

and the results which are likely to follow in its wake. Our Civil War was a proper war on the part of the North, and worth all the sacrifices which it entailed—although all that the South asked was “to be let alone” and “freedom from interference in her domestic affairs.” Karl Marx was therefore one of the most enthusiastic supporters of the North during that war, and his services were highly appreciated by Lincoln. The Spanish-American war was not such a war on the part of America, and the followers of Marx in this country therefore refused to support the Government in that war. It is not a question whether the war is fought in the immediate interest of the working class, for our Civil War was fought in the interest of the capitalist development of this country—in the immediate interest of the capitalist class. Nor is it a question whether the ostensible, or even real object of the war is to free somebody, for the ostensible object of the Spanish-American war was to free Cuba, and Cuba *was* freed after a fashion. The real question is the ultimate interest of the working class, which is the interest of the world at large; and must therefore be approached not from a local but a world-wide point of view.

It follows that Socialists are not peace-at-any-price men. Peace at any price is merely the reverse side of the medal on the obverse side of which is written: “no resistance.” If we are ready to resist evil, we naturally must fight until evil has been successfully resisted; except, of course, when we own ourselves defeated either because resistance is impossible or the cost of resistance too prohibitive to make it worth while, which makes the question of terms a question of expediency. Not being non-resistant pacifists, the Socialists do not consider the mere cessation of bloodshed such an overtowering boon as to make them ready to purchase it at any cost whatever.

In the manifesto issued by the radical Russian Socialists led by Martof and Axelrod shortly after the Russian Revolution they indignantly repudiated any suspicion that they were in favor of a separate peace between Russia and Germany. And when Morris Hillquit, International Secretary of the Socialist Party of this country, was, shortly thereafter, suspected of favoring

such separate peace he issued a similar denial, stating that he did not know of a single Socialist of any importance in this country who favored such a peace. The radical Socialists of Germany have always opposed the efforts of the German Government to obtain a separate peace with Russia, and even the “majority” Socialists have been forced by Socialist public opinion to declare against a separate peace. But why should Socialists be opposed to the cessation of bloodshed at least on part of the European battlefield? Why shouldn’t they favor the restoration of peace between Russia on the one hand and Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey, on the other, which would reduce the war-area by about one-half? Why should Socialists who are opposed “to all war” insist on Russia continuing the war, and treat the suspicion that they are trying to reduce the war-area and “localize” the war as an insult and an aspersion on their Socialist honor?

The answer is: Because being opposed to all war does not imply indifference to the manner in which this war or any other war may terminate. We are in favor of peace only if we can have it upon our own terms. And since a separate peace between Russia and Germany is bound to react unfavorably on the chances of the present war terminating in the manner in which we want it to terminate, and peace concluded upon terms satisfactory to us, we are opposed to such separate peace. In other words: *We are willing to fight for what we consider proper terms of peace.* This makes a discussion of what are proper terms of peace for Socialists to advocate and demand a matter of the very greatest importance. Unfortunately, this phase of the peace agitation is being entirely neglected by the Socialists of this country.

This may startle some of our readers: For, haven’t we got the “Socialist” peace-formula announced by the Russian Revolutionary Government?

To which, in reply: The Russian formula is not a statement of terms of peace, and was not intended to be such. Its primary object was to announce the leading principles upon which the