

scheid, Rudolf, *Staatssozialismus oder Staatskapitalismus* (3rd ed. Vienna 1917); Sorol, G., *Réflexions sur la violence* (7th ed. Paris 1930), tr. by T. F. Hulme (New York 1914), and *La décomposition du Marxisme* (3rd ed. Paris 1923); Berth, Édouard, *Les derniers aspects du socialisme, Études sur le devenir social*, vol. xvii (Paris 1923); Lorwin, L. L., *Syndicalism in France*, Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, no. 116 (2nd ed. New York 1914); Leroy, Maxime, *Les techniques nouvelles du syndicalisme* (Paris 1921); Brissenden, P. K., *The I. W. W.; a Study of American Syndicalism*, Columbia University, Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, no. 193 (2nd ed. New York 1920); Rathenus, W., *Die neue Gesellschaft* (Berlin 1919), tr. by Arthur Windham (London 1921); T'awney, R. H., *The Sickness of an Acquisitive Society* (London 1920); Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization* (London 1923), and *A Constitution for the Socialist Commonwealth of Great Britain* (London 1920); Penty, A. J., *Guilds and the Social Crisis* (London 1919); Cole, G. D. H., *Self-Government in Industry* (5th ed. London 1920); Shaw, G. B., *The Intelligent Woman's Guide to Socialism and Capitalism* (London 1928).

FOR WAR AND POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS: Luxemburg, R., *Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie* (Berne 1916), English translation (New York 1918); Zinoviev, G., *Die Weltrevolution und die III. kommunistische Internationale* (Berlin 1920), English translation (London 1920); Jászai, Oszkár, *Magyarországi Szocializmus Sávja* (Munich 1923), tr. from the German by E. W. Dickes as *Revolution and Counter-Revolution in Hungary* (London 1924); Varga, Eugen, *Die wirtschaftspolitischen Probleme der proletarischen Diktatur* (2nd ed. St. Petersburg 1921); Dobb, Maurice H., *Russian Economic Development since the Revolution* (2nd ed. London 1920); Heiler, Arthur, *Das Experiment des Bolschewismus* (Frankfurt 1929), tr. by H. J. Stanning (London 1930); Chamberlin, W. H., *Soviet Russia* (rev. ed. Boston 1931); Gurjan, Waldemar, *Der Bolschewismus* (Freiburg i. Br. 1931), tr. by E. I. Wadkin (London 1932); Stalin, I., *Voprosi leninizma* (8th ed. Moscow 1931), tr. by E. and C. Paul as *Leninism*, 2 vols. (London 1928-33); Brutzkus, Boris, *Die Lehren des Marxismus im Lichte der russischen Revolution* (Berlin 1928); Kautsky, Karl, *Der Bolschewismus in der Suchgasse* (Berlin 1930), tr. by B. Prikshard as *Bolshevism at a Deadlock* (London 1931); Bukharin, N. I., *Karl Kautsky und Sowjetrußland*, tr. from the Russian (Vienna 1925); Dobb, Maurice H., *On Marxian To-day* (London 1932); Strachey, John, *The Coming Struggle for Power* (London 1932); Rosselli, C., *Socialisme libéral*, tr. from Italian ms. by S. Priacel (Paris 1930); Labriola, A., *Au delà du capitalisme et de socialisme*, tr. from the Italian by S. Priacel (Paris 1932); Keynes, J. M., *Laissez-Faire and Communism* (New York 1926); Cole, G. D. H., *The Intelligent Man's Guide through World Chaos* (London 1932); Renner, Karl, *Staatswirtschaft, Weltwirtschaft und Sozialismus* (Berlin 1929); Lederer, Emil, *Technischer Fortschritt und Arbeitslosigkeit* (Tübingen 1921); Laski, H. J., *Democracy in Crisis* (Chapel Hill, N. C. 1933).

