

self to be far stronger than the bourgeoisie. An actual bourgeois government existed in Russia at the time that Lvoff, Milyukoff and Gutchkoff were in power, but alas, they were in power only for a very short time. They existed only for a short time because the class upon which they depended was weaker than the Proletariat. Besides this, the peasants in Russia are very revolutionary. The hundreds of years of oppression by the Czar stored up in the hearts of the moujiks and peasants a violent anger against the wealthy and ruling classes. For this reason the peasants endorsed and helped any class which offered the most radical issues, in this case the Soviets. The psychology of the Russian peasant is not that of a small owner, for he lived in a communal atmosphere, known as the Mir, hence, the help he offers the industrial proletariat.

The sociological structure of Germany is somewhat different. The industrial proletariat in Germany is numerically very large. In the last election for the Reichstag (under the Kaiser) about 4¼ millions of votes were cast for the Socialist candidates. Industry in Germany is also very highly developed. Capitalism in Germany is much more advanced than in Russia. The trouble though is that the counter-forces of the power of the proletariat are very strong. The bourgeois revolution in Germany occurred in 1848. At that time the power of the German proletariat was almost negligible and the bourgeoisie had an opportunity to strengthen its position socially, politically, as well as culturally. The bourgeois ideology was preached and propagated in the universities and academies. Their literature and art had for its purpose only the deification of the bourgeois ideals. It is no wonder that even the proletarians were greatly influenced by this bourgeois psychology. Added to this, we must not forget that the German peasant is a small proprietor. He always supported the reactionary forces against the free movement of the Socialists. Just as they formerly supported the Junkers and the Kaiser, so they now uphold the conservative class and the bourgeoisie. It is very noteworthy to remark that immediately after the Kaiser lost his power the peasants issued a manifesto stating that they would support the new government, provided that the right of private ownership would not be interfered with. This explains why in Russia we hear of a Council of Workers and Peasants, while in Germany we merely hear of a "Council of Workers." The peasants in Germany are against the workers.

This brief analysis solves the puzzle. We know now why the proletariat in Russia, although a very small minor-

ity, is in power, and why in Germany the proletariat, though very powerful, is oppressed and not yet in control of the government. For, as was seen, it does not depend upon the power of the proletariat alone, but the power of the counter-forces must be taken into consideration. Frederick Engels would in such an instance say that we have to deal here with a parallelogram of forces (with forces and counter-forces).

If we were asked to express our opinion as to where Socialism will be first realized—in Germany or in Russia, we would without any hesitation say in Germany. We would say this in spite of the fact that in Germany the radical workers are not yet in control of the government. For we know that the realization of Socialism does not depend upon decrees and manifestos from the powers that be, but rather upon the objective industrial economic conditions. And the objective industrial economic conditions are more favorable in Germany than in Russia. The Plekhanovs would have been right in their opposition to the Soviets if the latter would only have as their purposes and aims the realization of Socialism in Russia. The fact though is that the significance of the Soviets is not their Socialist work, but rather their revolutionary accomplishments. Here is revealed the great disagreement between Plekhanov and Lenin as far as their attitude towards the government of the Soviets is concerned. Plekhanov considered the government of the Soviets as a factor, the function of which is to *socialize* Russia; whereas Lenin considered the government of the Soviets as a factor, the function of which should be the *revolutionizing of the entire world*. And here Lenin proved himself to be a better prophet than Plekhanov. Lenin better understood the power of revolutionary agitation than Plekhanov. Although the Kaiser was still in full power when the Soviets were first organized in Russia; although Russia was at that time absolutely isolated, yet Lenin was certain that sooner or later the German Proletariat would be infected with the revolutionary ideas and that the power of the Kaiser would be undermined. He did not think of the Soviets as a national Russian institution, but rather as an international factor. For this reason, and for no other, was he willing to sign the infamous Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which the Kaiser and his Junkers forced upon the Russian people, little caring whether the Russian territory would be decreased. Lenin's idea was to acquire such a position that he might be enabled to spread the gospel of revolutionary thought. To acquire this position meant to him much more than several Russian provinces. Plekhanov looked at