

SOCIAL WORK, TRAINING FOR. See SOCIAL WORK, section on SOCIAL WORK, TRAINING FOR.

**SOCIALISM.** The terms socialism, communism and collectivism, which have often been used interchangeably, are ambiguous and ill defined; for this reason they have an exceedingly wide range of specific connotations. Proudhon, who passionately combated communism as understood in his time, was later classed by Heinrich Dietzel as a communist. The Bakuninists in the First International were the original collectivists, but to Paul Leroy-Beaulieu collectivism stood for all varieties of scientific socialism. The term socialism was first used in its modern sense in 1827 in the *Owenite Co-operative Magazine* to denote tendencies opposed to liberal individualism and in the 1830's was applied in both England and France to describe the social ideals of Owen, Saint-Simon and Fourier. With the victory of the Marxian ideology, however, it came to be interpreted in a restricted sense. George Bernard Shaw, for example, understands by socialism "the complete discarding of the institution of private property . . . and the division of the resultant public income equally and indiscriminately among the entire population," a description which would not apply to the social order advocated by Saint-Simonians and Fourierists and would be rejected also by many socialist leaders of the present time. Every definition must fail—as Dietzel and Sombart have conclusively shown—which focuses attention upon external features only and overlooks the central motif of all socialist movements.

Although collectivism has been used as the general concept of which socialism, communism and anarchism are the special variants, it seems wiser to adopt socialism, an expression which has left so much deeper an imprint on the public mind, as the all inclusive term. For the purposes of this article therefore the definition of socialism must embrace the characteristic common to all these ideologies throughout history and to the organized socialist movements of the more recent period. These are: first, a condemnation of the existing political and social order as unjust; second, an advocacy of a new order consistent with moral values; third, a belief that this ideal is realizable; fourth, a conviction that the immorality of the established order is traceable not to a fixed world order or to the unchanging nature of man but to corrupt insti-

tutions; fifth, a program of action leading to the ideal through a fundamental remolding of human nature or of institutions or both; and, sixth, a revolutionary will to carry out this program. The fact can scarcely be overemphasized that no true socialist is satisfied with merely economic reforms but advocates also a distinct educational, ethical and aesthetic policy.

The content of socialism may further be circumscribed if it is indicated what doctrines and movements, to which the socialist label has for some reason become attached, are not to be regarded as forms of socialism. To begin with, the communism which some students discern in certain types of primitive social organization is not a socialist phenomenon, since it represents a natural, organic evolution rather than a conscious effort. Nor is the communism of the early Christians and of some of their later followers a manifestation of socialism. If they rebelled against the existing order, it was to save their own souls rather than to build a new society; and their organization represented a communism of consumption of goods freely given and received, a form of *religiöser Liebeskommunismus* (Uroeltsch). Similarly the communistic orders of mediæval friars were not fighting the world but fleeing from it. The famous Jesuit colony in Paraguay, which flourished between 1602 and 1767, did not attempt to create a better society but was merely an experiment in religious colonization and missionary work among the natives. Organized Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant, has never been socialistic; it has tried to eradicate the worst features of the prevailing system by developing the moral forces of society. The *Rerum novarum* of Leo XIII promulgated in 1891 and the *Quadragesimo anno* of Pius XI in 1931 are of similar purport, except that the later encyclical indulges in a stronger criticism of the existing order. Analogous in spirit was the *Social Creed* announced by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America in 1908; it emphasized humanitarian principles and has been revised in line with newer programs of social planning and control in *Social Ideals of the Churches*, which was approved by the same body in 1933.

In recent years a number of governmental policies have been improperly identified with socialism. One of them is war communism, which has often recurred in history, coupled occasionally with an exalted messianism. An outstanding instance of this is the empire of the Incas in Peru, which was primarily a military

organization serving the interests of its rulers. The glorification of the regulative measures of belligerents in the World War as war socialism was in part a halting apology for a war which members of the Second International supported; such misinterpretation was possible only because of an overemphasis on the externals of socialism. Municipal socialism may in the future become an integral part of a functioning socialist system, but in its present form it is a purely utilitarian program. The same is true of all schemes of planned economy and partial socialization which do not disturb the essential features of capitalism. Nor is the Italian corporative state, which has not been fully realized as yet, a socialist institution. Despite its pretensions at a synthesis of nationalism and socialism German National Socialism is fundamentally a reaction against socialism. Yet some elements in this extremely heterogeneous movement may be regarded as a late offspring of the feudal and romantic type of socialism. Thus Gottfried Feder, an early and still important theorist of Hitlerism, considers the domination of finance capital to be the chief cause of economic distress; he advocates the nationalization of banks and the financing of public works through the issue of non-interest bearing certificates.

Finally, the programs of certain reform groups have sometimes been unjustly interpreted as socialistic. The teachings of a school of leading German professors in the last third of the nineteenth century were designated by their opponents as socialism of the chair merely because they criticized the shortcomings of laissez faire capitalism and advocated its regulation. There is not much more socialism in the economic, sociological and juristic doctrines of the French solidarists, who without rejecting the capitalist system propose to make it more cooperative in character, thereby improving the status of the propertyless groups. A similar judgment should be passed upon so-called Darwinian socialism of Ludwig Woltmann and others, who attempt to base socialism upon the principle of struggle for existence.

Varieties of socialism may be classified according to their ideals of justice, their motivations, their attitudes toward the state and their methods of attaining their ideals. The aristocratic socialism of Plato, of Campanella, of Fichte in his later period, of some of the romantics and of Rodbertus condemns existing society from the point of view of society, not of the individual, in terms of the *volonté générale*

rather than of the *volonté de tous* (Dietzel). The *sum cuique* of Plato is therefore its regulative principle. It is socialism imposed from above which disregards the selfish interests of individuals and tries to establish justice by organizing society in variegated groups. In recent years Othmar Spann, who regards popular socialism as an inconsistent medley of collectivism and liberalism, has sought to revamp such aristocratic socialism in a system which he calls universalism.

Communitistic socialism, the oldest of all forms, looks toward the ideal of absolute equality and seeks to express the *volonté de tous*; it appears in practically all periods when masses are living in wretchedness, surrounded by wealth. Its ideal, which represents an unlimited extension of the ideal of the family to the state, can be expressed in the maxim, probably of stoic origin: "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs." On the other hand, the socialism which has as its ideal not a mechanical equality of all members of society but rather a potential equality—in the sense of the maxim of Saint-Simon's followers, "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his merit"—has as its fundamental tenet not common ownership but the elimination of all unearned increment. The contrast between these two ideals, which was striking when scientific socialism first emerged, virtually disappeared when Marxism became the dominant socialism of Europe; but after the World War the distinction again acquired vital importance.

Socialism may be motivated by the religious or moral convictions of its advocates or by principles derived from empirical facts claimed to be the source of Marxian socialism and other recent trends or by resentment against the ugliness of capitalist civilization, as in the case of William Morris. Socialist attitudes toward the state differ: state socialism would establish state ownership and would have the state control future production, while cooperative socialism, which distrusts the state and fears the overdevelopment of bureaucracy, would base its system upon the organization of independent producers (guild socialism, syndicalism, industrial unionism). On the other hand, anarchism holds the historical state to be the ultimate source of exploitation and maintains that no reasonable social order can be established without its destruction. Conceptions as to the methods whereby socialist ideals are to be realized likewise vary: experimental socialism claims

that the new social order can result only from new social inventions; evolutionary socialism assumes that the essential elements of the new order are gradually evolving within capitalist civilization; revolutionary socialism maintains that the establishment of the new society can be achieved only by violent uprising; agrarian or liberal socialism regards as the only remedy the elimination of land monopoly, which it considers to be the sole cause of exploitation; jurist socialism conceives the main task of the new society as the codification of economic rights, of which A. Menger holds three to be fundamental: the right to the whole produce of labor, to existence and to work.

All attempts to show strictly delimited periods in the development of socialism have failed. There is no positive correlation between the socio-economic surroundings and the type of socialistic theory, for the creative power of great individuals is always decisive. Neither is it true that modern socialism is exclusively scientific whereas the previous forms of socialism were utopian. There are, for example, elements in the thought of Plato, More and Proudhon which express fundamental relations more clearly than do any of the later socialists. It is nevertheless true that there is a dominant tendency in modern socialism to secularize the state completely, to base socialism exclusively on science and to make it a conscious movement of the proletarian class.

**PRE-MARXIAN SOCIALISM.** The precursors of socialism from antiquity until the eighteenth century worked in a highly religious or metaphysical atmosphere. Certain theories or movements developed during this period, however, show sentimental reactions or ideologic constructions which approach certain aspects of modern socialism. Robert von Pöhlmann has contended that socialism entered Europe in the sixth century B.C. and became the central problem of the Greek world from the fourth century on. Max Weber, on the other hand, has affirmed that the foundations for a socialistic movement were lacking in Greece. It is obvious that the ancient world could not produce a socialism of the modern type, because there were no capitalistic structures but only capitalists eager for gain; small industry prevailed and there was no progressive concentration of industry; there was no labor problem, as the system was based on slavery; and the class struggle was confined to the oligarchic parties. But it is equally true that from the fifth century the disintegration in the

ancient state and the bankruptcy of traditional moral values had reached a point where there was widespread distrust of existing institutions. Dissatisfied intellectuals embraced the surviving traditions of the golden age; Sparta and Athens of the past were admired for their unified social structure. A comedy of Aristophanes, the *Ecclesiazusae*, was a satirical attack upon communist phantasmagorias and radical feminism. But far more important than these symptoms was Plato's *Republic*, in which he laid down a complete system of aristocratic communism. Although Plato's scheme is to be considered not as a utopia but as a genuine revolutionary effort, Platonic communism was essentially different from modern communism and according to Barker is more analogous to mediaeval monasticism. It maintained a rigid class rule based on slavery; its communism was confined to consumption; it repudiated equality; its outlook was not hedonistic but ascetic; it was militaristic and not international. The other products of ancient socialism, the series of utopias exemplified by the *Sun-State* of Iambulos, seem to be purely literary products rather than manifestations of revolutionary thought.

From the tenth century on, popular mass movements developed which were strange combinations of religious and social revolt. These movements, practically universal in the more developed countries of Europe, were the result partly of the dissatisfaction of peasants and partly of the discontent of industrial workers, especially weavers exploited by rising capitalism. As belief in the immediate approach of the Kingdom of God decreased, people became conscious of the antagonism between the equality of men preached by the gospel and cruel reality. A combination of religion and communism became the ideology of the Cathari, the Bogomiles, the Patarins, the Arnoldists, the Albigenses, the Lollards and many other sects. Some preached a moral asceticism, which makes them precursors of Tolstoy; others, like John Ball, expressed vehement class hatred. These movements increased greatly during the Reformation, when revolts broke out in some mining districts of Germany and agrarian discontent assumed a menacing form in other regions. The most stirring religious movements were associated with the Anabaptists, whose doctrine was a kind of anarchistic socialism looking toward equality in Christendom. Their condemnation of the whole fabric of society led to the mass uprising in Mühlhausen in 1525 led by Thomas

Münzer, who advocated what might be designated as a religious dictatorship of the proletariat. Another Anabaptist rising in the city of Münster in 1534-35 led to the establishment of the "New Zion." The Anabaptist communities established in Moravia in the sixteenth century were the largest communistic organizations on Christian foundations in Europe.

With the spirit of criticism aroused by the Renaissance and the Reformation and with the beginnings of capitalism a significant literature came into being, of which the *Utopia* of Thomas More (1516) has become the classic model. The new utopias are comparable to those of the Greeks, yet their tone is far more earnest; they are animated not by sensationalism but by a deep moral conviction. More, exasperated by the misery following the enclosure system, when "sheep ate men," described an ideal community on a strictly communistic basis. He was an ardent individualist, seeking a maximum of pleasure for everyone. The acumen of More's criticism has rarely been surpassed. The remarkable utopia of Campanella, *Civitas solis* (Frankfort 1623), is nearer the *Republic* of Plato than the work of More; it is distinctly of the aristocratic type, based on the absolutistic rule of a philosopher-priest-prince. Harrington's *Oceana* (1650) may be called a liberal-socialist utopia for it placed greatest stress on the equal distribution of landed property.

