

by recent historic developments. In his article, "Socialist Policy in Peace and War," he devotes two pages to what he calls the "Socialistic" stand on war policy, and the shortness of this part makes its inconsistency all the more clear. The Socialist, according to Boudin, does not "take sides" in the sense of favoring one group of warring capitalists against another. But he "desires the success of that group whose policies" etc. Although he "desires" he does not "favor" them even in thought, for the "taking sides" in this connection is evidently only a mental process. He is "never a partisan in the ordinary sense of the world," although his "neutrality" may be "benevolent" to one of the parties in the struggle. And at times, "he may deem it his duty to take a hand in the struggle in order to secure a lasting and a just peace for all concerned." Now mind that this refers to capitalist struggles between one group of nations against another and that these struggles have the character of struggles for world dominion. One might suggest that Boudin means by "taking a hand in the struggle" some revolutionary move of the proletariat. But he specifically states: "When he (the socialist) does that, he must, of course, fight on the side of one capitalist group, his national group." It does, of course, matter very little that he declares this to be "not out of national but international considerations." The same has been declared by Walling, Stokes, Spargo, Slobodin and the rest.

And what is the excuse which Boudin gives for breaking down his own war policy? The absolute independence and freedom of development of all "peoples" is called "one of the cardinal tenets" of Socialism and again "the possibility of a crushing defeat of one of the parties to the struggle is a controlling consideration with the Socialist." And he even goes so far as to construe a socialist policy based on the consideration "that his sympathies in the struggle usually depend on the condition of the *war map*, being usually with whoever may be the underdog FOR THE TIME BEING."

There never was poorer opportunism advocated by a man who so far devoted a great part of his life to fight opportunism in the Socialist party. Once on the way down on account of his losing sight of actual developments, he ends with the same ridiculous suggestions already given in his book on "Socialism and War." If the socialist decides to fight voluntarily on the side of one capitalist group, "he must preserve absolute freedom of action." The working class fighting together with its exploiters in a national life and death struggle "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."

Here it is suggested to throw an entire working class population voluntarily into a modern capitalist war, delivering the workers to all the

machinations of discipline, censorship, and the entire power of militarism, and then evidently a small group of clever leaders sits watching all the time to see whether the ruling class does not go too far, and if it does, calls the workers back from the trenches.

If this could be done as easily as taking a figure from a chess board, the so weakened national army would most likely become the losing party and it would be necessary to hurl the soldiers back to the battlefield to prevent the "crushing defeat of one of the parties," this being a "controlling consideration" with socialists.

The national standpoint under present-day Imperialistic Capitalism is simply reactionary no matter what the "international considerations." And the only way out is to stick to the fight against capitalism and against the government in peace and in war all over the world.

S. J. RUTGERS.