

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 deplures. 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