The movement of the Diggers, or True Levellers, which arose during the Cromwellian revolution, culminated in 1649 when Winstanley led a few men in Surrey to dig and manure land which did not belong to them. Leonard Woolf calls the Diggers the first fathers of modern democracy, but it was virtually their intention to establish communities as the Anabaptist colonists had tried to do a century earlier. Winstanley has been described as a communist by Max Beer; the main ardor of the Digger movement, however, was directed against monopoly in land.

In all these manifestations the reaction against the historical state was more sentimental and religious than political and rationalistic, and the movements had an individual or sectarian character. In the eighteenth century, when a world new in both its economic and its moral structure emerged, several traits of modern socialism appeared. Increasing importance was attributed to economic life. An entirely lay conception of the state was developed and the world view of the individual became more ra-

tionalistic. With the rise of large scale industry came a proletarian class and the social outlook became more and more international. All these tendencies reached their climax in the French Revolution. Significant changes in social views had occurred between the sixteenth century and the eighteenth. The spirit of the natural sciences, of Galileo, Kepler, Harvey and Newton, had undermined the preponderance of religious cosmogony. The movement of the Enlightenment had encouraged the individual to use his own reason. Economic life had been divorced from the interference of religion. The new morality of the puritan sects had overemphasized work, moderation and asceticism and had served to encourage the entrepreneur. The doctrines of the law of nature had been revived and in the hands of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Kant had asserted the necessity of a rational political order. Modern economic science was born and the physiocrats and Adam Smith tried to emancipate economic life from the despotism of the mercantilistic state. Morality came to be separated ever more pronouncedly from religion and utilitarianism declared enlightened self-interest to be the foundation of the commonweal. The deistic metaphysics of Rousseau and the critical idealism of Kant showed the existence of a superindividual moral law. Finally, the fight against despotism by Locke, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau and the *encyclopedistes* had sought to transform the absolutistic state into a government controlled by the people.

More imminent were the economic changes, whose influence has been felt progressively since the second half of the eighteenth century. The beginnings of the industrial revolution had shaken the foundations of the guild system and the self-sufficiency of the local centers. Closely connected with these changes was the growing disintegration of the feudal agricultural world, which had prevailed almost unaltered for a thousand years. The ancient manorial system with its many collective regulations, its joint participation in common land, forest and pasture and its intimate connection with the handicraft system proved an obstacle to the new economic forces. Rationalistic and competitive individualism were far more remunerative. The resulting army of bankrupt artisans and peasants laid the foundation for the modern proletariat. This socio-political process was accelerated by the "political means" of violence and fraud. The new enclosure movement in England, from the eighteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth

century, the previous expropriation of the religious orders in various countries, whose charitable work was suddenly dissolved, the devastation following upon wars, the dissolution of the remnants of the clan system and the increasing pressure of taxation in the absolutistic states produced growing misery. In one of the most dramatic chapters of *Das Kapital* Marx describes what he calls "the secret of primary accumulation." He refutes the classic theory that capital was accumulated by the economic virtues of the capitalists and depicts in broad although often exaggerated lines "the violent expropriation of the masses from the last third of the fifteenth until the end of the eighteenth century." According to one estimate there were about 500,000 vagabonds in France on the eve of the revolution, and Beer states that no fewer than 5,700,000 acres were withdrawn from small cultivators in England in the second half of the eighteenth century and at the beginning of the nineteenth.

All these factors helped to replace religious universalism with a system of individualism. It has become a widely accepted thesis that it is this spirit of individualism against which modern socialism is in revolt. Such a formulation is erroneous. Socialism, to be sure, became more powerful in the ratio in which individualistic liberalism seemed to be unable to cure economic evils. But liberalism in its beginning was a doctrine in the interest of the peasants against the seigniors, of the journeymen against the privileges of the masters, of the wage earners against the capitalists, of the broad masses of the consumers against feudal monopolies (Dietzel.) With the victory of the rich bourgeoisie individualism became more and more a capitalistic doctrine and liberalism became Manchesterism. At the beginning socialism differed from liberalism not in its aims but in its method; both were offspring of the same spirit of individualism and free criticism. Generally speaking, the early socialists continued liberal doctrine even while combating it. With Locke, the physiocrats and Adam Smith they accepted the labor theory of value and their main attack was therefore leveled against the right of inheritance and land monopoly. They carried the liberal doctrine to its full conclusions. Albert Schäffle rightly said that "both Liberalism and Socialism are offspring of the same spirit of Individualism, a pair of Siamese twins." For this reason the ideology of the French Revolution is a mixture of individualistic and socialistic principles. Perhaps the

most revolutionary idea of the new synthesis was that of the right to personal happiness; as Robespierre expressed it, *Le bonheur est une idée neuve en Europe*. From this perspective, as Lorenz von Stein has declared, "the equality of communism presented itself as the natural ultimate of the idea of equality upon which the revolution was built."

Not only liberal but strictly socialist ideas penetrated even conservative circles in France before the revolution. Turgot was one of the first to formulate the doctrine of surplus value. Necker in 1775 maintained that the misery of the people is caused by the exploitation of the workers. Linguet, an influential publicist, emphasized that liberty was illusory for the workers and that the liberation of the serfs made their situation even worse. Faiguac recommended the establishment of cooperative communities like those of the Moravians. Several decades before the revolution communist concepts were voiced in the works of Meslier and Morelly. Brissot in 1780 anticipated the dictum of Proudhon in the phrase, *La propriété exclusive est un délit contre la nature*. Mably attacked the laissez faire principle of the physiocrats.

Laski and others have contended that there was nothing distinctly socialistic in the French Revolution until Babeuf. From the point of view of Marxian socialism this diagnosis is correct; but in a broader sense the teachings of Rousseau were already markedly socialist in character. His philosophy is not distinctly communist, as some have declared it to be; but he did recognize the essential foundation of socialism when he stated, for example, "My thought is not to destroy absolutely private property, because this is impossible, but to restrict it to the closest limits, to give it . . . a bridle which reins it, which directs it, which subjects it, and keeps it always subordinate to the general will." Babeuf was unique in the period of the French Revolution not so much for his communism as for his application of organized revolutionary means, which foreshadowed those of the Bolsheviks in Russia, who regard themselves as continuing the direct revolutionary tradition of Babeuf, Marx and Rosa Luxemburg.

Even in Germany, which was far more backward socially and economically, the spirit of the *Aufklärung* led inevitably to socialistic conclusions; and Herman Cohen is not incorrect when he declares that Kant, the follower of Rousseau, in his political writings was "the true and real beginner of German socialism," for his moral

law was a radical condemnation of all historical society.

Analogous tendencies prevailed in the English socialism of the period with the difference that there was less moral tension than in France, although capitalism was more advanced and the agricultural revolution more complete. The two revolutions made possible the development of bourgeois forces. English aristocracy did not develop into a purely parasitical class as in France. The way toward socialism was already prepared by the founders of English liberal thought, by Locke in politics and Smith in economics. Both taught a labor theory of value, and Smith declared that "in the original state of things, which precedes both the appropriation of land and the accumulation of stock, the whole produce of labour belongs to the labourer." Archdeacon Paley in a parable showed the injustice of the present system. As in France the trend of this whole philosophy centered around the idea of equality; some acute observers foresaw that the contest for social and political equality must engender a struggle for economic equality. Likewise the first manifestations of socialism in England as in France were ultimately concerned with monopoly in land, which was regarded as a manifest infringement of natural law. The social gospels of Spence, Ogilvie and Paine emphasized the difference between landed property as a product of nature and industrial property as a product of work. At the same time there was a current of opinion which was not satisfied with this frontal attack against land monopolies and assumed a thoroughgoing communistic attitude. Godwin in his *Inquiry concerning Political Justice* (2 vols., London 1793) was more anarchist than socialist, for he did not believe in legislative action or in revolution; he preached an ethical communism. At the same time Wordsworth, Coleridge and Southey, influenced by the first humanitarian period of the French Revolution, became romantic admirers of communism.

From the beginning of the nineteenth century until the suppression of the Paris Commune the industrial and agrarian revolutions remolded radically the whole framework of society. There has recently been a tendency to dispense with the concept of the industrial revolution and to supplant it with the idea of a slow evolution; the very essence of revolution, however, is that quantitative changes suddenly become transmuted into qualitative changes. Robert Owen emphasized the fact that peace after the Na-

poleonic wars "found Great Britain in possession of a new power in constant action, which . . . far exceeded the labour of one hundred millions of the most industrious human beings. . . ." Describing the change from eighteenth to nineteenth century France, Henri Sée states that "in a period of fifty years a more far reaching transformation took place than had marked the entire three centuries since the end of the Middle Ages." With better hygiene and growing efficiency in production the population of Europe grew from the beginning of the nineteenth century until 1914 from about 180,000,000 to about 452,000,000. The masses congregated more and more in large cities and the proletariat slowly acquired a moral and mental outlook previously unknown in the history of mankind. The workers first began to revolt violently and to destroy the new machinery, as in the case of the English Luddites between the years 1811 and 1817. There set in a period of more intense exploitation of women and children, which lasted almost until the middle of the century. An inquiry in 1840 concerning the mining and other industries in England showed that women and children, some of the latter only six years old, were employed in mines, seldom less than eleven hours a day. Contemporary descriptions reveal that sanitary and dwelling conditions were appalling. The development of the slums long prevented the emergence of a feeling of community of interests. At the same time growing liberal democracy and technical efficiency brought about a state machinery whose power was greater than absolutism had ever been; this power was often used most ruthlessly, as in France, to tax the peasants almost to the subsistence level. Finally, the growing intensity of commercial crises (1817, 1825, 1836, 1847) made the wretched existence of the masses even more precarious.

Idealists were deeply stirred by the degrading poverty of the industrial centers. The misery which had prevailed through centuries of feudalism, formerly hidden in the back yards of the feudal estates, became visible in the show windows of the great cities (Oppenheimer). La Bruyère's description of the *animaux farouches*, scarcely distinguishable as men, who worked in the fields of France was still true even a century later. Intellectuals of the ruling classes, such as Michelet, Hugo, George Sand, Carlyle and Dickens, were moved by the sufferings of the new proletariat and Disraeli's parable of the "two nations" pictured the hopeless polarization

of society. Napoleon III in his *Extinction du paupérisme* (Paris 1844) warned society of the approaching danger, as did de Tocqueville, speaking in the Chamber of Deputies in January, 1848. The revolt was spreading against the philosophy of economic liberalism. Sismondi tried to show that the liberal doctrine of spontaneous readjustment was no longer valid. In an essay honored by the French Académie des Sciences Morales et Politiques (*De la misère des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France*, 2 vols., Paris 1840) Buret demonstrated that industrial civilization uncontrolled by the state must lead inevitably to destitution.

This setting was undoubtedly propitious for the maturation of the socialist doctrine. After the transitory calm of the post-Napoleonic period there came a rebirth of the revolutionary propaganda focused around Paris among the circles of various countries. Secret societies multiplied; a new wave of Jacobinism flourished. The Carbonari, the Young Europe, the Amis de la Vérité, the Amis du Peuple, the Société des Droits de l'Homme and other secret conspiratorial organizations were formed. Under all these influences an extremely rich socialist and communist literature arose.

