

lic opinion," supplemented by occasional use of armed force during strikes, Capitalism maintains itself as a government of one class.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a recognition of the fact that only one class in society counts, the working class; that it is the mission of this class to end class rule by annihilating the basis of class rule—the bourgeois control of industry. In the reconstruction of society on a Socialist basis, the proletariat alone is the dynamic force; all other classes are necessarily opposed to Socialism, and counter-revolutionary. A Constituent Assembly, accordingly, by instituting a "government of all the classes," acts against the coming of Socialism; and while in this government "Socialist" influence may be strong or even predominant, the government will gradually become more and more bourgeois, since the retention of bourgeois democracy, of bourgeois control of industry, of the parliamentary and other institutions of Capitalism will baffle proletarian action, will strengthen the control of the bourgeoisie, and the "government of all classes" becomes a government of one class—the predatory class of capital.

The proletarian revolution marks a complete break with the relations, social institutions and ideology of the past. It is a revolution that must penetrate deep into the basis of society and the ideology of the masses before it can conquer and assure the coming of Socialism. The bourgeois revolution was a small affair in comparison, since it produced no fundamental changes, social or economic; it was a political revolution, annihilating the class rule of Feudalism in order to establish the class rule of Capitalism. The ease with which the bourgeoisie adapted itself to a restoration of monarchy, in France and in England, or to the retention of monarchy as in Germany, proves the comparatively superficial transformations accomplished by the bourgeois revolution. The bourgeois revolution requires no fundamental ideological revolution: the ideology of master and slave remains under a new form. Nor does the bourgeois revolution have to be drastic, make a complete break with the past: it can adapt itself to remnants of the old order, or rather make these remnants adapt themselves to the new: and the compromise is made, assuring the supremacy of Capitalism.

But the proletarian revolution cannot compromise with the past: compromise means the inevitable coming into power of Capitalism again. Compromise is fatal. Either the bourgeoisie is completely annihilated, or it will gather its forces anew and annihilate Socialism and the proletariat. The proletarian revolution must conquer the bourgeoisie politically, expropriate it economically, create new social and industrial relations and a new ideology: it is a giant task. The antagonisms, the hatreds and the counter-revolutionary activity aroused by the proletarian revolution are consequently enormous: and enormous is the task of crushing the old order, a task requiring dictatorial and drastic methods, the full measure of the energy, the initiative and the power of the proletariat. The introduction of Socialism is the task of the Revolution in Germany; Socialism is realizable only through the class action of the proletariat,—the real revolution in Germany, accordingly, insists upon proletarian dictatorship as the only means of realizing its ideals.

The peculiar thing about this dictatorship of the proletariat, however, is that it functions democratically. A Soviet government is the most democratic form of government conceivable, based directly upon the producers in the factory and the field, a government that can be changed every three months, or within less time by the votes of its constituents. The citizens of the Soviet Republic are active agents of government. It is a dictatorship, moreover, that introduces industrial democracy, that ends the private ownership of the means of life, that destroys the old system where the worker was an industrial serf, and makes the workers the conscious masters of industry—and of their own life and destiny.

The use of force is incidental, and is characteristic of every revolution. The counter-revolution in Russia, and perhaps soon in Germany, resorts to force to crush the new Socialist state: force is answered by force. The dictatorship of the proletariat, however, is dynamic, not static; its every act is not to preserve itself as dictatorship, but to bring about those new relations of society in which dictatorship disappears. It is indeed a peculiar dictatorship that strives to transform itself into a superfluity!

The dictatorship of the proletariat, moreover, realizes that the forms of bourgeois democracy are incompatible with the task of the revolution-

ary proletariat: it annihilates bourgeois democracy and the parliamentary system. The concepts of bourgeois democracy in Russia were a fetter upon the action and emancipation of the proletariat; they are equally a fetter upon the revolutionary proletariat in Germany. Revolutionary Socialism there opposes the Constituent Assembly because it is an expression of bourgeois democracy, the organ of the Capitalist republic, assuring the supremacy of Capitalism and Imperialism. In annihilating Capitalism, Socialism in Germany must equally annihilate the "democracy" of Capitalism.

Either Constituent Assembly or dictatorship of the proletariat, either Capitalism or Socialism—that is the issue of the revolution in Germany, the decisive issue.

Revolutions and "Separatism"

THE "Socialist" Republic in Bavaria has threatened to break diplomatic relations with the rest of Germany unless the government grants certain measures, the dismissal of Dr. Solf and Erzberger, and the crushing of all counter-revolutionary elements. Concerning this threat of Bavarian Premier Eisner, Liebknecht in "The Red Flag" says:

"His threat of breaking off diplomatic relations will probably have a result that Eisner never intended. The reactionary elements in Bavaria and the rest of South Germany will find it easy to use his threat for counter-revolutionary purposes."

Eisner is de facto encouraging the separatist tendency in Bavaria. The Bavarian bourgeoisie is trying to absolve itself of all blame for causing the war, and is eager to make a "separate peace" with the Allies, imagining this will mean easier terms. This is one phase of the movement to declare Bavaria an independent Republic. But the fundamental factor in the "separatist" tendency, in spite of Eisner's immediately radical purpose, a Liebknecht-Haase Government, is that separatism is to act as a breakwater against the spread of revolutionary Socialism to Bavaria. The reaction and the counter-revolution in Bavaria, Silesia and the Rhine provinces are threatening secession if "proletarian dictation" persists in Berlin. Eisner is playing with fire. By publishing documents proving that the counter-revolutionary elements in Berlin conspired for war, Eisner promotes the revolution; by threatening a severance of diplomatic relations, he indirectly assists the bourgeois reaction. A revolutionary overthrow of the reactionary government—that is the tactic necessary.

