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Socialists and the European War.

When looking upon the ghastly drama enacted upon the threshold of the twentieth century, with Europe as the stage, and the most cultured and powerful nations as the actors, every individual who has the elementary faculties of thought and feeling, will ponder and shudder. It is a historical spectacle, a tragedy, performed by the participants with all the force and vitality born of a deep-rooted conviction; it is realism enveloped in a holocaust symbolizing all elements of destruction. The Roman invasion of Gaul, the Frankish conquests and the pillages of the Huns, gigantic historical episodes though they were, are pygmea and insignificant when compared with the struggle now raging on the Continent.

However, every struggle in society has a certain cause, a certain material or economic basis, for its propelling or motive force. This is one of the pillars upon which the structure of Socialist philosophy rests, and it has been very fittingly called the key with which to unlock the door to an understanding of the seemingly impenetrable mysteries of history. When a student or truth-seeker applies this theory of the materialist conception of history diligently in the analysis of current events, then he generally comes to entirely different conclusions and draws more coherent deductions than does the patriotic sentimentalist or the human newspaper depository. And, I maintain that if the citizens of the world, specifically the so-called Socialists, were better trained in this mode of thought, such wildcat theories and phantastic schemes circulating about this war would be nigh impossible. Also the cheap platitudinous patriotism parading about, and the seemingly humanitarian protest against militarism, not navyism, mind you, indulged in by the Allies and their sympathizers, would quickly be penetrated by the Socialist economist and relegated into oblivion.

BASIC SOCIALIST PHILOSOPHY.

However, we are not going to discuss the limitations of Socialist education to-night, but are assembled here for the purpose of discussing the Socialists' relation to the present European war. In order to do this without any bias or national hatred, we must avail ourselves of the Socialist philosophy and proceed therefrom. Therefore, anybody who
looks upon the situation from other premises than the Socialist, will land with minute certainty into the mire of sentimentality, jingoism, or capitalist patriotism.

The Socialist philosophy is predicated upon the august principles of international solidarity, and this international solidarity flows from an identity of interests encircling the wage slaves throughout the world. This international community of interests of the exploited is the basis for a united effort of the workers of the world against the capitalists of the world, irrespective of creed, colour, or race. It was this conception of the international enslavement of the workers that prompted the master of Socialist letters, Karl Marx, to send that symbolic slogan, "Workers of the world, unite, etc.," into the world about half a century ago, and it was this conception that prompted the delegates at the Industrialists' convention in Chicago, nine years ago, to organize the constructive supplement to this conception: the I.W.W.

In the economic sense the interests of the capitalists in relation to each other may not be and are not identical. The war drastically confirmed this statement. This diversity of interests is principally created by the competition in the international market. Many Socialists, and I was one of them, formerly thought that the centralization of industries and the concentration of wealth had reached a far greater international character than actually was the case.

This war, as stated before, adequately illustrates that the national phase of capitalist production is the dominant one. However, the workers are not held back by any ties of national interests, and are, consequently, at liberty to organize on a far more effective basis than the capitalists, who are in the majority of cases kept apart by conflicting economic interests. It matters not to the worker whether he is exploited by an English, French, or German capitalist. The fact remains: he is exploited and condemned, under the present system to eternal wage slavery.

For the worker, boundary lines are illusions, for wherever his footsteps may lead him, the exploiter awaits him. "But," the culture-preserving Socialist will say, "is it not better to be exploited under German culture than under Russian barbarism?" In answer to this latest piece of sophisticated reasoning, which, by the way, was born to shield the acts of certain Socialists, I will say that conditions create culture and barbarism respectively, and that if the presumptively barbarous Russians were to enter Germany and run German industries—which is not at all probable—those Russians would have to adapt themselves to the prevailing conditions, and would eventually be permeated by the superior German culture. The contact of Russia with Germany can only re-
dound to the ultimate benefit of the former, just as the in­fluence of Gallic and Roman culture moulded the development of the ferocious, victorious Franks.

WORKERS' CAUSE INTERNATIONAL.

So let us underscore the fact that the cause of the ex­ploited is an international one, and that the conduct of the workers must therefore be one of international fellowship. This conduct or attitude is dictated to them by their class position and is also (to state in passing) in conformity with a standard of culture truly noble and typically illustrative of the larger aspects of Socialism. The economic situation of the capitalists, as stated before, does not allow such an inter­national fraternization of their class, and even at times their interests compel them to wage a war of extermination against each other. These wars are purely commercial wars, or wars of capitalists for capitalist interests. The workers who stand the brunt of these conflicts are acting against their interests, and fight because they are not conscious of their class position.

These are not new principles I am enunciating to-night. They have been expounded before, and may be classified as stale. I am compelled to voice them again, because I firmly believe that there is a vast difference between absorbing a principle and acting in accord with that principle. The con­duct of an organization should square with its principles, is a maxim taught to me years ago by a Socialist Labor Party man who is probably here to-night. Any organisation that ad­vocates certain theories, that can support these theories by scientific data, and whose tactics or conduct do not square with these theories, is either committing an act of betrayal, or an act of cowardice.

Now, as a resume of my introductory remarks, I desire to emphasize first, that every social struggle has its economic basis; second, that our discussion to-night must be pivoted upon the appreciation of this fact; third, that our interests as workers are international; fourth, that the interests of the capitalists are primarily national in scope and therefore give rise to conflicts and wars; fifth, that the worker has no interest in these struggles for capitalist supremacy; and sixth, that the workers' organisation must either act in accord with these principles or stand convicted as being opposed to the true welfare of the proletariat.

And now, having placed ourselves upon a firm foundation, we will proceed with the analysis of the material so plenti­fully produced by past and current events, and so repulsive to the finer senses of the true humanitarian and Socialist.
II.

RECENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

For a clear understanding of the question at issue a somewhat brief sketch of the recent economic development in the principal countries involved is indispensable. This sketch, though very crude, may be conducive toward enabling the auditors to make their own deductions. A comparison with those of the lecturer will furnish interesting material for discussion. As stated before, the lecturer does not desire to go deep into history, and, therefore, no pretense of thoroughness is made.

Prior to the Franco-Prussian war, England and France were the dominant countries in Europe, economically speaking. Primarily England was then considered the classical country of capitalism. If I am not mistaken, it was our eminent leader, Marx, who quoted England as the mirror in which the future of other countries was reflected. And it was industrial England that was to be an example worthy of emulation to Germany. After the unification of German states an era of industrial enterprise known as the Gruenderjahre (founders' years) set in. The same geographical limits that compelled Great Britain to adopt a policy of expansion, also force Germany into the fray for foreign markets and trade. German industry grew with leaps and bounds after the war with France, and well were the symbolic words, "In unity there is strength," illustrated by the enormous growth of German industrial resources.

However, Germany in comparison to other countries, particularly England, France, Russia, and the United States, is the most densely populated, and has no outlet for its overpopulation—at least no GERMAN colonies of any importance, wherein German thrift and capital could be employed. The few colonies in the possession of Germany, East Africa, Togo, Kamerun, and South-west Africa, are nigh bare of natural resources, and therefore worthless to the enterprising capitalists. It may be added as an illustration that up to the present date the German colonies have continued to yield a deficit to the German Government. In what a crowded condition the Germans are may be surmised from a table compiled by Dr. Albert Wirth, a noted writer on economics and sociology in Germany. Dr. Wirth claims that the statistics available show that for every Englishman there is 1/8 km.; for every American, 1/11 km.; for every Russian, 1/23 km.; and for every German but 1/80 km.

