CORRESPONDENCE

IMPLICATIONS

To The NEW REVIEW:

A "distinguished American Socialist," at the recent Intercollegiate Socialist Society Convention, maintained that the Great War means "the moral triumph of Socialism and the collapse of Capitalism."

Accordingly—

1.—War waged by Capitalism is a crime against civilization; waged by Capitalism abetted by Socialism, war becomes a "moral triumph of Socialism."

2.—It is a "collapse of Capitalism" when Capitalism bends Socialism to its purposes, temporarily wipes out the class struggle and shatters Socialist international solidarity.

3.—Socialism scores a "moral triumph" whenever it allows itself to become the tool of governmental and Capitalist interests.

Our "distinguished American Socialist" doesn't draw these conclusions. The Great War, according to this "distinguished Socialist," means the "moral triumph" of Socialism because, based upon the theory that Capitalism inherently produces war, Socialists predicted this war.

Accordingly—

1.—The German, French and British chauvinists who raucously predicted this war as inevitable have scored a "moral triumph."

2.—While foreseeing the war, Socialists, particularly the German Socialists, failed to prepare adequately and when the war came were not in a position to oppose it—which naturally constitutes a "moral triumph."

3—Socialism scores a "moral triumph" whenever it foresees an event and fails to prepare for it.

The Great War means the "collapse of Capitalism" because it proves that Capitalism inherently produces war and is consequently unfit to control the destiny of civilization, is the "distinguished Socialist's" theory.

Accordingly—

1.—When Capitalism is fatalistically driven into war, doing that which is necessary to its existence, it means the "collapse of Capitalism."

2.—But when Socialism, which claims superiority and hostility to Capitalism, proves itself weakling and craven, not at all superior to Capitalism in spite of claims to the contrary, Socialism scores a "moral triumph" and proves that it alone is fit to control the destiny of civilization.

The beautiful theory of our "distinguished American Socialist" assumes that the Socialists of all the belligerent nations were equally justified. But here one meets a contradiction: The French, Belgian and German Socialists "backed up" their governments; the Russian Social-Democrats, the Socialists of Servia and certain British Socialists bitterly opposed their governments. Are they all equally justified? How? Unanimous justification should imply unanimity of action.

Accordingly—

Socialists' action is a justification in itself; any and all of their acts constitute a "moral triumph of Socialism."

Another "distinguished Socialist," slightly less distinguished than the "distinguished American Socialist," attempts in the New York *Call* to defend the German Social Democracy by insinuating that Socialists who condemn the Social Democracy are victims of "bourgeois American Germanophobia."

Accordingly—

Karl Liebknecht, Anton Pannekoek, the Chicago *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, the San Francisco *Vorwärts*, the New York *Volkszeitung*, are all victims of "bourgeois American Germanophobia," seeing that they all condemn the German Social Democracy.

Socialists who desire a victory of the Allies because its consequences would mean a new era of democratic progress in Europe, are victims of "bourgeois American Germanophobia," because their desire coincides with a similar desire of bourgeois democrats.

Accordingly—

1.—The "distinguished Socialists" who ascribe the Great War to commercial rivalry are victims of bourgeois stupidity of thought, seeing that many bourgeois thinkers agree with their view.

2.—"Democratic progress" is a meaningless term. There is nothing to choose politically betwen democratic and non-democratic nations. Socialism is a denial of social evolution.

3.—Marx was all wrong in urging democratic progress as a necessary precedent to the progress of Socialism; and his demand for a war in the interests of democracy against Russia, then the center of reaction in Europe, proves Marx to have ben the victim of mid-continental Russophobia.

Nationalism, the dynamic synthesis of the economic interests of nations and their antagonisms, was an active cause of the Great War. The "war against war" must therefore become a war against Nationalism. Our "distinguished Socialists," however, are celebrating an orgy of Nationalism: national interests are above class interests, and Nationalism will always be with us.

Accordingly—

1.—Capitalism, the economic development of which *tends* to minimize Nationalism and strengthen Internationalism, offers better prospects of universal peace than Socialism.

2.—As Nationalism may produce war, and national interests are above class interests, the Socialist proletariat must favor adequate armaments.

3.—Socialism is not international, and not the enemy of the barbarism of war. "Workers of the world, unite to slaughter each other. You have nothing to lose but your lives, and Nationalism to maintain."

The practical purpose behind the monstrous theorizing of our "distinguished Socialists" is the endeavor to "save the face" of the German Social Democracy. It is now clear that the dominant elements in the Socialist movement are seeking a re-organization of the International along the same nationalist lines that prevailed before the war. The German party was the center of nationalistic reaction in the old International. Our own nationalists derived their animating sentiments from the Social Democracy of Germany; and condemnation of the German party condemns the nationalists in our American party. The supremacy in the new International of the German Social Democracy *as now constituted* means the supremacy of Nationalism.

Accordingly—

Let us forget the apostasy of the German party, and perpetuate the apostates' control of the Socialist movement.

LOUIS C. FRAINA.

New York City.