

system. They defend with all their might the individualistic form of consumption which was a necessity only then when individualism existed also in the production, which was justified at a time when our present form of machinery was not yet dreamed of.

This class-struggle must and will only end with a victory for the workers, because only the demands of the workers correspond with the new technique, with the new productive forces. A system where a contradiction exists between production and consumption is not normal. The abnormal conditions of the present system are clearly seen at the time of a crisis.

Imagine such conditions as the following: thanks to the fact that the shoemakers have manufactured too many shoes people must go barefooted; due to the fact that the tailors made too many clothes people are compelled to go naked; just because the bricklayers happened to build too many houses people have no place in which to live; because the crops happened to be favorable, people have nothing to eat. Can you imagine such conditions? No, did you say? Ah, but they exist. When are the people deprived of food, clothing, and shelter? In times of a crisis. What is a crisis? Is a crisis caused by a lack of commodities? Not at all: It is caused by an *overproduction*. These crises are the symptoms of a chronic disease with which our system is afflicted. This disease is caused by the contradiction between the production which is socialistic and the consumption which is individualistic. The only remedy which we can apply to our system is the removing of the cause. The form of consumption must be adapted to the form of production; private ownership must be abolished and Socialism established.

The historical necessity for Socialism is thus made clear to every right thinking individual.

This much for the Marxian Theory of Socialism. Until Marx, Socialism was only a noble desire, but Marx had made a science of it. Marx by means of his analysis of the capitalistic system of production has shown that Socialism does not depend upon the will of anyone, but is a natural result of the productive forces in the present system.

#### *The Soviets as Seen by Plekhanov and Lenin*

The brief review of utopian and scientific Socialism makes it clear to us why the followers of the Marxian Philosophy and the Economical Interpretation of History, as Plekhanov, Kautsky and others, so vigorously oppose the Soviet Government. They

opposed such a form of government not because they thought that the Soviet Government would hasten the cause of Socialism, but just for the contrary reason. They thought it would retard the fulfillment of Socialism. At the time when the Soviets first took control of the government in Russia, the entire power of the government of Germany was still in the hands of the Junkers and their Supreme Chief, William II. The program of the Soviets was limited to Russian territory. Plekhanov and his comrades claimed that Russia was not yet ripe for Socialism; that capitalism in Russia was not yet sufficiently developed; that the industrial proletariat formed only a very small part of the population—about 8 or 9 per cent; and that the machine production had not yet come up to the standard of the western countries. And therefore they argued, that under such conditions to attempt to establish a Socialist Régime was a dangerous experiment which might do more harm than good. Modern Socialism takes its root in the Capitalistic System, and therefore Socialism must be the heir of Capitalism. Where Capitalism has nothing to leave, Socialism can inherit nothing. In conclusion, they claimed, just as the experiments of Robert Owen were a failure, just as the communards in France in the year 1871 were a failure, just so must the attempt of the Soviets be a failure.

The Plekhanovs and Kautskys erred due to the fact that they did not take into consideration the relationship of the power of the different economic classes and groups of Russia. They were right as far as the theory is concerned, but they blundered in their judgment regarding the sociological structure. They measured the power of the Russian industrial proletariat as a unit by itself, as an isolated power. What they should have done was to measure the power of the Russian industrial proletariat in relationship with the other social forces or classes.

When a general leads his army into battle he not only thinks of his own strength, but of that of the enemy. It is possible for him to win a battle with a small army provided the opponent has a still smaller one; on the other hand, he can lose a battle even though he may have a large army if the opponent has a still larger one. This fact Plekhanov and his comrades could not see, and therefore they could not comprehend the significance of the Soviets. It is true that the Proletarian force in Russia is proportionally very small, but the forces that are against them are still weaker. The Russian bourgeoisie had been oppressed by the Czar. They had no opportunity to organize themselves in order to become a strong force. Immediately after the Czar's dethronement, the Proletarian movement had already shown it-