It was the geographical limitations that developed the imperialistic spirit in England, and it is the same condition that is forcing Germany into the same adventurous path. 

cite the presence of this factor, because I believe the same plays a role in this historical drama, although, by the strange circumstances of events, only a minor one.

**GERMAN GROWTH AT ENGLAND'S EXPENSE.**

From the standpoint of imperialistic enterprise England and Russia are the chief rivals of Germany. And, as I stated before, after the Franco-Prussian war Germany grew socially and industrially with leaps and bounds. This healthy industrial growth, however, took place at the expense of a rather matured rival—England. In other words, since the past forty years, roughly speaking, Germany has been menacing British foreign trade all over the globe. To substantiate my assertion let me cite you figures covering the period of 1890-1900. In this period, which, by the way, was an epoch unparalleled in the economic development of the world, English and French trade received a setback at the expense of German and American trade. I have compiled a table to illustrate this assertion, and the figures reveal that the exports of manufactured commodities for the stated period were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>51.81%</td>
<td>41.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>24.20%</td>
<td>27.13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>6.17%</td>
<td>16.03%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>17.82%</td>
<td>15.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I have stated, the period 1890-1900 is known as an era of rapid development and rather abnormal industrial growth in the economic history of the world. To give you an idea of the gigantic forward stride made in this short lapse of time, I quote herewith the figures compiled by Edmond Thery, an eminent French statistician, which were published in his work entitled "Historie Economique 1890-1900." These figures will serve as a picture illustrating effectively the changes that took place in the industrial life of the world during the period under review:

**Communication and Transportation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroads, km.</td>
<td>607,925</td>
<td>790,570</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraphs, km.</td>
<td>1,306,262</td>
<td>1,660,576</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant Marine, tons</td>
<td>8,365,000</td>
<td>13,848,000</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the Production of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal (thous. tons)</td>
<td>491,101</td>
<td>768,636</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>27,777</td>
<td>40,970</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the face of this wonderful growth, this period of vigorous economic progress, is it not a gloomy spectacle for particularly the English capitalists to behold that even during this period, when the export trade of the world was increased by twenty-eight per cent., their export of manufactured commodities suffered a decline. And for England this was not a setback in the relative sense, but an absolute loss. Expressed in specific figures the loss of British export trade from 1890-1900 was 86 million francs or about 17½ million dollars. And to forestall any misunderstanding, I want to emphasize the fact that the figures just quoted were not prepared to meet the situation for any set of patriots who have an axe to grind, but are figures published about ten years ago. And, taking nationality into consideration, they are the figures of a Frenchman.

ECONOMIC CAUSE OF THE WAR.

Let me reiterate, in the face of these drastic English reverses, German manufacturing and trading enterprises grew healthily. To show another instance of the marked growth in German trade it may be cited that in 1860 the German trade with the world amounted to 29 milliard marks, and in 1897 to 73 milliard marks. Another illustration clearly showing the growth of German foreign trade may be gleaned from the following quotation, taken from a pamphlet published under the auspices of a string of prominent German statesmen, professors, writers, and capitalists. The name of the pamphlet is "Truth about Germany, Facts about the War," and on the last page we are informed:

One thing should be clearly understood on the shores of the five oceans, that the cause of this most terrible war does not emanate from the dark Balkans, or from a Russian military group, but from envy and hate which healthy, young, and striving Germany has aroused in her older rivals; not because this or that demand was made by one cabinet and refused by another, but because it was believed there was finally an opportunity to destroy the hated opponent who threatened to put the older Western European powers in the shade, and for this reason England and France put their strength into the service of criminal and brutal Servia. The following statistics
will, perhaps, throw some light on the development of
the foreign trade of the principal countries from 1870
to 1913 (in billions of marks):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>9,180</td>
<td>23,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>12,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4,240</td>
<td>20,440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these forty-three years, which have been decisive in
the development of international economy, England,
France, and Russia have not been able even to increase
their foreign trade three times, WHILE GERMANY AND
THE UNITED STATES HAVE INCREASED THEIRS
FIVE TIMES. The trade of Germany and the United
States has increased from 7.6 to 38 billion marks.

Whether we agree with the deductions made by these de­
defenders of Germany or not, matters little. One fact pro­
trudes flagrantiy out of the figures presented, namely, that
the competitors against Germany are slowly but surely losing
ground, that the slow conquest of the international market
has been accomplished at the cost of the decline of English
trade principally.

And we must take into consideration that this wonderful
development of German industry and trade has been accom­
plished without any aggressive imperialist policy. In recent
years England has gobbled up the Boer republics, Italy prac­
tised imperialism in Tripoli, and Russia went into Manchuria.
What would the result have been had Germany been as aggres­
sive in her colonial policy as England was in her earlier and
even later years? However, until this war, Germany ex­
panded her influence along peaceful lines. But the cry for
more land and a bigger Germany has been heard more power­
fully in late years, and emanates from causes that are purely
capitalistic. The Morocco incident three years ago may be
cited as an attempt by Germany to practise imperialism. The
German Government had been influenced by certain mining
interests to send a cruiser to Agadir, as an opening act of
hostilities, and it was only the unanimous protest of the
Socialists and Radicals that saved Germany then from a war
with the French Republic. The Morocco affair, however,
serves as a signpost in leading up to an explanation of Ger­
many's aggressive attitude in the present war.

GERMAN-RUSSIAN ECONOMIC CONFLICT.

her economic development Germany has not only
with English and French trade, but is also becoming
ze to Russia in the East.
For the past century Russia's chief ambition has been to extend her boundaries to Constantinople, and thereby secure control of a strategic point that ensured her economic reign over the Balkans, Asia Minor, Persia, and Asia. The control of the Dardanelles would also secure for Russia a direct route for her Black Sea trade with the Mediterranean, and as a base for imperialistic ambitions; while innumerable prospects were opened thereby for the Muscovites. In 1823 their first attempt seemed about to be crowned with success, but the Crimean war again removed Russia a long way from her aim. Then in July, 1875, the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina rebelled against Turkish oppression. Servia and Montenegro assisted the insurgents. Here Russia, as kinsman of all Slavonic people, protector of Greek Christians, and last but not least aspirant for the control of the Dardanelles, steps in and champions the cause of the subjected provinces. England answers this move by strengthening her grip in the East, through the purchase of the Suez Canal from the Khedive of Egypt. England also refused to join with Russia, Germany, Austria, and France in forcefully compelling the Ottoman Empire to carry out certain reforms in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The powers demanded certain guarantees from the Sultan. Having, however, at this stage been assured of England's support the Sultan refused to give these assurances. Here we notice that so-called culture does not amount to a pinch of snuff when economic interests are at stake. England aided Turkey, reactionary and barbarous Turkey, because behind the demands of the powers stood the Czar's ambition to possess Constantinople. This deadlock gave birth to the Russo-Turkish war in which the Turks were worsted and appealed to England for help. The Russians were in possession of Adrianople, and the Englishmen were ready to interfere for the sake of the Sultan and—Constantinople. They appeared with a powerful fleet at the Dardanelles and threatened to shoot upon the Russians, if they would attempt to erect the cross upon the Hagia Sophia. Here we note militarism-despising England, the England that just loves to call the Germans the modern Huns, whose papers fairly teem with so-called German atrocities, upholding a government that tolerated the atrocities known in history as the Bulgarian massacre (1876), just because she feared the consequences of Russia's control of Constantinople.