The socialism of the nineteenth century shows certain characteristics which differentiate it from both eighteenth century socialism and the later Marxian synthesis. It was undoubtedly more scientific than the previous socialism. General formulae of reason and the law of nature had a lesser appeal; economic problems were now stressed. It differed in several respects from Marxian socialism. In the first place, it was based on a desire for sympathy and better understanding between the classes. Most of its representatives therefore, far from teaching a recognition of class struggle, placed their emphasis upon cooperation. The appeal of Owen is typical: "It will therefore be the essence of wisdom in the privileged classes to cooperate sincerely and cordially with those who desire not to touch one iota of the supposed advantages which they now possess. . . ." Second, it was an isolated intellectual movement and often assumed the form of sects. Third, it favored socialist colonies as practical economic experiments. Fourth, it was bound to the traditional moral and religious values.

In France Saint-Simon gave new impetus to socialism. He was convinced that a central organ regulating economic life and a new humanitarian religion instead of a falsified Christianity were

necessary if anarchy was to be avoided. He declared the new society to be preformed in the body of the old. The work of the French Revolution he regarded as incomplete because the world still remained feudal in essence, ruled by lawyers, soldiers and metaphysicians. As a form of organization for the new world of the industrialists Saint-Simon proposed a kind of socialization of economic forces, the subordination of private enterprise to regulation and directive councils of experts to maintain the harmony of the whole. His successors Bazard and Enfantin corrupted his teaching in many respects with materialistic mysticism or sexual libertinage. Nevertheless, certain popularizations of the Saint-Simon school had considerable influence upon contemporary and later thought. They emphasized the exploitation of man by man, the need for emancipation of the workers, the suppression of surplus value, and they expressed the fundamental principles of socialism more clearly than did the preceding schools. Present efforts toward a planned economy may be said to have a Saint-Simonian character.

Fourier on the other hand, can best be described as a liberal cooperative socialist. The essential for him was not the establishment of a general plan and leadership from above, but rather the building of fundamental social units in which a healthy economic life might develop. Believing that an attraction exists between human desires and the various economic occupations, he proposed the remolding of society on the basis of spontaneous cooperative associations. He ridiculed the idea of a sovereign people dying of hunger and maintained that the proper satisfaction of individual desires would lead to the most efficient type of production. Fourier may be regarded as one of the chief predecessors of the antistate movement. At the same time he expressed clearly the law of capitalist concentration and of the growing misery of the masses. Victor Considérant, the most important member of the Fourier school, in his *Principes de socialisme* (Paris 1847) formulated the ideas of capitalistic concentration, proletarianization, pauperism, the right to work, insurance for workers, the transformation of the wage system and the appearance of a new industrial feudalism with such vigor that the book may be regarded as an important step toward the *Communist Manifesto*, which appeared in 1848 (G. Sorci).

The liberal socialism of Proudhon urged not the suppression of capital, but only the elimination of its function of exploitation; it ad-

vocated the organization of a national cooperative bank which would be able to give gratuitous credit to all producers. Proudhon believed that the producers, liberated from the bondage of capital, would form spontaneous associations and would exchange their products on the basis of labor value; that government would thus be supplanted by the economic organism; and that this would lead to true industrial democracy (Proudhon was perhaps first to use this term), without which political democracy would always remain a farce. He proposed a system of political federalism which in his opinion would break down the centralized unity of France. Proudhon exerted a strong influence on the French masses, still *petit bourgeois* in character. It was doubtful for some years whether the First International would become Proudhonist or Marxist. At the end of the nineteenth century Proudhonism revived in the syndicalist movement.

The rebirth of religious feeling in large circles of French society gave impetus to several propagandists called Christian Socialists. Buchez tried to found a producers' cooperative movement; Lamennais in the second part of his career openly embraced the principles of communism; Cabet in his influential utopian work, *Voyage en Icarie* (Paris 1840), carried on the traditions of More, Campanella and to some extent of Fourier. Pecqueur, another religious socialist, had far greater theoretical importance; he described the process of growing capitalistic concentration and advocated the idea of nationalizing the means of production, with an admixture of cooperative socialist principles. He may be regarded as a precursor of the idea of occupational representation.

More important in its practical consequences was the work of Louis Blanc, a keen critic of capitalist society, who analyzed the process of concentration in detail and emphasized that a system of competition must lead to monopoly. He attacked the consequences of the liberal system and declared that the principle of *laissez aller* meant *laissez mourir*. He advocated productive associations of working men provided with necessary capital by the state, which should, however, not be the administrator or the proprietor of these workshops but only make the laws regulating them.

In England during this period socialism did not elaborate as many systems as it did in France and it showed more sobriety and greater realism, largely because of the higher development of the

British labor movement. English socialism continued the natural rights theory and especially the labor theory of value as initiated by Locke and scientifically developed by Ricardo. The influence of the latter on English socialism cannot be overrated; his reduction of value to labor in practically all important cases, his prediction that wages could not fail to be pressed down to the level of subsistence, his theory of land rent, his construction of the *homo oeconomicus*, were factors fostering belief in the necessity of class struggle. Charles Hall's agrarian socialism advocated the nationalization of the land and its division among the proletariat. Hall is one of the founders of the theory of surplus value—he held that the poor are robbed of seven eighths of their natural income—and of the theory of class struggle. Thomas Hodgskin was an individualistic socialist who made acute observations concerning the labor theory of value, class warfare and exploitation. He hoped that the coalition of workers would limit the unearned increment of lazy capitalists but insisted that working capitalists were entitled to an adequate wage. He was an anticommunist, declaring the right of property to be essential to the welfare of society. John Gray sought the solution of the social problem in the process of circulation; he asserted that barter and barter alone is the basis of society and urged that since the whole principle of exchange was falsified, national warehouses should be established to determine the price of all commodities on the basis of labor value. John Francis Bray gave a kind of synthesis of Owenite teachings and anticapitalistic criticism.

The two dominant figures among the founders of English socialism were William Thompson and Robert Owen. Thompson, whose original teachings Menger contends were appropriated by Rodbertus and Marx, was a follower of Bentham. He maintained that the first agent in the economic process was not the capitalist but the producer, and formulated what later became the *eternes Lohngesetz*, iron law of wages, of Lassalle. In his hope for the transformation of capitalist society through cooperative-socialist communities composed of associations of producers he shared the plans of his contemporary Robert Owen, by far the greatest figure in British socialist history. Owen had little interest in political reforms but was convinced that the main task for the social reformer was the elimination of disorderly competition and faulty education. When he commenced his activity he was



scarcely more than an ardent social reformer; later, exacerbated by the resistance of the cotton lords, he became more and more a communist. He was convinced that the new economic system would create unlimited prosperity and therefore he never seriously contemplated the problem of distribution. His plans for education, for making work agreeable, dignified and pleasurable, are comparable to those of Fourier, while in his emphasis on the necessity of establishing free productive associations he can be regarded as a precursor of Blanc. In his views on the state he came closer to Proudhon than to the state socialists. He was the first to initiate labor defense legislation, trade unionism, cooperative organizations and all embracing educational reforms.

In Germany the socialism of this period was far more abstract and theoretical than was the French and English, because the German structure of society remained traditional, feudal and autocratic. German socialism was a moral protest and a religious hope rather than the battle cry of an organized class. What later became militant German socialism had its source in four ideologic currents. First, there was the tradition of the German idealist philosophy of Kant, especially as formulated by Fichte, who elaborated a system of socialism of an aristocratic and authoritative character in which elements of state socialism were combined with a kind of guild socialism in order to guarantee to the individual the right to a minimum subsistence. Fichte proposed that a meticulous system of planned economy be developed, that the frontiers of the state be closed to foreign commerce and that all the citizens be organized on an occupational basis. The second current was the type of socialism which Marx denounced as German, or "true," socialism, represented by such men as Hess, Weitling and Grün. This school, also called *Handwerksburschen-Sozialismus*, represented a humanitarian, optimistic tendency comparable with that of early French and English socialism. Feuerbach's philosophy also exerted a growing influence. A third strain was the reaction against the beginnings of capitalism among the ideologists of the old regime, which gave rise to a romantic and authoritative type of semisocialistic thought described by Marx as reactionary, or feudal, socialism. In fact, however, it was not entirely reactionary; occasionally it was a genuine protest against unbridled Manchesterism, calling for the reorganization of professional life along medi-

eval lines, thus representing an early precursor of guild socialism. In particular Franz von Baader and Adam Müller sharply criticized the capitalist system and prophesied its collapse, and Winkelblech proposed a detailed plan of guild organization. Finally, there was the current of socialist thought which is generally characterized as scientific, with the implication that economic researches play a paramount part in its formulations. The term scientific is not a fortunate one, because previous types of socialism cannot simply be discarded as unscientific; an economic foundation does not necessarily go deeper than a psychological or a moral one. A leading figure among early scientific socialists was Karl Rodbertus, who vigorously criticized the capitalist system as creating pauperism and commercial crises, because five sixths of the nation by virtue of the meagerness of their incomes are in effect excluded from the benefits of civilization. As a remedy he recommended that the working class be given a greater share in the national income. Rodbertus was an anti-individualist and anti-egalitarian socialist of the type of Plato, Saint-Simon and Fichte. Another protagonist of scientific socialism was Lassalle, who from a practical point of view was post-Marxian but in his theoretical foundation was rather pre-Marxian, deeply influenced by Blanc and Lorenz von Stein. He popularized the wage theory of Ricardo under the slogan of the *ehernes Lohngesetz*, which makes the rise of the working class impossible. Following Malthus he argued that if wages should be above the point of minimum subsistence, more frequent marriages and more rapid reproduction would occur and the increase in the supply of workers would depress wages. But if wages should be below this point, emigration, celibacy and sexual abstinence would diminish the supply and wages would rise accordingly. He contended that neither the cooperative nor the trade union movement could offer a way out of this dilemma but that the only true road toward freedom was the intervention of the state, which, in opposition to Marx and in accordance with Hegel, Lassalle regarded as the supreme reality. In his opinion the state could emancipate the working class by giving them credit with which they could organize producers' associations. He regarded universal and equal suffrage as a means of conquering the state and as the royal road to socialism. Likewise in opposition to Marx and later socialism, Lassalle was a convinced nationalist and urged the proletariat to cooperate

with the state; in this regard he gave great impetus to post-Marxian socialism.

Certain practical experiments also influenced the next period of socialism, mostly in a negative way. In France the unfortunate venture with the *ateliers nationaux* in 1848 compromised the idea of productive associations, although the experiment had not had a fair trial. The codification of the principle of the right to work proved to be ineffective. The tragic battle in June with its consequent deportations crushed the revolutionary ardor of the proletariat by depriving it of 10,000 of its most revolutionary elements. The collapse of many communistic colonies inspired by the schemes of Fourier, Cabet and Owen or by religious groups was also discouraging. Lorenz von Stein had attributed the greatest importance to these endeavors, quite unhampered in the United States, because he saw in them a crucial test for socialist doctrine. As practically all these experiments were failures, he was convinced that they had demonstrated amply the impossibility of communism, for all these communities had succumbed not in competition with the capitalist system but because discipline and harmonious cooperation could not be maintained. Socialists argued, however, that the situation would be quite different if only one social and economic pattern, supported by an inclusive system of social education, were to be tolerated. The growing impatience of the proletariat with the political and experimental method gave new fervor to the tradition of Babeuf. Dézamy rejected bourgeois aid and summoned the proletariat to free itself. Blanqui was involved in a series of violent plots. He was one of the leaders of the demonstrators who in 1848 entered parliament and dispersed the Assembly. The culmination of the movement of unsuccessful armed upheavals was the Paris Commune in 1871. Although recent researches have proved that socialism was not the most important element of the revolution and that its general ideology was more Proudhonist than Marxian, coupled with national indignation against an inefficient government, yet the commune became a landmark in the history of communism, and Marx hailed it as the "glorious harbinger of a new society."