Immediately upon the development of revolution in Austria-Hungary, Hungary, that is to say, the Hungarian ruling class, declared itself an independent republic, a measure calculated to stem the tide of Social Revolution by misdirecting the energy of the masses into the sterile channels of national independence.

In Russia during the Revolution, the landowners, bourgeoisie and petty bourgeois Socialists of the Ukraine separated from Soviet Russia to prevent the Bolsheviks from conquering in the Ukraine and get "easier" peace terms. Wherever counter-revolution raises its head in Russia, it immediately organizes an "independent republic"—of the Don, of the Caucasus, of Siberia.

In this separatist tendency, the bourgeoisie arouses old racial antagonisms which have long since lost all meaning, and tries by this method to create antagonism against the Socialist Republic, split the proletariat and misdirect its energy. This is precisely the tendency of bourgeois separatism in Bavaria.

In Russia there was a reason for the separatist tendency. Russia was a conglomeration of nationalities, not as yet assimilated because of the brutal, stupid nature of Czarism. The Bolshevik policy, accordingly, was to grant these nationalities the full right of secession, depending upon the proletarian class struggle to conquer and unite the Russian nationalities on a new basis—that of a federated Socialist Republic. A Socialist Russia would have a powerful attraction for the proletariat in Finland, in Poland, in the Ukraine; and by means of this the different nationalities would be amalgamated into one republic.

But in Germany there is no such reason. Germany has long since been unified into one nation, except in Prussian Poland, Schleswig, subject territory. But as the bourgeoisie favored national unity to accomplish its "manifest destiny" of becoming powerful and predatory, so now this bourgeoisie in Bavaria and Silesia would break the unity of Germany if Socialism conquers, in order to protect its "manifest destiny." Separatism is necessarily an instrument of the counter-

revolutionary bourgeoisie and agrarian aristocracy, in Germany as in Russia.

But as the success of Socialism in Prussia develops a separatist tendency among the Bavarian and Silesian bourgeoisie and agrarian aristocracy, it simultaneously develops a "unifying" tendency among the Bavarian workers and peasants, who, under the pressure of events, will see their interests realized in a unified Socialist Germany as a preliminary to a unified Socialist United States of Europe.

The separatist tendency in Bavaria and Silesia, the tendency for national independence in Austria-Hungary and the Slav races, all are expressions of the developing class struggle. Clearly, the interests of the workers and peasants of Germany, of Austria, of Bohemia, of Poland, of Galicia are not promoted by "national independence"—national independence for small states is a mockery under the conditions of Imperialism; but by means of federation in a Socialist Republic. The bourgeois cry of national independence in South-eastern Europe is directly counter-revolutionary; the workers and peasants must unite with Soviet Russia, with the oncoming Socialist Germany.

A revolution lets loose two sets of forces, one centripetal, the other centrifugal, one scatters, the other unifies. The proletarian revolution in Germany necessarily, at first, scatters, disintegrates the old national unity: the impact of the class struggle produces disintegration of the old, an apparent end of all things, "anarchic disorder." But as under conditions of revolution the forces of the bourgeoisie are centripetal, so the forces of the proletariat are centrifugal. The proletarian revolution conquers, and unifies again, on a new and higher basis. The separatist tendency is incidental a temporary instrument of counter-revolution.

Bolshevikjabs

NOW that peace is declared Mr. Gompers again assumes a belligerent attitude. Speaking at a "jubilee" meeting of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy, though what that unfortunate organization has got to be jubilant about is shrouded in mystery, the redoubtable Sammy breathes fire and devastation in a manner calculated to give the bloated plutocrats the shivers until he announces that he has no intention of turning to any "patented panacea for all the ills of human kind," and then our friend the capitalist settles back comfortably in his seat assured once more that "all's right with the world."

We are indebted to our old and trusted friend, the bourgeois press, for the latest confidential inside information regarding affairs in the poor old Emerald Isle. It appears that the Kaiser is to be offered a haven of refuge in Ireland. When we search our memory there appears only one place in Ireland that could fittingly be set apart to receive such a distinguished visitor—from the number of English Lords that have, from time to time, graced its halls and from its general historical associations, Dublin Castle seems to be just the place for Mr. Hohenzollern.

"Ex-Kaiser Blames Russia for the War," says a newspaper headline. Well, taking everything into consideration, it is more than we expected of Wilhelm that he would be so considerate as to blame somebody that couldn't be punished, but, still, in fairness to the late ex-Czar, we would say that if he did start the war he never intended that it should go so far.

Field Marshal Von Hindenburg has issued an order in which he states that "no offense will be taken at the display of the red flag." We await with eagerness for the German Socialists to tender a vote of thanks to the doughty soldier for his kindly consideration.

Who would ever have thought that Hindenburg would outdo our mayors in the matter of toleration? Human nature's wonderful!

"Dutch to decide Wilhelm's status," says a news item. Might we offer the suggestion that the unknown quantity is decidedly X.

"Congress Cool to President" says the headlines. From the fact that none of the much heralded Republican heckling materialized it would not be unfair to assume that the coolness was chiefly of the pedal extremities.

King Nicholas I of Montenegro has been deposed. Another "ad" in the situations wanted column