THE BALKAN EMBROGLIO.

At the Berlin Congress (1878) Servia, Montenegro and Rumania received their independence, and Bosnia and Herze-
govina were put under the protectorate of Austria. Russia was greatly embittered against Germany for aiding Austria in getting virtual control over these provinces, because she saw in this protectorate or annexation an advance of Austria in the direction of a control of the Balkans. At this stage we also note the first attempt to form alliances—Russia and France, and Germany and Austria. And since the formation of the so-called buffer states in the Balkans trouble has been brewing galore. The last Balkan war did not serve to clear the atmosphere and left the situation unaltered, with the powers interpreting their interests through their buffer-state representatives.

Russia has for the past fifty years developed her commerce enormously in Asia Minor, Persia and Manchuria. Russia, assisted by French and Belgian capital, has practically monopolized all the transportation industries in Persia and Manchuria. And had it not been for German competition, she in conjunction with her French and English allies, would have monopolized Turkey. So, however, Germany has for the past twenty years entered strenuously into the race for Oriental trade and investment. The building of the Anatolian Railway by the Deutsche Bank put the French and English roads into the hands of a receiver. And so the struggle in the West is transferred to the East, where again the different national capitalist interests conflict with each other. To aggravate the already tense relation between the competitors, in late years German products and financial enterprise have been particularly favoured by the Turkish government. These conditions led to very friendly relations between the governments of the two countries. Even the military equipments were ordered in Germany, and the Turkish troops were instructed by German officers.

In concluding this short historical sketch, let us review the chief factors which may be considered the driving forces in the past social struggles and the terrific war raging on the continent to-day.

We are now aware that in the battle for the world's market the German capitalists have been victorious all along the line. We know that the development of German foreign trade was made at the expense of English and French trade. We also are aware that in a peaceful competitive race Germany would continue to be victorious. Here we may also locate the cause of the race indulged in by the powers in upbuilding their respective armies and navies. Further, we notice that the competition menacing England and France in the West is also becoming dangerous to the amalgamated French, English, Belgian and Russian interests in the East. Especially English and Russian capitalists are compelled to take cognizance of the growth of German financial and political power in the Orient,
and begin to fear for their economic rule in Asia. Russia sees her hopes of becoming a factor in Constantinople shattered by the semi-official co-operation of Turkish and German military officials.

ARMED CLASH INEVITABLE.

The small Balkan states remind me of a crowd of children quarrelling at the behest of elder instigators. Every Balkan State is backed by one of the big powers, and therefore, for years the skirmishes fought in the circles of Balkan diplomacy marked the imminent danger of a world war. Here the big capitalist interests of the European powers clashed and clamored for settlement. The buffer states acted as the advance guards for their masters. From the economic position of the different capitalist interests wrestling here for supremacy a peaceful solution was impossible. For a peaceful solution meant a slow but sure downfall of English, French, and Russian trade at the expense of Germany and the United States. The capitalists of Europe had seen the spectre of German economic dominance slowly advancing, scented the danger—and prepared for it. German capitalists also knew that their conquest had entered the vitals of their competitors and knew that a day would come when they would have to protect their trade against the armed forces of their economic antagonists. They were also aware that, due to their overpopulated country, Germany was losing yearly thousands of its inhabitants, who were compelled to go to other countries to employ their industry for the profit of other capitalists and governments. Therefore, expansion had also become an important issue for the German government.

CAPITALIST RULE OF FORCE.

Hand in hand with the race for the world’s market and colonial possessions went the race for military supremacy. For the capitalists are fully aware that the last court to render verdict on the question involved will be the mailed fist. They know that throughout the ages Right has been a meaningless and worthless platitude, when not enforced by Might. They also know that in a conflict for economic and social supremacy the class having the might, in this case the force of arms, behind it, dictates what is right according to its interests, and absolutely compels the vanquished foe to accept and live up to that conception. These were the conditions in the days of antiquity, when the righteous cause of nations was trampled upon and overridden by the might of Roman legions; these were the conditions in the days of feudalism, when knightly valor decided the justice of a cause; and these are the conditions to-day, when the armed forces of the nations decide in a bloody strife who shall dictate what is right or wrong. And,
therefore, comrades it is the man with the might that decides a question, not the merits of a cause. Therefore, the cause of the workers may be just, humane and of absolute benefit to the Commonwealth, but if the workers have not the power to compel acceptance of their Socialist conception then their theories and ideals will remain a cherished anticipation and a dreamy utopia.

For the ruling class to-day, for capitalists, the police, military and naval forces are the instruments with which they realize their ambitions or defend and insure their possessions. They control these executive agencies of the capitalist State, because they control the government. And the power with which to emancipate the workers is to be found in the force in their possession, the force necessary to insure the life and prosperity of society-labour. The might that rests in the refusal to toil will bring the giant capitalist to his knees and to terms. The might that rests in the refusal to serve as a soldier will make the legions of the capitalist armies worthless. And the might that rests in the effective economic lockout of the capitalist class will bring in the Industrial Republic.

THE BURDEN OF MILITARISM.

However, I am deviating from the subject. At present we are dealing with the might of the capitalist, the might so expressively symbolized in the institution known as militarism. This military power, necessary to enforce the demands of capitalistic interests, if a peaceful solution cannot be reached, has become a tremendous burden to the powers of Europe in the last years. If you take into consideration that the "armed peace" of Europe necessitates an unproductive expenditure of six to seven million dollars a day, then you can estimate to what extent the institution of militarism is sapping the financial vitality of the capitalists throughout the world. To be more definite in my statement, according to the figures compiled by the military expert of the New York "Times," and published under date of October 29, 1914, the military expenditures of the principal European countries for the year 1912 were as following:

- England $150,000,000
- Russia $226,000,000
- France $180,000,000
- Germany $170,000,000

And ever heavier became the burden, piled on the tax-paying classes of Europe, due to the wild race for additional armaments. This burden was, as stated before, sapping the life blood of the nations, and here we have another cause of the conflict, which is of course subservient to the main one. It was to settle once and for all the questions agitating the interests behind the European governments, and this settlement de-
manded the vanquishing of one financial group or one national capitalist class by another national group or capitalist class as the only way to throw off the burden of militarism. And this is why, I believe, Germany and Austria took the aggressive position in the formal preliminaries of this war, because they were suffering more severely than all the other countries under this burden. When I make this statement the comrades will ponder over the figures just quoted, and reason about as follows: How can Germany be suffering the severest under militarism, if her contribution to the military budget is next to the smallest on the list? That is why a qualification of my statement is necessary. It is true that other countries, who now claim to be fighting German militarism, spend more or about as much for the maintenance of their armies as Germany, but it must also be appreciated that their military expenses are productive of results to the capitalists or feudal interests, whereas German colonies are not worth a farthing to the man who pays for the so-called war lord's legions. You see, it pays to hire professional soldiers to preserve the peace of India, South Africa, Java, or, let us say, the Congo, because these countries produce wealth for the employers of the armies, but it certainly is a most discouraging proposition, when you have a military institution and don't know what to do with it. Therefore, when the archduke was assassinated in the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Austria considered this as a gauntlet thrown down by Russia through Servia, and accepted the challenge.

And now, having some indispensable prerequisites at our disposal, we can intelligently discuss the more actual phases of the war.

III.

IMPERIALISM BEHIND THE WAR.