The first important experiment in England toward independent political action by class conscious workers and the first great movement in modern times directed and controlled by working men was the Chartist movement (1830-48). In addition to the efforts of the Chartists for

constitutional change they were concerned with socialist issues. At the same time the first socialist international organization was established as the Society of Fraternal Democrats. A Christian Socialist movement was organized in 1848 under the leadership of the humanitarian clergymen Maurice and Kingsley and Ludlow, a lawyer; it resembled the French religious socialist movement, except that it did not preach a single principle or doctrine peculiar to socialism. About forty "associations for cooperative production" were founded, but all of these collapsed and in 1854 the movement disappeared. In Germany in 1863 Lassalle succeeded in founding the first independent labor party, the *Allgemeiner deutscher Arbeiterverein*. His sudden death, however, weakened the resistance of his ideology to the new synthesis of socialism, which had as its center the International Working Men's Association, of which Marx became the leading spirit.

**MARXIAN SOCIALISM.** Although the most important aspects of modern socialism were performed in a long course of historical development, nevertheless the synthesis associated with the names of Marx and Engels represents a new variety, some characteristics of which were determined by the further development of the structure of capitalism. The industrial proletariat became more independent of the other classes of society, and at the same time a new intellectual class developed which lost its connection with the upper classes and felt itself to be the exponent of the proletariat. The proletariat began to develop its own élite. The growing strength of the proletarian organizations rendered their press and ideology financially independent. The Marxian synthesis was not, however, a simple reflex of a new situation but was partly a result of previous currents of thought and partly the creation of the genius of Marx and Engels. It has often been emphasized, usually in a deprecatory way, that the founders of the new socialism did not add anything original to socialist thought; that the theory of surplus value was an inheritance from Turgot, Godwin, Hall and Thompson, the theory of capitalist concentration from Proudhon, Fourier and Blanc; that the class struggle theory was already developed by Plato and Aristotle and modernized by Blanc, von Stein, Thierry and Guizot; that the theory of the growing misery of the proletariat originated with Rodbertus and the crisis theory with Owen, Siamondi, Fourier and Rodbertus; and that the technologic-eco-

conomic theory of history was completely developed at the end of the eighteenth century. Even granting these assertions, it cannot be denied that socialist theory received a synthesis and completeness through Marx and Engels and that because of such dynamic impetus socialism, which had formerly been confined to the speculation of isolated thinkers or of sectarians, became a mass movement embracing the entire world.

Marxian thought contained several elements which caused it to triumph over all former varieties. In the first place, Marxian socialism made a definite turn toward communism. As Engels declared: "In 1847 socialism was a bourgeois movement, whereas communism was working class. Socialism was, on the continent at least, quite respectable, whereas communism was the very opposite. Since, already at that date, we were wholly convinced that 'the emancipation of the workers must be the task of the working class itself,' we could have no hesitation as to which of the two words we should choose. Nor has there ever been any inclination on our part to repudiate our first choice." Second, it abandoned all the religious and moral claims of pre-Marxian socialism and became rigorously "scientific." The slogan "Religion is the opiate of the people" was a creation of Marx. Third, it did not concern itself with the economic institutions of the future society, which were the chief interest of pre-Marxian socialism; this attitude enhanced its fighting strength. Fourth, it ridiculed the experimental method of former socialism as utopianism and accepted an evolutionary interpretation of human history. Engels declared at Marx' funeral, "Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution of human history." The new doctrine, however, combined with this evolutionary interpretation a distinctly revolutionary philosophy. Fifth, the new ideology not only abandoned the principle of cooperation with other classes but glorified the class struggle as the source of all virtues for the proletariat. The working class was described as the class which alone had the historic role of bringing about a better social order. Sixth, Marxian socialism taught a kind of radical behaviorism, as expressed in Marx' phrase, "The whole of history is a continuous remolding [*Umwandlung*] of human nature."

It is easy to understand the extraordinary dynamic power of this synthesis. The checks and restraints of traditional religion and morality

were released; the expectation of a transcendental millennium was replaced by hope for an ideal future society on earth based on materialistic principles. It not only developed the feeling of dignity in a class until then neglected, but exalted its self-consciousness. Finally, the element of Bakuninism in this synthesis, favoring the ruthless qualities of human nature, becomes justified because the destruction of capitalist society is regarded as absolutely necessary to insure the future of civilization.

The origins of the new synthesis are to be observed in the atmosphere of the English philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, especially in the spirit of Hobbes and Locke; its transformation is to be seen in the materialistic philosophy of the precursors of the French Revolution, in the daring optimism of the French and English socialists, in the devastating religious criticism of Feuerbach, in the humanitarian visions of the "true" German socialists and in the evolutionary spirit of the new natural science. Engels declared that the German socialists were proud of their descent not only from Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen but also from Kant, Fichte and Hegel. In spite of the insistence of Sombart and others to the contrary, the works of the young Marx prove that he was deeply influenced by German idealism; that he was motivated by an ethical humanitarianism; that his system not only has as its purpose the improvement of the economic status of the masses but that its fundamental thought is to abolish the "fetishism of commodities," the malevolent power of human products over the free will of men. Spengler has contended that the Prussian concept of *Obrigkeitsstaat* had an important influence on Marxian socialism. Finally, the influence of "the Jewish spirit" in Marxian socialism has often been stressed; for example, by Bakunin, Dühring, Sombart, Plenge and the National Socialists. The idea of justice has always been strong in the Jewish race, and its hereditary prophetic chiliasm found an outlet in a materialistic quest for a new society. Furthermore because of their lack of a national homeland they have made a virtue of internationalism. Yet this racial factor should not be exaggerated; the role of the Jews has been disproportionate in all other intellectual activities as well, and public careers have been closed to them in many bourgeois parties.

The reconstruction of the main elements of Marxian thought is difficult because Marx and Engels adopted different points of view in

different periods and at times the system is obscured. Furthermore Marxian socialism as a driving force is an ideology and not a theory: it lives not only in the works of the founders but in the diverse interpretations of disciples. Its philosophical foundation, historical materialism, sometimes qualified as economic interpretation of history, transformed the static materialism of the eighteenth century and of Feuerbach into a dynamic materialism. This synthesis was achieved through the dialectic conception of Hegel; but whereas Hegel held reason, or the idea, to be the ultimate promoter of the whole process, Marx regarded the idea as nothing but the material process becoming conscious in the brain of man. This materialistic dialectic helped Marx to describe the movements of ideas, not as rigid categories but as manifestations of an ever changing reality. The doctrine was never fully developed; it was merely formulated in some brilliant passages, especially those in Marx' preface to the *Critique of Political Economy* and by Engels in *Anti-Dühring*. The fundamental idea is that "the mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness." New forces of production, which cannot find sufficient activity in the existing jurial and ideologic framework of society, are continuously developing. The result is a struggle between the class representing the old status of the forces of production and the class representing the new. Engels thus concludes that "the final causes of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's brains, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange. They are to be sought, not in the *philosophy* but in the *economics* of each particular epoch."

This concept involves several propositions. The first is the *Überbau* theory, according to which all the spiritual forces of society, law, religion, art, philosophy, are only a superstructure developed by the material, productive forces of society. Second, the chief cause of movement in society which in its totality is considered progress is the antagonism between the productive forces and the existing relations of production. Third, this development of the productive forces is inevitable; either the new forces through their representative class will be vic-

torious or society will perish in a blind and useless strife. Human reason cannot alter this inevitable evolution; it can merely alleviate the pain of creation of the new society which is already developed in the body of the old. Fourth, every phase of the historical process is inevitable and reasonable in its relative position. Fifth, the approaching revolution of the proletariat will be a final one, because it will mean the emancipation of the last class in society; no exploited class will remain. Therefore mankind's prehistoric period will end; man will make the final leap from the realm of necessity into the realm of freedom, because all the productive forces of society will be controlled by reason in a classless society of free and equal men. The strict materialistic determinism of the original formulation was later considerably mitigated not only by certain followers but by Engels himself. In a letter to Mehring in 1893 Engels acknowledged at least the relative independence of spiritual forces in history. The idea of the forces of production (*Produktivkräfte*) which determine the relations of production (*Produktionsverhältnisse*), the organization of the economic structure, upon which the spiritual and cultural superstructure is based, has remained vague and contradictory. Sometimes it is used, apparently quite correctly, to refer only to the "forces of production or what is the same . . . the stage of development (*Entwicklungsstufe*) of the technic," as by Bukharin; other writers, such as Bernstein, include climate, natural surroundings, law, religious traditions and the nature of man.

The central thesis of the economic teachings of Marx and Engels is that capitalist society is hopelessly torn by antagonistic forces which will ultimately destroy the whole social fabric, but in such a way that the communist embryo preformed in capitalist society will be set free. Marxian economic theory is based on the Ricardian theory of value, with the limitation that for Marx pure economics did not exist; economic laws, like all other so-called social laws, are to him only transitory categories. Marx made the Ricardian theory of value more rigid and exclusive, leaving no room for consideration of scarcity and utility. Value for Marx is an objective substance; it is congealed labor, not visible but measurable. The value of commodities is determined by the "average socially necessary labor" expended in their production. This definition is an apotheosis of physical labor, because highly qualified intellectual labor cannot be

measured under this category. Human labor is the sole factor in production of goods, for capital is only previous human labor not consumed but used in the process of production. It follows that the interest on capital, the entrepreneur's profit and the land rent are all paid out of the work of the laborers as surplus value. The creation of this surplus value is explained by the fact that the value of the labor force depends upon the amount of labor needed for the production of those things which are necessary to maintain the worker and his family on the minimum level of subsistence. But in a day's work under the capitalist system the worker produces more than the necessities of his minimum existence; the rest of his work constitutes the surplus value. In this way the essence of capital is not a sum of money or an agglomeration of productive implements but an instrument for the production of surplus value. Workers perform this surplus work for the capitalists, without physical or legal compulsion, because the land and the other means of production are in the hands of a few capitalists who have at their disposal free workers, free in the double sense that they are free to make contracts and that they are free of all possessions other than their working energy. The workers constitute an industrial reserve army, composed of a growing number of unemployed, whose competition keeps wages always at the lowest possible level and makes it necessary for the workers to do the surplus work. Without such an industrial reserve army capitalism could not exist, for if wages should increase above the subsistence level the working class could save enough capital to acquire the necessary means of production. The question as to how this reserve army of the capitalist system is continuously reproduced was not difficult for Malthusians like Ricardo or Lassalle, but Marx repudiated their explanations categorically. He described the reserve army as created purely by economic means; the small artisans were ruined by large scale industry, capitalists expanded the working hours, and the employment of cheap woman and child labor was made possible through the development of machinery. The whole trend of the industrial revolution is the replacement of the worker by the machine, which continuously increases the number of the unemployed. Therefore the chief cause of the reserve army is technological unemployment. On the other hand, Marx showed elsewhere that the capitalist system was created not by its economic superiority but by the violent and

lawless expropriation of the rural masses, who became paupers and who thus afforded a cheap labor supply for the capitalist. Whether these two explanations can be reconciled and whether violence itself is an economic power, as Marx sometimes asserted, was never thoroughly treated.

