasion" and "Czarism" have disappeared. It is this that makes German Socialists join in the cry that "England is the Enemy." It is this that makes the German "majority" Socialists approve of their government's Balkan policy—fighting shy of any definite promise to demand of their government the complete restoration of Serbian independence. It is this point of view that makes them so solicitous about the restoration to Germany of her colonies as a condition of peace.

I repeat: It is not because of any vulgar "patriotism" that the German Socialists have supported their government in this war through thick and thin. And it is not because of the ordinary "patriotism" that the "majority" Socialists of Germany now insist on a "German Peace." It is not because they are solicitous about the "honor" or "glory" of the German Empire, nor because they are anxious for the spread of German "Kultur" that they violate all Socialist traditions in demanding as conditions of peace that Germany's road to Bagdad be kept open and a Colonial Empire secured to her. There may, of course, be some Socialists in Germany who are actuated in these matters by purely nationalistic motives. Nay, there probably *are* some nationalists among the Socialists of Germany as there are in every other country. But the backbone of the German Socialists' policy, whether in entering the war or in being ready to continue it until a "German Peace" can be secured, is not this nationalistic element. The bulk of the German Socialists who are still behind the "Policy of August 4" is actuated by entirely different motives.

As I see it, the "Policy of August 4," including the insistence on a "German Peace," is, in the main, dictated by an honest desire to protect and conserve the interests of the working class of Germany. The German "majority" Socialists, instead of being "traitors" to the working class—men who would sacrifice its interests on the altar of national "glory" so that German capitalists might exploit the world instead of English or French—are, for the most part, men who do all that lies in their power to serve that class *according to their lights*. It is not that their moral sense is obtuse, but their lights are dim.

And their lights are those of the "trade unionist"—transferred

from the "industry" to the economic entity called the "nation." Mind you, not the "racial" or "cultural" nation, but the economic one. Or, to be more exact, it is not a question of the "nation" at all, but of the political entity, *the state*, representing an economic entity co-extensive with it, and whether it happens to correspond more or less to any "nation," as in the case of Germany, or comprises a conglomeration of "nations," as in the case of Austria. For we must always bear in mind that the "Policy of August 4" is not merely a German, but a German-Austrian policy. Since August 4, 1914, the German Socialists of the Empire (Reichsdeutsche) and the Austro-Germans have been very closely associated, and have followed the same course of action. As there is no Austrian "nation," the motives behind this course of action could not possibly be "nationalistic" in the ordinary sense of the word.

And the writings of the Austrian "Social Patriotic" leader, Dr. Karl Renner, and of many important German Socialists (of the Empire) leave very little room for doubt that the determining considerations with them are the economic interests of the working class. But these interests are seen in the light of what might be called "an enlarged trade unionism."

The resemblance of this point of view to the old line, pure-and-simple, trade union point of view becomes manifest at the very outset of the discussion, when we attempt to inquire just whose interests exactly it is that are being looked after. For right here we shall find that, whatever the expressions used, the interest is limited so as not to include the entire working class of the world. In a general, fraternal sort of way, both the pure and simple trade unionist as well as the August 4th Socialist are interested in the welfare of the entire working class the world over. But each has a special and particular interest in a certain portion of that working class. One is interested in the workers of "his industry" and the other in those of "his country."

And when we go a step further we find that this specialization of interest is not due necessarily to any selfishness or lack of sympathy with the rest of the workers, but rather to a common conception of the nature of the case, and the resemblance of the

two points of view becomes an identity. The August 4th Socialist, like the old line trade unionist, believes that the welfare of the workers is bound up, as long as the capitalist system lasts, with the welfare of the economic entity of which they happen to be a part. What the "industry" is to the one, "the country" is to the other. If "the country" is prosperous work is abundant, wages high, conditions of work healthful, etc., etc. The workers are not only "well off," but in a better position to fight for their emancipation than under adverse industrial conditions. But the prosperity of a country depends upon "its position in the world," and this position can only be obtained or maintained by fighting for it—since we, unfortunately, do live in a world of fight and struggle. The different economic entities called "countries," like the "industries" of old, are struggling with each other for economic advantages—international "politics" being very much the same as the national variety, and war being merely a continuation of "politics" with different means. Whatever country wins in this struggle has secured an economic advantage, has taken hostages of the future. And since the prosperity of "the country" means the prosperity of its working class, the workers have "a stake" in "their" country, for which they must of necessity fight when a fight is on in which that prosperity is seriously threatened.

When the German "majority" Socialist fights for Germany's "place in the sun," it is not because he wants the German capitalists to bask in it—but because he wants the German working class to share in the fruit which the sunshine will ripen for the whole German "country." It is, of course, a great pity that the prosperity of the German workers should involve a struggle for advantages, the advantage of the German workers depending on disadvantages to the workers of other countries. But that is something over which we have no control. It is all the fault of this cursed capitalist system of ours, which we, the followers of the "Policy of August 4th," are just as anxious to abolish as any other kind of Socialists. But as long as the capitalist system exists the different capitalist groups called "nations" or "countries" *will* fight for economic advantages, and as long as they *do* fight for them these advantages *will* go to the victor. So long, therefore, as this system endures the interests

of the workers within these different countries will be intimately connected with the prosperity of "their" respective countries, and so long will the workers of the different countries be reduced to the unfortunate necessity of fighting each other for the interests of their masters. It is one of the evils of the capitalist system which we must endure along with its many other evils—our only hope of escape being in the abolition of that system.

Opposed to this point of view is that of the *internationalist*, who, enlarging the meaning of "class" so as to include all the members of the same class the world over, transcends the bounds of the "nation" or "country" as he does those of the "industry." He believes that the benefits which the workers of any country derive from the "prosperity" which accompanies or follows the obtaining of special international advantages are largely illusory, and that whatever small change benefits they may thus obtain are counter-balanced and outweighed a thousand-fold by the great and irreparable losses which the working class as a whole must sustain by reason of the division in its ranks which the hunt for such "advantages" involves, and the general reactionary trend which it engenders and fosters. The internationalist therefore insists that the workers of a country can unite with the capitalists of that country in an international struggle with no more propriety than the workers of any industry can unite with the capitalists of that industry in an intra-national political struggle.

But the internationalists are by no means all united as to the practical policy to be pursued by the workers, except the negative policy of not making any "common cause" with the capitalists under any circumstances. And the division here follows the same lines as the division between anarchists and Socialists in "peace times."

The anarchist position is simple enough—it is, in effect, a replica of his position with respect to "politics" in peace times. War is, indeed, "politics" conducted by different means. Like the "political game" generally, it is partly a fight between different capitalist groups for special advantages and partly a sham battle devised by the ruling classes in order to divide the working class so as to be in a better position to exploit it. The workers

must not, therefore, take "sides" in this struggle, and cannot be "interested" in it, except to end it as speedily as possible. The outcome of any such struggle is a matter of *complete indifference* to the workers, who are truly "neutral" between the combatants. This *indifference* relates not merely to the fortunes of war, but also to the terms upon which it is terminated. The *terms* of peace do not concern us—the *obtaining of peace upon any terms is the only thing which really concerns the workers.*

The attitude of the Socialist is much more complicated, but not more so than is his attitude towards political action in peace times. As is the case with the other two groups that we have considered, the Socialist attitude on war is merely the logical outgrowth of what we have described as the Socialist point of view and Socialist policy with respect to the fight of different groups within the nation. It is but an application to international relations of the principles and tactics which the Socialist movement has developed in intra-national conflicts.

The Socialist begins by repudiating the idea of *indifferentism*. Knowing that war is a continuation of "politics," he follows the fortunes of war with the same intelligent interest with which he follows any political struggle. He does not "take sides" in the sense of favoring one group of warring capitalists against another. But whenever the different groups of warring capitalists represent different political or economic policies he desires the success of that group whose policies are more in accord with those of the Socialist movement and the ultimate interests of the working class.

But the nature of the struggle imposes an important limitation upon his departure from strict "neutrality." The absolute independence and freedom of development of all peoples being one of the cardinal tenets of Socialism, he cannot desire any crushing defeat for either side—except, perhaps, in a very exceptional and extraordinary case—for the reason that such a defeat may involve the loss of liberty or of the chance of free development of the vanquished. He is, therefore, never a partisan in the ordinary sense of the word—although his "neutrality" may be "benevolent" to one of the parties to the struggle.

This circumstance—the possibility of a crushing defeat of one of the parties to the struggle—is a controlling consideration with the Socialist. So much so that his “sympathies” in the struggle usually depend on the condition of the “war map,” being usually with whoever may be the under-dog for the time being.

In other words: His interest in the war is not so much in the war itself as in the nature of the peace which is likely to follow it—both *as to its durability and as to its desirability*. The question of *peace terms* is therefore a matter of paramount importance to him. *He is not for peace at any price. And at times he may deem it his duty to take a hand in the struggle in order to secure a lasting and just peace for all concerned.*

When he does that he must of course fight on the side of one capitalist group, his “national” group. But he does so not out of national but international considerations. And in order to make sure that he will not be made use of for purely “national” purposes—or any other purposes not his own—he must preserve absolute freedom of action.

Independent political action is, to him, the only kind of action proper for the working class, whether the field of operations be “home” politics or “foreign” politics—the intra-national or the international struggle. And independent political action implies an independent program—with definite, working class aims and purposes—as well as an independent working class organization. Such organization must be free from the moral or intellectual tutelage of the ruling class, and must maintain its freedom and independence both in form and in substance, so that there may be no mistake about it on the part of either “friend” or “foe.” It must always be in control of its own forces, so as to constantly direct them towards its chosen goal and be in a position to withdraw them from the enterprise whenever it becomes apparent that it cannot control the situation and there is danger of its forces being used for aims and purposes not its own.

That the three points of view just described and the three policies based thereon represent actual points of view held and policies followed in the Labor Movement since the outbreak of

the great war seems to me to be beyond any doubt. That the points of view and policies labelled “trade union,” “anarchist” and “Socialist” respectively have actually been followed by the groups whose names I have so used, I do not contend. In fact, as can be seen from the example of the German “majority” Socialists which I have cited, I hold that at least a large portion of the “Socialist” movement has followed what I believe to be a “trade union” policy. The same holds good for some portions of the other groups. Why this is so requires a more detailed study of the subject than is possible in the space of this article. But the fact of its being so does not militate against the central idea which I endeavored to convey—that there is continuity of thought and action in the Labor Movement in peace and war.

A War Legislature

By JOSEPH A. WHITEHORN

Socialist Member of N. Y. State Assembly

To the reader of the capitalist press the doings of the State Legislature at Albany have always seemed of small significance. While the bills and measures that come before the National Congress are spread over pages of print, the dangerous, often many times more insidious, activity of the parliament of the State of New York has received practically no publicity. It is this fact that has made possible the notorious ease with which measures contrary to every interest and wish of the public at large have been passed. It was this that made it possible last year to pass the "Bloody Five," the military laws, that even in peace times put the population of our state on a war basis, in the name of preparedness.

With the election of Shiplacoff and myself to the Assembly, this peaceful idyll of capitalist law-making was rudely disturbed. Not only did we refuse to vote for their measures—that would have troubled them but little—but our patent intention to drag the family skeleton of their body into the public, our inconvenient habit of rushing into print every attempt to "put over" something on the people of the State, may explain the unpopularity that we enjoyed among our colleagues in the Assembly.

If last year's legislature stood in the sign of military preparedness, this session just finished has striven nobly to present to the exploiters of the state a form of industrial preparedness that has given them in the name of patriotism an opportunity to trample down the scanty, hard-won social protection that the workers of New York have enjoyed.

The outbreak of war has brought to New York, as to every state and nation under the rule of capitalist interests, increased military burdens, a curtailment of personal rights and liberties as foreshadowed by the recent state registration, whose purpose it is, beyond a doubt, to pave the way for a system of general registration, similar to those that prevailed in Germany, Austria and other reactionary countries before the war.

In observing and judging the New York Assembly, it is not only profitable but proper to note the physical surroundings.

The Assembly Chamber is a tremendously large room, about two hundred feet long, two hundred feet wide, and almost one hundred feet high. The accoustics of the Chamber are so poor that at a public meeting held in Albany the latter part of January, at which meeting the speaker of the Assembly honored us with his presence—the first time in the history of the State that a speaker of the Assembly was part of the audience at a Socialist meeting—I charged that, had the architects who planned the building of the Assembly Chamber deliberately intended to build a room in which the people's voices could not be heard, they could not have succeeded more capitally than they did. That charge stands uncontradicted to this day.

The chairs for the legislators are arranged in semi-circular fashion, covering the entire width of the Chamber. In the center of the room and probably in the center of the height of it as well, there are strung up a cluster of wires. These wires make it possible for the centrally seated men to hear what is going on. Those seated on the right and on the left of the Chamber must do the best they can with "blind ears."

A resolution was introduced by me in the early stages of the session to remedy this defect, but this resolution joined the company of a great many other resolutions in the grave yard of the Assembly. The capitalist politicians do not propose to have the people's representatives know what is going on there.

Politically, the Republican party was in the overwhelming majority this year in both branches of the State Legislature. In the Senate they had thirty-six out of fifty-one. In the Assembly they had ninety-nine out of one hundred and fifty. The remaining fifty-one in the Assembly were forty-nine Democrats and the two Socialists.

Practically, however, on almost all of the important legislation that was considered this year, there were two Socialists on one side of the question and the remaining members of the body on the other side of the question.

Those who believe that there is any difference between the two old parties live in dreamland. No such difference was discernible, even in broad daylight, while one watched the Legislature at work.

It was the most usual thing, an ordinary matter of course occurrence for the minority leader, supposedly representing the forces of the Democratic party in the most important Legislature of the Union, to rise upon the floor, to orate against a proposed bill, to show by "convincing" arguments that the bill is detrimental to the interests of the people, that it ought not to pass, and then to withdraw his objection, sit down and—vote for the bill.

By occupation or profession, the lawyers and the farmers have the greatest representation in the Assembly. These two classes furnished two-thirds of the Members of the Assembly this year. The remaining fifty were distributed among all manner of businesses and professions, such as merchants, manufacturers, real estate men, brokers, doctors for horse and human being, dentists and one auctioneer and one undertaker. Workers there were none among the members of the Assembly this year. There was but one who may lay claim to be of the workers and he was a union official—the other Socialist member of the House, my comrade Shiplacoff.

What the working class could expect from this body, thus constituted politically and by their interests in preserving things as they are, with all the rottenness and the evils of to-day, is exactly what the working class got this year.

In these observations it may be proper to mention that, of the one hundred and fifty men constituting the Assembly, probably not more than about twenty-five were active on the floor of the House. The others were mere rubber stamps or so many sticks. To pass a law seventy-six votes are required. To cast votes was the chief function and activity of these rubber stamps. If their votes were not required, they might, to better profit for themselves and for the rest of us, never have existed.

From the viewpoint of the interests of the working class, this year's Legislature was the worst of Legislatures within recent years. From the very beginning it became apparent that because of the shadow and darkness cast by the war clouds, the capitalists of this State, through their tools in Albany, were not only ready but eager to take advantage of the situation and to get through such laws for which they have been yearning for years but did not dare to "put over."

The two great classes of legislation which occupied the attention of the legislators this year were the military laws and the undoing of the labor laws of the State.

Not only were none of the "bloody five" of last year repealed, but the ones which relate to the military training of children up to sixteen years of age and of the children between the ages of sixteen and eighteen were more firmly established. These were made more "efficient" than under the original laws of a year ago. Of course, that was done, as a great many other things were done, in the name of "patriotism."

The general military laws of the State were overhauled in real up-to-date war fashion, for peace times, however. The State Constitution provides that the militia shall consist of not less than ten thousand enlisted men. The military laws of the State up to this year provided that the number of the militia shall be not less than ten thousand, but not more than twenty-one thousand. Now the law provides that the minimum shall be, of course, not less than ten thousand, *but the maximum is left entirely to the will, whim and caprice of the Governor.* There is no longer any limitation to that. He may make that one hundred thousand, or two hundred thousand, or any other number that he chooses. With Governors, such as Mr. Whitman, we may know what to expect.

Until now, men and officers were all required to take the usual constitutional oath. That, too, has been changed. Now the officers, besides being required to swear allegiance to the Constitution and to protect the State of New York against all foreign enemies, must swear more than that. They also, by their oaths, must oblige themselves to protect the State against all DOMESTIC ENEMIES. I am speaking now of the law apply-

ing to PEACE times. Who these domestic enemies are we need not guess very long.

The Governor was also authorized to take a census of the military resources of the State. What the Governor has done in exercising that authority, the people of this State have by this time learned to their sorrow. Not only has the Governor been guided by the constitutional provisions and limitations, whereby the able-bodied male citizens between the ages of eighteen and forty-five are required to render military service to the State, but he has gone far beyond that. By his proclamation issued on June 6th, he required all these and children from sixteen years up and men up to fifty-one years and all the women to be registered as part of the military resources of the State, under penalty of six months' imprisonment for failure to do so.

One of the military bills of this year and one of the very worst of them did NOT become a law chiefly because of the presence in the Assembly of the two Socialists.

This law as proposed would have required all the young men of the State between the ages of eighteen and twenty-three to take compulsory military training for a period of five years for sliding terms each year, i. e., for six months during the first year, four months during the second year, etc., until it should be one month for the last and fifth year. The State was to pay just the railroad fare and the board and food for these boys during their periods of training and to furnish them with the necessary equipment. The bill expressly stated that no wages or compensation should be paid for time lost.

Contrary to the usual procedure of having public hearings upon all important bills, the committee on military affairs intended to have no hearing on this bill. The Socialist Assemblymen, however, discovered that on a certain day the committee was to consider this bill and procured the State office to send Comrade Beardsley to Albany, and the two members of the House with his assistance were the only ones to appear before the committee to oppose that bill. No one appeared for it.

It would occupy too much space to relate here all the arguments that the Socialists advanced against the bill. Suffice it to

say that the Socialists laid before the committee all the arguments that the Socialist movement has against militarism. But those were not the arguments that moved the committee to pigeon-hole the bill. In the course of the argument, not that it was the one which appealed to the Socialists particularly, but because we thought that it might accomplish the purpose which we sought, the huge expense to the State of New York and to the industries of the State which this law would entail was emphasized before the military committee. Great stress was laid about the tens of millions of dollars that it would cost the "poor taxpayers" of the State, curiously enough, about which phase of the question the chairman of the committee said he had never thought before.

Within a day or two after the hearing, a short news item appeared in the Albany papers, in a very inconspicuous part, to be sure, announcing that the military committee killed this bill, because they found that it would be too costly and too expensive for the State of New York to have it made into law. Evidently, the "patriots" of the military committee, who were ready to send the youth of this State and land to be maimed and crippled, or even killed, thought more of the dollars of the wealthy of the State, than of the lives of the sons of the working class.

On January 3rd, when we convened, there were a certain number of labor laws on the Statute books of the State. To be sure, they were not all that they should be. But they were some safeguard, some protection to the lives and limbs of the workers. On May 11th, when the Legislature adjourned, there was not a man who could tell which of these labor laws, so far as the Legislature was concerned, are still in existence. The Legislature, by passing an omnibus bill, introduced by Senator Brown, the majority leader of the Senate and one of the attorneys for the New York Central Railroad Company, empowered the Industrial Commission to suspend any and all of the labor laws, without distinction whatever, during the period of the war and for two months thereafter—for good measure. A bill previously passed this year practically gave every inspector and every inconsequential employee of the Industrial Commission power and discretion to act for that Commission. What would have happened to the laboring masses if this had actually become law, no one can foretell.

Mr. Whitman, who will most probably seek to be again elected Governor, in order to obtain the Republican nomination for President in 1920, was too scared to sign this bill. His political ambitions saved the day for the workers of the State, temporarily.

But not all the labor laws were saved by the Governor's political ambitions. The fire protection laws were almost entirely wiped out, in the interests of the builders of factories and factory owners.

After the Triangle catastrophe, laws were passed to prevent the repetition of that tragic occurrence, in which the lives of one hundred and forty-seven daughters of the working class were brutally snuffed out by capitalist greed. These laws were relaxed and weakened. One exit was required for every one hundred feet of factory space. Now one exit for every three hundred feet of factory space is permitted.

Until this year the owners of factories were required to have sanitary toilets for the needs of the workers. This year's Legislature thought that that is a bit too good for the producers of the world's wealth. And they amended the law by permitting unsanitary toilets to be constructed in factory buildings hereafter.

The constabulary bill was one of the measures which were "put over" this year in the name of flag and country. For years the capitalists of this State, in their envy for the good fortune of the capitalists of the State of Pennsylvania, who had been enjoying the benefits of the Cossacks, were yearning to have that "democratic" institution introduced into the life of our State. For years they attempted to get their office boys in Albany to give them that law. But never before this year did these office boys muster sufficient courage to bless us with the rule of the Cossacks. But this was truly the year of the exploiters. What they could never before have accomplished, they accomplished this year.

It is true that the Democrats solidly voted against the Cossack bill. But there is little comfort in that for the workers. The three reasons which chiefly caused the Democrats to do as they did were, firstly, because the Cossacks are not to be required to

come under civil service law; secondly, because the City of New York will have to pay about seventy per cent. of the cost. The City of New York pays about seventy per cent. of all State expenditures. The third and perhaps the most important reason for the reluctance of the Democrats to assent to this measure was their eagerness to grasp this perfectly harmless opportunity to play to the galleries, and to assure their strong labor union constituency in the large cities of their pro-labor sympathies. Especially as the Democrats were in such a decided minority. Were it not for these reasons, few, if any, Democrats would have voted against the bill.

The high regard in which the Legislators hold the welfare of the workers is evidenced by another bill. Until this bill was passed the law prohibited the sale of skimmed milk in the City of New York. In the argument both publicly and privately when the amendment to that law came up for discussion, it was frankly admitted that the skimmed milk, which is really adulterated milk, is now being fed to the pigs on the farms, and they are not overanxious for it. "Whole milk," or pure milk, is being fed to the calves. Skimmed milk is not good enough for them. But, this year's Legislature thought that skimmed milk is good enough for the workers' babies in New York City and the law was amended to that effect. An amendment to the bill, to require certain regulations in the sale of the adulterated milk, was defeated on the pretext that it was too late in the session for the printer to change the bill. So, as matters now stand, the milk trust and other profit-mongers in the milk business may by authority of the law feed the babies of the working class upon milk which is now fed only to pigs.

The manner in which the Legislature took cognizance of the high cost of living was most remarkable. The salaries of almost all officials in the State were raised. The least significant as well as the high ones were taken care of. I deliberately use the term officials. Intentionally I did not use the term workers. The workers of the Cities and Counties were forgotten entirely. Thus, while the Judges' Stenographers and confidential Clerks, for example, were raised from Twenty-five Hundred Dollars

to Thirty-five Hundred Dollars a year, and while the Borough Presidents were raised from Five Thousand and Seventy-five Hundred Dollars a year to Ten Thousand Dollars per annum the Street Cleaners were allowed to get along as best they may upon their old wages.

The instances of the foregoing might be multiplied a hundred fold, but those above given are characteristic and give the reader a fair example of the Assembly.

A great many may wonder as to whether the Legislators are honest or otherwise. I could not state that they are dishonest. I could not say that they have sold out to the Capitalist class. But that was quite needless. Had they done so, they could not have worked with greater faith and devotion for the interests of those who are the possessors of the wealth of the State and against the interests of those who have created that wealth than they actually did. Nor could they have done it with greater skill.

While I would not say that the Legislators are dishonest, I will let the speaker of the House say something as to that. One day, probably five or six weeks before adjournment, the Speaker of the House publicly stated to the men on the floor, that the next time he will observe an Assemblyman voting for an absent neighbor, dire punishment will be meted out to the culprit. As to the honesty of men who will do that, no comment need be made.

To those who are in the habit of trusting Capitalist candidates for office because of their reputed, or rather boasted, efficiency let me note this fact. That because of mistakes and other improper ways of drawing proposed bills, amendments are often made by the introducers. In some instances bills have been amended as many as six and seven times. Of course, a great many of these amendments were made because of "pressure" which was brought to bear upon the introducers by various interests. So widespread and expensive has this habit become that at one session the speaker openly stated that the cost of the single item of amendments for one day during the previous

week was just the "trifling" sum of Three Hundred and Fifty Dollars.