In the foregoing I have in the calmest and most unbiased manner at my command sought for the economic motives that led the capitalist governments to make war upon each other. With the searchlight radiating from the lighthouse of historical materialism we were able to penetrate the darkness—the darkness made still darker by the news agencies dominated by capitalist interests, and we can now distinguish the general as well as the principal driving forces underlying this terrible and stupendous struggle.

We now know that this war is not fought to preserve German culture against the onslaughts of Russian barbarism, or to save Europe from the despotism of German militarism—or to enforce proper respect for the questionable neutrality of Belgium. These pretences and highly idealized excuses are all garbs taken from the theatrical wardrobe for the sole purpose
of dressing the hideous figure of capitalist greed with an ethical or cultural cloak. And to be sure, imperialism is only another phase of modern capitalism, made imperative by economic forces inherent in the capitalist system of production: the system that spells exploitation and under-consumption for the workers and parasitism and over-production for the capitalists.

The imperialism of Germany is, due to the absence of practically all colonial possessions, an aggressive one—far more so than the imperialism of England and France. The imperialist policy of England and France is an established institution and stands effectively exonerated before the industrial barons of those countries. Naturally their policy under normal circumstances must needs be tranquil and peaceful, and, under the most threatening conditions, only defensive. Of course defence also permits aggression as an effective tactic. Had not Russia’s desire for control of Constantinople and the Balkans in general, and the decline of the Allies’ foreign trade whipped England, France and Russia on, then, it is my personal belief, a purely imperialistic war, a war for the expansion of Germany’s boundaries, would nevertheless have been fought in the near future. The indications have been visible in plenty in recent years. In coming to this conclusion, I always take the absence of a class conscious, revolutionary proletariat into consideration.

Now, what do we understand by the term imperialism, and what attitude is the class-conscious worker, the Socialist, to take toward a war emanating therefrom? The careful discussion of this theme will give us the solution to the question propounded by so many Socialists, rebels and libertarians in this country during the last few months; namely, whether the attitude of the European Socialists was an attitude in conformity with Socialist principles and in the interests of the workers.

**PANNEKOEK ON THE WAR.**

By imperialism we understand an effort on the part of the capitalist class of a certain nation to acquire through its government, new spheres of influence in the form of concessions, dominions, etc., at the expense of the capitalists of other nations. In other words, imperialism means the expansion of national capitalist influence, carried on for no other purpose than the development of a large national capitalist dominance. Therefore, quoting Anton, Pannekoek, an eminent German Socialist scholar:

The pure type of an imperialistic war is to be recognized by this: It does not break out on account of a particular object, but arises from the GENERAL antagonisms of states. These antagonisms are rooted in the competition to win world power or to defend it: and this struggle for world
power is nothing else but the struggle of every country to win for its capital colonies, contracts, spheres of influence, and favorable opportunities for investment in Asia and Africa. Every country has for a long time felt itself threatened by others because all of them make hostile preparations against one another. Hence every one of them believes itself attacked by the others.

And commenting upon the relation of imperialism to their war Pannekoek continues:

In this war we see clearer than ever before how powerful imperialism is and how potent are all peace congresses and peace societies. It is true that the forceful struggle for world-power brings direct advantage to large capital only; but the whole possessing class feels itself in harmony with. All contractors, business men, merchants and educated or professional people (engineers, technicians) have the feeling that better business, better positions await them in proportion as their country increases its reputation in the world and as large industry prospers. Hence an imperialistic policy finds a sounding board in the entire propertied class.

Twenty years ago in Germany the Liberals and the Catholic Center Party were opponents of militarism and the colonial policy; but since the elections of 1907 all opposition of these petty bourgeois circles against policies of violence and force has disappeared. The firm determination, rising at times even to joyous enthusiasm, with which the mass of the German people now enter into the war (and the same determination is seen in Austria, France, Belgium and England) demonstrates that at present the requirements of large CAPITAL for room to expand DOMINATES the spirit and will of large masses of the people and leads them with compelling force.

In her pamphlet "Sozialreform oder Revolution" ("Social Reform or Revolution"), published in 1908, Rosa Luxemburg, discussing militarism, has the following pointed remarks, bearing on the subject under discussion to-night, to make:

When international political relations have developed to a threatening conflict, then this conflict does not rest upon the opening of new countries to capitalism, but upon completed European differences which have been transplanted to other parts of the world and culminate there. The groups which to-day participate in armed conflict, whether in Europe or in foreign lands, are not developed capitalist countries on one side and undeveloped countries, abounding in natural resources, on the other, but are countries, which, through the similarity of their high capitalist development, are driven into this conflict.
For the future development this conflict can have fatal consequences, because it will create deep convulsions and an economic revolution in all capitalist countries. It is different, viewed from the standpoint of the capitalist class. For this class militarism has become indispensable, for three reasons: First, as a weapon for competitive national interests against other national groups; second, also as an important feature of investment for financial as well as industrial capital, and third, as a tool of the ruling class at home against the proletariat. These are all interests that have nothing in common with the progress proper of the capitalist system of production. And what discloses the specific character of militarism more effectively, is its general growth, the race for the most powerful armaments, in all countries. It seems as if an inherent mechanical driving force is at work here. This appearance was unknown twenty years ago, and bears the ominous signs of an unavoidable, fatal explosion; with, however, no visible traces of a definite cause for such an explosion between the interested powers. Here we have the approaching catastrophe, without being able to place the immediate or nearer circumstances.

Here in a few concise statements this profound Marxian thinker gave, as far back as 1908, a forecast of the situation in which we are living to-day and discussing to-night. The explosion did occur, and the motives for this war are not embodied in any specific object but are of a general character. Here we can ascertain the astonishing mathematical exactness with which Socialist philosophy analyzes economic phenomena. The quotations also show that the economic causes of this war are also known on the other side of the world, and are also there declared by the more studious element purely a result of capitalist ambitions.

UNQUESTIONABLY A WAR OF CAPITALIST GREED. By our figures and facts, revealed in the course of this lecture, we can now arrive at the conclusion that the present war is first, last and all the way through a struggle waged by the national capitalists for international supremacy. It is a struggle of one set of interests against another—a purely capitalist fight emanating from capitalist greed. This I am certain of, and I take the liberty to presume that you are also.

I do not wish to be misunderstood, however, when I speak of capitalist greed. I don't want you to think I apply this term in a personal sense. It is a greed springing from the peculiarities of private property. It is peculiar to capitalism. It is the forces of idle capital and unsold wares that drives the capitalists into adventures of this kind; it is the inherent quality to reproduce itself that stamps capitalism greedy, barbarous,
and anti-social. Here we see how capitalism, the system, dominates its representatives and makes willing tools out of them. The capitalists, being victims of their environment, cannot act otherwise than they are acting—they are in the claws of a monster capital. It is capitalism that is sapping the life blood of society to-day, and it is the mission of the workers to save society from this damnable oppression by slaying this vampire, known in the terminology of economics as private property.

Knowing the causes and object of the gigantic struggle raging on the European continent, it is now a simple matter to ascertain the position of the workers in this war. Knowing that is is capitalist interests fighting for the control of fields of enterprise, then we can easily arrive at the conclusion that the propertyless workers have no interest in this war. For it matters little to them who shall exploit the rich natural deposits in Africa and Asia, or who shall build the railroads, telephones, and telegraphs in Manchuria and Persia. They know, or at least should know, that as long as the present system of production reigns they are condemned to toil for a mere living, and that the fruits of their labor are appropriated by the owners of the means of production, the capitalists.

THE CLASS WAR IS THE WORKERS’ WAR.