The theory of value and surplus value leads inevitably to the law of concentration, according to which capitalist enterprises tend to grow continuously by the extermination of the smaller establishments. In the course of evolution all production will be concentrated in a few colossal enterprises. By reason of the bankruptcy of smaller producers and the growing exploitation of the workers, not only the technical implements but wealth itself tends to concentrate in a few hands according to the law of capitalist accumulation. This inevitable process, which will culminate in increasing misery of the masses, is thus described by Marx: "While there is thus a progressive diminution in the number of the capitalist magnates (who usurp and monopolize all the advantages of this transformative process), there occurs a corresponding increase in the mass of poverty, oppression, enslavement, degeneration, and exploitation" of the swelling masses of labor. The growing efficiency of production and the accumulating misery of the masses, combined with the anarchy of the capitalist system, under which every capitalist produces at random, lead to more and more devastating crises. This crisis theory, with the theory of concentration, is the most important bulwark of the Marxian system, because Marx was convinced that soon the crises would destroy the entire capitalist structure. Marx and Engels in this connection laid the foundation for a theory of imperialism: "The conditions of bourgeois society are too narrow to comprise the wealth created by them. And how does the bourgeoisie get over these crises? On the one hand, by enforced destruction of a mass of productive forces; on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises. . . ." Marx and Engels were convinced that the world revolution was imminent, that one of these sharp crises would be the turning point at which "the knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." This gloomy prophecy contains an element of hope for the theory of concentration and at the same time involves a theory of

socialization—for colossal private enterprises absorb great masses of workers who carry on socialized production. As Engels said: "The contradiction between socialized production and capitalistic appropriation manifested itself as the antagonism of proletariat and bourgeoisie," as "an antagonism between the organization of production in the individual workshop and the anarchy of production in society generally." This tension will continue to increase; the capitalist integument will burst asunder; the communist embryo will come to life with the birth pangs of the social revolution. Although the character of the new society is not described, certain statements indicate that Marx and Engels believed in an ultimate state of "free association of individuals" and in a classless society, wherein everyone would receive according to his needs.

The political conclusions of the system follow from its philosophic and economic theses. The doctrine as a whole is less developed than the other parts of the system. It consists of occasional remarks, historical fragments and propagandistic guides. According to Marx the state is a new institution not known in the feudal period; only after the dissolution of the political power of the church was the state established. Engels, influenced by the studies of Lewis H. Morgan, described with great admiration the tribal organization of the Iroquois as an example of a stateless society founded on equality and freedom. He contended that the agglomeration of wealth, the beginning of sharp class divisions, destroyed the stateless condition of mankind and established the historical state, which "having arisen amid these conflicts . . . is as a rule the state of the most powerful economic class. . . ." Only in exceptional cases do the "struggling classes balance each other so nearly that the public power gains a certain degree of independence by posing as the mediator between them. . . ." The modern state is "nothing more than a committee for the administration of the consolidated affairs of the bourgeois class as a whole." The state thus assumes simply the role of an instrument of class exploitation. This situation will not last for long; "We are now rapidly approaching a stage of evolution in production, in which the existence of classes has not only ceased to be a necessity, but becomes a positive fetter on production. Hence these classes must fall as inevitably as they once arose. The state must irrevocably fall with them. The society that is to reorganize production on the basis of a free and equal association of producers

will transfer the machinery of state where it will then belong: into the Museum of Antiquities, by the side of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe." This is the theory of the withering away of the state, in which Marx and Engels and practically all the founders of modern socialism agree with the ultimate consequences of the anarchist doctrine. The picture of the new political society, like that of the economic, has never been fully portrayed, although in many isolated passages its chief features have been described. Not only will the state and classes disappear but also the difference between manual and intellectual labor and the gulf between town and country. The parliamentary system will be replaced by the occupational representation of the workers. The main feature of the new society will be colossal abundance of production on the basis of an all embracing planned economy.

Tactical considerations play a very significant part in the Marxian system. This feature is so strong that Croce rightly asserts that it would be far more difficult to continue the political perspicacity than the theoretical work of Marx, the "most remarkable continuator of Machiavelli." The most important and immediate objective is the organization of the proletariat into a class conscious proletarian party. This party must be international in scope, for working men know no country; they must unite the world over. The emancipation of the proletariat will be brought about by a world revolution, which will be accompanied by warlike complications. Marxism is not pacifism; the concept of the brotherhood of man was characterized as "the most trivial stump oratory." The wars of the capitalist countries must be utilized in the interest of proletarian emancipation, the fight for which should be different in various countries. Although Marx and Engels made utterances which seem to indicate that in highly advanced democratic countries, such as the United States, England and Holland, a peaceful transformation would be possible, their fundamental teaching was that of revolutionary action and a complete destruction of other classes. Reformistic measures are only auxiliary means of overthrowing the bourgeois state. The proletariat is not to take compromises with the bourgeois class seriously, but to keep the revolution permanent is to disregard all agreements. In this continuous revolutionary struggle the working class should not be hindered by considerations of conventional justice and morality.

The final transition to a communist society can be made only by the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was not only in his youth that Marx entertained such an opinion; as late as 1875 in criticising the Gotha Program he announced that "between the capitalist and communist society lies a period of revolutionary transformation from one to the other. There corresponds also to this a political transition period during which the state can be nothing else than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." Engels made an analogous declaration a few years before his death. Marx and Engels therefore did not oppose the methods of armed violence advocated by Babeuf and Blanqui but only conspiracies not sufficiently prepared and organized. Violence is held to be "the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one."

**DEVELOPMENTS AFTER MARX.** After the founding of the Second International in 1889 socialism became a world movement. Its internationalism, however, was rather decorative, and in various countries national differences came to the fore. German socialism was the leading force within the International; its power in Germany after the Erfurt program (1891) was very great and throughout central and eastern Europe it became a strong revolutionary force. But while the scientific and moral prestige of Marxian socialism grew in the great western democracies, it remained a minority opinion. This difference is due to some extent to the feudal, aristocratic and authoritarian character of central and eastern European countries where the working class had to fight not only for its economic emancipation but also for the political rights which had already been achieved by bourgeois revolutions in the west. At the same time religion remained in these countries largely an ally of the state, glossing over social exploitation. Whereas in the west democracy led inevitably toward cooperation between the working class and the advanced elements of the bourgeoisie, in central and eastern Europe the gulf remained unbridgeable. Central and eastern European socialism was as a consequence animated by a consciousness of social inferiority on the part of the working class, a feeling which did not exist in the west.

Differences in national character also are important. The system making, metaphysical outlook of the Germans and the sentimental mysticism of the Slavs were propitious for the acceptance of the rigid architecture of the Marxian synthesis with its prophecies for a future society; whereas the common sense

philosophy of the English and the lucidity of the French, combined with the humanitarian religion of the French Revolution, revolted against a system in which the ideology of individual rights was discarded. These national differences resulted in a process of cross fertilization of orthodox Marxism with certain new tendencies.

In no country of the world, with the exception of Russia, has socialism encountered so much persecution, chicanery and contempt as in Germany. The *Socialistengesetz* of Bismarck from 1878 to 1890 made it an outcast, able to maintain its political existence only through underground organization. Later, however, with the growing forces of democracy and relative prosperity, as in France and England, the Social Democratic party became one of the strongest organizations in the country. The exclusively proletarian color of Marxian ideology became less intense; large masses of the petty bourgeoisie and of the intellectuals became socialists. At the same time the antimilitaristic efforts of socialism endowed the movement with a broad humanitarian appeal. In the years immediately preceding the World War socialism came to be regarded as a bulwark against all kinds of reaction; in 1912 at the congress of the Second International at Basel Jean Jaurès, the idealist leader of French socialism, reflected European labor opinion when he asserted that "the International represents all the moral forces in the world."

The change in the mentality of the socialist movement became so marked that Engels in 1895, the last year of his life, wrote a preface to the new edition of Marx' *Class Struggles in France* in which he modified considerably the revolutionary rigidity of Marxian philosophy. Although Ryazanov has proved that certain passages of the preface were falsified and some completely suppressed by the editor, the tone of the whole document was less revolutionary than Engels' earlier work; the importance of peaceful action was emphasized and the difficulties of revolutionary street fighting were stressed. The influence of the preface was great; Rosa Luxemburg attacked it as pernicious in its effect upon the labor movement. The growing participation of socialism in national life brought about a widening gulf between the practical needs of the movement and the formulæ of Marxian socialism, which remained unchanged in the official ideology of the party. In 1899 Masaryk, who stood outside the socialist camp, saw the dangers of this antagonism and concluded that "hushing up and diplomatizing hurts the party more than

an open revision of the contested questions and the confession that the philosophical and to a large extent the sociological bases of Marxism are untenable."

The revisionist movement grew out of this awkward situation. In 1899 Eduard Bernstein published his *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus und die Aufgaben der Sozialdemokratie* (Stuttgart; tr. by E. C. Harvey, London 1909), in which he challenged the fundamental theses of the Marxian system and restated many points of the anti-Marxian bourgeois criticism. He tried to show that a gulf existed between orthodox Marxian theory and the realities of life which made the development of an efficient proletarian movement impossible. He attacked the theoretical foundation of the system and emphasized the independence and importance of ideologic factors in history. He invoked the spirit of Kant and especially of F. A. Lange and asserted that a critical revision of the whole Marxian system had become inevitable. He held the interests of society as a whole to be above class considerations. In the economic field he made many concessions to professorial criticism and to the theory of marginal utility. He contended that the concentration of industrial enterprises did not mean a concentration of property, that the number of owners of capital grows both absolutely and relatively. He saw no sign of that collapse of capitalist economy which Marxism prognosticated and found no polarization of society among the immensely rich and the starving majority; on the contrary, the structure of capitalist society had become far more complicated and differentiated. He argued that agricultural evolution especially had categorically refuted Marxian prognostications in that the peasants not only remained as peasants but the rule of the large estates was shaken all over the world. The recent trend of capitalist evolution he interpreted as showing that crises instead of becoming more and more catastrophic have been attenuated by growing cartels, which serve as a more efficient check against overproduction. In the light of these conclusions Bernstein rejected the theory of the growing misery of the masses. When dealing with the political foundations of the Marxian system he sought to refute the violence theory and overestimation of the state, and he defined socialism as a movement toward a cooperative scheme of production. He believed that no state would be able to take over even the largest and the middle sized enterprises without a collapse. He emphasized the great

importance of the peasants and their cooperative movement and the necessity of democratic agrarian reforms. His criticism culminated in the assertion that socialism must be purified of utopian elements which still remained in the Marxian system. Instead of the mechanical inevitability of communism he urged the radical democratization of the movement and cooperation with all progressive forces of society. He stressed the lasting values of liberalism and cautioned the proletariat not to overestimate its own importance and not to regard the bourgeoisie as a decadent and corrupt class.

Simultaneously a movement with the slogan *Zurück auf Kant* tried to reconcile Marxian fundamentals with the principles of critical idealism. But although both tendencies were expounded by able men and although the criticisms of Bernstein were adopted by a group of socialist leaders, the majority of the party congresses remained loyal to the rigid Marxian interpretation of the then revolutionary leader, Karl Kautsky. Although revisionism was crushed by the anathema of the official party, nevertheless the practical activity of the party was more and more determined by Bernstein's views. After the World War the Social Democratic party became the bulwark of the German Republic and assumed a revisionist role along the lines of Lassalle and Bernstein. The theoretical foundation of the party remained, however, purely Marxian.

Another movement which has also proved unable to cope with Marxian orthodoxy is liberal socialism, which originated in the Anglo-Saxon countries with the works of Spence, Ogilvie, Paine and to a lesser extent with those of James and John Stuart Mill. The doctrine was later developed with great force by Henry George, who in *Progress and Poverty* (San Francisco 1879) restated the argument against monopoly in land and urged the confiscation of land rent in the form of a single tax. The same ideas, but with different methods of solution, were advocated by Alfred Russel Wallace. The doctrine assumed its most systematic development, however, in Germany, where independently of his predecessors Eugen Dühring formulated a new system of socialism, called by him the *sozialistisches System*, in which in opposition to Marxian socialism he stressed the decisive influence of politics on economics. He declared that value is not only an economic category but is influenced fundamentally by political factors, the chief of which is *Gewaltigentum*, property created by



conquest, which leads to inequality and oppression. Dühring called for a system which would base all human relations on just reciprocity. The chief method of emancipation he believed would be the growing coalition of workers, through which the capitalist power would be met by an equal power, with justice the alternative of chaos.