FOR CRITIQUE: Pareto, V., *Les systèmes socialistes*, 2 vols. (Paris 1902-03); Bourguin, M., *Les systèmes socialistes et l'évolution économique* (3rd ed. Paris 1921);

Dietzel, Heinrich, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Sozialismus und Kommunismus*, Staatswissenschaftliche Musterbücher, no. 2 (Essen 1920); Liefmann, Robert, *Geschichte und Kritik des Sozialismus* (2nd ed. Leipzig 1923); Sombart, W., *Sozialismus und soziale Bewegung im 19. Jahrhundert* (Jena 1896; 10th ed. as *Der proletarische Sozialismus, "Marxismus,"* 2 vols., Jena 1924), tr. from 6th ed. by M. Epstein as *Socialism and the Social Movement* (London 1909); Russell, Bertrand, *Roads to Freedom* (London 1918); Böhm-Bawerk, Eugen von, *Geschichte und Kritik der Kapitalism-Theorien* (3rd ed. Innsbruck 1914), tr. by W. Smart (London 1890); Mill, John Stuart, *Principles of Political Economy* (7th ed. London 1871) bk. ii, ch. i, bk. iv, ch. v, and bk. v, ch. vi; Dühring, Eugen, *Kritische Geschichte der Nationalökonomie und des Sozialismus* (4th ed. Leipzig 1900); Schaffle, A., *Die Quintessenz des Sozialismus* (14th ed. Gotha 1906), tr. under the supervision of Bernard Bosanquet (London 1888), and *Die Aussichtslosigkeit der Sozialdemokratie* (4th ed. Tübingen 1891), tr. by A. C. Morant (London 1892); Cathrein, Viktor, *Der Sozialismus* (16th ed. Freiburg i. Br. 1923); Ryan, John A., *Industrial Democracy from a Catholic Viewpoint* (Baltimore 1925); Adler, Georg, *Die Zukunft der sozialen Frage* (Jena 1900); Wolf, J., *Sozialismus und kapitalistische Gesellschaftsordnung* (Stuttgart 1892); Leroy-Beaulieu, Paul, *Le collectivisme. Essai sur critique du nouveau socialisme* (5th ed. Paris 1909), tr. by Arthur Clay (London 1908); Flint, Robert, *Socialism* (2nd ed. London 1908); Clark, J. B., *Social Justice without Socialism* (Boston 1914); Weber, Max, *Der Sozialismus* (Vienna 1918); Schuspanner, J., "Sozialistische Möglichkeiten von heute" in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, vol. xiviii (1920-21) 305-60; Mises, Ludwig, *Die Gemeinwirtschaft* (2nd ed. Jena 1932); Weber, Adolf, *Ende des Kapitalismus?* (Munich 1929), tr. by H. J. Stanning as *In Defense of Capitalism* (London 1930); Cassel, Gustav, *Socialism eller framåtidsståndet* (Stockholm 1928), tr. into German as *Sozialismus oder Fortschritt* (Berlin 1929); Pöhl, Ludwig, *Kapitalismus und Sozialismus* (4th ed. Berlin 1931); Kelsen, Hans, *Sozialismus und Staat* (2nd ed. Leipzig 1923), and *Marx oder Lassalle* (Leipzig 1924); Scheler, Max, "Prophetischer oder marxistischer Sozialismus?" in his *Schriften zur Soziologie und Weltanschauungslehre*, 3 vols. (Leipzig 1923-24) vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 1-25; Van, Hendrik de, *Zijn Psychologie des Socialismus* (new ed. Jena 1927), tr. by E. and C. Paul (New York 1927), and *Die Intellektuellen und der Sozialismus* (Jena 1926); Mannheim, Karl, *Ideologie und Utopie* (Bonn 1930).

See also bibliographies appended to biographical articles on major socialist figures.

SOCIALIST PARTIES. The origin of socialist parties may be traced to the rise of the industrial proletariat, just as the more remote lineage of the European liberal and conservative parties goes back to the mediaeval estates. The peculiar ideology acquired by each of the older parties is paralleled by the position which Marxism has held since the nineteenth century in the class policy of the industrial workers. If Marxism be interpreted, in this context, as aiming to replace

the capitalistic system by the socialization of the means of production, socialist parties may be defined as those political parties of industrial workers which are striving to realize the transformation of the prevailing political and economic system in accordance with the teachings of Karl Marx. The parties formed after 1914 as a result of secessions from the older socialist parties and now united in the Communist International have been treated elsewhere (see COMMUNIST PARTIES), as have the labor parties (q.v.) of Anglo-Saxon countries. While the latter have never formally subscribed to Marxist tenets, from the beginning they have had significant relations with the professedly Marxist socialist parties and since the World War British Labour has evolved into the leading socialist party of the world.