Knowing all this, the workers must come to the conclusion that as long as capitalism holds sway, they have only one enemy in the world—the capitalist. It matters little whether the workers toil in England, Russia, France, or Germany, capitalism reigns, with exploitation supreme everywhere. Wherever the workers turn they meet their unrelenting foe, the foe that condemns them to life-long poverty and drudgery—capitalism. Therefore, wherever the proletarians reside, their only object should be to seek the abolition of this iniquitous system. The workers have, therefore, NO INTEREST IN ANY OTHER WAR THAN THE CLASS WAR, CARRIED ON SOLELY FOR THE ERADICATION OF ALL CLASSES AND THE ORGANIZATION OF THE INDUSTRIAL REPUBLIC OF LABOR. If, consequently, the workers take up arms for any other cause than their own, they are unconsciously or consciously besmirching the august principle of international solidarity, and directly assisting the interests of their masters, the capitalists. This conduct may also be stigmatized as ignoring the proletarian class position, and the betrayal of Socialist principles. These are very severe terms, but the situation, the Socialist movement throughout the world, demands objective criticism in plain and expressive language.

The war in Europe is a purely commercial or capitalist struggle. How can we, in the face of this acknowledgment, explain the attitude of our European comrades?
We have seen by the quotations of Pannekoek and Luxemburg that they had grasped the causes which animate modern wars, and when we read the account of the last anti-war meeting held after the extraordinary session of the International Socialist Bureau, in Brussels, July 29, 1914, we are certain that the leading representatives knew at least what war meant to the workers.

Comrade Keir Hardie, speaking at this meeting, said:

Europe is filled with anxiety to-night. The fear of the horrors of war is haunting the minds of men, and yet the proletarians of Europe do not desire it. They are endeavouring to obtain peace. If the people of Europe are opposed to war, why does the fear of war exist? Because the common people do not rule. “War is a game which, were their subjects wise, kings would not play at.” The proletarians are in the majority. They have to pay for war in money, bloodshed, and heartache, and if they outnumber the ruling class ten to one, why do they not control the government? The working class allows itself to be divided by religion, nationalities, want of knowledge. If only they will sink their petty differences, they will become masters, and war will disappear. It is not good to preach morality so long as all conditions contribute to make for war. Socialism is the one means to freedom and liberty, and unity is the means whereby this may be obtained. Remember that you are first working people, and by working together in unity war will be stopped. Long live the Belgian Socialist Party! Long live the International, who is unifying the people of the world in the last great fight for human liberty!

Delegate Haase, of Germany, “told the comrades how when the Morocco affair was brewing and the Kaiser was endeavouring to plunge the country into a war with France, hundreds of thousands of German Socialists convened in Berlin, raised their voices against the demon war, and through press, telegrams, letters, agitation of every kind, helped effectively to ward it off. He declared that the Social Democrats in this emergency would do what lay in their power to stem the tide that was now setting in. He pictured the destroyed homes of the workers, the agony of wife and child which followed in the wake of battle, and bitterly denounced the so-called diplomats who had involved the countries of Europe in this present tragic situation. Every reference to the Kaiser was met with the ‘boo-oo’ of the audience and every mention of the German comrades with warm applause.”

JAURES WARNED THE SOCIALISTS.

The last public speech of Comrade Jaures was held at this meeting, and in the main he said:
The forces of peace will now be able to function. It is the urgent duty of all of us to utilize the days or the hours of respite to denounce the crime, to affirm and organize the solidarity of the proletariat of all countries against the abhorrent menace.

To exchange the views and the information which have presented themselves to the International Bureau, it follows that the Socialists everywhere are conscientious enough to do their duty.

The vigorous demonstration of the German Socialists is a magnificent response to those who denounced the supposed inertia of our comrades. Ought not the nationalists and reactionaries of France to be infinitely ashamed of their stupidity and refrain from their perfidy?

It is with a great feeling of desire and hopefulness that the International Socialist Congress will reunite on the ninth of August in Paris.

I am sure that Vaillant, Guesde, and myself, in accepting as delegates of the party the responsibility for the French Socialists in organizing the International Congress, have responded to the sentiment of all of our comrades. We have but a few days to prepare ourselves, but the zeal of all will supply that which is lacking in time, and we will be able to open the congress by a magnificent manifestation prepared at the Pre Saint-Gervais, where hundreds of thousands of workers of Paris may acclaim peace.

"Jaures then described how the bigoted French nationalist would soon be heard complimenting the French Socialist on his patriotism and superiority to Socialist comrades of other lands and endeavouring, by every method of persuasion, to arouse a feeling of bitterness against his fellow-workman in Germany and elsewhere. But he hoped and believed the French Socialist would not be misled by such sham patriotism and hypocrisy and that he would do his part to stem the tide of war which seemed to be rising—that he would show himself a genuine internationalist. 'Long live the International! Long live the revolution!' were his last impassioned words—the last public utterances of him who had given the best part of his life to advance the cause of the social revolution."

In reporting the essence of the speeches delivered at this memorable meeting, I take the report of Dr. Laidler, organizing secretary of the International Socialist Society, as my basis, because Dr. Laidler personally attended the meeting, and also because his description of the same corresponds strikingly with a version given to me by a reporter of the "Volkswille," in Hanover, Germany. The speeches delivered at Brussels were for some reason or the other not published by
the German Socialist press, only a small notice, informing the
readers of the special session of the Bureau, and the holding of
the International Socialist Congress at Paris, was given to
this important event. When I questioned my Socialist friend
about this rather meagre information, and also about the
probability of the holding of the Congress at Paris, he very
laconically informed me that the best thing I could do was to
pack my duds and go, as there positively would be no gather­
ing in Paris. This was twenty-four hours after the meeting
in Brussels.

PROTEST MEETINGS LACKED CONVICTION.

The protest meetings in Germany, which Jaures re­fers to in his speech, were colossal, as far as numbers
are concerned, but absolute failures in spreading intelligence
on the subject. I had the questionable pleasure of attending
three of these meetings in the city of Hanover, and found that
the subject was treated in a manner by the speakers that
would have done credit to a bourgeois radical. The economic
causes of the approaching war were absolutely disregarded,
and the speakers treated the subject from the familiar angle
of a conspiracy in diplomatic circles to plunge Germany into
the war. The Socialist press in Germany was also lukewarm,
and in many cases was already reassuring the Government of
the Socialists' support in case of war. The quotation of Com­
rade Bebel, in which he declares that in case his fatherland
was threatened he also would shoulder a musket, was worked
to death by the revisionistic editors, and when I approached
Comrade Meyer, provincial secretary of the Freien Gewerk­
schaften in the Province of Hanover, and asked him where a
philosophy called the materialist conception of history could
be located, he shrugged his shoulders and jokingly replied
that for the time being they had placed it in cold storage. And
then when war was declared, and the German Socialists had
voted for the extraordinary war credit, the spirit in the move­
ment and the press took another slump and started to fume
maledictions against the Russian invaders.

How ridiculous the present position of the German Social
Democracy really is can be best ascertained from an article
that appeared on August 3, 1914, in the Berlin "Vorwaerts." At that date I was in Germany and a reader of that paper, so
I vouch for the accuracy of the quotation I now present to
you from an article by Wm. English Walling, published in the
October issue of "The New Review." The quotation reads
as follows:—

On Monday, August 3, when the Social Democratic
group in the Reichstag decided to vote in favour of the war
budget, the "Vorwaerts" printed an article condemning
German "patriotism" and the "patriots" who suddenly became warriors for "freedom against Czarism."

