

In explanation of Germany's course during the Austro-Serbian crisis which led to the present war, the German Emperor stated that the Serbian nationalist propaganda threatened to so weaken the Austrian Empire (militarily) that she would have been of no use to Germany as an ally. And this was considered by the German people not only a good and sufficient reason for the thwarting of the national aspirations of the Serbs but even for the bringing on of the World War. The logic of war is such that fear of being weaker for war to-morrow requires one to go to war to-day.

But even those who do not accept the full logic of war and militarism must, nevertheless, pay it a certain tribute. The Russian Revolution under the Socialist regime has clearly abjured all warlike designs and militaristic aspirations. And the first consequence was a truly remarkable act of self-abnegation in its pronouncement in favor of the creation of a really free Poland. But even the Russian Revolutionary Government paused before the creation of an absolutely independent Finland which would make Petrograd untenable from a military point of view.

These are, of course, merely illustrations and suggestions. It would take us too far afield to enter upon a detailed discussion of the problem of nationality here. But all those who are familiar with the subject must admit that the crux of the problem is a military one. No doubt, in many cases it is complicated with other considerations; and no doubt, also, the status quo ante may be improved upon without seriously endangering the security of any nation. But, unfortunately, what is needed for a nation's "security" is liable to be a matter of serious difference of opinion between the suppressed nation and the nation that lords it over her. Also, concededly, the principle of nationality cannot have absolute free play so long as we must take strategic and economic-strategic considerations into account.

If, therefore, we are serious in our determination to bring about a peace based upon the right of each nation, whether big or small, to decide upon its own destiny; if we are serious in our efforts to bring about a just and *lasting* peace; above all, if we are really desirous of making this war the last of all wars, there

is only one way open for us: *absolute disarmament and international organization.*

The time when *any* kind of disarmament and *any* kind of international organization was considered a utopian dream of Socialists and other "visionaries" is past. The most "practical" men are now talking about it, proving their great "practical" sense by coming about a generation too late as compared with the "visionaries." But like the good "practical" men that they are, our "practical" men not only come when it is late but they do not see any further than their own noses. They are therefore insisting on half or quarter measures which are worse than useless. It is therefore up to those who have some vision, who can take broad and long-range views of great world-problems, to step into the breach and to demand that the problem be solved once and for all, instead of the present difficulty be merely tided over by some patched-up arrangement, which must necessarily become the starting point for even greater difficulties.

Above all, it is up to the Socialists. The present crisis has shown that as long as the problem of war remains unsolved, the entire fabric of the international socialist movement is as flimsy as a cobweb which the slightest wind will blow away. If the International Socialist Movement is to be built upon secure foundations, we must do away with the possibility of war. We must demand *complete disarmament and international organization.* International organization not to *enforce* peace, but to *secure* peace.