

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.