The article, which is entitled "War Against Czarism," expresses the fallacy of German patriotic jingoists who have for years been trying to plunge the country into a war by crying out that it is being menaced by the enemy.

It also ridicules the position of the Government which for years has sided with Russian barbarism and the Czar and persecuted Socialists for "insulting" Nicholas, but which suddenly changed its front and adopted the stand of Marx, Engels, and Bebel, who always spoke of the necessity of smashing the Czar's rule.

The article continues:

Since the above-named leaders of the Social Democracy expressed their opinion that it was necessary to wage a democratic war against Russian despotism, conditions have changed considerably.

Russia to-day is no longer a stronghold of reaction, but it is a land of revolution. The overthrow of the monarchy and Czarism is now the aim of the Russian people in general and the Russian workers in particular.

The article then goes on to state that shortly before war was declared Russia was in the midst of a revolutionary blaze that was sweeping the country. Czarism has not been weakened by the declaration of war, but, on the contrary, it has been considerably strengthened. The war has given the despotic government a chance to distract the hatred of vast numbers of Russian people against the monarchy and Czarism, and gain the confidence of the people by its incitation against the Germans. By its agitation the German Social Democracy had shown the Russian people that its enemy is not across the border, but right in their own home.

Nothing was more unpleasant to the Russian reactionaries, the "real Russian" jingoists, than to hear of the great peace demonstrations of the German Socialists, continues the editorial. Oh, how glad they would have been to come out to the revolutionary working class in Russia and say: "Why, the German Socialists call upon the people to war against the Russian people."

The "little father" at St. Petersburg would have felt as though a great burden had been removed from him. He would have exclaimed, "That's just what I need! Now, that the German Socialists call upon the people to war on Russia, my worst enemy, the revolutionary movement, has broken its backbone. The international solidarity of the working class is now smashed, and I can get a chance to let out a yell of patriotic nationalism. Oh, I am saved!"
“VORWAERTS” DOESN’T REPRESENT PARTY SENTIMENT.

However, when judging the spirit or tendency prevailing in the German Socialist press, you cannot take the “Vorwaerts” as a criterion, because the central or official organ of the German party no longer reflects the views of the organization. This may seem strange and paradoxical, but it is a fact. The principles and political views of the majority of the party’s membership were entirely different from the principles and views advocated by its official organ. With the exception of possibly a meagre half-dozen, all the papers of the party were of a revisionistic tendency, and Revisionism is pure and simple Reformism. That is why in the majority of the Socialist papers municipal politics, communal reform, industrial and social welfare or settlement work played a far more important role than Socialism. I venture the assertion that in some so-called party papers you can read about every topic under the sun during a whole year, but I guarantee you will never run across an out and out Socialist article in the twelve months under investigation. That is why I must unequivocally endorse the opinion of Comrade Pannekoek, who states:

We have already said that within the party the symptoms of a change were long present, but did not come to the surface owing to the force of tradition and old habituated phrases. But in stormy social crises, when the passions of men are stirred to the depths, the venerable catchwords fall suddenly away like a torn cloak and WHAT ONE REALLY IS, what lies in one’s deepest nature, is unexpectedly revealed.

The leaders of the party, parliamentarians and office-holders, were averse to keen strife and, though retaining the Marxian expressions, had repeatedly sought in elections to let the party co-operate with the liberal progressives. And the masses, thanks to a twenty-year economic prosperity, had gradually become demoralized.

The “Vorwaerts,” true to its old principles and time-honored traditions, came out firmly against the Government and the war, gallantly supported by such papers as “Die Bremer Buergerzeitung,” to which Comrade Pannekoek largely contributes, “Die Leipziger Volkszeitung,” which is the organ voicing the views of Dr. Rosa Luxemburg, and “Der Braunschweiger Volksfreund.” The rest of the mighty Socialist press dropped the question of war against war altogether, and a policy to stamp this conflict as a purely defensive struggle was adopted, thereby conclusively substantiating my claim that the “Vorwaerts” did not and does not voice the sentiments of the party’s membership.
VAIN PRETENCE THE RESULT OF INCOMPETENCE.

I believe that this position of pretending to act as defenders their followers, they were absolutely incompetent to avoid of German culture in invading Belgium and France was forced upon the German Socialists, because, due to the quality of war effectively. To prove my assertion, I again quote Comrade Pannekoek, writing in the October issue of the "International Socialist Review":—

To expect from narrow parliamentarians and bureaucrats like Scheidemann and Ebert any revolutionary initiative would have been ridiculous, and just as little could one expect that the masses, accustomed to do only what the party ordered, would now come forward independently without the leaders of the party.

On Tuesday evening, the 28th of July, well attended meetings were held to protest against the war. That was all. And in these meetings there was a total lack of enthusiasm. With a feeling of depression, they realized that Fate was approaching, without being able to stop it.

But there was not only lack of capacity for action against the war. The question HOW the war could be resisted was never even raised, because the question WHETHER the war ought to be resisted was not even answered with a decisive YES. Among the workers was a lack of spirit to come out against the war.

I quote Comrade Pannekoek at length, because I consider the opinion of a man, who has grown up with the movement of more importance than my own: he ought to know. However, after my return from Germany in 1912, I gave the following general criticism of the German trade union movement, the same was the closing passage of an open letter to Mr. Karl Legien, secretary of Die Freien Gewerkshäften in Germany:—

Of the total of 2,432,549 organized workers, or 35 per cent. of all the workers, there are four national and still many more local factions.

These factions by no means practise solidarity or cooperation during strikes, nay, in innumerable cases they have taken hostile positions to the satisfaction of the capitalist class. It must also be stated here that by this diversity of principles a concerted action is made nigh impossible. Here we have a convincing example of results flowing from the acts of men who are not firmly planted to the principles dictated unerringly by a clear Socialist conception of capitalism. This is an illustration of what intellectual confusion will do in an economic movement, and in the face of it: LEGIEN IS IN FEAR OF TOO MUCH SOCIALIST
UNIONISM! The German trade union movement denies the theory that the economic and political organizations of labor must supplement each other and that both must rest squarely upon Socialist principles, in order successfully to combat and overpower the capitalist class. Instead of heeding this warning the leaders cry, "Modify the 'radical' position, revise it," and thus a lesson taught by hard knocks is unheeded and would-be mentors adopt the tactics of their presumptive pupils. The "Freien Gewerkschaften" are certainly steering into the quagmire of A. F. of Hellism. This is certainly anti-revolution, and there is no clear head of a Marx, a Liebknecht, or a von Schweizer to stop it.

These factions by no means practice solidarity or co-operation during strikes, nay, in innumerable cases they have taken hostile positions to the satisfaction of the capitalist class. It must also be stated here that by this diversity of principles a concerted action is made nigh impossible. Here we have a convincing example of results flowing from the acts of men who are not firmly planted upon the principles dictated unerringly by a clear Socialist conception of capitalism. This is an illustration of what intellectual confusion will do in an economic movement, and in the face of it: LEGION IS IN FEAR OF TOO MUCH SOCIALIST UNIONISM! The German trade union movement denies the theory that the economic and political organizations of labor must supplement each other and that both must rest squarely upon Socialist principles, in order successfully to combat and overpower the capitalist class. Instead of heeding this warning the leaders cry, "modify the 'radical' position, revise it," and thus a lesson taught by hard knocks is unheeded and would-be mentors adopt the tactics of their presumptive pupils. The Freien Gewerkschaften are certainly steering into the quagmire of A. F. of Hellism. This is certainly anti-revolution and there is no clear head of a Marx, a Liebknecht, or a von Schweizer to stop it. Gompers seems here to be the father of the new idea.