To mention the numerous bills which were introduced by Comrade Shiplacoff and myself would be taking up altogether too much space. For the purpose of this article, it would serve no practical use. For, none of these bills became law as yet, though the bill introduced by Comrade Shiplacoff to prohibit the "third degree" by the police passed the Assembly. In the passing of that there is one significant fact. The vote was practically unanimous. It was a complimentary vote by the Assembly to the Socialist representation. It was complimentary because the Assembly knew that the bill could not pass the Senate. Even if it did, the Assembly hoped that our "liberal" Governor Whitman would not stand for such a humanitarian measure.

Our activities in the Assembly this year could be summed up by the instancing of what occurred at a public hearing of one of the writer's bills. It was the bill which proposed to prohibit the advertising for strike breakers without stating that a strike or lockout is on at the employer's place. A public hearing was demanded and given on that bill. The opposition at Assembly public hearings is usually heard first and the affirmative is heard lastly. The opposition to this bill came from the New York Central Railroad Company, from the Lehigh Valley Railroad Company, from the Brooklyn Rapid Transit, from the New York Traction Trust and from the Allied Dry Goods Association, which represents all the Department Stores of the City. The wealth represented by that opposition was over Two Billions of Dollars.

When the opposition finished, the chairman of the committee, before whom the bill was pending, stated to the writer that inasmuch as only twelve minutes of their allotted twenty was used up by the opposition, the affirmative shall please take no more. The committee had other important business to attend to. To this the writer, on the spur of the moment, replied in substance: The opposition could well afford to make the committee a present of 40 per cent. of their time. Because the opposition represented vast wealth, tremendous property interests

and vested rights. That the writer had neither the authority nor the desire to represent such interests. That he represented but human souls, that he was contending but for the rights of human beings, therefore he required all of the twenty minutes given to his side. The full twenty minutes were used up by the affirmative.

That was characteristic of all the activities of the Socialist representation in the Assembly. The rest fought for, maintained and fortified the rights of property and of vested interests. The Socialists throughout the session fought for, as well as they knew how, the rights of human souls—the rights of the working class of the State.

Political Majorities and Industrial Minorities

By ERIC NIEL

I. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

The people of this country are not agreed even now on the question whether the war was made by a minority or a majority. To all appearances we have a government based on majority decision; the government declared war, therefore it was the act of the majority. On the other hand, there was no referendum, neither on war nor on conscription, and all indications other than the official acts of government, such as the volunteer system, the Liberty loan subscriptions, the exemptions claimed under the selective draft, etc., etc., leave open the inference that the majority does not want to participate in war.

To arrive at any sort of a clear understanding of these psychological reflexes, we must reach down to the material conditions from which they are derived and derivable.

Our people are engaged in production for sale under the leadership of the interests of privately owned capital. These interests manifest themselves concretely in two ways or spheres of

action—in the world-wide network of production with its institutions of manufacture, transportation, sale, banking, etc., and in the stock market where the ownership of production attains its most concentrated and therefore most highly organized form.

While the former is a matter of common knowledge, the latter is subject to conventional views and criticisms that are extremely contradictory. We must therefore arrive at a consistent objective understanding of what Wall Street is and does.

Wall Street is a place where not only stocks and bonds are bought and sold, but where every imaginable value of any kind having a market is quoted. Also the latest news and statistics from all over the world are here assembled with the utmost speed and efficiency attainable.

The market is highly sensitized to any occurrences or changes which affect values favorably or otherwise, and these are immediately transmuted into action through the price changes. The stock market prices are the unfailing barometer of the world's economic interests and developments; these price movements represent the quickest and most accurate psychological reflex of what is going on in the outside world.

Of course such reflexes are subject to error and manipulation, but ultimate correction in the further course of prices is as inevitable as the error itself.

Wall Street values are not all of one kind, as is usually taken for granted, notwithstanding that they are all quoted in the same denomination—money. Commodity prices represent products which are consumed to sustain life directly or indirectly. Stock or bond values represent titles to producing institutions, the purpose here being to secure an income by such ownership while preserving the invested capital unimpaired. Commodities are use values, shares are of use by drawing an income and the value of the share is based on the size and permanence of the income.

Bearing in mind these distinctions and principles, and on the basis of them, we will outline the price changes from the beginning of the war, specifying at the same time the outside occurrences to which the price movements corresponded.

1. Acute collapse at the outbreak of the great conflict resulting in the close of the Stock Exchange. Specific causes were:

(a) The similar collapse of other exchanges closely inter-related with New York so that liquidation in London and Paris also produced liquidation here.

(b) Collapse of industry no longer required to satisfy the demands of peace times.

(c) The cutting off at a stroke of the entire foreign trade of Germany and Austria-Hungary.

2. Reopening of the Exchange followed by continued recovery culminating in a tremendous "bull" market under the leadership of the war stocks. The material conditions underlying this recovery were:

(a) Control of the seas by the Allies, placing them in a position to take delivery of purchases in this market, and

(b) Consequent readjustment of our industry to the new war consumption.

Incidentally the term war stocks does not simply mean the stocks of corporations making shells, ammunition, guns, etc. Leather, wheat, oil, etc., can be war stocks; in fact, that is what they are just now, and again they can be peace stocks at other times and under other circumstances. The term war stocks refers to a quantitative outlet based on war requirements. Thus the unlimited market for metals in war time makes them war stocks; the demand for these commodities does not cease in peace times, however, but becomes a *limited* one, as a result of which the same metals are no longer war stocks, but are then quantitatively on a peace basis. The very same is true of wheat and foodstuffs generally, etc., etc. Therefore war stocks characterize production qualitatively, but to much greater extent also, quantitatively.

Thus far the prices of stocks rise with and parallel to the advance in the prices of commodities, and are the result thereof. But from that stage onward a strange divergence enters—the prices of commodities continue to rise, but the prices of stocks stop advancing in proportion; in fact, a series of "bear" movements take place, ending in an even lower price level. All old

axioms were overthrown by this new factor, which was puzzling not merely because of its newness, but equally, because it seemed to contradict and nullify the accumulated unvarying experience of years.

The market had collapsed in 1907, but as a direct result of the cessation in the movement of merchandise, and the decline of the prices of products to their absolute minimum. The same was always true of previous crises.

None of the symptoms of the divergence in prices were understood in Wall Street. Neither the best experts nor the biggest operators offered anything like an analysis that analyzed or an explanation that explained. Of course they had to accept what they could not alter or control, meanwhile doing the best they could by watchful waiting, in the hope perhaps that the old law of parallel values might yet be rediscovered lurking about.

II. THE POLITICAL FACTOR

It shall be the province of our further analysis to establish that the contradictory symptoms in the industrial situation, and the violation of what seemed to be permanent or inherent industrial canons are not alone explainable, but are quite adequately accounted for in every phase and detail by political factors.

All that follows, therefore, is to be based on a thorough understanding, and careful definition of the term political. As currently used, it refers to the activities and functions of government; political is the abstract reference, government the concrete manifestation.

But why is the government a concrete expression of political factors? In other words, what is the active principle of the term political? In answer, we find that the political sphere refers not to the parts, divisions or functions of society taken severally or separately, but to the whole social structure or network in its territorial extent. That is the reason why governmental activity is political in its nature, inasmuch as it covers the social and economic network of a territory and is built on, from and for a definite territorial region.

It is not impossible, on the other hand, for a government to tend away from political functions. When the Brazilian government supervises the storing and marketing of coffee, or when the U. S. government furnishes crop estimates and forecasts that have a trade value, etc., etc., it indicates a tendency away from political and toward industrial activity.

Industrial activity is considered non-political because it is a separate sphere or layer within the social system. In other words, the industrial spheres are parts which taken together constitute the political total in any given territory.

If the sum total of industrial spheres equals the political sphere, then combined industrial action is political action, whether it be governmental or not. And inter-industrial action, whether it be concentration of ownership on the part of big capital or a combination of unions, is a tendency toward political action.

Thus there are powerful political tendencies to be found outside of the government.

The concentration of capital represents not alone an industrial but also a political tendency. As in the case of Ford, who began by buying his motor and assembling the car, then manufactured his own motor, and is now building his own smelting plant, so in each and every case the association in one ownership of allied industries goes hand in hand with the concentration of capital; this concentration tends to control increasing portions of territory, not only through spreading industrial unification but also through control of the banking facilities, which affect industries territorially, whether they are allied or not. Besides in the last analysis all industries are interwoven. Finally this process is further strengthened by the department store system and by the stock market, with its interlocking ownership.

Labor undergoes political development also. Not, however, in the conventional sense that the working class does or does not believe in parliamentary representation, but because the industrial union tends to become wider in its membership and the unions themselves combine into always larger and larger organizations. Thus the organized activity which begins in isolated industrial spheres, widens until it becomes territorial in extent.

In proportion as this tendency is successful, the power of the unions is political.

Government, therefore, is one political manifestation of the system of production and is characterized by the following essentials:

Under the class system of industry the interests of the owning class determine the amount and character of necessary work; this involves not single acts at long intervals, as in the voting system, but is a continuous life-long process. This system in its normal operation takes up the full available time of the members of the working class and part only of the available time of the owning body. From this it follows that the owning class becomes the ruling class politically and governmentally because it has both the inherent interest and the necessary facilities for that purpose. The owning class can do work without pay not only for the government, but also in the form of voluntary political activity, including self-training for government work; it thereby has a monopoly of honorary unpaid offices which are often very important. Last and by no means least, it has the capacity to carry on continuous political activity, instead of at certain stated intervals, as in the case of the worker whose time is monopolized mostly for industrial requirements.

Thus the tendency to political rule by the working class is usually transient, though sometimes volcanic and radical, in contrast to the political rule of the owning body, which is a continuous steady stream of activity. The working class may, by an irruption of activity, assume the reins of government, but if, as has so often been the case, the property relations are not altered to correspond to the political upheaval, the ruling class in production reasserts itself politically as soon as the working class goes back to work.

III. THE AMERICAN INTERPRETATION

The American public seems to have arrived at the self-satisfied conclusion that these truths may be good enough for past history or even for the European nations, whose present condition is still burdened with the heritage of former customs and conditions;

whereas we have always been and still are the custodians of personal and political liberty to a far greater extent than can be appreciated by the other less fortunate peoples. The correctness or incorrectness of this view must have a very material bearing on all that is to follow, so we shall be obliged to investigate the merits of the preceding general statements by testing their applicability to the American government and the American people.

It can hardly be questioned, to begin with, that our system of production is a perfect specimen of capitalism, and therefore of the inherent antagonism between capital and labor. Then we cannot very well avoid the conclusion that the owning or capitalist class contains the bulk of those individuals who have the time and the facilities for continuous political activity and management with or without pay. It ought to be equally correct to conclude that, as the wage earners' efforts are pre-empted by industry to the fullest extent before becoming available for political activity, the working class contains a minimum of members fitted by their industrial situation to carry on continuous political action.

If, now, in spite of this industrial foundation, the government represents the people of its territory and not merely the interests of the industrial ruling class, our next step must be to examine that government and its operations.

In theory the people are represented through their voting power plus the various safeguards that go with it, such as the secret ballot, etc. That is the concrete or visible government.

But even we have not been oblivious to the fact for some time past that there is also an invisible government, for the term "invisible government" is in fact an American discovery.

The invisible regime is not an institution operated on the wage system, but implies voluntary association and membership; its activity does not depend on fixed dates for elections, and therefore operates at any and all times between elections as desired. Its ramifications are social as well as industrial, including all forms of political action not included directly in popular elections, such as merchants' associations, political and economic clubs and societies, etc., etc. These agencies are not simply accessory to public elections, but are in touch with executive and legislative workings

at any and all times and places; they are in a position to study and investigate daily what is being done, and to recommend what is to be done from time to time, either to the President or to Congress or to the Legislature, etc. Thus by the very nature of its facilities and interests the invisible government is quite a power behind the throne.

If the membership is voluntary and unpaid then it must be recruited from the industrial ruling class, whose adherents alone can qualify in these respects. This does not exclude candidates without money, for the political organizations are a big power in the distribution of employment, and welcome those who are useful and ambitious in the "right way." It is agreed or rather implied that division of spoils shall be the basis of operation and co-operation and that those who come without money shall assist those with capital to secure the spoils to be divided. In short the propertyless membership is parasitic in its morality towards the capitalists' interest, which are adopted and accepted by all alike as basic.

The invisible government is organized and is a going concern in continuous operation. The voting public is unorganized. But the executive work to be done by the real visible government must depend on the selection of functionaries through knowledge of the capacity and qualifications of persons so chosen or appointed, based on a close acquaintance with their most recent activity as well as their past accomplishments. A slate of this character cannot be put together by an unorganized voting public whose activity is intermittent instead of continuous; the result is that the invisible regime furnishes the functionaries to the visible government. What the public really does in this connection when it votes is to nominate the successful entry from among the several candidates submitted by competing capitalist groups or parties.

But aside from the functionaries of the government, we have still to consider its functions; these are supposed to be for the benefit of the entire territorial population and not a particular class, if not in practice at least in theory.

What is the province of government? As currently defined, to maintain law and order. But if the industrial regime contained

no antagonisms and if it took care of all by satisfying the interests and needs of each, then law and order would be inherent in the harmony of industry. The co-ordinated action of the various industrial spheres would be about the extent of government required.

However, industry with its present class control does not operate harmoniously, it develops antagonisms which means that it conflicts with the interests of some of its members. These excluded or oppressed members range all the way from criminals and insane to social revolutionaries.

Therefore the function of government is to maintain the law and order that industry needs and does not maintain; in other words, the government must maintain the continuity of production of which law and order are regarded as the necessary means. This is the true essential of government, without which no country can exist.

But our government is not a scrap of paper, it is a living institution and it can only maintain *that* law and order which its executives are capable of understanding by previous training and present psychology. It will therefore regard the existing industrial regime as the means of maintaining the continuity of production and will oppose those contrarily minded, by suppression or punishment, to whatever extent may be considered necessary. Our government performs these functions as faithfully as any other, so it would seem that the American notion of the relation of government to society in America is not a peculiarly American truth, but a distinctly American error.

It is true that where there is no political equality in government like in Germany, the ruling class or caste declares and executes its purposes in a way that is so raw and repulsive that it leaves the most intense animus in its wake. But it is nevertheless the form of which capitalism is the substance. That such a form cannot be tolerated for a moment goes without saying, but the fact remains that the capitalist contents must be the object of attack, not only where the form is at its worst, but everywhere and at all times.

Neither does our recent rapid development toward imperialism appear to be less imperialistic or more of a blessing to exploited peoples than in the case of the European nations. The active principle of imperialism is the political support of industrial growth; it is accompanied therefore by the class controlled governmental invasion of the industrial sphere, not in order to democratize the industrial basis of production, but to serve as a more efficient means of expanding the outlet for existing private production.

American capital does not free foreign labor or solve the antagonisms of capital and labor any more than other capital. And the political factors that maintain the security of capital and its exploitation in other countries, namely the army and navy, or in other words, our physical power as a territorial whole, in making our capital safe must be making the industrial slavery of the labor in such territory secure. In spreading our capitalism we cannot avoid spreading industrial slavery and creating a very poor basis for industrial and political freedom.

For what freedom are we spreading but the freedom that goes with the success of our capital! Indeed, if that be freedom, then it already exists everywhere or nearly so; if you call a thing freedom in one place, you must call the same thing by the same name anywhere else. The freedom that is being spread by autocratic governments and the freedom of the present political democracies do not differ or disagree in any of the essentials here described.

And it is for this that the American working class is asked to give its blood and labor. It is to be patriotic, not by securing industrial freedom within our political boundaries, but by defending the property and property rights of our capital with its lines of communication all over the world.

Do other capitalist groups ask any more than this, even if they ask no less? Can the American worker attain freedom by helping his capitalist to spread his profit-taking across the sea any more than any other worker? Surely if he is to get freedom at all he must get it at home. Then it is time enough to speak of spreading freedom, but in the meantime we cannot spread what we have not got.

That is the situation in America to-day, the same as in other nations, because irrespective of past differences, the present essentials are identical in all advanced countries. And we, like they, are developing physical force as a means of making our capital and our capitalist connections by land and sea secure. And we, like they, are teaching our working class the faults or pretended faults of the workers of competing nations, whether it be the yellow peril or Mexican treachery or something else. So long as this is successful, the working class is prevented from uniting against the supremacy of minority interests.

IV. CONCLUSION

That brings us back to the divergence in price between commodities and securities. The increased price of commodities is based on war consumption, meaning an unlimited outlet plus a decreasing supply of producers.

The relatively decreased prices of securities is due to factors which threaten profits or the permanence of profits, that being the basis on which these are estimated by their inherent purpose. But profits and their continuance are founded on a continually expanding outlet. What have been and what are the unfavorable indications in this respect?

The first big drop in the values of securities resulted from the peace manoeuvres of the German government. If successful, they would have brought the war consumption to a sudden stop, and peace, before too much life and capital had been wiped out, would have meant the contraction of our outlet plus the return of European competition. So the market promptly went to pieces for fear that killing would end "prematurely," even before we knew the terms or details. Anyone who was at all informed might have known that the German government was incapable of offering a lasting peace, and therefore one that was fit to accept. But who could tell if and when the German people might force the government to make peace and break up the policy of the German ruling elements! This was equally a menace to our outlet, so that the mere knowledge of *any* kind of peace was fully sufficient

to enable those traders who had been tipped off in advance to raid the market and demoralize it completely.

However, the threatened peace did not materialize, and we retained our war trade. Then the submarine menace appeared on the scene; we had retained our customers but the outlet was again endangered by threatened cessation of delivery to them of our products. Without sea communication we would be compelled to keep our capital and our merchandise at home—the last place that we had any use for them. So we asserted our moral right to navigate the open sea. This moral right had existed at any and all times, but we had never before been so acutely in need of exercising it. At this stage, however, failure to assert this moral right would have meant worse material collapse than ever before, and it was carefully so recorded in the stock market prices, which went tumbling to new low records. The entire capitalized value of our productive forces was in danger.

Wall Street not alone saw this, it foresaw it because it felt it in the price changes, ahead of the rest of the country. It therefore became warlike not in order to relieve an already existing depression in industry, usually the preliminary condition for making war acceptable to the masses, but to prevent a coming depression.

It had its work cut out to make the country as warlike as itself. For the people had not been asked to declare war, but had merely been told that they had done so, after which they promptly failed to volunteer either their lives or their money.

In fairness to our ruling class and our democracy, it is no more than just to call for an explanation of why Wall Street did not wait for the industrial depression to arrive, and then make war. The big capitalists could meanwhile have weathered the storm, at least as well as the rest of the country, and such a war would then have been the result of a majority conviction. A ruling minority in all sincerity has no such faith in a future majority, and cannot moreover do so logically. Later on, the choice of war and peace would be out of the hands of the Wall Street powers. It will rest in the greater mass outside, which is not nearly so certain to decide for war and the security of capital and its transportation

to foreign parts, it might be peace by revolution at home instead. Our ruling class was not insincere, and it did not make a mistake in declaring war—the rest of the country did.

Also, it merely proves again, and once and for all, that war is the work of imperialism and not of militaristic inheritances and military castes, which are after all results and not causes; and the saddling of wars on the latter elements is simply a matter of choosing convenient cases instead of making a genuine diagnosis.

Granting all this, however, we must still ask ourselves how it was that this country of ours went to war if it was wanted not by the majority, but by a minority.

Wall Street, representing the concentrated power of the ruling class, used its political powers and functionaries to declare war in the first place. The problem then remained to deal with any possible opposition. The possible opposition was the middle class and the working class. The middle class is disorganized politically because it is industrially decentralized. Those of the middle class who accepted the interests of the big capitalists as their own joined an existing compactly centralized organization and made their influence felt. The remaining big mass of the middle class were unable to organize with sudden rapidity and efficiency and their efforts to do the impossible collapsed.

The working class had only a national and not an international program, therefore while it did not want war in its heart and soul it had no constructive policy with which to check big capital. It did not understand how to present a communistic basis of operation as an alternative to the capitalist form, and on the other hand it accepted and had to accept the maintenance of the continuity of production as fundamental. Thus the capitalist program of action had the field to itself, and it did not permit so favorable an opportunity to escape. As a result also of this situation the working class could not rally to its standard, that large portion of the middle class which opposed war, and would gladly have joined a powerful proletarian movement for international peace. Thus a minority carried the day in free America because its industrial compactness stood out against the decentralized disorganized condition of the majority.

For the organization of big capital is inherent in industry and is consequently automatic. The middle class and the working class are automatically disorganized by industry, and must reach a stage of organization comparable to that of big capital by a mental realization of the supremacy of proletarian interests—in short, through class consciousness and the class struggle.

Socialists and War

By ROBERT RIVES LA MONTE

I.

The editors of *The Class Struggle* have honored me by inviting me to debate "on the proper attitude of the Socialist Movement toward the War." For convenience of discussion, I take it, we must divide this subject into two parts; first, we must consider the proper attitude of the International Socialist Movement toward War with a big W—war in general; after that we can take up the more specific question of the proper attitude of American Socialism toward this particular War.

In approaching the subject at all we at once find ourselves confronted with an obstacle that appears almost insurmountable. I refer to the incurable romanticism of Socialists. For we Socialists are intense romanticists. Facts are for us seen only through a distorting medium of theories and hopes. We are above all else dreamers, idealists, utopians. In saying this I do not imply any note of disparagement. On the contrary our chief distinction is that we have had the courage and persistence to stick to our ideals amid the sordid horrors and grim realities of Twentieth Century Capitalism. I remember Maeterlinck in one of his finest passages likens Society to a sailing vessel in which the conservatives and reactionaries perform the function of ballast, while the idealists and radicals are the sails that carry the ship ahead. Any one can be ballast; it takes a forward-looking brain and a warm heart to fit one to be a sail. The role of ballast

should be abhorrent to any one under thirty. The youthful reactionary appears to me abnormal and loathsome.

But while we need not be ashamed of our romanticism, we must none the less admit that it is a most deceptive refracting medium through which to observe facts.

Most of us have realized at least subconsciously, that we were at heart dreamers. And here was the irresistible strength of the appeal materialistic Marxism made to us. It gave or appeared to give us an absolutely scientific foundation for our romantic dreams. And so we eagerly and blithely swallowed whole Marxism—or whatever weird grotesque conception of Marxism we were able to form. But the label “Marxist” had no magic power to banish our dreams. We remained romanticists. In fact, fancying we had placed a solid scientific foundation beneath our fanciful superstructures, we but gave a freer rein to our imaginative faculties. We created fantasies that bore little or no resemblance to anything that ever was on sea or land, and went out gaily to do battle in a world of cruel facts with weapons forged on the anvil of fantasy.

The choicest product of our uncurbed imaginations was a kind of Marxian economic Man, a sort of Gordon Craig marionette without red blood or emotional impulses, who responded solely to economic stimuli. Just show this curious monster where lay his economic interest, especially if our refracting medium could distort it into a *class* interest, and he could be depended to pursue it ruthlessly through fire and blood, over the bleeding corpses of his nearest and dearest if need were. Such a demon never cursed the earth by existing on it. Marx, very likely, would have been the first to repudiate him. But nevertheless we Marxists have striven futilely for years to build up a tactic on the hypothesis of a world peopled by these grotesque marionettes.

Since August 4th, 1914, even the dullest of us are beginning to realize that men and women of flesh and blood do not act like economic marionettes.

Our romantic idealism has also endowed the proletariat with intellectual and moral attributes worthy of sages and saints.

In spite of our insistence that the workers have for centuries been robbed of almost all opportunities of intellectual and moral, even of proper physical development, with incredible inconsistency we have proclaimed that by some uncanny miracle they had been endowed with those mental and moral qualities that fitted them and them alone for world leadership and world rule. Were they as stunted mentally as we claimed capitalist slavery had made them, surely it was vain to expect them to have the far-seeing and broad vision necessary to cope with a world crisis. We now know they did not have such a vision when confronted by the world-wide peril of democracy; but many of us cling to our romantic conception of a proletariat made up of supermen.

If we are to see straight and think clearly in the present crisis, not to say act wisely, we must first of all resolutely tear into shreds and tatters our romanticism and face the facts of life.

There is no use in discussing this question on the assumption that there is now or ever has been an International Socialist Movement in the sense of a world-wide proletarian brotherhood bound firmly together by real solidarity. We must face the fact, as stated on the second page of the first number of this magazine, “that the Second International, instead of being a perfect union of the working class ‘one and indivisible,’ was, in reality, to most of its adherents, a mere confederation of national units to whom first allegiance was due in case of a conflict.” There is no use and no sense in discussing what should have been the action of a body that never was on sea or land.

