

others will prefer Democracy. Here we have the cause for the great quarrels between the different factions of the proletarian movement—both among the leaders as well as the rank and file. The present government of Soviets in Russia and the Spartacan movement in Germany are more in favor of Socialism. To them the economic equality is more important. If economic equality cannot be carried out by Democracy, then they contend that the question of Democracy must be ignored. If Socialism cannot work hand in hand with Democracy then the latter must be sacrificed for the sake of the former. The Kerensky faction in Russia, the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviki, as well as the Majority Socialists in Germany reason exactly in the opposite direction. They favor Democracy. They claim that since the Socialists have already fought against the bourgeoisie because the latter were not sufficiently democratic, therefore, when the Socialists are in control, they must act and behave themselves democratically. If Socialism and Democracy cannot work hand in hand the latter must be chosen.

Between these two factions there are the Independent Socialists in Germany under the leadership of Hugo Haase and Karl Kautsky. These Independent Socialists have a rather great following in Russia. They claim that Socialism and Democracy are inseparable. They are not two separate principles but are rather two complements of one unit; two arms of one body; two eyes of one head. Just as we have no right to make one healthy eye useless for the sake of the other (for ultimately the second will suffer for it), just so ought we not sacrifice either Socialism for Democracy, or Democracy for Socialism. A solution of the present situation must be found by their harmony and not by their contradiction.

This explains the reason why the Spartacans after the fall of the Kaiser were absolutely against a Constituent Assembly. They saw that the Constituent Assembly would be controlled by a majority who were bourgeois. This they would not permit, for it would form an obstacle to the fulfillment of Socialism. They therefore demanded the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and that the entire control of the government be given to the Soviets. In Russia, as we know, the Bolsheviki disbanded the members of the Constituent Assembly even after they had been called together. The Majority Socialists in Germany, under the leadership of Ebert, Scheidemann and Eduard David, and the Right Wing of the Mensheviki and Social-Revolutionists in Russia favored a Constituent Assembly. They desired that the foundation of the coming State should be democratic. The Independent Socialists, as we recollect, were neither in favor of

the program of the Spartacans, that is to ignore the Constituent Assembly—nor were they with the Majority Socialists that the Constituent Assembly be immediately convoked. They demanded a postponement of the elections for the Constituent Assembly. They wanted to wait until the workers should have entirely freed themselves from the bourgeois ideology—so that a conflict between Socialism and Democracy may be avoided.

The Revolutionary and Evolutionary Theories

Let us not assume that the great frictions in the proletarian movement came into being only after the revolution. They existed long before the revolution but they were not felt. Take a piece of wood with visible cracks. On the sides of this piece of wood place immense weights. Press these weights together. In a very short time you will discover that the cracks have seemingly disappeared. Remove the weights and the cracks will once more be noticable. The same can be said of the proletarian movement. As long as the bourgeoisie and the Junker classes formed one compact reactionary force and with this pressed the workers to the ground, the differences of opinion amongst the workers were very trivial and only had a polemical and theoretical importance. But after the revolution, when the bourgeois class was overthrown and the workers became the controlling factor, the disagreements became prominent and important as well as much wider in scope.

The quarrels of today are, indeed, a continuation of the former polemics amongst the theoreticians—the polemics which dealt with revolutionary and evolutionary theories. The disciples of the evolutionary theory claimed that Socialism will not come suddenly, but will develop slowly, organically, step by step, from the present capitalistic system. They thought that the way towards Socialism is the way of reform. Reforms they knew may be won in the legislative bodies—hence, the importance of Parliamentarism.

The followers of the revolutionary theory have laid very little stress upon reform—for reforms have only a temporary importance—they serve no better purpose than patches on old clothes. The reforms are only significant in as much as they help strengthen the power of the workers, but they are not by any means a part of Socialism. Therefore Parliamentarism, the place of reform, never meant very much to the Revolutionist. Parliaments afforded the revolutionists an opportune place from which the gospel of Socialism may be disseminated, but it was never considered by them as a direct route towards Socialism. The Lenins and Trozskys, Liebknechts and Luxemburgs are the