In the face of all this confusion we are compelled to ascertain that 65 per cent. of the German workers are still unorganized. Further, that a class conscious revolutionary position, a position in line with conditions and dictated by Socialist principles is held by none of the existing organizations. THERE IS ROOM FOR I.W.W. PROPAGANDA IN GERMANY, AND A STILL GREATER FIELD FOR THE PROPAGATION OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM! Economic evolution will rapidly tear down the last remnants of the feudal political State, and capitalism proper will have full sway. Capitalism will teach the German workers the TRUE
Socialist position, ECONOMIC AS WELL AS POLITICAL, and the teachings will fall on fecundent soil.

From these quotations you are at least able to get a bird’s-eye view of the Socialist situation in Germany prior to and at the time of the outbreak of the war. Can you, therefore, expect any different conduct from the “undeveloped masses,” as Comrade Pannekoek calls the German workers, and the leaders that such a movement gives birth to?

ATTITUDE OF OTHER EUROPEAN SOCIALISTS.

And now, having witnessed the collapse of a so-called Socialist Movement in Germany, primarily due to a deficiency in principles, we are confronted with the attitude of the French, Russian, Belgian, and English Socialists. And the most important question to be placed now is whether they did anything to prevent the war. When we look at the gigantic armies that day after day are flying at each other’s throat, we are compelled to answer the propounded interrogation in the negative.

A despatch in “The New York World,” of September 7, 1914, sums up the view of the French Socialist Party as follows:

French Socialists have issued a manifesto in three languages as proof to international Socialists that the French and Belgian sections have done their duty in favor of peace as against war. It recalls the French section’s opposition to armament, colonial expansion, the Government’s Moroccan policies and the three-years’ term of service which was the result of Germany’s increasing army.

The party kept itself in close contact with the French Government during the crisis due to Austria’s ultimatum to Servia. When Servia’s pacific reply was rejected, proving that imperialist Germany inspired and desired war, the Socialist Party assured itself that France had made every effort to maintain peace.

German Socialists in Paris fully approve the party’s attitude, but Socialists in Germany seem to have been deceived, says the manifesto, in regard to the facts.

The manifesto says that the accusations are false that French aviators dropped bombs on the city of Nuremberg, that French troops were invading or preparing to invade Belgium before the violation by Germany of the neutrality of Belgium and Luxemburg.

The manifesto concludes that the Socialists of France and Belgium submitted to the hard necessities of war, convinced that they were thereby upholding the principle of liberty and the rights of peoples to dispose of themselves.

The correctness of the despatch to “The World” has been in the meantime verified by the receipt of the official manifesto
by the national office of the Socialist Labor Party, publication of which was made in the "Weekly People," of October 24, 1914.

JULES GUESDE AND THE SYNDICALISTS.

Jules Guesde's statement in accepting a seat in the Cabinet was as follows:

"I go into the Cabinet as an envoy of my party, not to govern, but to fight. If I were younger I would have shouldered a gun. But as my age does not permit me to do this, I will nevertheless face the enemy and defend the cause of humanity.

I am confident of final victory, and without hesitation as to its subsequent role in France, the party will never deviate from the line of conduct laid out.

France has been attacked, and she will have no more ardent defenders than the workmen's party.

The solidarity of workmen does not shut out the right to defend themselves against traitor workmen. Nor does international solidarity exclude the right of one nation to defend itself against a government which is traitor to the peace of Europe.

This statement was cabled to America, and lacks confirmation, so take it for what you think it's worth. Personally, I think it may be considered reliable.

On or about August 12, 1914, the "Battaille Syndicaliste," official organ of the French Syndicalists, printed the following war glossary:

They were syndicalists. They were revolutionaries. They were pacifists and internationalists. Hatred of militarism pushed them to proclaim themselves "anti-patriots." To-day, when they see their hopes of peace, of union among peoples, of social transformation for the benefit of the working masses take flight amid the smoke of arms directed against liberty and humanity, they take their route by the side of those who do not think as they do and who in their ignorance used to regard them as traitors to their country.

Had it been a war of conquest that they were called upon to make, how quickly would they have risen in revolt. They would have stood up before any of their rulers who would have been mad enough to hurl them on the hearth and liberties of another people. But it is exactly the opposite which has occurred. They know that the men who are at the head of our destinies have tried everything, even to the point of appearing weak, to save the lives of thousands and avoid the horrors of devastation.

Being not very proficient in French, I was compelled to take the translation published by William Englist Walling in "The New Review," for October. However, I verified the
authenticity of the translation by consulting a regular subscriber, for this paper, who by the way is a capable French student and an earnest revolutionist.

POSITION OF THE ENGLISH PARTIES.

It is very interesting to note the effect of the war on the Socialist forces in Great Britain. The Independent Labor Party, of which Keir Hardie and Ramsay MacDonald are members, in an anti-war manifesto, takes decided stand against imperialistic diplomacy. Among other forceful passages the following appeal to me as the strongest and most expressive of the party's position:

Tens of thousands of our fellow-workers are in the front of battle, knowing not if they will ever return again. Already many have fallen, and soon the death-roll will mount appallingly and the wounded lie suffering on the battlefield, on the deck of ships, and in the hospitals. Among those who are bravely facing this fate are many of our Socialist comrades serving in the regular forces, the reserves, and the territorials.

Hardly less dread is the position of the women and children at home who are dependent on those who are under arms, and the countless workers and their families who are plunged into unemployment and destitution by the war. Almost no conceivable effort—even if the food supply of the country holds out—will prevent the occurrence of fearful privation among them.

And what is true of the soldiers and the workers and their families of our own country is no less true of those in France, Belgium, Germany, and other lands. Is it not right that we should remember this?

To us who are Socialists the workers of Germany and Austria, no less than the workers of France and Russia, are comrades and brothers; in this hour of carnage and eclipse we have friendship and compassion for all victims of militarism. Our nationality and independence, which are dear to us, we are ready to defend; but we cannot rejoice in the organized murder of tens of thousands of workers of other lands who go to kill and be killed at the command of rulers to whom the people are as pawns.

The war conflagration envelopes Europe; up to the last moment we labored to prevent the blaze. The nation must now watch for the first opportunity for effective intervention.

As to the future, we must begin to prepare our minds for the difficult and dangerous complications that will arise at the conclusion of the war.

The people must everywhere resist such territorial aggression and national abasement as will pave the way for
fresh wars; and, throughout Europe, the workers must press for frank and honest diplomatic policies, controlled by themselves, for the suppression of militarism and the establishment of the United States of Europe, thereby advancing toward the world's peace. Unless these steps are taken, Europe, after the present calamity, will be still more subject to the increasing domination of militarism, and liable to be drenched with blood.

The British Socialist Party, in its manifesto to the workers of the United Kingdom, also uses no uncertain language in the condemnation of the war, although in actually throwing light upon the causes underlying this great conflict, it is also very ineffective. As a resume of the manifesto the closing paragraphs are of interest to us. They set forth:

From the very first, and all through, the International Socialist Party has declared for peace, whilst always maintaining the right of nations to defend their national existence by force of arms. It is the working class in all lands who are called upon to bear the heaviest burden in this fratricidal conflict. Wives will lose their husbands and mothers their sons in tens of thousands before the power of Prussian militarism is broken and the German people themselves are freed from a crushing Imperialism. Hunger and starvation will be the lot of millions who do not fall by sword, shot or shell.