Another romantic assumption we must cast aside is the notion that the various national units of Socialism were strong enough to have prevented War, had they so willed. There is no country in the world save Germany where the Socialists were strong enough even to have delayed appreciably mobilization. In Germany they had the power to cripple the Empire by delaying mobilization for weeks, if not to have prevented it altogether, but they lacked the will to use the power.

When we come to America we constantly talk and write as though American Socialists had the power to affect appreciably the foreign policy of the United States. The first step to right reasoning is to admit that in this domain we are almost if not quite negligible. This may not be pleasing to our vanity, but it is the truth. It is to say the least asinine to predicate our action on the hypothesis that we have the power to wage a successful fight against, let us say, conscription. It is even doubtful if in such a fight we could show strength enough to amount to an effective protest. Personally I have no disposition at present to oppose conscription to raise an army to defend democracy and humanity, but if I had I would wish a better medium of protest than the present Socialist organization. But this is merely an illustration of my point that in discussing tactics we should consider not what it would be fine to do were we able to do it, but rather what with our present power and prestige, or lack of it, we are able to do that will further our ends.

But let us get back to the general question of the attitude of Socialists toward War. From about 1905 to 1913 it did appear to the more optimistic among us that the loose coalition or federation of the divers national Socialist parties adhering to the Second International was in a fair way to develop into the embryo of a true International Socialist Movement. We began to lose this illusion in 1907 when Hervé proposed to the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart that on the menaced outbreak of war the Socialists of the countries concerned should do their utmost by general strikes, particularly in the munition and transportation industries, to make the threatened war impossible. For the Socialists from most countries this was probably an academic question, as they had not the power to act effectively in this way. But for the Germans it was a very practical question. And the Germans would have none of it. They proved they were not internationalists, but Germans; or, to be more exact, Kaiserites, as from that day to this they have never hesitated to sacrifice the welfare of the German people to the wishes and policies of the Junker-bossed Kaiser. They have proved up

to the hilt the truth of Hervé's impassioned charge: "*Vous avez peur! Vous avez peur, vous Allemands!*"

Yes, alas, they were afraid; afraid to do anything that might lessen, however little, the power of the great political machine they had been so long building; afraid to appear disloyal to the Kaiser; afraid, madly afraid, of losing votes and seats in the Reichstag.

They had the power in 1907 to prevent Germany from waging a successful offensive war. There has never been a day or hour since when they have not had this power. They have ever been and still are afraid to use it; and yet this cowardly, narrowly national Socialist party has even now the effrontery to prate of "internationalism" in its eagerness to serve its royal master by intrigues at Stockholm!

For more than thirty years the vast army, the scientific military preparedness of Germany, has been the chief, practically the only serious menace to the peace of the world. This statement will surprise some of you; make some of you indignant. You will ask: Why was the German army more of a menace than the British navy? I might content myself by pointing out that with an army one can overrun and devastate the lands of a neighbor (witness Belgium and Serbia), while with a navy one cannot. Remember that it was more than two years after the present war started before England had an army that was not in the German sense "contemptible."

But even had England had an army comparable to the German murder-machine, still its menace would have been slight compared to the awful threat that for three decades has kept thoughtful men from sleeping sound o' nights—the threat of German invasion of foreign soil.

Why is this true? For several reasons. The economic one has never been put more clearly than by Louis B. Boudin in his book, "Socialism and War." He shows and proves that a capitalist country, in which the textile industries are predominant, tends on the whole to be peaceful and non-aggressive; but that just as soon as the Scepter passes from Cotton, Wool and Flax to Iron and Steel the country begins to

develop chauvinistic Imperialism. I cannot here repeat Boudin's convincing argument at length. It may, however, be briefly epitomized thus: Hats, shoes and calicoes can be sold under any old flag. Steel rails, steel ships, steam engines and structural iron tend rather to follow the flag of their nativity, or if they precede it they show a marked preference for territory over which floats a flag that never fails to salute with servile alacrity their natal emblem.

In developing this argument he shows that the statistics of pig iron production furnish a roughly accurate barometer of the growth of aggressive militarism. On page 124 of his book he prints a statistical table showing the pig iron production in long tons of the principal producing countries of Europe. From that table we learn that in 1912 Germany and Austria-Hungary together produced more pig iron than Great Britain, France, Russia and Belgium. But not only was the production in Germany so vast (more than *double* that of Great Britain), but it was growing at an appallingly rapid rate. Thus, in the twelve years from 1900 to 1912 it had more than doubled, while that of Great Britain during the same period had actually fallen off more than 100,000 tons.

So that while chauvinistic imperialism was growing so alarmingly in Germany, the tide had already begun to recede in Great Britain. And it is a matter of common notoriety that the England of the past five years has been much less imperialistic than the England of Cecil Rhodes and Joseph Chamberlain in which Kipling sang of "The White Man's Burden."

The typical spiritual manifestation of iron-begotten imperialism is an unfaltering faith in the superiority of the "Culture" of the great pig-iron producing Nation, together with a scathing contempt for the "cultures" of all other nations. "For the Destiny of the Nation is," in Boudin's words, "to diffuse its 'culture' among the nations, exterminating the cultures which it may find opposing its own, so as to bring dominion to the only true Culture, for the greater glory of God. In order to accomplish its mission—from which it is mortal offense to

shrink—the Chosen People must seek to subdue the entire world politically and dominate it economically. For experience has shown that 'Culture' follows the flag. History teaches us this lesson: that inferior races or nations, whether white or colored, fail to appreciate the beauties of a higher culture, and are utterly unable to acquire it even passively, unless and until they have been forcibly placed under the political tutelage and economic domination of the superior race whose culture is to be extended. In this connection it must be remembered that its language is a nation's most characteristically national means of expression. In fact it is part of its own flesh and blood and possesses some of those very mystic qualities which constitute the essence of the national character and the basis of its special Culture. The most potent means therefore of spreading the culture of any given nation among alien peoples is to make them use the *language* of that nation. But that can only be done when the nation of the higher Culture politically dominates the peoples among whom this Culture is to be spread. And in this material world of ours political dominion is inseparable from economic dominion. Hence the cultural mission of the Nation becomes of necessity a striving to dominate the entire world economically and politically—a *striving for World-Empire.*"

There you have Boudin's masterly delineation of the spirit of the German people, or at least of the dominant forces of the German Nation. And it is and was that spirit behind the German war machine which made it such a deadly menace to the cultural heritage of the human race. No such spirit lurked behind the British navy.

May I digress long enough to say that these imperialistic spiritual qualities—the belief that one is the sacred bearer of a higher Culture, and that all other cultures are beneath contempt—are the very hall-mark of the Marxian Socialist everywhere? Who that has ever sat in an International Socialist Convention has not been conscious of the amusing and insulting contempt exuding from every pore of the majority of the German delegates? What has hindered the growth of Socialism more than the contempt for those who differed from

them of Guesde in France, Hyndman in England and De Leon here?

But aside from this economic reason there are certain special circumstances in the history of the German peoples which made the German army a special danger to freedom and democracy.

The people of northern Europe and the United States are ethnically all of one stock, or to be more exact, all one hybrid of the same three stocks. Now this ancient stock, our ancestors, dwelt for some ten thousand years or more along the shores of the Baltic in small village communities which lived by agriculture and fishing chiefly. They owed some of their food to hunting, and in the latter part of their long sojourn on the Baltic took to piracy for variety, but it is doubtful if this piracy was ever economically profitable.

If we wish to look for our permanent racial traits we must go back and delve on the Baltic littoral. For that is the only mode of life and those the only institutions that our race has shown itself capable of flourishing under for any really long period of time. It matters not whether you take it that the race had certain fixed traits that adapted it to such an environment and life and institutions (or lack of them) or whether you take it that in the long course of ten to thirteen thousand years all those not adapted to such a life died off or at least left no posterity. It comes to the same thing. To find out what are the comparatively permanent traits of our race we must go to the Baltic. This is not to say that our race may not vary and change. Just because it is a hybrid race its range of variability is wide. But racial changes are very slow processes. And we have no warrant for believing that we have altered appreciably since our forefathers farmed and fished beside the Baltic.

We can find the chief characteristics of this life set forth by Thorstein Veblen in "Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution." There were no large towns. The people lived either in very small villages or scattered settlements. There is no trace of fortifications. Offensive weapons were very scarce. There was apparently no defensive armor. We are

driven to believe they were a peaceful people, not given to war. They had village minds. The hamlet was to them the largest social unit they ever thought of. Such ideas as country, race or nation would have been incomprehensible to them. In fact they are very nearly so to many of their village-minded descendants to-day. And yet these are the very people we hoped to make into true internationalists by the necromancy of a few well-worded resolutions!

Their civil institutions Veblen describes as "Pagan Anarchy." "All power vests finally," he tells us, "in the popular assembly, made up in effect of the freehold farmers, including under that designation the able-bodied male citizens of substantial standing, but not formally excluding any part of the free population, and perhaps not even with absolute rigor excluding all women.

"This deliberative assembly exercised the powers, such as were exercised, of legislation, executive (extremely slight) and judiciary. There is little if any police power, though there are established conventions of police regulation; and there is no conception of the 'king's peace' outside the king's farmyard." . . . "This civil system might be described as anarchy qualified by the common sense of a deliberative assembly that exercises no coercive control; or it might, if one's bias leads that way, be called a democratic government, the executive power of which is in abeyance."

It will be seen that insubordination was of the very essence of the scheme. There was a swift impatience of restraint. The most salient trait of our forebears was either a penchant for anarchy, if you like to so describe it, or what I prefer to think of as a fierce and ardent love of democratic freedom. And this has remained the distinguishing mark of these peoples wherever they have migrated—in France, in England, in New England, in Australia and New Zealand. Everywhere they retain the tendency to think in terms of the village, but also everywhere save in the German Empire they retain too their tendency to insubordination, their incurable love of freedom.

Why the anarchistic tendency of the race has died out in Germany is one of the great mysteries of history. I do not myself believe it is dead. I think it merely suffering a transitory obscuration or eclipse. I believe that deep down in the subconscious depths of the wonderful German nature there still burns the old ineradicable racial ardor for freedom. It is covered deep by the ashes of custom and military discipline, but I hope we will not have many years to wait before it will again glow red and warm and burst forth with mighty volcanic power. But it is comparatively easy to see why this love for freedom as an active factor has disappeared from German life.

During all the centuries when free institutions were emerging in England, France and America, and even in Scandinavia, to-day Germany has remained consistently organized (in Veblen's words) "on the pattern of the 'Territorial State'—a peculiar petty and peculiarly irresponsible autocracy, which has come to its best maturity only among the Germanic peoples." . . . "The territorial state is in effect a territorial aggregate, with its population conceived as an estate belonging in usufruct to a given prince; the concept is visibly of feudal derivation, and the habit of mind which makes it a practicable form of political organization is the feudal habit of personal subservience to a personal master. In such a polity subordination, personal allegiance, is the prime virtue, the chief condition precedent to its carrying on; while insubordination is the fatal vice, incompatible with such a coercive system."

The people of Germany have had probably over a thousand years of life under this and earlier and probably even more brutally coercive systems, so that they have come to loath insubordination. "The spirit of 'duty' in these people," says Veblen, "is apparently not 'nature,' in the sense of native proclivity; but it is 'second nature' with the people of the Fatherland, as being the ingrained traditional attitude induced by consistent and protracted experience."

In addition to this we have to reckon in the case of Prussia with 200 years of unremitting military discipline from the

days of Friedrich the Great down to the present hour. As Veblen puts it, "a military organization in war is a servile organization in peace." "It reaches its best efficiency," he adds, "only when the habit of arbitrary authority and unquestioning obedience has been so thoroughly ingrained that subservience has become a passionate aspiration with the subject population, where the habit of allegiance has attained that degree of automatism that the subject's ideal of liberty has come to be permission to obey orders." . . . "Such an ideal growth of patriotic sentiment appears to have been attained, in a tolerable degree of approximation, in the German case."

Boudin has told us why the German army was sure to be used aggressively and piratically. Veblen has shown us that the democratic conception of freedom had for all practical purposes ceased to function within the borders of the Fatherland. Is it any wonder that all thoughtful people stood aghast at the prospect of world domination by a race to whom freedom was an incomprehensible concept? Not only they did not know it in practise; they could not even conceive of its existence or nature.

Surely it is not necessary to tell readers of this magazine of the utterly undemocratic organization of the German Empire. They all must know that the German ministers are responsible not to the Reichstag, but to the Kaiser; that the Reichstag itself is no fair representative of the German people, as it is elected from districts that have not been altered since 1870, when most of the present great German cities were scarcely more than villages; that the Kaiser never or seldom hesitates to dismiss or prorogue the Reichstag when its actions are not subservient; that he can well afford to do this since he depends for what in England would be called his Civil List or in America salary for himself and relatives not on the Reichstag which speaks in the name of the Empire, but upon the Landtag or Diet of Prussia, for these are voted to him in his capacity of King of Prussia; and surely no Socialist is ignorant that under the Prussian three-class suffrage the Landtag is owned absolutely by the Prussian Junkers.

There is even less political democracy in Austria-Hungary than in Germany. It was thus long since obvious to those who were willing to cast aside romanticism and face facts that the German army was the ONE great menace to peace, to civilization, to progress and to those free democratic institutions which are a condition precedent to anything approaching a socialistic or communistic organization of modern societies. It was thus clearly the duty of all Socialists in all lands to do their utmost to avert the growth of the threatening Teutonic power. But this was pre-eminently the duty and the high privilege of the German Socialists, for they alone had the power to offer effective opposition to the ambition of militant autocracy to dominate the world and crush out representative democracy all over the earth.

There is only one conceivable answer to this argument. And that is to say that political liberty and representative institutions without industrial democracy and economic equality are empty, worthless baubles not worth fighting to retain. I am aware that there are Socialists who take his position. But that way madness lies. I believe that every upward, forward step the race has taken has been worth while, has been worth fighting for, aye, has been worth its cost in bloodshed. I believe the bourgeoisie have played a great and beneficent role in history. I believe that such democracy and political liberty as they have achieved has gone far to make life endurable to such village-minded anarchists as ourselves. I believe that their mission is still far from being fulfilled; that the world has not yet been made "safe for democracy," and that to join in the task of making it so is the duty of every Socialist just as it is the duty of every good citizen. I believe that Magna Charta was worth while. I believe that the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia Bill of Rights, Valley Forge, Bunker Hill, the Fall of the Bastille, the Battle of the Marne, the heroic defence of Verdun, the recent Russian Revolution with the release of the prisoners in the Fortress of Peter and Paul and the glorious home coming of the Siberian exiles were worth while, and worth all they have cost in human life and treasure. I do not believe our struggle upward and for-

ward has been in vain. And I think it a glorious privilege to be living to-day to do one's part, however humble, in saving the world from the domination of the Habsburgs and Hohenzollerns.

But let us go back to the year 1910. The one great threat to peace and freedom then, as in 1907, was the great German army. We gathered in the great Socialist Congress at Copenhagen well knowing that to be the case, and knowing also that the German Socialists and Socialist Trade Unions had the organized power to make German mobilization both difficult and dangerous for the Kaiser, if they could but be induced to use their might. Once again the attempt was made, this time by the late Keir Hardie of England and Edouard Vaillant of France. They introduced their resolution for a General Strike in case of war. It was well known that the Germans alone had the power to make it effective. And again the Germans would have none of it. I do not wish to attack anyone. But it is well to remember that of the eleven American delegates there only two (Haywood and myself) were outspokenly in favor of the only effective proposition to make aggressive war by Germany impossible. I will not mention names, but at least two of our Socialist "leaders," who, since August, 1914, have been most active in advocating an embargo on food and munitions and other steps directly in the interest of the Hohenzollern, were at Copenhagen, and did not utter a word or cast a vote to bind the German Socialists to make an honest effort to avoid war. They took their cue for guidance from the German Socialists then, just as they have taken it from Scheidemann, Suedekum and other Kaiserites since the war began its devastations.

What is the proper attitude of American Socialists toward this particular war? Let us rather ask what has their actual attitude been thus far? I find the answer on page four of the first number of this magazine in what appears to be a manifesto by the editors. Here it is: "The action of the German Socialists in supporting the Kaiser's government in this war was either openly approved by our official leadership or else we

were admonished not to *disapprove* of it on the plea of 'neutrality.'

"When Germany inaugurated a peace-propaganda in this country our party entered upon a peace agitation which was not essentially different in character from that of Germany's official and unofficial representatives. We not only waited with the launching of our peace agitation until the official and semi-official German propaganda in this country was ready for it, but the nature of our demands was largely a replica of that propaganda. The Socialist Party even entered into official relations with that propaganda, carried on in behalf of the governing classes of Germany, participating officially in 'peace' demonstrations organized in its behalf."

The *Cologne Gazette* the other day said: "The Kaiser's best allies are the German-Americans." Why was not "our" Party included? It has surely been faithful enough. By its treason to the United States, its shameless betrayal of the cause of democracy and political liberty it has become a stench in the nostrils of all forward-looking men and women, and it has not even won the guerdon of a kindly word from the Kaiser's sycophantic press.

It would hardly appear necessary to say that in my humble judgment the proper course for such American Socialists as are still affiliated with the Socialist party is to get out of it as quickly as may be and give their whole-hearted support to the Government of these United States in its splendid fight to "make the world safe for democracy." For myself I am proud to say I have not paid one cent of dues to the Socialist Party since the German Socialists voted for the war budget on August 4th, 1914; I voted for Woodrow Wilson for President in the election of 1916; I resigned from the Union Against Militarism when it began to attempt to hamper our government by a peace agitation after we had broken off diplomatic relations with the Kaiser's government; promptly on its organization I enlisted as a private soldier in the Connecticut Home Guard, the only military organization in which my age permitted me to enlist, and I am now serving as a sergeant in the Home Guard, doing my part to protect my neighbors

from the violence of well-meaning if feeble-minded pacifists, and releasing the regular militia for service against the enemy that "our" Party has been so zealously aiding. I further confess that I have so far given way to what this magazine stigmatizes as "vulgar patriotism" as to buy a Liberty Bond; and should there be further loan issues I have every intention of being vulgar again.

I note on page 3 of your first number that your editors appear to grieve because "the bulk of the Socialists of American stock" "are steeped in the vulgar pro-allyism," etc., etc. I hope that they are so steeped. I am tempted to add that the great need of the American Socialist Movement is to become vital and vulgar. *Vulgus* is a good old Latin word; it means the mob, the fellows whom Lincoln used to call the common people. The trouble with the Socialist party has been and is that it is so immersed in the obscurantism and romanticism of Marxist and neo-Marxist theory that it has never gotten into touch with and rubbed the elbows of the vulgar red-blooded mob of the common people who mean to see this war through until the world is made safe for democracy. The American Socialist Movement can take its choice: It can become vulgar and live; or it can remain refined and become a cadaver.

Lest anyone fancy that Veblen has exaggerated the servile alacrity, the docile subservience of the German people, I want to add my testimony. I spent the winter of 1910-11 in Munich among the kindly Bavarian Socialists. I questioned all with whom I talked about the possibility of its becoming a duty to oppose the Kaiser in case of war. I found just one comrade (a woman) to whom the idea was not absolutely inconceivable. Insubordination was to them simply unthinkable.

At a Congress of Bavarian Socialists to decide on tactics in the then approaching Reichstag elections, attended by several hundred Socialists, there was an official speaker who made a speech of about an hour's length confined mainly to warning them not to offend the Catholicism of the Bavarian peasants. At the conclusion of his rather weak address there was not

one single word of criticism or discussion. Subordination, obedience had become "ingrained" as Veblen said.

In holding as I do that the Habsburgs and Hohenzollern must go to make the world safe for democracy, I hold no brief for England or France. I have no doubt that much of cruelty and injustice toward their colonies and toward so-called "backward" races could be pointed out and exploited. But I do not forget that our racial trend toward kicking, toward insubordination, first found expression in the modern world in that great Mother of Parliaments that sits beside the Thames at Westminster. Nor do I forget that Liberty, Equality and Fraternity are vital words pregnant with meaning to the descendants of the heroes who overthrew the Bastille on July 14th, 1789.

I still see a vision of Communistic Equality to be reached, it may be, through painful years of State Socialism leading in time to Industrial Democracy. But I no longer believe in a proletariat of Supermen who are going to bring this to pass by a revolution. I no longer believe in tactics based on the existence of a race of economic marionettes. I no longer believe it possible to make people with village minds think in world terms.

I do not believe our race of village anarchists can ever fully adapt itself to life under large scale production conducted under unbridled capitalism.

I believe the supreme question for the statesmen of to-day and to-morrow is so to harness and alter the machinery of our lives as to make it possible for our race to survive under conditions so unsuited to its permanent mental habits until we can evolve a system in which we shall be more at home.

This is not to say that forces are not at work modifying the race to suit the environment. I am aware of the Machine Process and the effects of rapid transportation and electric communication. And, no doubt, the race has sufficient variability to be modified in time, but it takes much, very much time; while the industrial revolution has gone on and is going on with dizzying speed. Our hope must be in the main to

modify the environment to suit the race, rather than to trust to the race altering to suit the environment.

Under these conditions our race cannot but perish from the earth should we lose the one thing it possesses that responds to its deepest nature. That one thing is the political liberty enjoyed by the people of France, England and these United States. To support our government in the present war is something more than yielding to patriotism, vulgar or otherwise. It is to do one's part in battling for the continued existence of our portion of the human race on the earth.

Never was there a worthier and nobler cause for which to battle. I am proud to believe that the majority of those who have in the past voted for the Socialist party will not now be found wanting.

II

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

A

The most striking single feature of La Monte's article is its negative character. It is destructive, not constructive. You have a criticism of Marxism, or Marxists, a blast at German autocracy, an affirmation and a proof of the collapse of the Second International, and glittering generalizations incidentally. But what does La Monte substitute in the place of Socialism? If our attitude toward war in general, and this war in particular, is wrong, what is *his* attitude? Solemnly but carelessly wandering through the fields of history, ethnology, economics and philosophy does not in itself provide a constructive program of action. The acceptance of the concept that this is a war for democracy is not a sufficient substitute for the philosophy and movement that La Monte discards. Surely, La Monte's declaration that the Socialist should accept this "war for democracy" and see it through, cannot stand by itself; it should be proven, it should be related to the events of our day in particular, and to history in general. I may be unfair in my conclusion, but it strikes me that La Monte's position is this: the international collapsed, the German Socialist movement contemptibly entered into a war of conquest,

Socialism is a failure—and in despair, La Monte accepts the hypocritical idealism of this “war for democracy.”

The article is not an argument as much as a soliloquy. La Monte was thinking aloud, and put his thoughts on paper. And the peculiarity of it all is that La Monte is really arguing against himself, against the La Monte of five and fifteen years ago, against the errors that distinguished him and that he himself helped to make popular. The circumstance that La Monte was himself a peculiar victim of the errors he now attacks, is not an argument for or against those errors, or against La Monte; but it does explain the psychology of his reactions.

Consider the charge of “romanticism” that he hurls against the Marxist. The Marxist, according to La Monte, refuses to accept “the facts of life.” But here is a 6,000-word article on Socialists and war, an article that in places goes back to the period of the childhood of our race, and which makes only *one* mention of the Russian Revolution, the great “fact of life” in this war, and that a passing one—“I believe that . . . the recent Russian Revolution with the release of the prisoners in the Fortress of Peter and Paul and the glorious home-coming of the Siberian exiles was worth while.” I can understand the psychology of despair that seized upon La Monte because of the collapse of Socialism, but I cannot understand this failure to appreciate the Russian Revolution and its tremendous influence on our hopes and fears, and on our future activity. Nor can I, except on the basis of an incurable romanticism, understand his failure to appreciate the new aspect thrown upon this war by the Russian Revolution. Is not the attitude of the Allies, and of America in particular, toward the Russian Revolutionary democracy a sufficient refutation of their claim to be waging an unselfish war for democracy? Why does not America and its Allies accept the aspirations of the Russian democracy? Instead of accepting, they are rejecting; and in rejecting, they are using their industrial, financial and diplomatic forces to strengthen the imperialistic reaction in Russia.

La Monte’s incurable romanticism is evident again in his acceptance of the idealism of this “war for democracy.” I do

not imagine for a moment that La Monte believes that the United States went into the war to make the world safe for democracy. President Wilson’s urging of a “peace without victory” upon the belligerents is too fresh in our memory. The brutal, selfish indifference to events in Europe, an indifference that did not alter in the face of the devastation of Belgium, Serbia and Rumania, that did not act to protect France but transmuted its blood and agony into profits—this indifference has characterized American capitalism for two and a half years. The world needed to be made safe for democracy one year ago, two years ago, as much as to-day—but this country did not act. Perhaps La Monte believes that whatever may have been America’s motives, its act will conduce toward making the world safe for democracy. If that be the case, we anxiously await the proof and the demonstration.

