

word must be: arm the proletariat so that it may defeat, appropriate, and disarm the bourgeoisie. This is the only possible policy of the revolutionary class, a policy arising directly from the *actual evolution* of capitalistic militarism, in fact, dictated by this evolution. Only *after* having disarmed the bourgeoisie, can the proletariat, without betraying its historic mission, cast all weapons to the scrap-heap; and there is no doubt that the proletariat will do this, but only then, and not, by any possibility, before then.

While it is true that the present war calls forth, among reactionary Christian socialists and the whining *petit bourgeois*, only terror and intimidation, only an aversion to all use of arms, to blood, to death, etc., we, on the other hand, must declare that capitalist society always was and always will be *a terror without end*. And if now the present most reactionary of all wars is preparing to put *an end to the terror*, there is no reason for our falling victims to despair. But the "demand" of disarmament, at bottom, cannot be considered as anything but a counsel of despair—let us say "dreams of disarmament" rather than "demands of disarmament,"—at a time when it is clear to all eyes that see, that the forces of the bourgeoisie itself are preparing the way for the only war that is at once in accordance with the laws of evolution and revolution: the civil war against the imperialistic bourgeoisie.

To him who says that this is theory, out of contact with life, we answer by recalling two facts of importance in the world's history, namely, the part played by the trusts in bringing about the factory labor of women, and, second, the Commune of 1871 and the December uprising of 1905 in Russia.

It has been the function of the bourgeoisie to develop trusts, to drive children and women into factories, and there to torment them, ruin them morally, and condemn them to merciless exploitation. We do not "demand" this process, we do not "support" it, we struggle against it. But *how* do we struggle? We know that the trusts and the factory labor of women are steps in progress. We do not wish to retrace our steps to trade craftsman-

ship, to pre-monopolistic capitalism, to domestic labor of women. Onward through trusts, etc., and beyond them to Socialism!

This view, which takes into account the *actual course* of evolution, is applicable also, with corresponding modifications, to the present militarization of populations. The bourgeoisie is today militarizing not only all the men, but also all the boys. Why should it not proceed tomorrow to militarize all the women? In this connection we can only say: So much the better! Go right on! The faster you go, the nearer we are to an armed uprising against capitalism. How can social-democrats be alarmed at the militarization of boys, etc., unless they forget the example of the Commune? This is not "theory, out of contact with life," not a dream, but a fact. And there would be no cause for congratulation, should we find that social-democrats, contrary to all economic and political facts, should begin to doubt that the imperialist epoch and the imperialist wars will bring about the repetition of many such incidents.

In May 1871, a bourgeois observer of the Commune wrote, in an English paper, "If the French nation consisted only of women, what a frightful nation it would be!" Women, and children of thirteen, fought in the Commune by the side of men. And in the approaching combats for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, it will not be otherwise. Proletarian women cannot look on passively, while a well-armed bourgeoisie shoots down the poorly-armed or unarmed workers. They will take to arms, as in 1871, and out of the present intimidated nations, or rather, out of the present workers' movement, disorganized more by the opportunists than by the governments, there is not the slightest doubt that there will arise, sooner or later, an international league of the "frightful nations" of the revolutionary proletariat.

At present militarism is permeating all of social life. Imperialism is an infuriated struggle of the great powers for the division and redivision of the world. It must therefore inevitably lead to a further militarization of all countries, including the neutral countries and the small countries. What will proletarian women do about this? Will they simply abjure all warfare and