Never again must we entrust our foreign affairs to secret diplomacy. Never again must we regard foreign policy as being something with which we have no concern. The terrible period which we have yet to encounter and pass through must teach us a never-to-be-forgotten lesson. The war will break down the ententes, alliances and understandings made without our knowledge and consent. Then will come the opportunity for a genuine democratic agreement between the peoples themselves.

Such an agreement between the peoples of France, Germany and Great Britain will be solid guarantee of peace and a powerful bulwark against the encroachments of Russian despotism, a result which may easily come of the present war. To that end we shall continuously work, and we appeal most earnestly to you to keep this bright hope for the future before you through all the coming days of darkness and death.

Away with the War! Social Democracy for ever!

The Executive Committee of the British Socialist Party.
BRITISH S. L. P. ALONE CLEAR.

The only party that has actually grasped the significance of the war, and that unflinchingly upholds the banner of uncompromising Socialism in England is the Socialist Labor Party of Great Britain. This organization has a clear conception of the forces animating the war, and has therefrom very logically drawn the workers' position in the European conflagration. In the September issue of its official organ, "The Socialist," the party, in a stirring appeal, has among other pithy paragraphs the following convincing class-conscious remarks to make:

When the hand-rags of the capitalist class, whether they be journalists, politicians, priests, or parsons, call for men to defend the interests of the well-fed, widow-robbing, child-murdering, brain-clogged, soul-destroying, labor-exploiting, psalm-singing, hypocritical, double-dyed, blood-sucking fraternity of modern Dick Turpins, who buy us workingmen in the labor market in the same way as they buy horse-hair, pig-iron, cheese, ham, or any other commodity, tell them to go to hell.

If we must organise to fight—and assuredly we must—let us organize to fight the enemy at home. Let our army be built with its political and industrial battalions. Let us engage in the CLASS WAR, the war between the skinners and the skinned.

War with all its atrocious horrors would be impossible if the working class would refuse to be made handrags of.

It's up to you now, fellow worker. Are you a fully developed man or are you simply a perambulating piece of mechanism in the shape of a man, who can be knocked temporarily insane by listening to a clown on the music hall stage singing a "patriotic" song, or at sight of a crowd of irresponsible duffers, clad in khaki, marching along the streets trying to "chuck a chest."

Think it over. Choose which side you will fight on. An army is already in the field in every civilized country in the world, an army whose members fight the battles of the working class; an army whose members warn the workers to beware of the cunning knaves who would "kid" them into taking up arms on behalf of their exploiters.

That army flies the Red Flag of International Socialism. It calls upon the workers of all lands to unite.

This is all very strong language, but the acts necessary to enforce the adoption of the principles elucidated therein did not follow. At present Messrs. Hardie, Blatchford, Wells, Vandervelde and Sembat are discussing the merits and demerits of militarism, navyism, veiled diplomacy and barbarism. The workers, however, are fighting and dying for capitalism.
AGAINST WAR, BUT HELPLESSLY UNORGANIZED.

From the quotations so liberally given and the deductions of the lecturer, we can now safely arrive at the conclusion that the Socialists of Europe did not want the war, but when the capitalist governments of the countries involved forced the war, upon the people, they did not have the organized might to resist the aggression of capitalism. For years our European friends had declaimed and condemned war, and for years they failed to organize a militant Socialist force against it.

As elucidated in another part of my lecture, right without might is an illusion—a phantasmagoria. The proclamation of international solidarity of the wage slaves is a dream, unless behind this sublime aim there stands an army ready to uphold and defend it against the attacks of jingoistic capitalists. Anti-militarism is an effective weapon with which to disillusion the victims of capitalist education; it is, however, a failure, if no tool is created with which the anti-militarist sentiment may be crystallized into an active deed against militarism. In other words, all protests against war, militarism and capitalism are nothing but sheer bombastic drivel, unless behind these words there is the might to enforce their recognition.

The Socialists in Europe did not have this force to give weight to their protests. Their organization, gigantic as it was in numbers, lacked the revolutionary vitality born only of deep conviction. Their great political parties and trades unions, with their millions of members and voters, were not voters and members recruited by a clear and uncompromising Socialist agitation, nay, they were and are organizations built upon the quicksand of opportunism and compromise. It was this overbearing, boasting braggadocio of the German Socialist "successes" that strutted pretentiously about at the international conventions, and was so often instrumental in influencing the proceedings. It was this gasconading spirit that gave birth to the famous Milwaukee Idea in this country, and if this war, terrible as it is, has brought nothing but grief and defeat to the Socialist movement, it has at least illustrated to the thinking proletarians one truism, and this I am certain has been inscribed indelibly in the minds of many, namely: the fallacy of sacrificing principles for immediate political success. Had the Socialists of Europe upheld the unsoiled banner of Socialism, as it was entrusted to them by the great pioneers of the movement, then we would not have the delicate task of criticizing the action of our comrades to-night, we would not have to bury our shattered expectations with pessimistic gloom, but we would in every probability be celebrating the dawn of the Industrial Republic.
WAR MARKS TURNING POINT.

This war marks a turning point in the development of capitalism. Out of this bloody orgy a strong and more centralized capitalism will be born; a capitalism that will know no boundaries, a capitalism that will be truly international. This is my personal prediction, dictated to me by the tendency of current developments. And at this turning point the psychological moment had come for the forces of Socialism to assert themselves.

It was at this moment, when the national capitalists and their governmental henchmen were at each other's throat; that international Socialism should have struck its blow for emancipation. Had Socialism been vigorous enough to strike, then instead of witnessing a slaughter for capitalist interests, we would now gaze upon the forces of the Socialist revolution grappling with the battalions of capitalism. As stated before, however, the Socialist movement was erected upon a defective foundation and collapsed at the most crucial moment. Therefore, instead of fighting and dying for liberty, equality and fraternity, the millions are fighting and dying for a mightier capitalism.

What influence this new era will have upon Socialism I dare not presage. I only regret that the European Socialist movement did not heed the warning sounded so often by our much beloved leader in our press and at their conventions. I regret that the lesson so persistently taught by our deceased Comrade must now be written in the blood of the international proletariat. For, comrades, do not the simple words, spoken at that memorable meeting in Minneapolis now nearly ten years ago, by Daniel De Leon, seem prophetic, re-read in the light of current events?: "The Socialist ballot is weaker than a woman's tears,

Tamer than sleep, fonder than ignorance,
Less valiant than the virgin in the night,
And skillless as unpracticed infancy,

unless it is backed by the might to enforce it."

Ponder over the words of this truly great and lonely man, take into consideration my humble efforts to clarify the issue, and then I am convinced that you will have found the key to the situation.
A CORRECTION.

Through a typographical error, the statistical quotation with reference to the approximate acreage of land available for settlement in the principal countries under review was garbled. The text which appeared in the installment in the issue of November 21, top of third column, should have read as follows: "In what a crowded condition the Germans are may be surmised from a table compiled by Dr. Albrecht Wirth, a noted writer on economics and sociology in Germany. Dr. Wirth claims that the statistics procurable show that for every Englishman there is 1/8 km.; for every Russian 1/23 km.; for every American 1/11 km., and for every German but 1/80 km. OF LAND AVAILABLE." The words given here in capitals were unwittingly omitted in printing.