This incurable romanticism of La Monte is an old characteristic. His Marxism has always had a peculiar romantic tinge. I remember his argument, in *Socialism, Positive and Negative*, that Daniel De Leon was an utopian, because De Leon had expressed a doubt concerning the inevitability of Socialism! De Leon emphasized the human factor that would utilize and transform favorable economic conditions into Socialism; La Monte emphasized the economic factor. Moreover, in this book La Monte travesties the Socialist philosophy by maintaining that the materialistic conception of history ascribes pecuniary motives as dominating the conduct of the individual. The very “economic man” or “economic marionette” that La Monte now scorns is the warp and woof of the ideas promulgated in *Socialism, Positive and Negative*. This mechanistic mode of thought has played, and still plays, an important part in the ideas of many a Socialist; it was dominant in La Monte’s ideas. But it was never identified with Marxism. The Marxist was the first to repudiate it. It didn’t require August 4, 1914, to “make even the dullest of us . . . realize that men and women of flesh and blood do not act like economic marionettes.” Twenty years ago, one of the editors of this magazine, Louis B. Boudin, split a lance with La Monte on this very subject, accusing La Monte of garbling Marxism by promulgating ideas that La Monte now

very justly attacks. And in an article in *The New Review*, July, 1914, in discussing a certain school of Socialists, I said: "They neglected individual psychology, assuming that for all practical purposes it was sufficient to know that the social *milieu* conditions psychology. But that it not sufficient. While socially conditioned, *individual psychology nevertheless becomes an independent factor in the social process as a whole*, obedient to laws and motives of its own; laws and motives which men engaged in organizing human forces must comprehend if they desire success."

Nor is it true that romanticism was the curse of the Socialist movement. It may have been in the case of La Monte, but not of the movement in which he was a factor. The curse of the Socialist movement has been its readiness to discard its ideals, to look upon these ideals as pious aspirations, and to meekly accept the "facts of life." It was the greatest American opportunist of all, Victor L. Berger, who, whenever he argued for an abandonment of revolutionary Socialism, hurled the classic phrase, "It is a condition, not a theory, that confronts us." That has been the obstacle in our path—not our romanticism. The revolutionist was accused of neglecting the facts of life. It was upon this basis that German Socialism abandoned its revolutionary traditions. Surely, La Monte will not accuse Scheidemann, Wolfgang Heine and the whole pack of German Social-Patriots of romanticism! They are facing the temporary facts of life, they are making their compromise with these facts. The whole international Socialist movement made this compromise, accepting the immediate at the sacrifice of the ultimate. And it is against this compromise that we protest. Not because we are romantic, but because we face reality, because we are not afraid of reality, because we know that the compromise is a temporary one, made with temporary facts, and that through struggle we shall succeed.

Reality is a varying thing. There are all sorts and conditions of reality. The reality of the conservative is different from the reality of the revolutionist. A great deal depends upon your *interpretation* of reality. In a world dominated by a complexity of factors, we can all find the particular reality we desire. Among the contemporary facts of life is the war against Germany, and

its idealism, and the collapse of the International; but equally among these facts is the Russian Revolution and the against-the-war minority in the European Socialist movement. Which reality shall we cleave to? The one may to-day be stronger than the other: but since when did the revolutionist count the odds against him?

It is precisely because we revolutionary Marxists believe that the proletariat is composed of men and women of flesh and blood that we do not despair. The men and women in Russia who a year ago apparently enthusiastically accepted the war, to-day are a revolutionary factor and *against* the war. But they are the same men and women, with the same flesh and blood. And tomorrow their comrades in the other belligerent nations may equally become a revolutionary factor. Our ideals are planted upon the reality of economic facts *plus* the reality of human needs and aspirations. Nor do we idealize the proletariat, or conceive them as being supermen. We who have been fighting the proletariat organized in the A. F. of L. for its misdeeds cannot be accused of that error. We dare to go against the proletariat, to condemn the proletariat, when it takes the road to wrong and infamy.

The culture of the bourgeois, as culture is measured to-day, is superior to that of the proletariat. The culture of the barbarian hordes that overthrew the Roman Empire was inferior to that of the Romans, but the invasion gave a new impetus to progress. The culture of the Northmen that overran France was an inferior product, but their virility gave a new impetus to poetry, art and culture generally. The culture of the people that made the French Revolution wasn't much to boast of, but they created a new society out of which developed a finer culture. The "culture" of the Czar and his bureaucrats was infinitely superior to the soldiers and workmen that made the revolution, but mark the contrast in aspirations! The things worth while in this war have not come from the cultured gentlemen of the Wilhelmstrasse, nor of Paris and Downing Street, nor from the marvelously cultured scholar who occupies the White House. No! The things worth while have come from the Russian Revolution made by the peasants and the proletariat. The culture of to-day

is a decadent culture, the culture of a class that thrives on exploitation and misery. We want none of it. Truly, the conquests of civilization cannot be rejected. We must build upon their basis. But we shall transform and re-create. And the proletariat will accomplish a revolution and achieve "world leadership and world rule," not because it consists of supermen, but because it consists of men and women of flesh and blood who have suffered long and hard, and whose mission it is, historically and humanly, to overthrow this system of tyranny, and in self-defense erect a new and better system of things. The human beings who compose the proletariat want peace and freedom and the joy of life, and they will fight for it—and get it!

B

I do not see the relevancy of stressing the *fact* of the collapse of the second International. It would have point in a discussion with Morris Hillquit or Victor L. Berger, but surely not in a discussion with one of our group. In this discussion, accordingly, it is *causes* and *consequences* that should be stressed. There never was a real international—granted: is that a reason for acquiescing in this war? American Socialists do not have "the power to affect appreciably the foreign policy of the United States"—granted: is that a reason for acquiescing in this war? If we cannot conquer, we do not necessarily have to submit. A start must be made somewhere, we must develop the necessary power. The revolution is a process and not an ultimate act alone. Our action is based upon the recognition of being a minority. Since when did a minority become a majority by abandoning its principles and striking hands with its foe?

La Monte puts the case in a nutshell in his statement: "We should consider not what it would be fine to do were we able to do it, but rather what with our present power and prestige, or lack of it, we are able to do that will further our ends." But if we are so completely deficient in influence, would it matter any if we participated in this "war for democracy?" But that is incidental. What we are doing, or trying to do, is fully within our power. We do not expect to stop the war, nor accomplish a revolution. But we can maintain our principles, we can assert

our Socialist integrity, we can seek to influence public opinion in the direction of revolution. Does La Monte imagine that a minority such as the Socialist Party is wholly incapable of influencing events, if it rigidly and conscientiously carries on a revolutionary propaganda? Then the revolutionary Socialist minority in Germany should immediately cease its activity and support the Kaiser. The sacrifices of Karl Liebknecht, Fritz Adler and Rosa Luxemburg have been in vain. But it is *that* way madness lies!

The Social-Patriots of Germany could want nothing better than for American Socialism to acquiesce in this war. No greater blow morally could be struck at the minority in France and Germany, and at the Russian Revolution. Are we to fight Schiedemann by adopting the tactics of Scheidemann? Say what you will, our acquiescence in this war might differ in degree, but not in kind, from the action of Scheidemann and his cohorts.

And it is precisely here that we differ fundamentally with La Monte. To him, the collapse of the International is peculiarly a crime of the German Socialist movement. The evils of Socialism were much more marked in Germany, truly, but simply because the movement there was older and stronger. These evils were general. *The whole international movement failed to emphasize the international basis of Socialism and refused to accept aggressive action against militarism and war during the days of peace. The one international characteristic of the Second International was its general rejection of revolutionary tactics, against militarism, against war, and against capitalism.*

German Socialism bears the largest share of the guilt of the great collapse; but the Socialism of the other nations proportionately bears an equal share of the guilt.

It is this peculiar and exaggerated emphasis on the guilt of German Socialism that distinguishes the pro-war American Socialist from the revolutionary Socialist. The pro-war Socialist draws the line, more or less consciously and distinctly, between the Socialism of Germany and the Socialism of the Allies. *The demarcation is not between the Socialism of two groups of nations, but between the concept of Socialism held by antagonistic Socialist groups within each particular nation.*

There are to-day, and always have been, two Socialisms. In spite of a multiplicity of apparent tendencies, fundamentally the Socialist movement has been divided into two groups—the opportunist and the revolutionary. The opportunist has been dominant, and it is this dominance that brought disaster. It was nationalistic, and refused to adopt aggressive tactics equally against militarism and against capitalism. Shall we emphasize this nationalistic feature by separating the Allied sheep from the Austro-German goats? Or shall we strike a blow for revolutionary Socialism by separating the sheep from the goats in the Socialist movement of *each particular nation*?

It may be denied that there is such a thing as revolutionary Socialism. That, of course, would be in the true romantic style of denying the facts of life. The revolutionary Socialist is inspired by the minority in France and Germany, and by the intrepid stand of the Italian Socialist Party against the war. And it is these comrades that we cleave to in our action against the war, and not to the Austro-German majority, or to the majority of France. If the *whole* Socialist movement had acquiesced in war, I might sympathize with the philosophy of despair that has La Monte in its clutches. But it simply rouses my impatience, particularly when he accuses us of refusing to recognize the facts of life. Is it then only the *dominant* facts of life that deserve recognition?

It would seem that if acquiescence in war was the cause of the Socialist *debacle*, the finest contribution the American Socialist could make to the reconstruction of Socialism would be refusing to acquiesce in the war and expressing the revolutionary, international principles which alone make Socialism vital and vitalizing. But La Monte comes to a different conclusion, because under the influence of the philosophy of despair he sees with the eyes of the nationalist and not with the eyes of the revolutionary Socialist. But fortunately movements are sufficiently romantic and sufficiently vulgar not to be seized by the philosophy of despair *en masse*.

If in despair we are to reject Socialism incontinently, then any other course of action than that suggested by La Monte would be

unthinkable. But that is not our purpose. Where others have failed, we shall make good. We shall not imitate their errors, thereby strengthening their reactionary influence. We shall not criticize their actions, and then pursue a similar course of action. There being essentially two tendencies, or groups, in the Socialist movement, the collapse of the International becomes an incident in our development and an indictment of the dominant group. Our task, accordingly, is not to reject Socialism, but to reconstruct it. And in this reconstruction the Socialist attitude on war becomes fundamental. Our refusal to acquiesce in war will contribute mightily toward this revolutionary reconstruction; a contrary course would be disgraceful to-day, and suicidal in the days of reconstruction to come.

La Monte, apparently, believes in good wars and bad wars—this war against Germany being a good one. I shall discuss this later on, at this point I shall discuss the general principles applicable to all wars waged under the conditions of Imperialistic Capitalism.

Wars to-day are waged exclusively for purposes of aggression. A particular nation, in this case Germany and Austria, may be the immediate aggressor; but as the immediate causation of a war flows out of a preceding series of diplomatic struggles expressing economic interests, all nations engaged are fundamentally the aggressors—except the small nations that are simply pawns on the international chess-board of Imperialism. President Wilson has very justly said that this iniquitous war arose out of the *status quo ante*. And that status was not determined by the autocracy of Germany, but by the clash of Imperialistic interests between the two groups, in Morocco, in Mesopotamia and in Persia. The war that might have been precipitated at Agadir would have been no different than this one precipitated at Serajevo. Whatever the apparent causes, the driving purposes are identical—Imperialistic aggrandizement.

Our opposition to war is not simply based upon the fact that war is aggressive. It is equally based upon the fact that war is waged by nations, and for national interests. The nation has been a factor making for progress in the onward

and upward development of the race, but to-day the nation is a reactionary factor. National wars of liberation and democracy are a thing of the past. Once the carrier of democracy, the nation to-day is the carrier of Imperialism. National interests simply express or cloak the most brutal Imperialistic purposes. The strengthening of the nation means the strengthening of Imperialistic reaction and the retarding of the class struggle.

The acquiescence of Socialism in a war inevitably means the suspension of the class struggle—unless the war happens to be waged by a revolutionary government. The possibility may be assumed theoretically of Socialism participating in a Capitalist war and still waging the class struggle; but in the actual stress of events and because of the psychology of men and women of flesh and blood, the theoretical possibility becomes a practical impossibility. And the suspension of the class struggle is the greatest calamity that can happen to Socialism, equally during war and peace. The nation is the nation of the bourgeoisie, of Capitalism; and it does not change its character simply because it happens to be engaged in a war. The co-operation of classes during peace is disastrous, curbing revolutionary virility; during war it is tragic and suicidal. The class is superior to the nation, and deserves our first allegiance. It was this issue on which the Second International wrecked itself: the class was subordinated to the nation, with consequences that La Monte deplors. And yet he urges us to adopt the identical policy! Either Socialism is a class movement or it is nationalistic, in which event it ceases being Socialism—there is no other alternative.

This is not a theoretical problem alone. It is very practical. The "civil peace" in Europe has been used against the Working Class. It has bound the proletariat, but not the capitalist. It has made easier the forging of new instruments of oppression. The "civil peace" has destroyed the possibility of the proletariat using the opportunity of war to promote its own interests, but it has not at all deterred Capitalism from promoting *its* interests. Consider the trades unions. Their immediate purpose is to become a recognized caste in the govern-

ing system of the nation. The conditions of war provide a magnificent opportunity for accomplishing this purpose. The trades unions in Germany and France struck a truce with the government, and they have become pariahs. The British unions did not, and they have become a recognized caste in the governing system of the nation. In this country the A. F. of L. unreservedly pledged itself to the war and struck a truce with the ruling class. I will let David Lawrence, Washington correspondent of the *New York Evening Post*, describe the result: "To-day the labor groups (in England) have a representation in the government, and the labor organizations are virtually a part of the government, with the manufacturer much less potent than before. *No such step is to be undertaken here, because there is no real necessity for it, and very likely never will be.*" There you have the suicidal consequences of the suspension of the struggle against Capitalism—even from the opportunistic standpoint of securing immediate advantages.

Acquiescing in war means promoting the most brutal and reactionary purposes of the ruling class and destroying the morale of Socialism. Moreover, *it shatters the possibility of aggressive action on the part of Socialism.* War provides the conditions for revolutionary action and Socialism must act accordingly. It is inconceivable that Russian Socialism could have achieved the magnificent things it has if it had acquiesced in the war. The acquiescence would have tied its hands, would have crippled its propaganda, would have deadened the instinct for revolutionary action in the people. The Socialist movement must keep its hands free for action as the opportunity ripens; to acquiesce in war means to surrender this freedom of action. Refusal to participate in war not only gives Socialism the necessary physical power and moral prestige to act at the proper opportunity, but hastens the coming of the opportunity. And that is the vital thing, all else being incidental.

Moreover, the "civil peace" strengthens the governmental reaction and compels Socialism to acquiesce. The Socialist majority in Germany dares not protest against the most outrageous actions of the government—it has assumed responsibility for those actions. Guesde and Sembat and the French

Socialist majority have been compelled to acquiesce in the brutal acts of their government. The government is dominant and the government directs things its own way when there is no independent and aggressive waging of the class struggle.

But the most tragic feature of Socialist participation in a Capitalist war is that Socialism gradually, subtly, accepts the most reactionary war aims of the government. I do not for a moment believe that German Socialism consciously entered the war for purposes of conquest, and yet it is to-day accepting these very purposes. Nor do I believe that the Social Democracy entered the war to perpetuate the monarchy, but that is exactly what it is doing to-day; and, moreover, through the Berlin *Vorwärts* it rebukes the Russian Revolution for its appeal to the proletariat of Germany to overthrow the monarchy and *defends* the monarchy! A Socialism that acts in this manner will either have no influence at all on the terms of peace, or its influence will be reactionary. All governments seek Imperialistic terms of peace and only an independent and aggressive Socialist movement can express the general desire for a just peace and a peace expressing the interests of the proletariat. Surely, the Russian Socialist movement, which has been relentlessly waging the class struggle, is going to influence the peace settlement much more actively and progressively than the enslaved majority of Albert Thomas or Scheidemann.

Theoretically and practically, accordingly, the Socialist movement must maintain its independent character and integrity by refusing to participate in war. Its reconstruction must be based upon this refusal. The class struggle must be waged fearlessly and relentlessly under any and all conditions.

C

Precisely as German Socialism is held responsible for the collapse of the International, La Monte ascribes the guilt of the war exclusively to Germany. Before discussing this aspect of the subject in controversy, certain minor points may be considered.

The concept that the German army *in itself* is necessarily more of a menace than the British navy *in itself* is certainly very peculiar. In the final analysis, the menace of one or the other depends upon the aggressive strength of the nation and its animating purposes.

But the issue is much deeper. The history of modern wars shows, and Admiral Mahan has stressed this fact, that naval power eventually triumphs over military power. It was naval power that beat Napoleon and naval power may beat Germany. Moreover, under the conditions of modern Imperialism, *the structure of world empire depends in the final analysis upon naval power*. No merely military nation can permanently conquer in the clash of Imperialism. The British world empire was created and is maintained by naval power; and in the clash of Imperialism Great Britain has the advantage and is more menacing than any other great nation because of its mighty navy. Is not the recognition of this fact behind the program of American Imperialism for "incomparably the largest navy in the world"?

The menace of the German army is emphasized by La Monte by reference to German Imperialism, and to "special circumstances" in ancient and modern characteristics of the people of Germany. The economic argument is buttressed by the racial. I shall consider the latter first.

In the early days of the war there was nothing more amusing than the constant regrets for the "kindly and philosophic" Germany of Schiller and Goethe, as if that proved anything for or against Germany. My ethnological opponent goes much further back—ten and thirteen thousand years! The argument based on racial characteristics is dangerous, and particularly the one of La Monte. "Such ideas as country, race or nation would have been incomprehensible to them [the Baltic people's ancestors of ten thousand years ago—naturally!] In fact they are very nearly so to many of their village-minded descendants to-day. And yet these are the very people we hoped to make into true internationalists by the necromancy of a few well-worded resolutions!" This is the new gospel according to La Monte. The characteristics of our ancestors

ten thousand years ago are considered determinant to-day—in a world revolutionized by steam and electricity, and knit together by the wireless and international trade in all the seven corners of the earth!

The characteristics of the race, the fundamental ones, survive, and among them are *the instinct to happiness and the spirit of adaptation*. Based upon these two human factors, the race may completely revolutionize itself and its environment. The fundamental characteristics of races are identical, only their expressions vary.

The essential institutions of the Baltic peoples prevailed among the peoples of the Mediterranean at the same stage of civilization. The spirit of insubordination was universal. And if the spirit of subordination is greater in Germany, it is not because of any peculiarity in its people, but because of its social development. In passing, why does La Monte in his dithyrambic passage about Magna Charta, Valley Forge, the Bastille and the Battle of the Marne, omit any mention of the Reformation? The reformation of Luther struck the first great blow for the freedom of modern Europe. It was an event second only to the French Revolution, and it is a contribution measurable with that of Great Britain and France to modern history and civilization. Could “a race to whom freedom was an incomprehensible concept” achieve the Reformation?

The circumstance of Germany being organized on the basis of the territorial state proves nothing against Germany, or for La Monte's thesis. Every great nation of Europe has at periods in its history been organized on the basis of the territorial state. The territorial state is an incident in the onward and upward development of the nation, dominant at the period when the nation is consummating its unity and carving out its frontiers. If Germany had its Frederick the Great, France had its Louis XIV.

The perpetuation of the territorial state and of autocracy in Germany is not due to racial characteristics, *but to the conditions of modern Imperialism*.

Veblen, in *Imperial Germany*, points out that the introduction in Germany of the modern technology of capitalism did not overthrow the old political order because this technology was introduced from without, “borrowed,” to use Veblen's phrase, and was not developed from within. The development of this technology in other countries produced great social and political changes, it had to fight its way against the institutions of the old order and overthrow those institutions; whereas in Germany it was assimilated, which produced the phenomenon of a mighty and efficient capitalism without its corresponding political superstructure.

There is a great deal of truth in Veblen's analysis, but it is not the fundamental truth. In spite of the fact that the modern technology had its general beginnings in the Italy of the fourteenth century, these beginnings died out, and the modern technology in Italy was equally largely assimilated. This, however, did not produce a powerful autocratic state. In the case of Germany it did, *because its liberal middle class, in fear of the proletariat, compromised with and accepted autocracy temporarily; then Bismarckian autocracy emerged into Imperialistic autocracy, and the German bourgeois accepted autocracy permanently*.

Veblen believes, and I imagine that La Monte concurs in this belief, that autocracy prevails in Germany because of its own power, and dominates as an autocracy. It does not. Autocracy prevails in Germany to-day because Imperialistic capitalism has found it necessary and efficacious in the accomplishment of its aggressive purposes. The autocracy would not exist a day if it had not compromised with Imperialism and expressed the interests of Imperialism. It is precisely this Imperialism that makes German autocracy dangerous; and it is precisely this circumstance that largely produced the Russian Revolution, because the autocracy of the Czar did not express the interests of the nascent Imperialistic bourgeoisie. But in Russia to-day, there is a great danger that a compromise may be struck by the Imperialistic bourgeoisie and the autocracy, in order to secure power for pursuing projects of conquest and subduing the democracy of the proletariat—a compromise already secretly at-

tempted by the bourgeoisie on the eve of the Revolution. Moreover, a distinguishing feature of Imperialism is the acquisition of territory for purposes of exploitation, *and we find the nations of the world to-day developing more and more in the direction of a modern territorial state.* The feudal characteristics of autocracy in Germany are incidental; essentially it is the new autocracy of Imperialism, compounded of military power, a brutal state Socialism and the hunger for territory. This new autocracy is developing rapidly in the other Imperialistic nations, and it is this new autocracy that is the great menace to peace and freedom throughout the world.

Imperialism determined the survival of autocracy in Germany. National unity and democracy was not achieved in France and England immediately. It was a long process, and there were periods of reaction, the most marked being the era of Napoleonic autocracy. France emerged out of that era. The era of Bismarck was a roughly similar period, following the crushing of the Bourgeois revolution of 1848; and Germany did not emerge out of that era because before the liberal forces had acquired the necessary power the new era of Imperialism had set in. The German bourgeoisie realized the tremendous utility of the autocratic state in the struggles of Imperialism; the liberal struggle against the autocracy ceased, the state becoming an *Imperialistic* autocracy—and *that is the menace!* There are peculiarly revolting features about the German menace, but fundamentally it is Imperialistic.

In his analysis of German Imperialism, La Monte is in a hopeless tangle. The characterization of Imperialism made by Boudin in *Socialism and War* and approvingly quoted by La Monte, is made by Boudin as characteristic of the Imperialism of *all nations.* Germany is cited and emphasized as the most marked and highly developed of all; the characteristics are international. The Declaration of Principles of *The Class Struggle* expresses it accurately: "Modern Imperialism is a world-wide phenomenon, although it may be more pronounced in one country than in another. Similarly, the reactionary trend which accompanies it is as broad as our 'civilization,' although in some countries it may assume particularly revolting forms while in

others its *forms* may be less objectionable." As a matter of fact, the first definitely aggressive expression of modern Imperialism was the British conquest of the Boers.

The economic factors making for Imperialism are present in every nation in which the modern technology of Capitalism is dominant. The production of iron as a factor in Imperialism is determined by the circumstance that great industry depends upon iron, and as an Imperialistic factor it is a corollary of the export of capital, which is the determinant feature of modern Imperialism. The export of capital on a large scale pre-supposes concentrated industry operating to produce a gigantic volume of products, and the complete development of the home market. Means of production become an important item of export, in order to absorb equally the masses of surplus capital and to create new markets for the absorption of a nation's surplus products. New markets can be created only in undeveloped countries, and thereby ensues the struggle for their control. The circumstance that Great Britain and France usually checkmated the schemes of German Imperialism was because of the larger masses of export-capital in their control and their years of financial penetration. Great Britain and France were virtually invulnerable economically and financially, and therefore Germany sought the arbitrament of the sword.

But the picture of an innocent France and Britain is preposterous. They acted, where Germany simply threatened. The division of Persia between Russia and Great Britain and British aspirations in Mesopotamia were expressions of an aggressive British Imperialism. The French acquisition of Morocco and the financial penetration of Syria are equally aggressive expressions of modern Imperialism. Is it Germany alone that whets its Imperialistic chops at the prospect of the partition of China? Meseems each of the Allies who are now fighting to make the world safe for Democracy have for years been fighting each other and Germany financially and diplomatically to make the world safe for its own particular Capitalism. The Great War is incomprehensible except as the outcome of a general clash of Imperialism.