As a result of the slower pace of their industrial development the continental countries, where socialist parties originated and have attained their greatest success, failed until 1848 to produce a labor movement remotely comparable with that of England. In the form of Chartism the first genuine labor party had appeared in England before the publication of the fundamental doctrines of scientific socialism. Upon their arrival in England Marx and Engels, realizing the significance of the Chartist movement, sought to establish connections with its leaders and were disposed to convert it into a Marxist party, until its decline in the 1850's disappointed their hopes.

During the period when Chartism was at its height the only continental parties which stood to the left of the liberals were composite groups representing the poorer and more radical elements of the population in general—petty bourgeoisie, peasants and intellectuals as well as workers; it was such democratic movements which constituted the force behind the revolutions of 1848-49 in Germany, France and elsewhere. In 1847, however, the Communist League had been founded under the leadership of Marx and Engels. Marx and Engels intended that the league should join in the revolutionary struggles as the left wing of the democratic movements and after the victorious consummation of this first stage carry the revolution beyond its bourgeois limits. But even in Germany, where most of its following was recruited, the Communist League never became a real political party. Weak both in numbers and in the techniques and agencies necessary for effective agitation, it was unable to exercise an inde-

pendent influence on the masses and finally collapsed in 1852.

The first Marxist to win a few thousand workers from bourgeois liberalism and to weld them into a well knit and permanent organization carrying on an overt campaign of nation wide scope was Ferdinand Lassalle. In 1863 Lassalle founded in Germany the earliest real socialist labor party, the *Allgemeiner deutscher Arbeiterverein*. His organization, surviving his death in 1864, was to become the basis of the German Social Democratic party and the model for all other socialist parties. Parallel to the *Allgemeiner deutscher Arbeiterverein* there arose a second small German socialist party, created by August Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht and formally launched in 1869 at Eisenach as the *Sozialdemokratische Arbeiterpartei*. The designation social democratic was also used by Lassalle's party; henceforth this term, which in the earlier period had been applied to all democrats with an interest in social problems, or socialist, which had formerly been a generic name for social reformers, was generally assumed by Marxist groups, while communist, the term used in 1848, fell into discard. Between the two German socialist labor parties an important difference existed. The group founded by Liebknecht and Bebel was strongly anti-Prussian and *gross deutsch*, whereas Lassalle's followers accepted as inevitable the unification of Germany under Prussian leadership. Marx and Engels, accusing the Lassalleans of excessive subsmissiveness in their attitude toward the Prussian government, became increasingly estranged from them, until finally an open break resulted. It is curiously ironical that the first real socialist labor party was disclaimed by Marx.

The First International, which was established in 1864 under the leadership of Marx and which dominated the international labor movement for the next decade, can scarcely be considered to have been a cartel of socialist parties. Its basic nucleus consisted of the English trade unions, which after the decline of Chartism began to take a growing interest in political questions. In addition it included certain labor groups from the Latin nations, America, Switzerland and other countries; these were more or less loosely organized and varied greatly in ideology and tendency. The only genuine labor parties in the International were the two German parties and of these the Lassallean group soon withdrew. In France no socialist or labor party was in existence even at the time of the great uprising

of the Parisian workers which culminated in the Commune of 1871, while the disastrous defeat of the commune prevented the emergence of a socialist or revolutionary organization of French workers for many years to come. After the English trade unions abandoned active politics the International broke up as a result of the fundamental unsoundness of its structure.

In 1875 at Gotha the two German parties merged as the *Sozialistische Arbeiterpartei Deutschlands*, a name soon changed to *Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands*. With the new united front German Social Democracy entered upon a period of steady numerical expansion. Even the laws promulgated by Bismarck in 1878 against the labor movement involved only a temporary setback. During the 1880's Marxist parties and groups arose also in France, Italy, Austria, Scandinavia, Holland and Belgium. In 1889 all these socialist parties combined in the Second International, which lasted until 1914.