Using many ideas of his predecessors and combining them with elements of the Marxian system, Franz Oppenheimer tried to reconcile liberal economic thought with an advocacy of the elimination of all unearned increment, interest, profit and rent. He set out to show that not capital in general but only the large landed estates are the disturbing factors of social equilibrium, that they are an "alien body" which breeds disease. Accepting the Marxian theory of value and vindicating all its accusations against the capitalist system, he asserts that Marx was unable to give a satisfactory explanation of the industrial reserve army. According to Oppenheimer this reserve army was created not by economic but by political means, by the violent or fraudulent expropriation of land, through which large numbers of people have been rendered landless, whose desperate competition keeps wages at a subsistence level. This situation described by Marx he regards as a consequence not of the capitalist system but of the fact that free competition, in itself a highly beneficent force, is hindered by the existence of feudal or semifeudal monopolies. The capitalist system presents itself as "a bastard of freedom and servitude," in which freedom is defined as the element of liberalism in its true sense, servitude as the existence of a class monopoly created by the theft of land and of the political institutions based on it. In this situation Oppenheimer maintains that the remedy is not communism but the division of a sufficiently large number of landed estates among workers; through this measure free competition would be restored in favor of the workers and against the capitalists and mounting salaries would liberate the former from the latter's domination. These systems of liberal socialism have exercised a comparatively small influence in the history of social movements. In Germany a modified form of the single tax doctrine, represented by Darnaschke in his *Bodenreform* movement, which seeks an increase in taxation of urban land rent, has attracted a number of petty bourgeois followers.

In England Marxism never became a guiding

principle—although its intellectual influence was continually growing—but it served largely as an inspiration. After the fall of Chartism the labor movement assumed a more opportunistic attitude. Under the hegemony of British trade and finance trade unionism was able to obtain many advantages for its members, and therefore its policy became one of cautious progress. In the atmosphere of an expanding democracy and of religious movements penetrated by social principles labor found important allies among liberals, conservatives and churchmen. The English working class felt itself not an outcast of society but a group advancing in social power with little need for independent political action. From the 1880's on, some acute critics realized the necessity of independent action, and Hyndman tried to introduce the ideas of Marxian socialism. Its abstract philosophic generalizations, however, did not appeal to the English workers. In 1884 a group of writers, scientists and propagandists founded the Fabian Society and elaborated an opportunist type of socialism which rejected the class struggle and set out to smuggle into all parties socialist ideas for carrying on socialization in various fields. They may be called the pragmatists of socialism; they built a bridge between socialists and trade unionists and were instrumental in the creation of a unified labor party in 1900.

This cautious work did not satisfy those who believed that purely reformist activity would never lead to the overthrow of the capitalist system. The same necessity that was felt in France at approximately the same time, and which resulted there in the creation of the syndicalist movement, led in England to a new variety of socialism called guild socialism. Its underlying idea was that it was not enough to engage in parliamentary struggles and to absorb the interest of the workers in the quest for higher wages and better working conditions, but that the main problem was how labor organizations can take over production and distribution. The guild socialists held that trade unions should cease to be exclusively organs of utilitarian reform and should reassume the importance of the mediaeval guilds, which were real organizations for production and distribution. In the constitutional field this type of socialism attacked the traditional conception of sovereignty; its state philosophy was pluralistic and emphasized the independent existence of other organizations besides the state.

In France the spread of Marxian socialism

was checked by the fact that the country remained largely agrarian, in the hands of an independent peasantry; big industry was counterbalanced by a strong handicraft system; there was an influential intellectual middle class; and the tradition of the French Revolution prevailed. The efforts of Guesde and Lafargue to introduce Marxian principles into France were therefore only partly successful; the teachings of Proudhon, Blanqui and Bakunin and the memory of the Commune were kept alive. Many socialist parties and sects developed, and French socialism came to be characterized by lack of organization. A group of *possibilistes* used parliamentary tactics to achieve advantages for the proletarian class and to put socialists into leading positions. When, however, the importance of the role of the parliamentary socialist increased and when in 1899 Millerand entered the cabinet of Waldeck-Rousseau with Gallifet, who had crushed the Commune, many trade union members and socialist intellectuals began to regard the reputed gains of socialism as setbacks from the point of view of ultimate aims. There was elaborated a new theory of revolutionary socialism, called syndicalism, which combines elements of Marx, Proudhon and Bakunin. From Marx it derived the emphasis on the economic basis of society and the necessity of a revolutionary consciousness; from Proudhon, the distrust of the state and the emphasis on freedom; from Bakunin, the belief in violence. Syndicalism fights against the expanding importance of the politicians and regards the trade unions as the real basis of the future society. It is a radical antimilitaristic and antipatriotic movement; the will to revolt is to be kept alive continuously by sabotage and antimilitaristic propaganda, which will ultimately prepare the working class for a general strike, by means of which capitalist society will be overthrown. Syndicalism was thus a protest against parliamentary tactics, against the petty bourgeois spirit and against the "putrefaction of democracy" which became manifest during the Dreyfus affair. It has had powerful repercussions in the Latin countries.

Marxism made its entrance into Russia in 1883 when Plekhanov founded the first social democratic group, but its progress was slow. The revolutionary movement had as its basis a Russian socialism (*Narodnichestvo*), whose chief ideologic leaders were Herzen and later Lavrov and Mikhaylovsky and which emphasized individual freedom, rejected state omnipotence, urged a cooperative rebuilding of society by the

utilization of the mir and other forms of Russian collectivism and insisted that the peasants were the only group upon which a new social order could be built. The original nucleus of the movement soon became divided. One group ended with nihilism, repudiating all traditional values and favoring individual terroristic acts; the second, the Social Revolutionary party, which remained closest to its source, disagreed with the industrial formulae of Marxian communism; the third group, centering around Plekhanov, formed the Social Democratic party on a strict Marxian basis in 1898. The situation was propitious for revolutionary movements. Official Russia through its policy of repression had Europeanized legions of Russians and educated them to revolution. Terroristic pressure made Russia for decades a hotbed of anarchist revolts; artificial industrialization and the forcible Russification of the native population made the atmosphere even more tense. As the peasantry was easily crushed, the urban proletariat became the center of gravity of the revolution. The emotional religiosity of the people was a fertile ground for gospels of social reconstruction. In 1903 the Bolsheviks, who favored a radical, centralizing and dictatorial program, gained control within the Marxian party over the Mensheviks, who favored more caution and advocated cooperation with all the revolutionary elements of society. This schism became accentuated during the revolution of 1905, the rehearsal of the revolution of 1917, which was bourgeois and constitutional until the Bolsheviks came into power.

In the United States socialism made little headway; the possibility of social ascendancy, better living standards, free political institutions; the absence of feudalism, of an inferiority complex on the part of the workers and of hereditary haughtiness on the part of the bourgeoisie; and the existence of free land, all these factors made the idea of class struggle unpalatable. The influence of Fourier, Owen, Cabet and Proudhon was apparent in the establishment of a number of utopian colonies. The first mass movement following a socialist pattern was the Knights of Labor (1877-87), which in many respects was markedly analogous to the Chartist movement. After its collapse the American Federation of Labor became the promoter of a trade unionist policy of the orthodox type. A reaction against this spirit of compromise was the ideology of industrial unionism, whose most influential leader was Daniel DeLeon, a man whom, ac-

ending to Rasky, Lenin considered "the greatest of modern socialists, the only one who added anything to socialist thought since Marx." Industrial unionism fought against craft unionism and against reformism of the western parliamentary type represented by Morris Hillquit. DeLeon campaigned against Kautsky when the latter was still the acknowledged revolutionary leader of European socialism, and he was treated as an anarchist. The ideology of the movement had much in common with French syndicalism, with the important difference that it stressed the necessity of a centralized and disciplined leadership. It was not unlike Bolshevism, except that it did not accept the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat, maintaining that in highly industrialized countries like the United States such a political structure would be unnecessary.

The World War changed the status of Marxian socialism considerably and led to a crucial schism within the movement. The patriotic participation of the leading socialist parties put an end to the inspiring legend that the unity of the working class would maintain the peace of the world through the International. The proletarian instead faced governments which stressed national concentration, and the imperialistic war was supported by the socialist parties of the allied countries as a war of liberation against czarist oppression and by those of the Entente as a war for democracy and national self-determination. The resulting suffering of the masses provoked vehement criticism against the Second International and formidable moral conflicts among its leaders. In April, 1915, Rosa Luxemburg accused German Social Democracy of having betrayed "the fatherland in the hour of greatest danger. For the first duty in that hour . . . was to show the background of this imperialistic war, and to tear asunder the fabric of patriotic and diplomatic lies. . . ." Instead the leaders of the Social Democratic party collaborated with the imperialistic system and secured for it popular support. Friedrich Adler, as a symbolic protest against the manoeuvres of the Austrian Social Democratic party, killed the Austrian premier and at his trial vehemently attacked the party for abandoning the thought of social revolution. The feeling of rebellion became more embittered when in Germany the socialists in power, under the leadership of Ebert and Noske, participated in crushing the Spartacus movement and at least tolerated the counter-revolutionary organization of former

officers which killed Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. The Second International was likewise discredited by the bureaucratization of the socialist parties, especially in Germany; the leaders tended increasingly to become comparatively well paid party officials entitled to pensions. Membership in the party became almost traditional—it was said that the proletarian worker was born into the Social Democratic party as was the Catholic German peasant into the Center party. There was also growing dissatisfaction with the fact that the victorious socialist parties of Germany and Austria did not try to realize their Marxian program; they fought for democracy and social reforms but did not take a single step toward real socialistic measures.

In 1917 this revolt of the masses found powerful leadership in the Russian Revolution, after which began a vast experiment toward the establishment of a communist state. Lenin, Trotsky and other professional revolutionists elaborated a new doctrine of Marxian socialism, conveniently called Leninism, which denounced the tactics of the Second International, its outlook and its theoretical background. The Communist Third International was founded in Moscow and a bitter campaign was organized against the "social patriots," the "social traitors" of the Second International who "falsified the principles of true Marxian socialism." Social Democracy of western and central Europe refused to participate in the preparation for the world revolution and in England, Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia accepted cooperation in the government of bourgeois states. This meant defense of bourgeois democracy against the attacks of the communists and led to a further modification of the practices and ideological formulae of the Second International. The abyss between the Second and the Third Internationals became unbridgeable, in spite of the endeavors of the Austrian Marxists, who tried to restore the original intransigency of the doctrine.

The rebirth of revolutionary Marxism was caused also by economic developments. Before the World War there was a marked tendency toward prosperity and a diminution of the crises; the gloomy economic laws of Marx were considered definitively repudiated by the facts. After the World War, however, unheard of misery afflicted many European countries; and following a short period of relief a world crisis of unprecedented magnitude commenced to strangle mankind. This crisis was interpreted by the

Bolsheviks as the full realization of the Marxian formulae, as a colossal *Verelendung* due to technical progress and imperialist expansion. The many other explanations of the crisis—the consequences of the World War, the growing trend of economic nationalism, the rebirth of mercantilism, the new system of pseudo-capitalism, new frontier barriers, reckless lending and borrowing, ruthless inflationist policies, the spendthrift expenses of military dictatorships, the race for armaments—did not temper the expectation of the final collapse of the capitalist system.

According to Stalin, "Leninism is Marxism in the epoch of imperialism and of the proletarian revolution," which means that the Bolshevik doctrine has reconstituted the original revolutionary purity of the Marxian doctrine and has developed according to the necessities of a new situation. The Bolshevik doctrine is an accentuation of all the revolutionary elements of Marxism with the omission of its later moderating elements. The Bolsheviks seek the complete destruction of the capitalist state; they advocate mass insurrection and class terrorism; they develop the Marxian idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat; they stress the necessity of a transitional period between capitalism and communism through state socialism. If this final aim should be realized, there will be no need for the state; its withering away will be achieved mainly by the radical simplification of state functions. However, until the ideal of a stateless society has been reached, the state will not diminish its power but will on the contrary intensify it. Only through vigorous dictatorial power can the enemies of the proletariat be crushed, the structures of communist production be established and the people become accustomed "to observing the elementary conditions of social existence without force and without subjection." There must be a system of compulsory and universal state education, and religion must be destroyed through mass propaganda and the removal of the social conditions which promote its influence upon the masses.