And the United States? The war with Spain and the acquisition of the Philippines are characterized by Walter E. Weyl in *American World Policies*, as an experiment in "unripe Imperialism." This country's financial penetration of Mexico and Venezuela and the growing demand for the acquisition of American control in Mexico are expressions of a developing aggressive Imperialism. The Carribbeans and Central America are a satrapy of American capital, political vassals of this country—and what is it all but Imperialism?

La Monte accepts the theory that the production of iron is the driving force behind Imperialism. Well, the United States produced *twice as much* iron as Germany in 1912. This tremendous production of iron is going to bulk large in the events of the immediate future. Moreover, what has restrained our Imperialism was the fact of America being a debtor nation. To-day, because of the war, this country is a creditor nation, and is accumulating a vast mass of surplus capital. This accumulation of capital and the tremendous production of iron and steel will inevitably make the export of capital the distinguishing economic feature of American Capitalism, as it is today—and that means Imperialism. The Monroe Doctrine is already being transformed into an Imperialistic instrument for the financial and political domination of the American continents by the United States.

Imperialism, accordingly, is a phenomenon characteristic of all economically highly-developed nations. It is only by bearing this fact in mind that we can safely traverse the events and problems of our day. International Imperialism must be fought by the international action of the proletariat. The proletariat may fail, but it may try again. To participate in a war with our government against the Imperialism of another nation simply strengthens our own Imperialism. Has not America's participation in the war already strengthened its Imperialism and reactionary character? *Against all Imperialism, because all Imperialism is alike*—the apparent differences disappear as events shape themselves more definitely.

D

The general idea that animates La Monte's argument is that America and its allies are fighting "to make the world safe for democracy." I might rest my case on the analysis of the Imperialistic causes of the war, but the issue is vastly important and deserves fuller analysis.

The democratic claims of none of the Allies are more contemptible and less worthy of credence than the claims of the United States. A great nation that is systematically and brutally suppressing democracy and the rights of small nations in Central America and the Carribbeans pretending to be waging an unselfish war for democracy and civilization against Germany! The brutal facts of America's deeds answer the hypocrisy of America's words. The attitude of America toward the war has been brutally selfish throughout. Scan the diplomatic record of President Wilson and the fact stands out clear as a pike that his animating purpose was to maintain a "benevolent neutrality" that brought great profits to America; that the President refused to organize a League of Neutrals to protect *all* neutrals' rights because it was considered inimical to America's selfish purposes; that as long as "our" trade with the Allies was considered safe, America through its official representatives cared not a snap of the fingers what happened to other neutral rights, cared nothing about the menace to democracy and the rights of small nations; and that it was only when the criminal desperation of Germany threatened American trade and American prestige beyond diplomatic redress that this country went to war "against autocracy." A nation may have the right to wage a war to protect its trade, but do not call it an unselfish war for democracy!

At this point I might again rest my case. But I shall not. La Monte is as aware as I am of the facts in the preceding paragraph. Neither of us, I take it, are interested in scoring points, but in discussing the larger aspects of the subject. And the problem of the relations between Socialism and democracy is vitally important. It is a crucial problem.

I agree with La Monte that "political liberty and representative institutions" are not "empty worthless baubles not worth fighting to retain." The preservation *and extension* of democracy are cardinal features of the revolutionary program of Socialism: the larger contains the lesser. On this head I shall again quote *The Class Struggle*, in its Declaration of Principles:

"We are not indifferent to the fate of democracy. On the contrary we believe that the Socialist movement is particularly charged with the duty of preserving and extending all democratic institutions. Furthermore, we believe that the revolutionary working class is the only social power capable of doing it. But far from this being a reason for our supporting any of the governments now at war, we believe that the interests of true democracy require that we refuse to join hands with any of these governments and the interests which support them and that we work for a speedy termination of this war by the action and pressure of the working class and Socialist movement of the belligerent nations. . . . The only hope of democracy lies in those revolutionary elements of each country which are ready to fight Imperialism in all its manifestations and wherever found."

The defense of democracy is the task of revolutionary Socialism. The circumstance that Socialism failed does not alter the situation. The only considerable group in any of the belligerents that fights for democracy and against reaction is precisely the revolutionary Socialist minority. Eventually, ultimately, Socialism must carry out its task, because historic conditions and its own necessity decree it. Socialism having failed, La Monte despairingly turns to war as the only alternative. The Russian revolution should have offered him another alternative. Democracy has gained from this war only in Russia, and that through revolutionary action. And only similar revolutionary action in all the belligerents can make the world safe for democracy.

La Monte apparently accepts the President's statement that the war arose out of "the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force, which is controlled wholly by their

will and not by the will of their people." The term "autocratic government" used against Germany refers to the remnants of Junkerthum, the feudal caste, still powerful in Germany. No sane man denies that this caste is powerful. It is a contributing menace to peace and freedom in Germany. But it is not the decisive factor in the causation of war. It is powerful only in the measure that it identifies itself with and represents the interests of aggressive Imperialism; in fact, it has been absorbed by Imperialism. The most ruthless plans for war and conquest in Germany come, not from the Junkerthum, but from the National Liberals, the representatives of finance-capital and Imperialism. A similar form of "autocratic government" prevails in Japan. The interests of Japan and this country clash Imperialistically. They clash not because Japan has an "autocratic government," but because the purposes of its aggressive Imperialism antagonize the Imperialism of America. A war between Japan and this country is not at all inconceivable; and when it comes, the then President of the United States may indulge in sentiments against "autocratic governments" and "making the world safe for democracy." The survival of an autocratic government such as Germany's is a "sport" in social evolution. It survives and is powerful not because of its feudal remnants, but because of the Capitalism that uses it for purposes of its own—imperialistic conquest and the suppression of the revolutionary movement.

Can autocracy be overthrown by this war? The "war for democracy" has brought with it the suspension of democracy, brutal reaction and dictatorship. Now, it is conceivable that dictatorship might serve the ends of democracy and progress, as during the wars of the French Revolution; *but it must be a dictatorship of the progressive and revolutionary forces.* A dictatorship of the revolutionary working class in Russia to-day would serve the ends of democracy. And it would be a *temporary* dictatorship. But the dictatorship created by this war is a dictatorship of all the reactionary forces as expressed in the ruling class, and that strikes directly at democracy; not alone for purposes of this war, but as a precedent and a weapon for the

future. And this dictatorship of the ruling class is *permanent* in its character.

The essential characteristic of autocracy in Germany is not its feudal remnants, *but the new form of autocracy produced by Imperialism and State Socialism*. What makes a Capitalist war for democracy hopeless and a tragic farce is that the new era of Imperialism makes Capitalism itself the worst foe of the democracy of Capitalism.

War is not the only consequence of Imperialism. It is completely altering the social and governmental structure of every nation that it controls. Imperialism means the merging of Capitalist class interests into a brutal and brutalizing State Socialism. The industrial Middle Class, once the "defender of the democratic faith" against Plutocracy, has struck its colors and compromised with Plutocracy. As long as the home market was the dominant market, the two could afford to fight each other; but Imperialism imposes unity of action upon the Capitalist, as only a unified Capitalism can successfully conquer foreign markets to-day. This has created a new Middle Class, dependent upon Imperialism and concentrated industry, and everywhere this new class is unanimously and violently Imperialistic. Democracy served the ends of the bourgeoisie against feudalism, democracy served the ends of the old Middle Class against Plutocracy; but to-day democracy is in the discard, Imperialism and democracy being incompatible.

There was once a theory that Capitalism requires democracy and the democratic republic. But the brutal fact is that it is not the form of government that matters to Capitalism, but a government that promotes its interests. The democratic republic is fading away because it does not serve the ends of Imperialism. State Socialism is the new form of government—militaristic, autocratic, belligerent. A new autocracy has arisen. Governments must be centralized, powerful, autocratic, to cope with the armed struggles precipitated by Imperialism. Formerly liberal social elements acquiesce in this new autocracy because it promotes their material interests. The severity of international competition compels a nation to develop its maximum efficiency;

the forces of Capitalism must be organized and marshalled—and all this is done through State Socialism and its new autocracy. The liberty of *laissez-faire* is incompatible with the requirements of Imperialism. The democracy of Capitalism is rapidly becoming a thing of the past.

This reactionary trend, away from democracy, is the determining tendency of our day. It is characteristic of all nations. That it has assumed its most brutal and definite form in Germany is simply an indication of speedier development. The tendency was active in Great Britain, France and the United States before the war, and it is being made dominant by the war's stimulus upon Imperialism. And the Pro-Consul system of government that Imperialism imposes upon its possessions and "spheres of influence" reacts upon and destroys democracy at home.

There are certain features about this new autocracy that mislead romantic radicals. One of them is the fact that it provides for the material comforts of the people, and yields certain forms of sham democracy. It is a readjustment. The working class is coddled along through State Socialism to make it ready to lay down their lives for "their" country—when its Imperialism is in danger! Imperialism means international reaction, government and industrial autocracy, but a certain amount of social reform and "democracy" as a bribe to the people. The essential fact, however, is that the trend is away from fundamental democracy. The distinguishing feature of the Imperialistic nation is that it substitutes "kultur" in the place of democracy. Under the illusion that the nation is still the carrier of democracy, European Socialism went out to fight for national freedom—and lo and behold! it was a brutal Imperialism that was being promoted.

Under these circumstances, the revolutionary Socialist refuses to become *particeps criminis* in the wars for democracy waged by a hypocritical Capitalism. It is Imperialism that menaces democracy, and Imperialism alone that we shall fight. In the pre-Imperialistic era Socialism and democracy could be separated; and the demand of Marx for a war of the liberal powers against autocratic Russia was a legitimate one. *To-day the struggle for democ-*

racy as such can be waged only as an integral part of our general revolutionary struggle for Socialism. Our action must be international, our way the way of the proletariat of Russia.

E

I shall not waste much time on the charge that the Socialist party is pro-German. That was never true of the party as a whole, simply of certain prominent members of the bureaucracy. I despise their attitude as much as La Monte does. But it does not at all enter into the question as to what attitude the party should take towards America in the war. If La Monte, under the control of his philosophy of despair, had not left the party he would know that it was the radical membership that forced the bureaucracy into an aggressive anti-war stand. Shall we play into the hands of this handful of pro-Germans by becoming pro-Ally? *The only effective way to fight the degrading pro-Germanism of these bureaucrats is to fight for revolutionary Socialism.* The bureaucrat is pro-German because he is pro-Scheidemann.

It is the philosophy of despair that makes La Monte urge that "the proper course for such American Socialists as are still affiliated with the Socialist party is to get out of it as quickly as may be and give their whole-hearted support to the government of these United States in its splendid fight to 'make the world safe for democracy.'" Imagine! The philosophy of despair inevitably generates the policy of surrender. And I have no doubt that after the hysteria of this war is over La Monte will regret these words, "I am now serving as a sergeant in the Home Guard doing my part to protect my neighbors from the violence of well-meaning if feeble-minded pacifists." I have had experience with the contemptible acts of the Home Guard of New York City, and its citizens need to be protected from *their* violence. It is the Home Guard and the soldiers that deliberately provoke riots at pacifist and Socialist meetings. The peculiar feature of the Socialist that acquiesces in war is that he becomes more reactionary than the government itself. Even Secretary of War Baker has rebuked the violence of soldiers and sailors at Socialist and pacifist meetings! But this is a minor objection. The Home Guard is an expression of militarism; imagine the

formerly revolutionary La Monte identifying himself with militarism!

But such are the vagaries of the philosophy of despair. It inevitably leads to reaction. And in this connection a well-known passage from Marx' *Eighteenth Brumaire* is appropriate:

"Proletarian revolutions criticize themselves constantly; constantly interrupt themselves in their own course; come back to what seems to have been accomplished, in order to start over anew; scorn with cruel thoroughness the half measures, weaknesses and meannesses of their first attempts; seem to throw down their adversary only in order to enable him to draw fresh strength from the earth, and again to rise up against them in more gigantic stature; constantly recoil in fear before the undefined monster magnitude of their own objects—until finally that situation is created which renders all retreat impossible, and the conditions themselves cry out:

"Hic Rhodus, hic salta!"

We are against this war because we do not despair. We do not despair because we know that revolutions are not made in a day and that errors and weaknesses are inevitable. The brilliant passage of Marx expresses exactly the situation to-day. We have failed—come, build anew!

The task is gigantic. It means a complete reconstruction of the Socialist movement, of its theory and its practice. We shall build upon the truth of the past and discard the errors. We shall forge a new movement—comprehensive, aggressive, revolutionary, a movement adapted to the new conditions of Imperialism. This new movement must be built upon the fundamentals of Socialism, purged of error and compromise; the revolutionary spirit of Marxism emphasized against the deadening practice of the Socialist Majority.

This is the great opportunity of Socialism. To despair is to accept defeat. Out of great events arises great action. There can be no faltering. All for Socialism—*revolutionary* Socialism!

Philipp Scheidemann

A PEN PICTURE

Philipp Scheidemann, erstwhile compositor, a good public school education to which he has added considerably, an open head, clever, mentally very active. A born agitator, familiar with all the tricks of a demagogue. He knows the masses, knows how to approach them. He has developed the art of playing up the "horny hand of toil" against the intellectual, until he has reached a degree of perfection that rarely fails in its effect.

Is Herr Scheidemann a social patriot from conviction?

Just as little as he ever was a convinced Internationalist.

Has Herr Scheidemann become a monarchist?

Just as little as he was ever, in spite of his famous accusation of "the traditional perjury of the Hohenzollern," a convinced republican.

Convictions are a ballast with which Herr Scheidemann refuses to burden himself. They are a hindrance to any career. And a career Herr Scheidemann will have, under all circumstances.

To be sure, the possibilities for his political advancement are limited.

He is dependent upon the social-democratic movement. Outside of this movement he is nobody. He knows this and acts accordingly.

It has ever been Herrn Scheidemann's greatest aspiration to stand at the head of a mighty social-democratic party, to be in a position to dictate, in this capacity, to the German national government.

What the character of this social-democratic party shall be, whether revolutionary, reformistic, opportunistic, radical, revisionistic, nationalistic or international, is, to Herrn Scheidemann of absolutely no consequence. He is ready to adjust himself to the prevailing tendency of the moment, in the fullest measure.

So long as the German labor movement was engulfed in a wave of chauvinism, Philipp Scheidemann was a social patriot,

with a tendency toward social imperialism—being careful, however, to avoid open utterances favoring annexations.

Now, that the long duration of the war, and the lack of food have driven all chauvinist ideas out of the heads of the laboring masses, Herr Scheidemann is a moderated social patriot, with pronounced international pacifist leanings.

And we are convinced that he is ready to undergo still further modifications in his social patriotism, to the point, if necessary, where his patriotism will completely vanish, should the continued radicalization of the labor masses so demand.

No, forsooth, the cool mathematician Scheidemann knows no convictions.

He deems to stand high above all things human and inanimate.

And still, perhaps he is mistaken after all.

Perhaps, after all, Bethmann-Hollweg was the wiser of the two.

No scruples, no traditions hinder the former compositor, who has become the leader of the strongest party, numerically, in Germany.

But he has one failing, the common failing of all men of his kind.

He is immeasurably vain and Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg seems to have discovered the Achilles heel of the leader of the social-democratic myrmidons.

Reventlow and his crowd insist that Herr Scheidemann has terrorized Herrn von Bethmann-Hollweg.

Perhaps. But to us it would seem as if Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg had used Herrn Scheidemann's vanity to make of him a willing tool with which to influence the German workers on the one hand, and the foreign workers on the other, in so far, at least, as they are amenable to the influence of the German Social-Democracy.

So the fate that so often overtakes the very ones who deem themselves wisest has claimed Herrn Scheidemann; he deemed himself a master, and is but a tool.

W.

J'accuse!

Friedrich Adler's Address in Court

I.

In the first place I must oppose the legend that has been woven about my person. I recognized from the beginning that my act would be attributed to a temporary state of mental aberration. I was prepared for the cry of the whole press that only an insane man could have done such a deed at a time when all the rest of the population was in complete harmony with the regime of Count Stürgkh.

I expected that the press of the government Socialists in Austria as well as in Germany would try to cast me off as one who had lost his reason, and I have since, after I have had the opportunity to see the Berlin Vorwärts, read, under a great headline, "The Deed of a Maniac," what they have had to say about it. The Vorwärts at that time had already been endowed with an editorial department favorable not to the working class but to the government. I was, of course, prepared for the repudiation of the Vienna "Arbeiter-Zeitung" and its attempt to line up all the psychological moments it could find to prove that I had not been in complete possession of my mental faculties.

I desire to declare that I deny all responsibility for any statements made here by my attorney and that I am determined to oppose, most emphatically, any attempt on the part of my counsel to present this plea in my favor. It may be the duty of my attorney to take care of my body but it is my duty to protect my convictions which are more important than the *hanging of one man more in Austria during the war*. The case is a much more serious one than that which is engrossing my attorney here. I desire, therefore, to say from the start: I did not commit this deed in a fit of mental darkness, but after ripe consideration; I have considered it for a year and a half, have weighted all its effects, from every side. You see it is not a deed inspired by the moment but a premeditated act, undertaken and carried out with the fullest realization that with it my life is

closed. When I entered this house in October I was convinced that I would not leave it alive. I was certain that in view of the political situation of that time there could be but one end, that the court before which I was to be tried could pass no other sentence than one of death by hanging. And I beg of you, much as you may have to bear from me, to be convinced of this, that I shall say not one word to hinder you from passing the only judgment that you as a special court can pass, yet I am convinced, were this a jury trial, I should perhaps look forward to a different judgment.

I am by no means inclined to overestimate the institution of trial by jury but I do believe it possible that the natural feeling of justice of people who have only to decide according to the lights of their conscience might find its expression here; you, on the other hand are placed here, not to decide according to the dictates of your conscience, but according to the cold letter of the law.

I harbor no delusion, therefore, and will certainly not attempt to overthrow this judgment; on the contrary, I will do everything to make it clear that there can be no other judgment.

First I should like to speak for a moment of the indictment rendered by the public prosecutor that was read here. When it was first read to me in November I laughed aloud at the point where it says, "The use of murder as a political weapon can hardly be a subject for discussion among ethical people, in an ordinary state of society." The prosecutor has set himself an easy task, to be sure. He passes lightly over the real problem, in a sentence, by inserting the premise. I agree with the State attorney that in an orderly state of society murder cannot be a political weapon.

But the premise, which is here to be proven, is the question as to whether we are living in an orderly state of society.

And right here the whole matter assumes an entirely new character. I will not go into the question as to the ethical character of our ruling powers. That is a moral question. I will confine myself to the wholly concrete problem, "are we living in an orderly state of society." Out of this question arises my moral

justification for using murder as a political weapon. I cannot here enter upon the whole problem of the disorderly conditions of the country, of the real anarchy in the Austrian nation. I will return later to the question of constitutionality in so far as it is related to Parliament. But I will here, in connection with the words used by the counsel in his motion, calmly and dispassionately state what is to me *a justification of myself and of the deed I have committed.*

I maintain that the fact that such trials as this are possible, alone, justifies every act of violence against the rulers of Austria. This trial alone, and all such trials, are to me a moral justification and I desire to emphasize in this connection that it was just this state of justice in Austria that has oppressed me most since the war began, that violated my every sense of honor, that made me ashamed of the fact that I am an Austrian. I will show you that the Stürgkh-Hochenburger ministry, as early as July 25, 1915, issued an imperial edict abolishing all jury courts, making way for the violation of our constitutional rights on the very day when diplomatic relations with Servia were severed. This edict, at that time already represented a real coup d'etat. I will illustrate to you the situation that has been created in Austria by the regime Stürgkh-Hochenburger by referring you to the ordinance issued on the 25th of July, 1914, providing for trial before a military court of persons who commit a punishable act.

Even at that time this edict was a clarification for me and the impression it made upon me has been deepened during the whole period of the war. If you look at these two ordinances you will find that they embody everything that has been done in Austria since the war began. They have used all kinds of subterfuges. They claim that the nationalist question in Austria is creating many difficulties, etc. What is a government to do if it cannot get along with its parliament, they ask, and see in the abolition of parliament the only possible solution. But later developments showed that these were nothing more than lying pretenses to justify their desire to rule, substituting paragraph 14 for rule by parliament. Yet no one has so systematically ruined parliament as Count Stürgkh who foresaw what was coming. How-

ever that is not a subject for discussion. It is not exactly a credit to the possibilities of Austria as a nation to claim that it can be governed only as an absolute monarchy. But the action of the 25th of July, 1914, has nothing to do with the political situation. It is proof of the fact that even before war was declared against Serbia war had already been declared against the people of Austria, that the government was determined to look upon the constitution as a scrap of paper, to stride rough-shod over everything that is law and right in Austria.

My case has been brought before this forum. But a large number of other cases which in accordance with the law should have been tried before jury courts have nevertheless not been brought before this court, in spite of the abolition of jury courts. All such political crimes, high treason, lese majeste, disturbance of public peace and order, all crimes which before jury courts were referred by the Imperial Edict of July 25, 1914, to the royal imperial Military Reserve Courts.

That the government no longer trusts the civil courts to dispense justice in the spirit of the reactionary Holzinger, that it feels impelled to carry all political crimes before senates, before gentlemen whose trustworthiness to carry out every order from above is assured by the fact that they stand ready to defend the front against the enemy at home at a sacrifice of their own moral personality, especially when they are thus in a position to secure their physical existence from the more dangerous attacks of the enemy across the border, is, in a sense, an honorable distinction conferred upon you by the powers of absolutism. To a person whose whole life is spent in political activity this turning over of all political crimes to military courts is obviously a matter of some concern. The fact that I have, from the beginning, denounced the shame of Austria and have openly declared in widely diversified publications that we live in a state whose absolutism is unequalled in the whole world is sufficient proof that there is in Austria to-day no authority that is responsible concerning Austrian constitutionality.

For this is the crucial point in the Austrian situation and this

explains my act that there is in Austria to-day no authority that is competent concerning Austrian constitutionality.

Everyone in Austria says: That does not concern me, I am not competent. The responsibility rests with him who has enacted this imperial decree. And if we deserve to be quite specific on this point we must admit that the Emperor is not responsible because, according to the constitution, he is irresponsible. No, the ministry is responsible and so this whole question of responsibility and of everything that is done in Austria becomes more and more complicated because the Austrian, in his good nature, does not feel as a citizen, but as a subject, while the instruments of government, on the other hand, do not consider themselves competent to test the legality of actions from above.

Thus, in the whole of Austria, no one is competent but the ministers and they have turned the constitution into a scrap of paper and have refused to be called to account. I ask you, therefore, what is to be done when there is no institution through which these eleven people may be called to account, what method remains but that of force? What other possibility is there, when a ministry rules by force to call it to account except the methods which they themselves are using. Does not, under such circumstances, force become a necessity, just as you have always said of war? In a state, which is called an orderly society, under such circumstances is there anything left but force? I will not speak of the right of revolution. The Social Democratic Party, upon whose program I have always stood and still stand today, does not deny force and has not condemned its use. It has declared in its program that it will use, for the realization of its aims, all effective means that are in accord with the natural sense of justice of the people.

* * *

With a full realization of what they were doing Hochenburger and Stürgkh prepared their coup d'état. Therefore the justification for my deed is to me, as a citizen, fully given. The question is not, is the use of force justifiable, but, what right have I, as an individual, to use force. In my opinion when law is trodden to earth every citizen has the right to take the law into his own

hands. Since the government has placed itself outside the plane of legal redress every citizen is justified in calling it to account outside the plane of legal action; nay, further, he is not only justified but rather in duty bound to do so. Only a morally degraded nation, a nation devoid of all pride of citizenship could bear it. Is the use of force effective? This question it is somewhat more difficult to answer. Here, too, I must differ with my attorney who will say that it was not effective, that it was not in accord with the tactical ideas of the social democracy, that it was a deviation from the principles which I have represented. I will relieve him from answering this difficult question and will show why my deed, that is in accord with my natural feelings of right, was likewise effective under the existing extraordinary conditions. Before entering upon this point, however, let me say a word to the remark made by the state's attorney to the effect that I have lived so long in foreign countries, a fact that explains to him the whole deed, since I have lost the natural love of my native land. By this remark the state's attorney intimates that I am *an enemy of Austria*. The state's attorney mentions that I accused the Arbeiter Zeitung of patriotic excesses, that I attacked Dr. Renner for his Austrianism. I do not claim to be a patriot. I have never made this claim, neither before nor during the war, nor will you believe that I, in order to gain your sympathy, will throw my convictions aside and say, "I am a patriot." You will see later that an entirely different train of thought has guided me. I have heard the word patriot frequently used in Austria as an abuse and this is not surprising for patriotism in Austria is a peculiar thing. Long before the war Austrian patriotism was denounced not only by social democrats but even by bourgeois as something inferior. The intelligent bourgeoisie was everywhere not patriotic but nationalistic; I need only call your attention to the fact that those people of the Deutsche National Verband, who to-day are so indignant at the unpatriotic activity of the Tschechs at one time called us the "k. k. (imperial) social democracy," to express their deepest contempt. At that time, the German bourgeoisie openly declared that its ideal was not Austria but the national state, that it belonged to the state of its nationality.