During this era the socialist parties succeeded in enlisting the majority of the industrial workers in Germany, France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, the Scandinavian countries, the Balkans and, despite enormous difficulties, in Russia. In England, on the other hand, notwithstanding numerous attempts to found socialist parties on the model of the continental parties, a socialist mass party failed to develop before 1914. The English trade unions increased in significance but confined themselves almost exclusively to their economic functions. The majority of the English workers continued to vote for the Liberals or even for the Conservatives and did not recognize the necessity of a separate socialist labor party. Even the Labour party, which appeared in the House of Commons in 1906, was nothing more than an appendage of the great Liberal party and in the years preceding the outbreak of the World War had only from about 30 to 40 representatives in the English Parliament out of a total membership of 670. In the United States also, although the present Socialist party was founded in 1901, the overwhelming majority of the workers continued to cast their ballots for the two great bourgeois parties. Nor did the Second International acquire any significant influence in Asia, Africa or South America. The strong Labour party of Australia, which achieved political power even before the World War, pursued its separate course. Thus to all intents and purposes the socialist parties of the Second International were confined to continental Europe.

By far the largest and best organized party of the Second International was that of Germany, especially after the laws restricting socialist activity in that country were revoked in 1890. At the outbreak of the World War the German Reichstag included 110 Social Democratic deputies out of a total membership of 397. By virtue of their revolutionary and theoretical activities the Russians also occupied a position of great significance in the International, while the Anglo-Saxons and the Latins played a subordinate role. The outstanding theorists of the socialist parties were the German Karl Kautsky and the Russian Plekhanov. The undisputed political leader of the International, after the death of Friedrich Engels, was August Bebel, the leader of the German socialists.

All the parties of the Second International were confronted by a basic dilemma. Owing their existence to the growth of industrial capitalism and to the rapidly expanding army of industrial proletarians, the parties were, on the one hand, the political representatives of working class interests. But since they had accepted as their ideological basis the revolutionary Marxism of 1848, it was also their avowed purpose to capture political power by revolutionary means and to abolish the private ownership of the instruments of production.

During the period between 1889 and 1914, both in the United States and in all the European nations except Russia, the position of the established governments and of the existing social order seemed too impregnable to offer any opportunity for serious revolution. The socialist parties were everywhere in a minority, and outside of Russia no revolutionary bourgeois groups existed with whom they could combine to overthrow the government. Hence none of them except the Russian carried on any real preparatory work for revolution, nor did any of them even visualize a socialist revolution with any degree of clarity. Had they been merely occupational parties of the working classes, their task of formulating a practical routine policy and program would have been comparatively simple. They would naturally have taken the same attitude toward state, nation, army and foreign policy as would, for instance, a peasants' party; they would merely have represented the interests of the workers within the framework of the existing political order and with legal means. Such a policy they might perhaps have pursued with resoluteness and clarity, had it not been for the complications resulting from their ad-

herence to Marxism. Yet they clung tenaciously to Marxist theory, despite the impossibility of realizing it in practise, because this theory provided the ideological force which distinguished them from the bourgeois parties and gave *elan* to the socialist organization.

It was natural that Marxism itself should undergo certain modifications in the course of these developments. What the socialist parties of the Second International took over was not the realistic and empirical revolutionary doctrines of 1848 but rather a system of dogmas which sought to supply a definitive answer to every question. The sum of these answers represented the party ideology. Friedrich Engels clearly recognized the ideological shortcomings of the Second International, although he was powerless to alter its course. While the Russian socialists took a revolutionary stand even during the period of the Second International, almost all the theoreticians among them were convinced that the imminent revolution in their country would be bourgeois rather than socialist. In Russia therefore Marxist doctrine was used to demonstrate the necessity of developing bourgeois capitalism and to work out the organization and technique fitted to the bourgeois revolution. The contradiction between the practical activity of the socialist parties and the ultimate Marxist goal is the basic explanation of all the vacillations, dissensions and difficulties with which the history of the parties down to 1914 is replete.

All socialists of the Second International were agreed on matters of practical social legislation, such as the eight-hour day, increased wages and improvement of working conditions. Likewise they all favored democracy, universal suffrage and the vesting of supreme authority in the decisions and assemblies which were based on universal suffrage. The Russian socialists were no exceptions in this respect, for they planned to convoke after the victorious revolution a Russian national assembly, which should establish a democratic and republican constitution. In principle the republican form of government was favored by all the socialist parties, but in practise they carried on an active struggle against monarchy only in lands, such as Germany and Russia, where monarchy was of a feudal and semi-absolutistic type.

