

lectively by some of the publications of their National Executive Committee, and particularly the rather pompous letter to Senator Overman in which this sentence occurs: "Let us make it plain, Sir, that we absolutely discard the strike, general or local, as a weapon of revolution." What an utterance to put forth in the midst of the events in Germany! The members of the committee have taken "the general strike" out of a pigeon-hole in their writing-desk and they "discard it" into their waste-basket, and that is about all the event amounts to. It is quite evident that their brains are merely "applying" the writings of DeLeon as a revealed dogma; they are not continuing the tradition of his alert intelligence.

The news now comes from Robert Minor that the *World* misquoted his despatch. What he actually wrote was that Lenin said that the Soviet Government did *not* grow up on the ideas formulated by Daniel DeLeon. The joke on the Socialist Labor Party is no more than it deserves.

Russia and Germany

(A Sociological Analysis)

By A. S. SACHS

In the various branches of human knowledge we differentiate speculative sciences from experimental. In the experimental sciences such as chemistry and physics—a problem is determined experimentally. Problems in speculative sciences, however, are solved abstractly (without proofs by facts). This explains the reason why we have such a great difference of opinion in respect to social problems. The human mind is greatly influenced by the environment. He, who has been raised in an atmosphere of wealth, who at no time lacked anything requisite for an easy and decent livelihood, who enjoys the best that is in nature, finds this world a very suitable and comfortable place to live in. It is only natural that those who desire a change in the existing system should be considered by the aforementioned individual as mere criminals. But he, who has been brought up in an atmosphere of poverty and misery, who had to toil while yet in his teens, if not younger, who had and still must endure all sorts of indescribable sufferings in some industrial dungeon, he does not consider this world a very pleasant place to live in at all. Sparks of protest are gradually developed in his heart as well as in his mind. Taking these things into consideration we see

that those who desire such a change in the existing system are not only not criminals, but are those who are actuated by the loftiest and most sublime ideals. They are not degenerates and cowards, but are the best and noblest heroes.

It is only very logical that there should be diverse ideas and theories in sociology. Some are bourgeois in character and others are proletarian in character. The mind of the intellectual, as well as that of the ordinary layman, is very much influenced by the class interest. Therefore we have always dealt with bourgeois ideas and proletarian ideas which have been as far apart as East from West. The bourgeois and proletariat have been reared in very different atmospheres, live in different worlds and speak different languages.

After the revolution had taken place in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe not only the leaders of the bourgeoisie fought against the proletarians but the latter vehemently opposed each other. We can readily perceive the reason why the bourgeoisie opposed the proletarians. How is it that the proletarians who have been reared in the same atmosphere, who have the same end in view, how is it that they cannot come to one conclusion whereby to solve the social problem? How is this to be explained? Is it not strange that the people who only yesterday fought shoulder to shoulder for the same cause are now such deadly enemies? We can best answer these questions by a brief analysis of historical events.

The labor movement of Russia and Germany was called the Social Democratic Party. They sought two ideals—Socialism and Democracy. Socialism is an economic principle, the aim of which is that all means of production and distribution shall belong not as now to private owners but shall be the property of the State. Democracy, on the other hand, is a political principle, the aim of which is that the government shall not be controlled by one class or one group but rather by the whole populace. Nowhere else do we find a better definition of democracy than in Lincoln—"A government of, by, and for the people." Socialism seeks economic equality while Democracy seeks political equality.

Now let us pause for a moment and ask ourselves the following question; we have no opportunity whatsoever to carry out both principles at the same time—Socialism and Democracy. If we desire to carry out Socialism we are compelled to sacrifice Democracy—on the other hand, if we desire to carry out Democracy we must sacrifice Socialism—which shall we better choose—economic or political equality? It is certain that various answers will be given to this question. Some will favor Socialism and