But in the course of developments this war has evolved a *change of functions in the conception of Fatherland*.

In former times there were no fatherlands, but simply nations which had to be governed. Since the 70's the ideal of a rational state has come to life in the bourgeoisie and so Austria was looked upon as a remnant of olden times, that was expected sooner or later to fall apart into separate national entities. Now this idea of the fatherland has met a new conception, one that is no longer based upon nationalist lines, but upon questions of economic interests. The bourgeoisie has discovered its interest in the conservation of the economic field of Austria, an interest not only in Austria but in the foundation of a great Central European empire with the King of Prussia, of course, at its head, to whom Austria shall be subservient. Its ideal is no longer national independence but national rule. They are no longer satisfied with the class rule of the bourgeoisie over the proletariat, they aspire to establish a kingdom from Berlin to Bagdad, over which the German people, i. e., the German bourgeoisie, shall rule.

Since the beginning of the war the same national and economic policy has made itself felt in other nations. We have seen that among the Czechs, too, economic interests have come into a sharp conflict with national interests. But the same change of functions has taken place within the Social Democracy. When Bebel attacked Bismarck most violently it was not because he had created the German Imperial government in place of a German Republic, but because he had created a Prussian Germany in place of a Greater Germany, for which the German democracy of that time and with it the labor democracy had been fighting. Now we see in this war that the labor movement has deviated from this old national principle, that *the Social Democrats have adopted the imperialist mode of thought*, and are defending a program in which they do not defend the German national state—which would correspond with the national defense of the French and the Belgians, but the integrity of the German Empire, including even its colonies. There was a period in the war when Social-democrats sacrificed the international character of their move-

ment by openly supporting a policy of might and strategic securities. There have been Social-Democrats who have gone so far as to surrender themselves to the shameless policy of conquest of an imperialist bourgeoisie. These words of the prosecutor cannot harm me. I do not say that it is inspiring to be an Austrian. I consider it to be a misfortune that must be borne, a misfortune especially where a Stürgkh is at the head of the nation. The party has always maintained that Austria can exist only as a federation of national states; much energy was spent in the effort to spread recognition of the necessity of democracy in the nation. I cannot, of course, foretell what will become of this nation in this war. There are only two eventualities, and I have furthered neither of these eventualities, but have, rather, occupied a strictly neutral position toward Austria. *The Socialist cause*, I have always maintained, *is far greater than any temporary state formation*, and we must therefore refuse to compromise or bind its fate by an intimate identity with the fate of a nation, a mistake that was made in the past, I regret to say, by a number of my former friends. Little as I shall claim the title patriot, I nevertheless refuse to be termed anti-patriot, particularly when this is represented as the motive for my deed. To be sure, Austria plays a part in my motives, not the national, but the moral existence of Austria, the *Austrian spirit*.

Even when I was still a boy at high school, I always felt that the greatest, the most unforgivable sin, is the sin against the spirit, and that is a national sin in Austria. If you desire to comprehend my deed and all that has led to it, an understanding of my revolt and my opposition to this sin that has smothered every vestige of manliness in Austria must run, like a red line, through your consideration.

We are living in a state that was recaptured for Catholicism in a counter reformation of fire and sword. We are a state that has nothing but scorn for the convictions of men, a state that has never recognized the right of the individual to act according to his convictions. We are a state in which the slavish servility of all classes of the population have led to happenings that stand before me as a burning mask of shame upon our people.

It is the state's lack of principle that has bred in me a hatred, not against Austria as a country, but against Austria as an immoral entity, against its lying spirit. This Austrian spirit exists in all of its parts and in all of its nations; all are degraded by it, and in all it is being fostered by lawlessness. And if you wish to understand what brought me here, it was that this lying spirit has entered into my party, that Dr. Karl Renner, who is nothing less than the Lueger of the Social Democracy, has brought this readiness to betray one's convictions, this readiness to humbug into our movement. I have become ashamed of the odium that it reflects upon us.

In this whole crisis I have tried in vain to shake off the filth that has been spewed by these politicians on that which has always filled my whole being. I have attempted again and again to get away to place myself in opposition to those who have betrayed the spirit of my party. That is the real cause for my deed. It was a protest against this spirit that has entered our movement.

A political party must always act according to its own principles. We have seen the Austrian party acting according to German nationalistic principles, as represented by Leuthner, Pernerstorfer and Hartman, to whom the International is not the highest law, acting under the influence of people like Dr. Renner, whose highest ideals are embodied in the Austrian state. I have the highest respect for Pernerstorfer, who is an honest, open German-Austrian nationalist. I have no objections to his convictions, but I have nothing but contempt for a party that will tolerate a political opponent as its chairman. I can understand that Leuthner should stand on German nationalist ground, and will not respect him the less because of it. But that a Social-democratic party that, according to its program, is an international party, that the masses who profess allegiance to this international party should allow a man who is an open German nationalist and practically the mouthpiece of the foreign office in Berlin, to daily conduct the political columns of the Arbeiterzeitung, is quite another matter. The situation becomes worse when Dr. Renner concocts from all sorts of half arguments a demagogic argument. For only thus can we look upon the smuggling of his

own inner Austro-national convictions as real, international principles into the party. That the party has lost its honesty to itself, that is the thing that has brought me here.

Though the public prosecutor says that I stand completely isolated in the party, he must admit that all the contempt that I feel for the Austrian system is shared by a large majority of the Executive Committee that, as a matter of fact, only one man, Dr. Renner, justifies every form of arbitrary action. But Dr. Renner cannot be considered representative of the party. These words can mean, then, merely that I stand alone in my act, in my use of terrorist methods. From this the prosecutor concludes that I discussed the matter with no one else. There were good reasons why I should not do so, for I hesitated to burden my friends with a responsibility that, in the end, only one would have to bear, to make them, too, the victims of persecution.

* * *

It will not be easy to reconstruct the situation that has developed since last October, for in these seven months a whole epoch has transpired. And yet it will be easy, for in this time, in many respects, the world has approached my point of view. Many a thing that was looked upon as an utter absurdity at the time has meanwhile become common property. Notice the contempt with which the indictment speaks of the International. And yet the very internationalism that, according to the prosecutor, was wiped off the earth, has risen in the estimation of the whole world; it has become the hope of the Austrian government. The prosecutor accuses me of having associated with a group of revolutionists in Switzerland; yet no one to-day cultivates the society of these very revolutionists more zealously than Count Czernin, the Prime Minister. They are the revolutionists who to-day have a certain measure of influence in Russia, and upon whose influence Austrian peace hopes are built. I cannot say that this method of clinging to these people appeals to me any more than does the fact that our Austrian party members go to Stockholm, not because they have remained international, but because they, like the government Socialists of Germany, have been officially sent as commis voyageurs of the foreign office.

The Austrian minority, which was very small in this country where free speech was impossible, while it was very large in Germany, *this minority will not be represented in Stockholm*. But it will be spoken of in Stockholm—your sentence will accomplish that. And the *real greetings from Austria* to the Stockholm Conference will be *the death sentence that you will pass upon me*.

The prosecutor says that I called out "Down with Absolutism! We want peace!" This cry was not heard by a single witness. It is true, I desired to demonstrate for peace without indemnities, without annexations. But if I had said that seven months ago in this hall I would have been considered a fool, while to-day this demand is a strong factor in the negotiations of our own government. On the 23d of October there was not a sign of constitutional government to be seen in Austria. To-day we are approaching a reconvening of Parliament, and the necessity of Parliament is much more generally recognized than before. I demonstrated furthermore for *more revolutionary tactics*.

I have, all my life, been a revolutionist. I have seen in the daily political activity of the party a weapon for the revolution and have never regarded revolution as a catch phrase of political activity. Had I spoken of revolution seven months ago you would have laughed at the idea of a revolution in times of war. The counsel would have called for alienists and you would have thought him justified. But to-day, not only the Arbeiter-Zeitung, but the entire capitalist press rejoices over the Russian revolution. To be sure, these gentlemen have ever been enthusiastic for freedom in other countries. And to-day even the Arbeiter-Zeitung celebrates the revolution in Russia.

The public prosecutor speaks of the milieu from which I have come. I believe it will be difficult for you to understand this, for it is an entirely different world from the one in which you are accustomed to live. Allow me to illustrate. Originally it was believed that the earth was the center of the world and that the sun and the stars moved around it. When Copernicus said "This solid earth moves," he was at first believed to be insane. When this was impossible he was dragged before a court of inquisition, to which at that time was assigned the function of a military reserve court, and conducted a trial against him. To-day

we can say dispassionately that in a certain sense both were right, that it all depends upon whether one is standing on the earth or transfers oneself to the sun. Both views are logically possible, although logically incompatible. We can never argue from more than one point of view. You are accustomed to see upon this earth the trenches of national warfare, but I have fixed all my hopes, so long as I have been able to think politically, upon those fronts of the class struggle that also exist in the world. If one argues from the point of view of national warfare, one reaches entirely different conclusions, and will easily be inclined to say to me "You are a fool." But when you see that that is useless you would call me maligner, criminal, hireling of the enemy. But I and my friends in Germany are just as little the accomplices of the Entente as our friends in France, in Russia and Italy, who support the International there, would be willing to become the accomplices of the Central Powers. This line of argumentation comes from an entirely different world.

We Socialists have always looked upon the world from the point of view of the class struggle—until the war began—and have subordinated everything else in the whole world to this highest point of view. We have looked upon the International as supreme, and yet there are people who say we must change this point of view; in peace the struggle between classes, in war the struggle between nations.

This change of viewpoint, according to the momentary situation is exceedingly attractive to the Austrian. But even if both points of view were correct, that on the earth and that on the sun, both points of view are nevertheless not of equal value. For the point of view of Copernicus has given to natural science a basis for its entire development, while the point of view of national warfare, the struggle between two competing imperialist powers, leads the world to ruin, leads to hunger, misery, to the destruction of the human race, leads to no higher development of humanity because it aims to establish one group as the rulers of the world.

Whether England or Germany will rule the world, new wars will follow. But the point of view of the International stands higher, because upon it depends the future of the human race, the

idea of humanity. We have always said: In fighting the class struggle of the proletariat we are fighting the cause of humanity. As I speak of humanity and progress I recall to you the Congress in Basel, which strove to prevent the war, and which said: "The proletariat feels that at this moment it is the bearer of the future of the human race." This idea of humanity gives to the class struggle of the proletariat a higher value. Yet this idea of humanity was betrayed by the Social Patriots at the beginning of the war and cannot now be revived.

Before the first of May you may have read in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* about this idea of humanity. But what differentiates me from other Social-democrats is that I upheld, at all times, the ideals that they propagated before the war.

If you wish to understand my struggle you must know that it has been my highest aim to bring my party comrades back to this program. And you will understand what a cataclysm the action of the Social-democrats of Austria has been for me. We were in the midst of preparations for an International congress. We had planned to publish in the Vienna *Arbeiter-Zeitung* articles from delegates of all nations. And then suddenly there appeared in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* of August 5 an article with the title "The Day of the German Nations," an article which stood completely on acceptance of the war. "We will never forget this day of the 4th of August," thus began the article. But our party leaders to-day would like to forget this article, and have said to me again and again that we in Austria had no 4th of August. To this I have always answered: "We had no 4th of August in Austria—the Sturgkh government never even asked us—but we had something that is much worse, a 5th of August, the day on which that article was printed in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, that harmed us far beyond the border, particularly in Italy, to where this article had been telegraphed." Thus I came into constant conflict with my party and my friends.

Current Affairs

Peace With Victory

Our entry into the war has worked a truly remarkable change in our conceptions of peace and war—at least in those of us who "stand behind the President" and in the President himself.

On January 22 the President, speaking before the United States Senate, declared in the name of the American people that the peace which is to end the Great War must be a peace *without victory*. That speech thrilled the world, or at least America, with the nobility of its sentiment, hoping for the conclusion of this greatest of all wars without victors or vanquished and the grandeur of its conceptions of a future world peace resting not upon military power but the international organization of the world. At least so we were assured by those who stood behind the President and some others who went into ecstasies over it. The *New Republic*, Wilson's mouthpiece to the radicals, thus put the matter before its readers in an editorial article bearing the modestly-grandiloquent title "America Speaks":

"It must be a peace without victory. . . . So long that the people of the world believe that a lasting peace can be secured by dictation rather than by negotiation, the world will be where it always has been, at the mercy of a teetering balance of power. Peace has never been secured in Europe by that method and never will be. . . . Is it (the war) to go on till the Allies can dictate a peace to a prostrate enemy? Are they to take the position that no peace is possible unless they have won an absolute decision in the field? Perhaps, but in that case Europe is likely to be so embittered with its sacrifices that any larger plan of security must fail. If Europe fights on in the belief that security can be had only by victory, then the foundations of a league will be shattered. It is likely to be the old peace which never lasted because it put all its faith in military power and ignored international organization. Obviously we cannot prevent Europeans from following this theory. The matter is in their hands. But if they do follow it, if they set their hearts on that rather than

on a concert of power, America will not leave her isolation. *A world organized on the creed of victory is a world in which America must arm to the teeth and pursue a purely national policy.*"

But a few short months have elapsed since. But, by the grace of Heaven, what a transformation!

Almost before the ink was dry on the pen that wrote those words, America did leave her isolation without exacting from the Allies a promise that they would not set their heart on victory. Nay, America, speaking through the self-same lips, has assumed the role of chief spokesman for an eloquent defender of the "creed of victory" when one of the Allies, the New Russia, renounced it. In his message to the Russian people as well as in practically all his recent utterances President Wilson now insists on "Peace With Victory" in as vehement a manner as any "European" statesman has ever done. The contemplation of an embittered world which would necessarily follow such a peace, which would shatter the foundations of any possible world organization, evidently does not make the fore-taste of victory distasteful to us.

A cynically-minded person might jump to the conclusion that "Peace *without* Victory" was a "creed" particularly suited to neutrals, while "Peace *with* Victory" was the natural "creed" of belligerents, and that for all its "nobility of sentiment," etc., etc., the former is as selfish at bottom as the latter. Such a conclusion would be entirely erroneous, however. Free Russia has demonstrated that there is nothing wrong with the world as such, but only with the particular world order of which Mr. Wilson is so typical an exponent. Revolutionary Russia, although a belligerent, has dropped the victory creed at the very moment that Reactionary America has adopted it. It is not merely a question of neutrality or belligerency. The revolutionary working class stands for freedom and world organization whether it be neutral or belligerent, for it does not seek any selfish ends either in neutrality or belligerency. On the other hand, the capitalist class and the remnants of feudalism allied with it make war or keep out of it for purely selfish reasons and *they* therefore "naturally" change their slogans to suit their selfish ends.

B.

Lost—A Peace Demand

One of the interesting by-products of our entry into the war and the change of "sentiment" effected thereby, is the dropping out of one of our "Peace Terms"—the demand for the Freedom of the Seas. The present writer was never counted among the admirers of this particular "peace" demand, believing it to be a demand of the German Imperialists masquerading under the guise of a "Freedom." So he does not mourn its demise. But the disappearance of this "Freedom" from the roster of official "freedoms" at this time is very interesting. Particularly in view of the fact that the American nation is rather hard put to it nowadays for high sounding phrases with which to dot its official eloquence. It is therefore worth while noting the fact of its disappearance—even though it may be too early to hold a post-mortem examination into the causes of its death.

Ever since the present war began and the German Imperialists have formulated *their* peace terms which included the demand for the Freedom of the Seas, we of these free and blessed United States never missed a chance of expressing our deep sympathy with this demand. In his famous address to the Senate, on January 22, Mr. Wilson mentioned it as one of the principal items on his program for a world peace. Since then, however, the Freedom of the Seas has not been heard from again.

To the vulgar pro-German this is, of course, another proof that Wilson has "sold out" to Great Britain. To the vulgar pro-Ally it is a redemption from Mr. Wilson's former pro-Germanism.

We do not care to inquire into this intensely interesting and "patriotic" psychological problem, beyond suggesting that this particular German demand happened to coincide with what is usually termed "American national interests" and that Mr. Wilson's insistence of the Freedom of the Seas was part of the policy of national selfishness which he has pursued throughout the entire war. And this raises a question of some moment to those who are interested in the question of the future peace and the means whereby it will be attained: Is our demand for the Freedom of the Seas dead or has it merely been put to sleep? Have we dropped it for the present out of consideration for our Al-

lies, in order not to create any disharmony while the fighting is going on, only to be revived at the "green table" when terms of peace will be taken up in earnest, and when we may find ourselves on the side of our erstwhile "enemies" struggling with our erstwhile Allies; or have we actually and definitely abandoned it? And if so, what "compensation" have we been promised for it? Are the Unfree Seas of the future to be controlled by a Joint Board of the Allies, or are they to be parcelled out among the different Ally Powers as special Spheres of Influence? And in the latter event, what is to be our particular domain? Is it to be the Caribbean only or the Caribbean "and?"

B.

"Automobile Patriots"

Those who have any doubts as to the high moral purposes for which we entered the war and the high moral plane on which we intend to conduct it, the sense of "service to the community" which has taken hold of us with the declaration of war should watch the proceedings of Congress, where the representatives of the people vie with each other in offering their own and their constituents' special interests on the altar of national welfare. Such an exhibition of unselfishness and spirit of sacrifice as those proceedings present is well calculated to make any "slacker" blush. The reading of the Congressional Record in which are recorded the doings of our National Legislature from day to day ought therefore be made obligatory by law on all men and women (including children above twelve years of age) dwelling within our borders. There is, for instance, the debate on the War Tax Bill in the House of Representatives: Whose soul is so dead but that his heart would not swell at the reading of it?

The question under consideration was, what articles of manufacture should be taxed, and how much, in order to raise some of the funds at least which are necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. And the spirit of patriotism was indeed marvelous to behold. "The debate," reports a war enthusiast, "was more real than the serious but artificial discussion over the question of going to war." For this was *real business*. The representatives, representing the different "industries" involved,

all did their duty—each trying to reduce the tax on his industry—"the Detroit members assailing a tax on automobiles, the representatives from Hartford objecting to a tax on insurance, and so on," as the same reporter informs us. The climax of this exhibition of self-sacrifice came when Mr. Meeker, the delegate from the perfume industry, offered an amendment reducing the tax on *his* industry. It seems that Mr. Meeker, whose amendment was similar to that of the Detroiters, expected support from that quarter. But the automobile makers' delegates had lost all interest in the proceedings of the House as soon as their amendment was carried, and when Mr. Meeker's amendment came up they were nowhere to be seen. Whereupon the disappointed and wrathful Mr. Meeker exclaimed:

"What has become of that bunch of automobile patriots who were here a while ago?"

Patriots all.

B.

Mr. Wilson and Child Labor

These are times which try men's souls. And many a man's innermost soul has been exhibited to the gaze of the world, which had been neatly tucked away in a corner in peace times where no one could observe it. Among others, these stirring times have brought to the surface President Wilson's innermost soul on the subject of child labor. Mr. Wilson's public record on the subject is a rather variegated one—like his record on "labor" generally. His antecedents, his political associations, as well as his natural bent of mind predisposed him in favor of child slavery. His first act after his election to the Presidency and before he assumed office was to announce his opposition to any Federal law against this evil. At a luncheon given in his honor by the social workers, many of whom had undoubtedly voted for him in the belief that he was friendly to the cause so particularly near their heart, he grasped the occasion to announce that a Federal anti-child labor law would violate the sacred principle of "State's Rights" and was not therefore to be thought of.

Later on, under the stress of circumstances, confronted with a campaign for re-election in which the "labor" vote and the vote

of the social workers was expected to be decisive, Mr. Wilson changed his position and approved of a Federal anti-child labor law which, poor as it is, conceded the principle of Federal legislation against child labor—the very thing that Mr. Wilson had previously announced he was opposed to “on principle.” That this change of mind has helped Mr. Wilson to his second helping of the Presidency is beyond dispute. But this does not seem to weigh heavily on his conscience. No more than the fact that a vast number of people have voted for him because he was going to keep us out of war. Our President is an exceedingly high-minded person, and he does not permit such minor and purely “personal” considerations as the reasons why people voted for him for the Presidency swerve him from the path of duty when his “duty” seems to him clear.

And his duty with respect to child labor seems to him now clear. After all, his original position, favoring child labor, seems to him clearly to have been the right one, and his approval of the Federal anti-child labor law a mistake. So he hastens to make amends. In prescribing the rules for exemptions under the draft law he set down the age limit of children who are to be considered dependents as twelve. Children twelve years of age and over are not to be considered “dependents,” and their father will not be entitled to any exemption on their score. *Children of twelve, says Mr. Wilson, should be self-supporting. Their place is in the shop, mill or factory, and not at school where they must be supported by their parents.*

B.

The War and American Unionism

It cannot be too much emphasized that the attitude of American unionism toward the war, and of laborism generally in all the belligerent nations, is a direct consequence of their general program during the days of peace.

The policy of “harmony between labor and capital,” the animating principle of the American Federation of Labor and trades unionism generally, results from the belief that the interests of labor depend upon the interests of capital.

Where these two clash, it is assumed as being purely accidental and incidental; their identity of interests is still the dominant factor. As the struggles between groups in the capitalist class, often severe and bitter, do not destroy their fundamental identity of interests, so the struggle between labor and capital, according to the union theory, does not altar their identity of interests.

Accordingly, the unions are careful that their struggles should in no way menace capitalism itself, or cripple the competitive power of their employers. Often has a union been cajoled into submission by the employer’s plea that its actions were endangering his power to compete successfully with a rival, and that the union was driving him out of business. The employer must be fought, but his power must not be menaced.

On the field of international action, this principle expresses itself in backing up the capitalist class in its projects of expansion and in its wars. If our capitalism is weakened by a defeat, reason the unions, we shall suffer through unemployment, higher hours and lower wages; and, therefore, they fight for the interests of their exploiters in the mistaken belief that they are thereby promoting their own interests. This narrow nationalism is manifest during the days of peace in the A. F. of L.’s stand against immigration, and also in the virtual exclusion of foreign, unskilled workers from membership in the unions.

It was therefore inevitable that American unionism should back up the government in the war. The A. F. of L. officially, and various of its affiliated unions, are active in the work of mobilizing our military and industrial forces. Samuel Gompers is an active member of the Council of National Defense; the unions are facilitating the work of recruiting, etc., and many members of the unions are pestiferous members of the Home Guard.

The “civil peace” concluded by the A. F. of L. with the ruling class is a corollary of the “civil peace” that prevailed before the war. Because of this fact, the government and the union officials expect no strikes and no troubles to impede industrial

mobilization. But the masters are uneasy, nevertheless. In spite of the fact that conscription provides the government with power to suppress strikes, the capitalist class is trying to make assurance doubly sure by means of no-strike legislation, plentifully proposed in Congress. The American government has learned from the mistakes of England, and is not contemplating any measures that would provoke labor—that is, measures against those petty privileges of unionism which unionism considers more vital than its fundamental general interests.

Samuel Gompers considered that he was playing a very shrewd game. His assumption was that, having offered the unions' services to the government, the unions would be in an excellent strategic position to extort concessions. But the government was shrewder. In a Washington dispatch to the *New York Evening Post*, David Lawrence very aptly summarizes the situation:

"England went through a trying experience. Strikes and industrial friction threatened to weaken the productive power of the nation at a moment when an agonizing call for munitions came out from the battlefields of France. There had been no industrial preparedness. England organized her munitions industry without giving attention to terms of agreements with the labor groups. Premier Lloyd George came to the rescue, and as a consequence of the lack of preparation, *England was compelled to go much further toward a recognition of labor's contention in the war than was really necessary.* To-day the labor groups have a representation in the government, and *the labor organizations are virtually a part of the government,* with the manufacturer much less potent than before. *No such step is to be undertaken here, because there is no real necessity for it, and very likely never will be.*"

Unionism and laborism in Great Britain used the opportunity of war to accomplish the great purpose of laborism everywhere—securing recognition as a caste in the governing system of the nation. That is equally the purpose of American unionism, and it has failed. The failure is all the more deplorable and disastrous, as its preceding actions still remain

as the policy of organized labor and thereby weaken the possibility of aggressive action.