There are several aspects of the Bolshevik system which seem to be distinct additions to the former ideology. The "scientific" and mechanical materialism of the Marxian successors has been transformed into a dialectic materialism; that is, from a static, metaphysical theory into knowledge of historical reality, from an evolutionary into a revolutionary theory. The Bolsheviks follow the thesis of Marx that "the im-

portant matter is not to know but to change the world." There is no abstract theory; the movement, the carrier of which is the proletariat, must itself be understood. Economic propaganda alone is inadequate; a general world view must be implanted in the proletariat. Therefore whereas in earlier literature the intellectuals played an almost despised role, Lenin attributed capital importance to the work of revolutionary intellectuals. Lenin realized the central importance of the agricultural problem, that without the assistance of the peasant masses there cannot be a successful revolution and without the socialization of peasant property true communism cannot be achieved. This is a problem which western socialism has not dared to face. The fundamental importance of the national problem was already acknowledged from a theoretical point of view by the Austrian school of socialism, especially by Otto Bauer and Karl Renner; but through Bolshevism the nationalistic point of view became a world force, with its emphasis on the principle that only "internationalism can satisfy nationalism." In the communists' campaign for world revolution the propaganda for national and racial emancipation has played perhaps a more decisive role than the fight for communism. The extreme importance of imperialism had been recognized in Hilferding's *Das Finanzkapital* (Vienna 1910) and in Luxemburg's *Die Akkumulation des Kapitals* (Berlin 1913), which contain the main elements of a doctrine of imperialism. Socialists like Cunow, Lensch and Parvus, impressed by these ideas, tried to show during the World War that a German victory would mean German imperialism and that a higher economic organization, propitious to the further development of socialism, would result. There was no place for such reactionary opportunism in Lenin's theory of imperialism. Economic imperialism is for him the climax of capitalist development; it means the replacement of competition by monopoly through trusts, syndicates and gigantic banks. Free competition goes hand in hand with democracy, monopoly with political reaction. The entire earth has been divided among the wealthiest countries and the system of capitalist monopolies will inevitably produce a rise in the cost of living and intensify the class struggle. This tension will be aggravated by national and racial oppression. There is no possible transition from monopolistic capitalism to socialism. Although atheism was always the preponderant mental attitude of Marxian socialists, the parliamen-

tarian competition for mass support led to the acceptance of the slogan, *Religion ist eine Privatsache*. To Bolshevism, on the other hand, militant atheism is absolutely fundamental.

The capital difference between the old and the new ideology of socialism is that whereas before the World War the revolutionary doctrines of Marx were only theoretical, they have now been put into practise in a vast country possessing one of the strongest military and police organizations of the world. Instead of waiting for slow evolution in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the small Communist party a revolutionary effort is being made to establish the prerequisites of the communist state; to create the industrial equipment for socialization, to eliminate the remnants of the bourgeois class, to collectivize the peasants, to establish a strong proletarian army, to develop the communist pattern of human nature. The Bolsheviks have introduced military discipline wherever necessary; they use the system of deportation against the kulaks; they accept methods of piecework wages and the Taylor system; they impose tremendous sacrifices on the working class in the belief that the end, the transformation of the lives of the masses in terms of the communist ideal, justifies the means.

Kautsky, Diehl, Schmidt and others declare that such doctrines and practises have nothing to do with true Marxian thought, while the Bolsheviks and academicians, such as Sombart, Liefmann and Brutzkus, maintain that Bolshevism is the only logical outcome of Marxian doctrine and that the Bolsheviks are "the legitimate executors of the Marxian heritage." The anti-Bolshevik thesis has been most clearly stated by Kautsky, who argues that "nowhere will the workers abdicate those liberties which they have hitherto acquired and which are dear to them." He contends moreover that according to Marx the new society must be preformed in the capitalist society before any serious revolution can be accomplished, whereas in Russia capitalism had only a rudimentary beginning. The communists, supported by many bourgeois thinkers, reply that the present stage of Russian communism is not real communism but is only a transitory stage. Furthermore Russia although very incompletely capitalized was the weakest link in the capitalist chain. The answer given to the preformation argument is that Marx already in 1848 and several times during the nineteenth century regarded the European situation as ripe for a communist revolution, and therefore Lenin

could regard Russia in 1917 as ready for this transformation.

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT. The controversies created by the Marxist school fill a library; only a very few can be mentioned here. In the philosophic field the Marxist system has an inner contradiction; it represents a fatalistic and mechanistic interpretation combined with an activist and revolutionary practise. It asserts the economic origin of all change, but it does not explain how the change occurs in the economic structure itself. The "forces of production" assume almost a fatalistic role while the creative spirit is neglected; yet no new type of civilization is simply the result of economic forces but is more or less a conscious work of a new vital and moral type. Capitalist civilization was created by the new bourgeois, as opposed to the older seignior type. Now the bourgeois type is decaying both intellectually and morally; hostility and disgust are growing against sheer wealth (Scheler).

In connection with the *Überbau* theory it must be recognized that the cause and effect relationship between social phenomena is not one-sided but involves mutual interdependence. The investigations of Troeltsch and Max Weber have tended to prove that religious conceptions have an independent development and have reacted on the economic series. Similarly, economic relations are at the same time legal relations and economics is meaningless without a correlative system of law (Stammier). The history of science also shows the relative independence of great scientific discoveries.

In regard to human nature there is a marked trend toward a purely economic or environmental interpretation, whereas Sorel, De Man and others clearly recognize the enormous importance of an independent moral idealism and of a heroic attitude in the emancipation of the working class.

In the field of economic theory the main criticism of the Marxist system has been directed against the exclusive labor theory of value. Böhm-Bawerk, Loria and others have shown that Marx in the third volume of *Das Kapital* practically abandoned the labor theory of value set forth in the first volume. The importance of this controversy was, however, exaggerated. Even several adherents of Marxian thought have discarded the theory and it has been demonstrated that the Marxian edifice would remain intact without it, provided that the dynamic

tendencies of capitalist evolution described by Marx and attacked by the revisionists were correct. More important is the consideration that a perfect equality of remuneration and, even more, a remuneration according to need would mean a system of exploitation to the detriment of the abler, more diligent worker. Besides it might easily be possible for the present "surplus-value" to flow, in an even greater amount, into the pockets of soldiers and bureaucrats. Furthermore many capitalists cannot be qualified as simple parasites, since they accomplish the highly trained work of organization which is absolutely necessary for a progressive economy. Because of the elimination of competition the new system would find it difficult to determine which branches of the economic system are productive and which are not. But the gravest danger is overcentralization, the unlimited power of bureaucracy, which inevitably means also the danger of a growing militarism and police force. Communist economy must lead toward the totalitarian state, a leviathan state more enormous than mankind has ever known. The theory of the unlimited plenty of a communist society has been seriously attacked by Poble, Cassel and Liefmann. Since Proudhon it has been correctly argued that the complete suppression of private property would mean slavery, and John Stuart Mill asserted that "the principle of private property never had a fair trial in history."

In the field of political theory the Marxist assertion that the state is simply an organ of economic exploitation is an exaggeration. The present dominance of the capitalist class is not due to a dictatorship but to the fact that the forces of democracy are not sufficiently organized, while popular culture is very low. The belief that the communist state will necessarily put an end to class struggle and establish a classless society may be questioned. The growth of social democracy has been followed by the emergence of a fifth estate; everywhere there has been a growing antagonism between intellectuals and non-intellectuals, between those who administer and those who are administered. The slogan that in a communist state the rule of men over men will be replaced by the administration of things by men may be answered in Kelsen's words: "There is no administration of things which would not be administration of men and there is no directing of production processes which would not be a government over persons." It may be argued further that no higher society can

be developed on the ruthless revolutionary tactics of civil war and terrorism. As Bertrand Russell has remarked, "There is no alchemy by which a universal harmony can be produced out of hatred." No economic order can be maintained by purely economic and coercive means, because, as Durkheim has shown, "the individual abandoned only to the pressure of his needs will never admit that he has arrived at the extreme limit of his rights. . . . In order that it should be otherwise, the existence of a moral power is necessary, a power whose superiority he recognizes and which tells him, 'You cannot go farther.'" As to the realization of a totalitarian communist state, it would inevitably lead to a *bellum omnium contra omnes*, because not only the capitalists but also the entire middle class and the peasants would bitterly oppose a system which menaced them with the total extinction of private property and personal freedom. The collapse of socialism in Germany is evidently connected with this fear complex of vast masses.

Whatever the scientific residue of socialist ideology may be, it has made a significant contribution to civilization. It has exercised a beneficent influence on the social sciences; it has destroyed the complacency of bourgeois science and laid bare the sore spots of contemporary society. It has organized the working class, filled it with a sense of human dignity and made it a conscious cooperator in the historical process. It has fostered a growing feeling of internationalism which mankind has never witnessed before. It has denounced war and all kinds of exploitation. And although its attack against religion has sometimes been narrow, it has contributed vitally to the elaboration of a new moral synthesis to replace the decaying old religion of the masses. "If communism achieves a certain success," Keynes has said, "it will achieve it not as an imposed economic technique, but as a religion." Socialism is not therefore a concomitant of modern industrialism nor is it, as Nietzsche and some of his reactionary followers contend, simply the resentment of the hungry and oppressed, a kind of slave uprising against the natural privileges of the superman. There has been a remarkable continuity in the socialist movement, which is derived from a deep common stock of ideas and emotions. It is not bound to any form of social or economic organization, but arises everywhere and at all times when this common inheritance of human nature is offended. These fundamental moral values were the real source of the revolutionary law of nature,

later adopted and divinized by early Christianity. The fight for religious and political freedom in later centuries was a logical continuation of the same development. And when religious and political equality, and to some extent national equality, were achieved, socialism necessarily appeared as a drive to economic equality.

The present setback of socialism in western Europe and its collapse in Germany and Italy do not indicate the downfall of socialist thought; they simply mean that western socialism needs a new ideologic synthesis more in accordance with social and moral realities. The growing fear of Bolshevism, the ideologic rigidity and practical impotence of the Second International, which seems unable to give new life to western socialism, serve as pretexts for counter-revolutionary forces in the organization of fascist, essentially capitalist, dictatorships. Lacking a new socialism, communism will remain the only ideologic system with a sufficient fighting force against nationalistic and militaristic fascism, because, however great the difficulties and logical contradictions in Bolshevism may be, the colossal attraction of its ultimate vision, combined with a heroic activism, will continue for mankind with the growth of intelligence and moral freedom. As John Stuart Mill said more than eighty years ago: "If . . . the choice were to be made between Communism with all its chances and the present state of society with all its sufferings and injustices; if the institution of private property necessarily carried with it as a consequence, that the produce of labour should be apportioned as we now see it, almost in an inverse ratio to the labour—the largest portions to those who have never worked at all, the next largest to those whose work is almost nominal, and so in a descending scale, the remuneration dwindling as the work grows harder and more disagreeable, until the most fatiguing and exhausting bodily labour cannot count with certainty on being able to earn even the necessaries of life; if this or Communism were the alternative, all the difficulties, great or small, of Communism would be but as dust in the balance."

OSCAR JASZI

See: COLLECTIVISM; COMMUNISM; GUILD SOCIALISM; FABIANISM; SYNDICALISM; MATERIALISM; ANARCHISM; SOCIALIST PARTIES; COMMUNIST PARTIES; LABOR PARTIES; LABOR MOVEMENT; CLASS; CLASS STRUGGLE; MASSES; PROLETARIAT; REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION; SOCIALIZATION; GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP; COOPERATION; PRODUCERS' COOPERATION; PROP-

ERTY; INHERITANCE; CAPITALISM; INDUSTRIALISM; INDIVIDUALISM. See also biographies of individual socialists.

