

*sion of collectivism*; and Germany's unity of purpose the most telling argument for democratic control that the world has before it. The war will be worth years of arguments in favor of democratic collectivism. And *Germany's impending triumph is the death knell of individualistic competition as the 'life of trade' . . . How any Socialist can wish for the success of feudal Russia and individualistic France and plutocratic England over against the State Socialism of Germany is a riddle I cannot find an answer to.*"

And from his point of view—the point of view which looks to the past to bring about the future over the head, so to say, of the present—Dr. Hall has just as much a right to be puzzled at the anti-Germanism of some Socialists as Mr. Angell has to be at the anti-war attitude of some others.

To Mr. Angell, who settled the question of the "common enemy" in the "liberal" sense, that is in favor of the community of interest between the working class and the bourgeoisie as against the remnants of feudalism and autocracy, the idea of Socialists refusing to help the bourgeoisie in any struggle against autocracy is shocking and such an attitude quite incomprehensible. But to Dr. Hall, who evidently settled this question the other way, it is the support by any Socialist of the liberal bourgeoisie that is shocking and incomprehensible. In this connection it is interesting to observe that the England that Dr. Hall particularly detests is the England of the "Whig plutocracy." Evidently to his mind there is no such a thing as a Tory plutocracy; or if there be such a thing it is for some reason or other less objectionable than Whig plutocracy. For which view Dr. Hall may cite illustrious authority, including Carlyle and Hyndman.

I could cite many more illustrations from the public prints and private correspondence. But I consider what has already been pointed out as quite sufficient, I must add, however, that I have the express assurance of a prominent Socialist and pacifist that "*we*" and the Kaiser have, or may have, a common enemy; that it is therefore possible for the Kaiser to be working for a Socialist peace and that he is therefore "uninfluenced" by the fact

that he and the Kaiser are, or may be, working for the same thing.

Needless to say that this good Socialist could not for a moment imagine that "we" and J. Pierpont Morgan could have a common enemy in any social class or institution, or could work side-by-side for a common cause in this war—although Mr. Norman Angell takes that possibility for granted.

At the root of the whole matter lies a dualistic conception of the term *Social Democracy*; to the one school *democracy* is the prime principle, while social organization or *socialization* is a secondary matter; while to the other school social organization or *socialization* is the primate and democracy a subsidiary consideration. This dualism in the conception of Social Democracy is a survival of the pre-Marxian epoch of the Socialist and Labor Movement. The progress of the Movement has steadily forced this dualistic conception to the background, its place being taken by the monistic conception of the proletarian Class Struggle and the policy of true independent working class political action based thereon. But the triumph of the newer conception over the older ones was far from complete when the war broke out. Hence the presence in this "emergency" of the vulgar pro-Allyism of some of our Socialists on the one hand and of the essentially pro-German and no less vulgar pacifism of some others of our Socialists on the other, to confuse and confound the counsels of the working class.

In order that the working class may adopt a correct policy toward the great problems which now confront us, it is therefore necessary that we rise superior to these dualistic conceptions and solve the "common enemy" problem in the light of the Marxian philosophy.

A clear understanding of the true meaning of working class independent political action is therefore imperative at this juncture.