However, war brings its own consequences and its own stimulus to action. The conditions may become ripe for the offensive, and the unions in self-defense may be compelled to act.

The war emphasizes the fact that the revolutionary Socialist must seriously assume the task of re-organizing the unions. Everywhere unionism failed even more miserably than Socialism. Without an aggressive union movement, there can be no aggressive Socialist Party and no aggressive action on a large scale.

And one very effective means of driving the existing unions forward to more aggressive action is to work for the unionizing of the unorganized and the unskilled. The unskilled are ripe for mass action, they are the pariahs of the existing order of things, they are the typical product of modern industry. Our action to awaken the unskilled will have decidedly revolutionary consequences.

We cannot expect much from organized labor, as such. It is simply working for a place in the governing system of the nation; it is dominated largely by skilled workers that profit from imperialism, and will act accordingly. Our one immediate hope is in the unskilled, and that portion of organized labor that is being menaced by the new industrial efficiency. The whole revolutionary movement must develop a new synthesis of organization, action and purposes, in accord with the new conditions of imperialism.

F.

The Russian Revolution and the War

Nothing that has happened since the commencement of the Great War has so deeply affected it as the Russian Revolution. To many the war has become an entirely different thing from what it was before. It is no secret that to many hundreds of

thousands and even millions of men, both within Russia and outside of it, the Revolution meant a change of allegiance as far as the war is concerned, a change of the "side" on which they ranged themselves in their sympathies, hopes and efforts. Whether or not this change of sentiment will affect a sufficient number of people to outweigh, from a military point of view, the disorganization of the Russian army which must necessarily follow such a tremendous internal upheaval, it is too early to judge. That depends largely upon the moral effect of the Revolution on the Poles of Russian Poland, the different Slav nationalities of the Austrian Empire and the working class of Germany and our information with respect to what is going on in these regions of the world is so meagre as not to permit of any intelligent estimate.

But there are some effects of the Russian Revolution upon the World Conflict which are quite certain, and these are of the most tremendous importance. One of these is the passing of the dream of a separate peace between Russia and Germany. Ever since the great retreat of the Russian armies from Poland in the summer of 1915 this possibility has been staring the Allies in the face, and the possibility was turning more and more into a probability as time was passing on, until it finally became almost a certainty. It is now known that negotiations for such a peace were well under way ever since last September, and that had the Revolution not intervened the Czar of Russia and the Emperor of Germany would now probably be openly avowing the friendship which they have always had for each other in secret, and "their" Empires would be allies instead of enemies. This possibility has now been done away with forever. The nightmare of an alliance between the evil forces of Russia and Germany to terrorize the civilized world shall trouble us no more. And even a separate peace between the two "countries" is beyond the range of probabilities so long as the evil powers which have been exorcised by the Revolution in Russia still remain dominant in Germany.

It is interesting in this connection to note the fact that the anti-war faction of the Social Democratic Party of Russia led

by Axelrod and Martoff took occasion in its first manifesto after the Revolution to brand as a lie and spurn as an insult the imputation that it favored a separate peace.

In speaking of the French and English "government Socialists," this manifesto mentions, as the acme of their misdeeds, that they "do not even shrink from the insinuation that the Russian Social Democracy, *after the manner of the Romanoff clique, is considering a separate peace with Germany.*"

But even more important than the impossibility of an alliance between Czar and Emperor and the improbability of a separate peace between Free Russia and Autocratic Germany is the effect the Russian Revolution is bound to have on the *kind* of peace in which the World War will terminate. An imperialistic peace is impossible as long as the Russian Revolution maintains itself in its present condition, with the proletariat and the revolutionary peasants in the ascendancy. And here we must note a distinction between the two stages of the Russian Revolution, in their relation to the two most important effects of the Revolution upon the war: The dream of a separate peace, dreamed by the combined reactionary forces of Russia and Germany, dissolved immediately upon the passing away of the "Romanoff clique." But the assurance of a just and lasting, non-imperialistic peace did not come until the revolutionary proletariat obtained control of the situation. Outwardly the second stage of the Russian Revolution was signaled by the retirement of Miljukoff and the entry of six Social Democrats, among them Tzeretelli and Skobelev, into the Provisional Government. And the first act of the new Provisional Government was the definite announcement of the now famous "No Annexations; No Indemnities" policy.

That this policy is going to win is now almost a certainty. Unless the hold which the really revolutionary forces now have upon the situation in Russia should be broken by a counter-revolution this policy must win, as Revolutionary Russia is not in a mood to temporize or compromise. And it is extremely doubtful whether the forces of Imperialism in the camps of the Allies would dare to even attempt such a move. The indications are that since the signal failure of Mr. Wilson's attempt to lecture

and bulldoze the Russian Revolution, the ruling powers of the Entente have decided to bow to the inevitable. This is the meaning of that truly remarkable passage in the speech of that most astute of Ally "statesmen," Mr. Lloyd George, at Glasgow on June 29, in which he declared that,

"Although these distractions (i. e., the Russian Revolution) had the effect of postponing complete victory, they made victory more sure than ever, more complete than ever and, *what is more important, they made surer than ever the quality of victory.*"

We doubt very much whether Mr. Lloyd George really likes the *quality* of victory which the Russian Revolution insures, but he and his friends have evidently made up their mind to accept it, and so he is ready to make a virtue of necessity. The Russian Revolution has made sure that this war will terminate in the right kind of peace.

B.

On the Road to the New International

The Swiss Social Democracy held an extraordinary convention in Berne on June 9 and 10 for the sole purpose of defining the attitude of the party on the military question. This was accomplished in a resolution, which for brevity and clearness of principle compares favorably with our own St. Louis declaration.

But not only the form and content of this resolution make it superior to that adopted by the Socialist Party; its origin and conception were equally admirable. For the Swiss convention was not the result of a sudden inspiration of the National Executive Committee, nor did the Swiss comrades decide upon this important question without the necessary preparation and discussion. Our comrades in the little republic proceeded more systematically. The last regular party convention appointed a committee of fifteen for the investigation of the military question in all its phases and instructed this commission to publish its findings in the party press at least six months before the calling of an extraordinary party convention. These instructions were duly carried out. The majority of the committee consisted of strict anti-militarists who denied the principle of father-

land defense; the minority were social-patriots. Both sides published their reports, accompanied by detailed arguments, in the party papers, and in so doing gave the foundation for a party discussion that was as thorough as it was objective. Canton and district party conventions were held everywhere for the instruction of delegates to the national convention in which the question was thoroughly ventilated.

The decision of the party convention at Berne is, therefore, not accidental, but truly expresses the intelligent conviction of the party.

The majority resolution, adopted by 222 against 77 votes, contains the following program:

'To conduct the fundamental struggle against militarism, chauvinism and nationalism, as well as against the influence of the bourgeois classes upon the children and young people of the working class, with increased intensity by means of: (a) Systematic education of the working class concerning the significance and purpose of militarism; (b) Fundamental opposition by the party and its elected representatives to all demands, budgets and laws which serve the purpose of upholding and strengthening militarism or threaten to create international complications; (c) Organization of the emphatic and united resistance of the working class against intervention of the country in any war. The party shall determine the *means* that shall be employed to increase in intensity the class struggle and opposition to war (demonstrations, strikes and refusal to render military service) in accordance with the strength of the labor movement and with the international situation; (d) Organized financial support of those comrades who refuse obedience when required as soldiers to act in opposition to the interests of the working class.

"This decision shall supercede all previous decisions of the party that may be in opposition to it."

The following extract from the report of the minority, aiming to pledge the party to the principle of national defense, will illustrate the spirit of the defeated resolution.

"The Social Democratic Party recognizes the necessity of military protection of the border of our neutral country by our

militia and proclaims its fundamental adhesion to the principle of national defense in case of attack from without, for the duration of the war and after the war, until the coming International shall have laid out the lines for a general fight against militarism, binding upon all parties and organizations affiliated with it."

It is interesting to note that the happenings of the St. Louis Convention were repeated at Berne. The radicals demanded an addition to the majority resolution, emphatically repudiating the idea of national defense. In Berne, as in St. Louis, the majority insisted that the decided opposition to *all* wars includes the repudiation of national defense. And yet in both countries the Left Wing demanded—and in both cases justly so—the insertion of a particular clause against national defense. Justly, because long years of experience have proven that our party leaders and theoreticians are as clever in the art of "interpretation" as the best "statesman."

The decision of the convention regarding the sending of delegates to the Stockholm Conference was equally unmistakable. It was decided by an overwhelming majority to send delegates to Stockholm only if its predecessor, the Zimmerwald Conference, should expressly endorse it. The action of Kienthal, the second conference of the Zimmerwald parties, received an almost unanimous endorsement. The resolution on the International says:

"The convention reaffirms its solidarity with the Internationalists of all nations who have striven to undermine the power of their governments; organizing and pursuing the class struggle, stimulating revolutions, to bring about the end of war and prepare the way for a Socialist peace.

"The Convention looks upon Socialists who support the war measures of their governments as renegades and calls upon the workers of all countries to act in accordance with the spirit of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal Conferences.

"The Convention supports the criticism and condemnation of the International Socialist Bureau expressed by the Kienthal Conference. Before an International of Labor can be firmly re-established, the policy of toleration toward those who have be-

trayed the class struggle and, in so doing, the decisions of the Second International, must be abandoned, the policies of the Social-Imperialists and Social-Patriots emphatically condemned, and the principles of the class struggle proclaimed. The future International must be founded upon the recognition of common principles and the determination for concerted action."

The Social-Democracy of Switzerland, a neutral nation, does not hesitate to condemn the Social-Patriotic parties nor is it afraid to call a traitor—traitor. It refuses to be as "gentleman-like, well mannered and judicious" as our Party and says what must be said: that no revolutionary International can be obtained with Social-Imperialists and Social-Patriots, at least not an International that will breast the storm of coming wars, that will tear down the whole superstructure of capitalist society.

And in this, too, our American Socialists may learn from their Swiss comrades.

L.

Friedrich Adler

Like the flare of a rocket against the black sky of night, the shot that Friedrich Adler fired upon the Austrian Premier Stuerghk illuminated the disruption of the Austrian Party. For the deed of Friedrich Adler, and this was recognized at the time by all who knew Austrian conditions, was as much of a cry of protest against his own party, as against the Austria that Stuerghk personified. That he, whose agonized and indignant protest found its final expression in this act is the son of the builder and architect of the Austrian Party, makes that the great tragedy of the International.

Friedrich Adler lived and worked in Switzerland until shortly before the war broke out. He belonged to the radical wing of the Social-Democracy, and thus stood, from the very beginning of the war, in opposition to his father and to the Austrian Party. But this conflict antedated the war. Long before the outbreak, father and son had developed along widely divergent paths of thought and action. In Victor Adler, who was even more influential in the Austrian movement than Bebel in that of Germany, the political stagnation of the Double Monarchy had produced

a spirit of pessimism that manifested itself in a policy of narrow, middle class opportunism. The small incidental work of reform became, under his leadership, the centre of gravity of the whole Socialist movement; compromises were made the A B C of politics. He and with him the Party gave in order to take, and thus inevitably lost all largeness of will and of action. Friedrich Adler, Fritz as he was called, is a natural scientist, and has made a name for himself in this capacity. And as a scientist it was natural that he should oppose this small minded point of view, the "shopkeepers" policy of his Party. He recognized the dangers that threatened the whole movement from the pursuit of such tactics, and feared that they would ultimately estrange the working class from Socialism to deliver it in the hands of a social-reformist bourgeois party.

On the other hand, his quiet studious nature revolted against the idea of loud propaganda, and made it impossible for him to place himself, as Karl Liebknecht had done in Germany, at the head of an energetic and determined opposition. He remained the secretary of the Party even after he realized that he was in opposition to every step taken by its leaders. He voiced his criticism in the "Kampf," the splendid organ of the Austrian Social-Democracy of which he was the editor, calling to his comrades again and again in spite of their complete mental alienation, to reconsider their actions.

He there characterized this political conflict as follows:

"It is not a scholastic conflict that has brought forth this deep diversity. A real political conflict has grown up within the Socialist movement. On the one side are the social-imperialists who, consciously or unconsciously, have capitulated to the ruling classes, sacrificing their own policies in order to lend unquestioning support to the policies of the government. On the other side are the minorities who, at the present time, conceive it to be their highest duty to direct the proletariat to a realization of the necessity of using its independent political power, of the necessity of following out the only policy conformable with the policy of the International."

These sentences show that Friedrich Adler did not, like Liebknecht, look upon the differences between the two socialist groups

in terms of revolutionary possibilities created by the war. For him it was sufficient that the working class should refuse to bear the responsibility for the great world catastrophe and throw it back upon the shoulders of imperialist capitalism. Like Renner, whom he holds chiefly responsible for the pitiful condition of the Party, he opposed revolutionary "illusions." In this respect, he was in full accord with his father. He did not believe in the possibility of large uprisings of the laboring masses in times of war. It was inconceivable to him that labor should possess the power to put an end to the terrible slaughter.

His fatalistic point of view was shared by his friends Dr. Dannenberg and Dr. Hilferding, the leading spirits of the Austrian opposition, making any real organization of the active Socialist opposition in Austria impossible.

As time went by, however, Friedrich Adler realized the futility of his efforts to reach the leaders of the movement through the "Kampf" or in their executive meetings. He, therefore, founded a weekly propaganda paper called "Das Volk" in July, 1916, in order to appeal to the rank and file of the movement. Meanwhile conditions in Austria were going from bad to worse. Every attempt to speak freely and openly was brutally suppressed. The prisons were crowded. There was no parliament through which one might have spoken indirectly to the masses, meetings could not be held. In short, it had become impossible to reach the party membership by means of any of the regular channels, while the leaders were quietly living their bureaucratic, social-patriotic life in calm placidity.

The hopelessness of the existing affairs seems to have worked a change in Fritz Adler. On the day preceding his attack upon Stuergh he called upon the Executive Committee to arrange mass demonstrations urging that the Party must act or bear the responsibility for the whole Austrian misery in the eyes of the people. But the gentlemen who for two years had supported the government, if not directly and actively at least indirectly by their silence, could not at this late hour, become its accusers. The Executive voted down Friedrich Adler's motions and contented itself with a mild remonstrance to the Prime Minister.

The plan to arouse the masses by sacrificing himself had long ago matured within him. Now, when all other means had failed, he made his last desperate attempt. There was no hatred for his victim in the act. On the contrary, he admired the strong personality of this representative of reactionary brutal Austrian bureaucracy. The deed was done simply as a last appeal to the masses, as an outcry of protest against the government and against the Party. In Karl Liebknecht, whose whole conception of political working class life translated revolutionary sentiment into organized mass action, this development would have been impossible. . . .

Soon afterward the Austrian Parliament was convoked. But the system of Stuergh lives on, and with it the system of the great triumvirate Victor Adler, Renner and Pernerstorfer.

Whether the noble sacrifice of Friedrich Adler, one of the best men of the whole International, has borne fruit—and in what measure—the European censorship makes it impossible to judge.

But Adler's speech before the court, which appears in this issue for the first time in the English language, bares to us a great and beautiful human soul.

L.

The Socialist Party and Stockholm

We are living in serious times. The government is advancing its heavy artillery upon the Socialist movement, refuses passports to its delegates to the Stockholm Conference, suppresses the Socialist press and indicates in a hundred other ways that, in its eyes, the Socialist Party is little more than a part of the German war-machine.

It is only natural that, under such circumstances, an increased feeling of solidarity to the party should make itself strongly felt within our ranks. Every one of us, no matter how decidedly we may differ on questions of principle and tactics, feels the need of a firmer union in order to face the enemy with a solid, impenetrable phalanx.

But, necessary as solidarity to the party is in this hour of danger, it would be as great a sin against the welfare of the party

should we on that account neglect to give to the affairs and occurrences within the movement the necessary attention. Distrust is one of the greatest of democratic virtues; serious and honest criticism are indispensable conditions for the healthy growth of a mass movement. The details surrounding the appointment of the American delegation to Stockholm emphasize the necessity of such criticism at all times.

It was a cable sent by our National Executive Committee to the Socialist parties of the European nations, urging them to arrange for an international conference as soon as possible, that gave the first impetus to the calling of the Stockholm conference. That was in December, 1916. In April, 1917, the National Emergency Convention was held in St. Louis, but nothing in the order of business prepared and submitted by the Executive Committee provided for the election of delegates or the discussion of peace terms or instructions to delegates of the international conference that was sure to come. It may be argued that the slogan "No Annexations, No Indemnities" fully covers all instructions that might have been given. And yet this is not so. Already a number of influential comrades in the Socialist International strongly advocate the insertion of the word "punitive" before "indemnities." What does "punitive" mean? Comrade Hillquit in a letter to the *Times* opposed the payment of an indemnity to Belgium. The delegates of the "Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany," the revolutionary "minority" party, on the other hand, have published a peace program in which they demand an indemnity for Belgium, in our opinion an absolutely justifiable demand. Our delegates should express, not their own personal opinions, but those of the American Socialist Party. To determine where the party stands, a thorough discussion of the whole question in the St. Louis Convention was necessary.

But not only was every opportunity of ascertaining the views of the party membership on the question of peace terms carefully avoided, the membership of the party was not even called upon for its opinion when the time came for the election of delegates as to who should represent it at the conference.

Our national constitution expressly provides that the delegates to international congresses should be elected by referendum vote. Since the motion for the calling of such a conference emanated from our own party, our executive was in a position to call for nominations as early as January and to proceed at once with the election had it cared to conduct party business on a democratic basis. It did nothing of the sort. Only when the Dutch committee of the International Socialist Bureau sent out invitations did they proceed to the election of delegates—by the five members of the National Executive Committee.

By that time it was of course too late to initiate a referendum. But even then there was a more democratic way than that actually followed. The National Committee should have been called upon to conduct the election. It comes with poor grace from our Executive Committee of four men—Spargo did not take part in the election—to elect two of their own members. The members of the National Committee could have conducted the election by wire almost as quickly, and we would have been spared this painful incident.

But that is not the whole story. Not only the election procedure, but the election itself, belongs to the most incomprehensible and regrettable mistakes that have been committed by our leaders in recent party history.

Hillquit as delegate was to be expected. He would have been chosen in any referendum. The choice of Algernon Lee, whose views are, on the whole, those of the centre of the party, is perhaps understandable. But the appointment of Victor L. Berger passes all understanding. To be sure, Comrade Berger, personally one of the most likeable figures in our party bureaucracy and often honest to the point of bluntness, believed it to be a matter of course that he should go to Europe. On the day before the Executive Committee was to meet he announced in an interview in the *Milwaukee Leader*, which interviews its editor-in-chief whenever an opportunity offers itself, that he was quite certain that Hillquit and Berger would be sent to Stockholm, since the membership had elected them on a previous occasion as delegates to an international congress. He referred, of course,

to the Vienna congress, that was to be held in the summer of 1914, to which not only Hillquit and Berger, but Ameringer and London had been delegated. What Berger forgot, however, was that three years of war had passed, showing many a Socialist as he really is and not as he appeared to be. A Social-Imperialist like Berger cannot conceivably represent the party in its present complexion. Were the circumstances different our Milwaukee comrade would stand to-day with Spargo, Russell and Ghent, with the group to which as a matter of fact he belongs.

It should be noted that Berger did not seem to know of Lee's candidacy on the eve of his trip to Chicago. Later developments revealed that Berger and Lee were delegated by the Executive Committee, while Hillquit was to go in his capacity as international secretary and member of the International Socialist Bureau. But even before the question had been settled in our own executive committee, Troelstra, the well-known Dutch Socialist, in an interview cabled to the Associated Press, declared that America would send Hillquit and probably Algernon Lee to the Stockholm Conference. Comrade Troelstra proved to be a pretty good guesser.

The New York State Executive Committee has called on the National Office to initiate a referendum in accordance with the constitution of the party to elect the delegates to the international conference called by the Russian Workmen's and Soldiers' Council. The City Convention of Greater New York did likewise and five weeks have passed and nothing seems to have been done.

Will the Executive Committee wait once more until it is too late and—an *emergency* exists?

L.

Spargo & Co.

In spite of Spargo's insistence during the weeks following the Emergency Convention that the adoption of the majority resolution would make it impossible for him to work together with the Socialist Party in the future, his resignation came as a surprise. A member of the party at the time it was founded, he has been so completely identified with it, has occupied such a prominent place in our American movement, that one can hardly con-

ceive of Spargo in another party. In this respect, Spargo's loss will mean to the party much more than that of Mr. and Mrs. Stokes, Charles Edward Russell, W. J. Ghent and William English Walling put together. But there was another factor that seemed to justify us in thinking that Spargo would be content, in the end, having declared his minority point of view to remain within the ranks of our movement; his intimate personal relations with the leading men of the S. P., with whose views on matters of principle as well as of tactics he has usually been in full accord.

It is clear, therefore, that the differences arising out of the war question alone could not have led him to separate himself from the party. They were the immediate but not the fundamental reason. Spargo made this difference the occasion of his resignation only because he felt convinced that the Socialist Party could be replaced by another party that would express his ideas and purposes more effectively and more successfully. In short, his social-patriotic indignation, honest as it undoubtedly is, was after all only a subterfuge to cover up a change of heart that had long since taken place within him. Spargo had lost all mental affiliation with the S. P. long before American intervention offered him the welcome opportunity to act according to the dictates of his utmost desires.

The delegates to the St. Louis Convention will know what we mean. On every question that arose, Spargo stood on the extreme right. He defended, on all occasions, a policy of determined opportunism. He favored fusion with other organizations, demanded "more liberal tactics" against "party orthodoxy" and "mental stagnation."

The pitiful remnants of the National Progressive Party that convened in a hall adjoining ours in Planters Hotel, St. Louis, held such a strong fascination for him that Spargo was hardly more than an occasional guest at the convention of his own party, after the day when the Progressives opened their meeting and had to be sent for, time and again, when his presence was desired. The whole spirit of the Socialist Party not its attitude on the war question alone had become objectionable to John Spargo.

He has expressed this, with the admirable honesty that has always been characteristic of him in all of his recently published statements:

"Conditions," says Spargo in his letter of resignation from the Party, "are ripe for a re-orientation of the Social-Democratic forces of the country upon a sound program of democratic public ownership which will appeal to all who are willing to aid in establishing an industrial democracy."

Thus "public ownership" is to take the place of Socialism; nor is he willing to restrict himself, in his appeal to the working class. An authorized interview recently published in the Philadelphia *Public Ledger* makes his meaning still more clear:

"Expressing Socialism in terms of American life and experience, this new party . . . will not cling to formulae and let the substance of Socialist hope pass by unnoticed. It will make its appeal, not to one class alone, but to all men and women of good will and social vision. It will be a party of the toilers, not because it sets them apart and panders to them, but because its principles carried into effect must bring their emancipation."

This can, of course, mean but one thing: that the new party will do away with the narrow-minded and un-American principle of the class struggle, once and for all times. It will adapt itself to all conceivable kinds of reform and freak movements and take them under its sheltering wings. The farmers with their Non-partisan League will be received with open arms. Roosevelt will, and we say this advisedly, find in the new party a reincarnation of his National Progressive Party that will give expression to his ideas and ideals far more faithfully, perhaps, than his own original organization. And Sam Gompers, too, may enter into more or less intimate relations with the Spargo conglomeration—so far at least, as his lawfully wedded spouse, the Wilson administration, will permit, should the radical elements in the A. F. of L. become too importunate in their demands. His recent growing intimacy with Charles Edward Russell and Wm. English Walling are, viewed in this light, not entirely devoid of significance.

But even the support of the Gompers machine would not alter the certainty that the firm Spargo, Russell & Co. will take its place in the long list of American reform parties that are constantly springing up out of our fertile American soil, giving place, after a short period of luxuriant bloom, to the next in order. It can never become the permanent political expression, the representative of the American proletariat.

We have but one regret: that this split has come in the midst of the war, making a clear cut division practically impossible. Owing to the war situation, many, who would otherwise have joined Spargo & Co., will remain in the Socialist Party, although their sympathies in general incline them toward the new organization because for one reason or another they cannot adopt its war policy. Members who in St. Louis stood with Spargo in all questions but in that of the war will remain with us, though they belong to him and his following. The re-orientation that the Spargo group proposes to undertake will only take place, all along the line, after the war is over and peace has been declared.