Consult: FOR HISTORY AND GENERAL DESCRIPTION: Beer, Max, *Allgemeine Geschichte des Sozialismus und der sozialen Kämpfe* (6th ed. Berlin 1929), tr. by H. J. Stanning, 5 vols. (London 1922-25); Löwler, H. W., *A History of Socialist Thought* (New York 1927); Adler, Georg, *Geschichte des Sozialismus und Kommunismus von Plato bis zur Gegenwart*, Hand- und Lehrbuch der Staatswissenschaften, pt. i, vol. iii (Leipzig 1899); Dichtl, Karl, *Über Sozialismus, Kommunismus und Anarchismus* (2nd ed. Jena 1911); Denis, Hector, *Histoire des systèmes économiques et socialistes*, 2 vols. (Paris 1904-07); Tuzin-Burunovsky, M. I., *Sovremennyi sotsializm v svoem istoricheskom razvitií* (St. Petersburg 1906), tr. by M. I. Redmont as *Modern Socialism in Its Historical Development* (London 1910); Lange, F. A., *Geschichte des Materialismus und Kritik seiner Bedeutung in der Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (new ed. by Heinrich Schmidt, Leipzig 1926), tr. by E. C. Thomas, 3 vols. (3rd ed. London 1890); Richard, G., *La question sociale et le mouvement philosophique au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle* (Paris 1914); Mayer, Gustav, *Soziale Bewegungen und Theorien bis zur modernen Arbeiterbewegung*, *Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, vol. ii (9th ed. Leipzig 1922); Herkner, Heinrich, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, 2 vols. (8th ed. Berlin 1922) vol. ii; Lorwin, I. J., *Labor and Internationalism* (New York 1920); Adler, Max, *Wegweiser; Studien zur Geistesgeschichte des Sozialismus* (5th ed. Vienna 1931); *Encyclopédie socialiste, syndicale et coopérative de l'Internationale ouvrière*, ed. by A. C. A. Compère-Morel, 8 vols. (Paris 1912-13); Compère-Morel, A. C. A., *Grande dictionnaire socialiste du mouvement politique et économique, national et international* (Paris 1924); Stegmann, Carl, and Lindemann, C. H., *Handbuch des Sozialismus* (Zurich 1897); Bliss, W. D. P., *A Handbook of Socialism* (London 1895); Shaw, G. B., and others, *Fabian Essays on Socialism* (new ed. London 1920); *What Is Socialism?*, ed. by Dan Griffiths (London 1924). See also the files of *Dokumente des Sozialismus*, 5 vols. (Berlin 1901-05); *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, 15 vols. (Leipzig 1911-30); *Neue Zeit*, 41 vols. (Stuttgart 1883-1923). For bibliographies: Stammhammer, Josef, *Bibliographie des Sozialismus und Kommunismus*, 3 vols. (Jena 1893-1909); Ralen, Michel, *Révolution et socialisme; essai de bibliographie* (Paris 1923); Hearnshaw, F. J. C., "Book List" in his *A Survey of Socialism* (London 1928) p. 449-66.

FOR DEVELOPMENTS BY PERIODS AND COUNTRIES: Pöhlmann, Robert von, *Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der modernen Welt*, 2 vols. (3rd ed. by Friedrich Oertel, Munich 1925); Troeltsch, E. D., *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. i (3rd ed. Tübingen 1923), tr. by Olive Wyon, 2 vols. (London 1931); Bloch, Ernst, *Théorie des classes et Théorie der Revolution* (Munich 1922); Kautsky, Karl, *Vorläufer des modernen Sozialismus*, 2 vols. (2nd ed. Stuttgart 1909); Mumford, L., *The Story of Utopias* (New York 1922); Gide, Charles, *Les colonies communistes et coopératives* (Paris 1928), tr. by E. F. Row (London 1930); Weber, Max, "Die protestantische Ethik und der Geist des Kapitalismus" in his *Gesammelte Auf-*

sätze zur Religionssoziologie, 3 vols. (1st and ed. Tübingen 1921-22) vol. 1, tr. by Talcott Parsons (London 1920); Sombart, Werner, *Der Bourgeois* (Munich 1913), tr. by M. Epstein as *The Quakeressence of Capitalism* (London 1915); Lawney, R. H., *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (London 1926); Krass, J. B., *Scholastik, Puritanismus, Kapitalismus* (Munich 1930); Groenhuysen, Bernhard, *Die Entstehung der bürgerlichen Welt- und Lebensanschauung in Frankreich*, Philosophie und Geisteswissenschaften, Buchreihe, vols. iv-v, 2 vols. (Halle 1927-30); Villgardelle, François, *Histoire des idées sociales avant la Révolution française* (Paris 1846); Laski, H. J., "The Socialist Tradition in the French Revolution" in *The Social and Political Ideas of Some Representative Thinkers of the Revolutionary Era*, ed. by F. J. C. Hearnshaw (London 1931) ch. viii; *Histoire socialiste (1789-1900)*, ed. by J. L. Jaurès, 13 vols. (Paris 1901-08); Stein, Lorenz von, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich von 1789 . . .*, 3 vols. (new ed. by G. Salomon, Munich 1921); Durkheim, É., *Le Socialisme; la doctrine saint-simonienne*, ed. by Marcel Mauss (Paris 1928); Weil, G. J., *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852-1924* (3rd ed. Paris 1924); Bourgin, Georges, *Histoire de la Commune* (Paris 1907); Bouglé, Célestin, *Socialismes français* (Paris 1912); Mehring, Franz, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, 4 vols. (12th ed. Stuttgart 1922); Macartney, C., *The Social Revolution in Austria* (Cambridge, Eng. 1926); Beer, Max, *A History of British Socialism*, 2 vols. (new ed. London 1929); Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, *The History of Trade Unionism* (rev. ed. London 1920); Cole, G. D. H., *A Short History of the British Working Class Movement, 1789-1927*, 3 vols. (new ed. London 1932); Lowenthal, E., *The Ricardian Socialists*, Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, no. 114 (New York 1917); Michels, Roberto, *Storia critica del movimento socialista italiano dagli inizi fino al 1911* (Florence 1926); Masaryk, T. G., *Russland und Europa*, 2 vols. (Jena 1913), tr. by E. and C. Paul as *The Spirit of Russia* (London 1916); Bulbnoff, Nicolai von, "Der Geist des volkstümlichen russischen Sozialismus" in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, vol. IV (1926) 362-406; Nordhoff, Charles, *The Communist Societies of the United States* (New York 1875); Stein, Lorenz von, "Der amerikanische Socialismus und Communismus" in *Nord und Süd*, vol. XV (1880) 87-101, 191-217; Sombart, Werner, *Warum gibt es in den Vereinigten Staaten keinen Sozialismus?* (Tübingen 1906); O'Neal, James, *American Communism* (New York 1927); Raisky, I. C., *Daniel DeLeon*, tr. from Russian ms. (New York 1932).

FOR MARXIAN SOCIALISM: Ryazimov, D., *Marx i Engels* (Moscow 1923), tr. by J. Kunitz as *Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels* (New York 1927); Laski, H. J., *Karl Marx* (London 1922); Loria, Achille, *Carlo Marx* (Genoa 1916), tr. by E. and C. Paul (London 1920), and "L'opera postuma di Carlo Marx" in *Nuova antologia*, 3rd ser., vol. IV (1895) 460-96; Man, Hendrik de, "Der neuentdeckte Marx" in *Kampf*, vol. XXV (1932) 224-29, 267-77; Adler, C. P. T., *Le manifeste communiste de Karl Marx et F. Engels* (Paris 1901); Labriola, Antonio, *Del materialismo storico*, Saggi intorno alla concezione materialistica della storia, vol. II (2nd ed. Rome 1902), tr.

by C. H. Kerr as *Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History* (Chicago 1904); Stammler, Rudolf, *Wirtschaft und Recht nach der materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung* (5th ed. Berlin 1924); Masaryk, T. G., *Die philosophischen und soziologischen Grundlagen des Marxismus* (Vienna 1899); Croce, B., *Materialismo storico ed economia marxistica* (5th ed. Bari 1927), tr. by C. M. Meredith (London 1914); Mondolfo, Rodolfo, *Il materialismo storico in Federico Engels* (Genoa 1912); Seligman, E. R. A., *The Economic Interpretation of History* (2nd ed. New York 1917); Rusanbert, A., *Geschichte des Bolschewismus* (Berlin 1932), tr. by Ian F. D. Morrow (New York 1934); Laski, H. J., *Communism* (London 1927); Lukács, Georg, *Lenin, Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft*, vol. I (Berlin 1924), and *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* (Berlin 1923); Bukharin, N., *Teoriya istoricheskogo materializma* (2nd ed. Moscow 1923), tr. as *Historical Materialism* (New York 1925); Korsch, Karl, *Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung* (Leipzig 1929); Hook, Sidney, *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx* (New York 1933); Plenge, Johann, *Marx and Hegel* (Tübingen 1911); Dellbrück, H., "Die marxische Geschichtsphilosophie" in *Preussische Jahrbücher*, vol. cxxxii (1920) 157-80; Hée, H., *Matérialisme historique et interprétation économique de l'histoire* (Paris 1927), tr. by M. M. Knight as *The Economic Interpretation of History* (New York 1929); Oppenheimer, Franz, *Das Grundgesetz der marxischen Gesellschaftslehre* (Berlin 1903); Simkhovitch, V. G., *Marxism versus Socialism* (New York 1913); Böhm-Bawerk, Eugen von, "Zum Abschluss des marxischen Systems" in *Staatswissenschaftliche Arbeiten. Festgabe für Karl Kries*, ed. by Otto von Baenigk (Berlin 1896) p. 85-205, tr. by A. M. Macdonald as *Karl Marx and the Close of His System* (London 1898); Jászai, O., *A történelmi materializmus általánosságok* (State philosophy of historical materialism) (3rd ed. Budapest 1908); Chang, Sherman H. M., *The Marxist Theory of the State* (Philadelphia 1931). See also the following bibliographies: Drahm, Ernst, *Marx-Bibliographie* (2nd ed. Berlin 1923), and *Bibliographie des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus 1914-1922* (Berlin 1923); "Die Literatur über Marx, Engels und über Marxismus seit Beginn des Weltkrieges," compiled by E. Czöbel and P. Hajdu, in *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. I (1925) 467-537.

FOR OTHER TRENDS: Buret, Eugène, *De la naissance des classes laborieuses en Angleterre et en France*, 2 vols. (Paris 1840); Büttner, J. von, *Der Einfluss der herrschenden Ideen des 19. Jahrhunderts auf den Staat*, 2 vols. (Vienna and Leipzig 1851-54); Lange, F. A., *Die Arbeiterfrage* (rev. ed. by A. Gorkhowsky, Leipzig 1910); Menger, Anton, *Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsvertrag in geschichtlicher Darstellung* (3rd ed. Stuttgart 1904), tr. by M. E. Tannur (London 1899), and *Neue Staatslehre* (3rd ed. Jena 1906); L'Année, F., *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft; Abhandlung des Communismus und des Sozialismus als empirischer Kulturformen* (Leipzig 1887); Oppenheimer, Franz, *Weder Kapitalismus noch Kommunismus* (Jena 1932); David, Eduard, *Sozialismus und Landwirtschaft* (2nd ed. Leipzig 1922); Bauer, Otto, *Die Nationalitätenfrage und die Sozialdemokratie*, Marx-Studien, vol. II (2nd ed. Vienna 1924); Landauer, G., *Anspruch zion Sozialismus* (2nd ed. Berlin 1919); Heimann, Eduard, *Kapitalismus und Sozialismus* (Potsdam 1931); Spinn, Othmar, *Der wahre Staat* (3rd ed. Jena 1931); Gold-