L.

The Attitude of Lenin

The American press has malignantly and persistently slandered the Russian Revolutionary democracy, but perhaps no other factor has been more slandered than our comrade N. Lenin and the group he represents. Lenin has been accused of being in favor of a separate peace with Germany; he has been stigmatized as an anarchist; even his private life has been foully maligned. And, strange to say, the New York *Call* has itself indulged in slanders against Lenin. A day or two after the recent elections in Petrograd the *Call* characterized Lenin and his group as "Anarchistic," and generally indulged in the cheap sneers that are the *Call's* editorial characteristic. This performance is all the more discreditable in that no authentic statement of Lenin's position had up to that time been received in this country. It was a judgment based on prejudice, not on fact.

The first authentic statement of Lenin's views that has ap-

peared in the American press was printed in *The New Internationalist* of June 30, consisting of a lecture on "The Russian Revolution" that Lenin delivered in Switzerland shortly before his departure for Russia. One passage in this lecture completely annihilates the charge of "Anarchist" hurled at Lenin:

"As to the *revolutionary organization* and its task, the conquest of the power of the State and militarism: From the praxis of the French Commune of 1871, Marx shows that 'the working class cannot simply take over the governmental machinery as built by the bourgeoisie, and use this machinery for its own purposes.' The proletariat must break down this machinery. And this has been either concealed or denied by the opportunists. But it is the most valuable lesson of the Paris Commune of 1871 and the Revolution in Russia of 1905.

"The difference between us and the anarchists is, that we admit the State is a necessity in the development of our Revolution. The difference with the opportunists and the Kautsky disciples is that we claim we do not need the Bourgeois State machinery as completed in the 'democratic' bourgeois republics, but the *direct power of armed and organized workers*. Such is the State we need. Such was the character of the Commune of 1871 and of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers of 1905 and 1917. On this basis we build."

Lenin's programme was to initiate the second period of the Revolution, "from the revolt against the Czarism into the revolt against the Bourgeoisie, against the Imperialistic war." His programme is the programme of the "Central Committee of the S. D. P." in Russia: Democratic Republic; confiscation of the landed estates of the nobility in favor of the peasants; immediate preparations for peace negotiations: "Peace negotiations should not be carried on by and with Bourgeois governments, but with the proletariat in each of the warring countries." He is absolutely opposed to the Social-Patriot Kerensky, and he differs from Tscheidse and his group on the policy of immediate tactics:

"Tscheidse and his friends are drifting to and fro, which is reflected in the opinions of the *Times* and the *Temps*: alternately

they are praised and blamed by these papers. If refusing to join the second provisional Government, if the latter declared the war an Imperialistic war, Tscheidse was in harmony with the proletarian policy. But the fact that Tscheidse participated in the first provisional Government (the Duma Committee), his demand that a sufficient number of representatives of the Russian workers participate in this Government (which would mean that Internationalists would have to participate in the government of the Imperialistic war), and his further demand, together with Skobelev, that this Imperialistic Government initiate peace negotiations (instead of showing the workers that the bourgeoisie is tied hand and foot to the interests of financial capital and without any possibility of denouncing Imperialism), then Tscheidse and his friends follow the worst bourgeois policy detrimental to the interests of the Revolution."

In his course of action, Lenin seems to be what one might call a revolutionary opportunist. He is not blind to the impracticability of establishing Socialism, but he wishes to use the present situation for revolutionary international action. In a letter to the Swiss comrades after his departure for Russia, reprinted in *The New International* of July 23, Lenin says:

"Historic conditions have made the Russians, perhaps *for a short period*, the leaders of the revolutionary world proletariat, but Socialism cannot now prevail in Russia. We can expect only an agrarian revolution, which will help to create more favorable conditions for further development of the proletarian forces and may result in measures for the control of production and distribution.

"The main result of the present Revolution will have to be the *creation of more favorable conditions for further revolutionary development and to influence the more highly-developed European countries into action.*"

The striking feature of this programme is that it is revolutionary without being hysterical or utopian. It cleaves to the fundamental facts of the Russian situation and of revolutionary Socialism.

The programme of peace of Lenin and his group is as follows:

"1. The Council of Workmen and Soldiers declares that as a revolutionary government, it does not recognize any treaty of Czarism or the bourgeoisie.

"2. It publishes immediately these treaties of exploitation.

"3. It proposes at once and publicly a truce to all participants in the war.

"4. Peace terms are: liberation of *all colonies* and of all oppressed peoples.

"5. A declaration of distrust in all bourgeois governments; appeal to the working class to overthrow those governments.

"6. The war debts of the bourgeoisie to be paid exclusively by the capitalists.

"By means of such a policy, the majority of the workers and small peasants can be won for the Social Democracy.

"The confiscation of feudal land property would be the result.

"Socialism would not yet be realized.

"But still, we would be willing to carry on a revolutionary war to enforce these peace terms. In such a revolutionary war we could expect the assistance of the revolutionary proletariat all over the world."

The course of the Russian Revolution has followed remarkably the program of the Lenin group. This was its program in April; what it is to-day, we do not know; but we may be sure it is not what the bourgeois press or the *Call* says it is.

F.

Documents for Future Socialist History

Majority Resolution on War and Militarism

**Adopted by Referendum Vote with overwhelming Majority against
Minority Resolution A**

The Socialist Party of the United States in the present grave crisis, solemnly reaffirms its allegiance to the principle of internationalism and working class solidarity the world over, and proclaims its unalterable opposition to the war just declared by the government of the United States.

Modern wars as a rule have been caused by the commercial and financial rivalry and intrigues of the capitalist interests in the different countries. Whether they have been frankly waged as wars of aggression or have been hypocritically represented as wars of "defense," they have always been made by the classes and fought by the masses. Wars bring wealth and power to the ruling classes, and suffering, death and demoralization to the workers.

They breed a sinister spirit of passion, unreason, race hatred and false patriotism. They obscure the struggles of the workers for life, liberty and social justice. They tend to sever the vital bonds of solidarity between them and their brothers in other countries, to destroy their organizations and to curtail their civic and political rights and liberties.

The Socialist Party of the United States is unalterably opposed to the system of exploitation and class rule which is upheld and strengthened by military power and sham national patriotism. We, therefore, call upon the workers of all countries to refuse support to their governments in their wars. The wars of the contending national groups of capitalists are not the concern of the workers. The only struggle which would justify the workers in taking up arms is the great struggle of the working class of the world to free itself from economic exploitation and political oppression, *and we particularly warn the workers against the snare and delusion of defensive warfare.* As against the false doctrine of national patriotism we uphold the ideal of international working class solidarity. In support of capitalism, we will not willingly give a single life or a single dollar; in support of the struggle of the workers for freedom we pledge our all.

The mad orgy of death and destruction which is now convulsing unfortunate Europe was caused by the conflict of capitalist interests in the European countries.

In each of these countries, the workers were oppressed and exploited. They produced enormous wealth but the bulk of it was withheld from

them by the owners of the industries. The workers were thus deprived of the means to repurchase the wealth, which they themselves had created.

The capitalist class of each country was forced to look for foreign markets to dispose of the accumulated "surplus" wealth. The huge profits made by the capitalists could no longer be profitably reinvested in their own countries, hence, they were driven to look for foreign fields of investment. The geographical boundaries of each modern capitalist country thus became too narrow for the industrial and commercial operations of its capitalist class.

The efforts of the capitalists of all leading nations were therefore centered upon the domination of the world markets. Imperialism became the dominant note in the politics of Europe. The acquisition of colonial possessions and the extension of spheres of commercial and political influence became the object of diplomatic intrigues and the cause of constant clashes between nations.

The acute competition between the capitalist powers of the earth, their jealousies and distrusts of one another and the fear of the rising power of the working class forced each of them to arm to the teeth. This led to the mad rivalry of armament, which, years before the outbreak of the present war had turned the leading countries of Europe into armed camps with standing armies of many millions, drilled and equipped for war in times of "peace."

Capitalism, imperialism and militarism had thus laid the foundation of an inevitable general conflict in Europe. The ghastly war in Europe was not caused by an accidental event, nor by the policy or institutions of any single nation. It was the logical outcome of the competitive capitalist system.

The six million men of all countries and races who have been ruthlessly slain in the first thirty months of this war, the millions of others who have been crippled and maimed, the vast treasures of wealth that have been destroyed, the untold misery and sufferings of Europe, have not been sacrifices exacted in a struggle for principles or ideals, but wanton offerings upon the altar of private profit.

The forces of capitalism which have led to the war in Europe are even more hideously transparent in the war recently provoked by the ruling class of this country.

When Belgium was invaded, the Government enjoined upon the people of this country the duty of remaining neutral, thus clearly demonstrating that the "dictates of humanity," and the fate of small nations and of democratic institutions were matters that did not concern it. But when our enormous war traffic was seriously threatened, our government calls upon us to rally to the "defense of democracy and civilization."

Our entrance into the European war was instigated by the predatory capitalists in the United States who boast of the enormous profit of seven billion dollars from the manufacture and sale of munitions and war supplies and from the exportation of American foodstuffs and other necessities. They are also deeply interested in the continuance of war and the success of the allied arms through their huge loans to the governments of the allied powers and through their commercial ties. It is the same interests which strive for imperialistic domination of the Western Hemisphere.

The war of the United States against Germany cannot be justified even on the plea that it is a war in defense of American rights or American "honor." Ruthless as the unrestricted submarine war policy of the German government was and is, it is not an invasion of the rights of the American people as such, but only an interference with the opportunity of certain groups of American capitalists to coin cold profits, out of the blood and sufferings of our fellow men in the warring countries of Europe.

It is not a war against the militarist regime of the Central Powers. Militarism can never be abolished by militarism.

It is not a war to advance the cause of democracy in Europe. Democracy can never be imposed upon any country by a foreign power by force of arms.

It is cant and hypocrisy to say that the war is not directed against the German people, but against the Imperial Government of Germany. If we send an armed force to the battlefields of Europe, its cannon will mow down the masses of the German people and not the Imperial German Government.

Our entrance into the European conflict at this time will serve only to multiply the horrors of the war, to increase the toll of death and destruction and to prolong the fiendish slaughter. It will bring death, suffering and destitution to the people of the United States and particularly to the working class. It will give the powers of reaction in this country the pretext for an attempt to throttle our rights and to crush our democratic institutions, and to fasten upon his country a permanent militarism.

The working class of the United States has no quarrel with the working class of Germany or of any other country. The people of the United States have no quarrel with the people of Germany or of any other country. The American people did not want and do not want this war. They have not been consulted about the war and have had no part in declaring war. They have been plunged into this war by the trickery and treachery of the ruling class of the country through its representatives in the National Administration and National Congress, its demagogic

agitators, its subsidized press, and other servile instruments of public expression.

We brand the declaration of war by our government as a crime against the people of the United States and against the nations of the world.

In all modern history there has been no war more unjustifiable than the war in which we are about to engage.

No greater dishonor has ever been forced upon a people than that which the capitalist class is forcing upon this nation against its will.

In harmony with these principles, the Socialist Party emphatically rejects the proposal that in time of war the workers should suspend their struggle for better conditions. On the contrary, the acute situation created by war calls for an even more vigorous prosecution of the class struggle, and we recommend to the workers and pledge ourselves to the following course of action:

1. Continuous, active, and public opposition to the war, through demonstrations, mass petitions, and all other means within our power.

2. Unyielding opposition to all proposed legislations for military or industrial conscription. Should such conscription be forced upon the people, we pledge ourselves to continuous efforts for the repeal of such laws and to the support of all mass movements in opposition to conscription. *We pledge ourselves to oppose with all our strength any attempt to raise money for payment of war expense by taxing the necessities of life or issuing bonds which will put the burden upon future generations. We demand that the capitalist class, which is responsible for the war, pay its cost. Let those who kindled the fire furnish the fuel.*

3. Vigorous resistance to all reactionary measures, such as censorship of press and mails, restriction of the rights of free speech, assemblage, and organization, or compulsory arbitration and limitation of the right to strike.

4. Consistent propaganda against military training and militaristic teaching in the public schools.

5. Extension of the campaign of education among the workers to organize them into strong, class conscious, and closely unified political and industrial organizations, to enable them by concerted and harmonious mass action to shorten this war and to establish lasting peace.

6. Widespread educational propaganda to enlighten the masses as to the true relation between capitalism and war and to rouse and organize them for action, not only against present war evils, but for the prevention of future wars and for the destruction of the causes of war.

7. To protect the masses of the American people from the pressing danger of starvation which the war in Europe has brought upon them, and which the entry of the United States has already accentuated, we demand—

(a) The restriction of food exports so long as the present shortage continues, the fixing of maximum prices, and whatever measures may be necessary to prevent the food speculators from holding back the supplies now in their hands;

(b) The socialization *and democratic management* of the great industries concerned with the production, transportation, storage, and the marketing of food and other necessities of life;

(c) The socialization *and democratic management* of all (agricultural) land *and other natural resources* (which is) now held out of use for monopolistic or speculative profit.

These measures are presented as means of protecting the workers against the evil results of the present war. The danger of recurrence of war will exist as long as the capitalist system of industry remains in existence. The end of war will come with the establishment of socialized industry and industrial democracy the world over. The Socialist Party calls upon all the workers to join it in its struggle to reach this goal, and thus bring into the world a new society in which peace, fraternity and human brotherhood will be the dominant ideals.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that the convention instruct our elected representatives in Congress, in the State Legislatures, and in local bodies, to vote against all proposed appropriations or loans for military, naval, and other war purposes.

2. We recommend that this convention instruct the National Executive Committee to extend and improve the propaganda among women, because they as housewives and as mothers are now particularly ready to accept our message.

3. We recommend that the convention instruct the National Executive Committee to initiate an organized movement of Socialists, organized workers, and other anti-war forces for concerted action along the lines of our program.

KATE RICHARDS O'HARE, *Chairman.*

VICTOR L. BERGER	PATRICK QUINLAN
JOB HARRIMAN	C. E. RUTHENBERG
MORRIS HILLQUIT	MAYNARD SHIPLEY
DAN HOGAN	GEO. SPIESS, JR.
FRANK MIDNEY	ALGERNON LEE, <i>Secretary.</i>

Minority Resolution on War and Militarism

Defeated by overwhelming vote of the Party Membership.

A

"Congress has declared that a state of war exists between this nation and Germany. War between the two nations is a fact.

"We opposed the entrance of this republic into the war, but we failed. The political and economic organizations of the working class were not strong enough to do more than protest.

"Having failed to prevent the war by our agitation, we can only recognize it as a fact and try to force upon the government, through pressure of public opinion, a constructive program.

"Our aim now must be to minimize the suffering and misery which the war will bring to our own people, to protect our rights and liberties against reactionary encroachments, and to promote an early peace upon a democratic basis, advantageous to the international working class.

"Furthermore, we must seize the opportunity presented by war conditions to advance our democratic collectivism. Every one of the other belligerent nations has discovered through the war that capitalism is inherently inefficient. To secure a maximum of efficiency, whether for military or civil needs, it has been found necessary to abandon the essential principle of capitalist industry. The warring nations have had to give up the organization and operation of industry and the primary economic functions for profit and to adopt the Socialist principle of production for use. Thus the war has demonstrated the superior efficiency of collective organization and operation of industry.

"Guided by this experience, we would so ^{reorganize} recognize our economic system as to secure for our permanent domestic needs the greatest possible results from the proper utilization of our national resources.

"In furtherance of these aims, we propose the following war program:

"1. We demand that the Socialist Party shall establish communication with the Socialists within the enemy nations, to the end that peace may be secured upon democratic terms at the earliest possible moment.

"2. We demand that there be no interference with freedom of speech, freedom of the press and freedom of assemblies.

"3. We demand that dealings between the government and the workers in all of the industries and services taken over and operated by the government shall be conducted through their organization, with due regard for the right of organization of those not yet organized.

"4. We demand that conscription, if it come at all, shall begin with wealth. All annual incomes in excess of \$5,000 should be taken by the government and used to pay the current expenses of the war. If it is just to conscript a human being, it is just to conscript wealth. Money is not as sacred as human life.

"5. We demand that there shall be no conscription of men until the American people shall have been given the right to vote upon it. Under the British empire the people of Australia were permitted to decide by ballot whether they should be conscripted. We demand for the American people the same right.

"6. We demand that the government seize, and operate for the benefit of the whole people, the great industries concerned with production, transportation, storage and marketing of the food and other necessities of the people.

"7. We demand that the government seize all suitable vacant land, and have the same cultivated for the purpose of furnishing food supplies for the national use.

"8. We demand that the government take over and operate all land and water transportation facilities, all water powers and irrigation plants, mines, forests and oil fields, and all industrial monopolies, and that this be done at once, before the nation shall suffer calamity from the failure of their capitalist direction and management under war pressure."

"Emil Seidel, Garrett T. Thorn, Job Harriman, J. Mahlon Barnes, George H. Goebel, Anna A. Maley, O. M. Wassing, Elda B. Conley, A. F. Stewart, S. Z. V. Young, G. J. Braun, Mary Raoul Millis, C. F. Bowman, Harold Metcalf, W. P. Collins, Frederick Krafft, Valentine Bausch, Murray E. King, W. H. Conley, W. B. Smith, J. C. Duke, John Spargo, Cameron H. King, A. P. Jones, Robert Buech, Cora Davenport, W. R. Gaylord, Florence Wattles, Walter J. Milliard, J. T. Cumbie, G. C. Porter, E. F. Atwood, J. R. Catton, C. E. Russell, Ingmar M. Iverson, W. P. Butler, L. C. Thompson, C. P. Neilson, Milo C. Jones, E. L. Moore, A. G. Sechrist, Leonard Johnson, U. G. Tuttle, J. W. Houchin, S. G. Stair, S. W. Semple, J. A. Lewis, Leo Krzkcki, J. R. Barnette, Clay Fulks, Fred L. Fairchild, Walter Thomas Mills, Ida A. Belooof, C. C. Loomis."

Minority Report on War

Not submitted to referendum vote.

Minority report of the committee on war and militarism, submitted by Louis B. Boudin, signed by Boudin, Kate Sädler and Walter P. Dillon.

In this grave hour in the history of this country, we, the representatives of the Socialist Party of the United States, in special convention assembled, deem it our duty to place before the membership of the Socialist Party and the working class of America a succinct statement of our position on the questions involved, and to outline a program of action which we believe to be in the interest of workers of this country to follow.

At the very outset we desire to declare our unalterable opposition to all wars declared and prosecuted by any ruling class, no matter what the

ostensible purpose. We believe that the interests of the great toiling masses cannot possibly be served by any such war. And we particularly warn the workers against the snare and delusion of so-called defensive wars and wars for the alleged furtherance of democracy.

Modern wars are not, except under very exceptional circumstances, waged for the purpose of subjugating free peoples who have achieved such a degree of civilization as to have a modern working class as one of its component elements, and none of the great civilized nations are in danger of being subjugated by any other nation. There can, therefore, be no question, at least in so far as the great civilized nations are concerned, of any nation needing defense against actual subjugation. The defense needed—even in the case of a genuine defensive war—is almost always of some interest of the capitalist class, usually a trade interest or the right and privilege to subjugate or exploit some backward race or country.

In the few and exceptional cases where the danger of actual subjugation may exist—the case of the few small civilized nations occupying a seacoast coveted by their stronger neighbors—the right of self-defense would be unavailing, and they would never dream of asserting it against one of the great powers but for the help which they may expect from small nations, mere pawns in the game of world politics played by the big modern nations, a game in which the working class has nothing to gain and considerable to lose whenever it attempts to play it in partnership with its ruling class.

This does not mean that we are indifferent to the independence of small nations, or to the right of all nations, great or small, to live their own lives in their own way, and to work out their own destinies. On the contrary, we feel very strongly on the subject. Socialism can only be brought about by the efforts of free men, and must be based on the fullest liberty of all races and nations.

But we believe and assert that the only security for the independence of small nations lies in the ethical concepts and economic interests of the revolutionary proletariat.

The same is true of the progress of democracy. We are not indifferent to the fate of democracy. On the contrary, we believe that the Socialist Movement is particularly charged with the duty of preserving and extending all democratic institutions. But we also know that the revolutionary working class is the only social force either willing or capable of doing it.

We deny that any of the nations engaged in this war fight for democracy, or that the ends of democracy in any way will be served by either side to the conflict winning a complete victory. This war is primarily the result of the economic forces which have brought about the imperialistic era in which we live, and of the general reactionary trend which is one of the most essential characteristics of this era.

Modern imperialism is a world wide phenomenon, although it may be more pronounced in one country than in another. Similarly, the reactionary trend which accompanies it is as broad as our "civilization." for the time being, although in some countries it may assume more obnoxious forms than in some others. The only hope of democracy, therefore, lies in those revolutionary elements of each country which are already to fight imperialism in all its manifestations and wherever found.

The entry of the United States into this world wide war does not in any way change the situation. On the contrary, it proves conclusively that no capitalist government, whether monarchial or republican in form, can be depended upon to fight for democracy, or, indeed, for anything but sordid capitalist interests.

When the great war opened with one of the most lawless and ruthless acts in history, the invasion of Belgium by Germany—an act not merely abhorrent in itself, but striking at the very roots of those international arrangements for which we have contended so long and which must lie at the foundation of any international order that will put an end to all wars, the president solemnly enjoined upon the people of this country the duty of remaining neutral, not only in deed but also in thought.

By that declaration President Wilson officially and authoritatively announced to the people of this country, as well as to the world at large, that the existence of international law, the dictates of humanity, the fate of small peoples, and of democratic institutions, were matters that do not concern "us."

And they did not concern "us" so long as "our" trade was not interfered with. But, when the enormous export trade which "we" have enjoyed during the past two and one-half years was seriously threatened, our rulers suddenly recalled the solemn duty resting upon "us" to come to the defense of democracy, civilization and international law.

We therefore brand as a piece of monumental hypocrisy President Wilson's statement to the Congress that in this war "we" wish to serve no selfish ends, and we emphatically declare that our participation in the great world war can serve nothing but the selfish and sordid ends of the capitalists of this country. We enter this war for the sole purpose of upholding the basic law of capitalistic society, that every consideration of humanity must be made subservient to the greed of the capitalist class, concretely represented in this instance by the sacred right of American capitalists to fatten upon the misfortunes of war-stricken Europe. And in defense of this sacred right the capitalists of this country are ready to sacrifice the lives and limbs of its women.

We must also remember that the war will have the incidental effect of fastening upon the people of this country a permanent military establish-

ment of a character quite unknown in its previous history, aside from the military tyranny which will prevail while it lasts, all to the great detriment of the democratic institutions of this country and the moral and material interests of its toiling masses.

The working men and women of this country will pay for this war while it lasts in blood and suffering, only to inherit when it is past a world in which their struggle for existence will be harder and the road to their final emancipation much more difficult.

All of these reasons lead us to the conclusion that we must oppose this war with all the powers at our command.

To the Socialists of the Belligerent Countries

(Adopted by the National Convention, St. Louis)

"Comrades—Now, that the people of the United States have been forced by their ruling class into this world cataclysm, as you have heretofore been by your own rulers, we, the Socialists of the United States, feel it our right and duty to address you on this most momentous subject.

"We wish to say at the outset that the workers of this country have no enmity towards the workers of Germany, and that we, the Socialists of the United States, feel that the great affliction now shared in common by the workers of the United States and Germany should, and we hope that it will, strengthen that consciousness of a common brotherhood between them which will ultimately bring about peace between these two countries, and a general world peace with it.

"We also wish to convey to you our firm determination, and we pledge ourselves to do our duty and make the sacrifice which may be necessary, to force our masters to conclude a speedy peace, and we hope and expect that, whatever may have been the policies which some of you may have followed in the past, you will henceforth adopt vigorous measures to force your masters to the same course of action.

"We therefore call upon you to join hands with us so that all of us may use all the means at our disposal in a common effort to bring about a general peace which will be just and lasting, without indem-

nities and without any forcible annexations of territory by any of the belligerents, whether avowed or sought to be hidden by some less offensive term that may be invented for the purpose; so that no nation may be deprived of any part of its liberty or made in any way dependent, politically or economically, upon any other nation; and that no change of territory shall take place without the consent of its inhabitants, freely and unmistakably expressed.

"Down with war! Down with misery and hunger and mass murder, must be the war cry of the proletariat. Long live peace! Long live the brotherhood of nations and the solidarity of the international proletariat!"