The socialist parties experienced particular difficulty in defining their relations toward state and nation. In view of the impossibility of carrying out a revolution the only policy which they

could adopt toward the existing system without repudiating Marxism was one of passive intransigence. The symbolic expression of this attitude was the opposition carried on by socialist parliamentary deputies toward the government budget. They criticized all measures proposed by the governments and voted against them. In particular the nationalistic, imperialistic and militaristic policies characteristic of the great powers in the generation before the World War came under the constant fire of the radical socialists, who made the support of international pacifism part of their daily routine. This involved a highly significant modification of Marxism, for Marx and Engels had always recognized war and force as decisive weapons and had moreover approved the existence at least of the great nations. Their only demand had been that the proletariat "must constitute itself the nation." The pacifism of the parties of the Second International was a specific result of their inability either to approve the existing order or to alter it by revolution.

This policy of unflinching obstructionism without real preparation for the revolution was characteristic of official socialism and until 1914 was the general direction followed by the German party executives, the majority of the Italian party and the international socialist congresses. But disagreement over the major political problems led to the development of internal cleavages both to the right and to the left.

To the right of the official radicals stood the revisionists. Refusing to allow their day to day policies to be determined by reference to what they regarded as a chimerical final goal, they strove to achieve practical gains for the working classes within the framework of the existing order. They saw no reason to shrink from compromise and would have welcomed any bourgeois allies who could be induced to support their routine policy. Minorities in the German and Italian parties belonged to the revisionist faction. In France an unusual opportunity was offered to the revisionists by the bitter clash, dramatized in the Dreyfus affair and the anti-clerical movement, between opposing factions of the bourgeoisie, the monarchistic and authoritarian right and the liberal and democratic left. Taking advantage of the situation the revisionist wing under the leadership of Jaures joined the bourgeois liberals in a left bloc for the defense of the republic. In this way the French socialists became for a long time a government party. Despite vehement protest on the part of the

radical members of the Socialist International, they even contributed to coalition cabinets of the left individual ministers, such as Millerand and Briand, both of whom eventually went over to the bourgeois camp.

The left wing of the socialist parties consisted of those members who discountenanced the unsubstantial Marxism of the center because they were convinced of the imminence of a period of great wars and revolutions. They believed therefore that the workers should make ready for real revolutionary activity, study the doctrines of the Russian revolution of 1905-06 and equip themselves for a general strike. Numerically weak, the left wing of the Socialist International was confined chiefly to the Rosa Luxemburg group in Germany and a small Marxist coterie in Holland.

Within Russian Social Democracy official radicalism in general was represented by the Mensheviks and the left by the followers of Trotsky. There were also certain adherents of revisionism. The Bolshevik group under Lenin, taking a unique stand, denied the advisability of building a mass party of workers organized on democratic principles and made it their chief objective to develop a highly disciplined nucleus of professional revolutionaries, who would be able to assume the leadership of the workers and peasants in the uprising against czarism.

The factional antagonisms within the socialist parties led to several open schisms. The Russian Bolsheviks broke away in 1903. In French socialism various conflicting parties and groups existed from the very beginning and it was not until 1905 that they achieved even a formal unity. Schisms also occurred in Holland and Bulgaria in the period prior to 1914.

The international affiliations between the individual socialist parties were very loose. International congresses, such as those held at Amsterdam in 1904, at Stuttgart in 1907, at Copenhagen in 1910 and at Basel in 1912, were convened at intervals of several years but their decisions exerted no profound influence on the policies of the individual national parties. The function of coordinating the parties rested with the International Socialist Bureau, established in 1900 at Brussels, but this organization was devoid of executive power. Since a strong and active international organization would have been a prerequisite for any serious struggle against nationalism by the socialist parties, its absence is further indication that their profession of internationalism was merely formal.

Parallel with their own organizations the socialist parties in all countries endeavored to create trade unions. The latter were intended to direct the purely economic and industrial disputes between workers and employers and were to recruit as many workers as possible, even those still indifferent to political radicalism. Although nominally independent, in practice these unions which were under socialist leadership worked in cooperation with the party. In Belgium the Socialist Labor party was nothing more than a cartel of the political, the trade union and the cooperative organizations.

In order to attract the laboring classes the socialist parties were forced to wage war on two fronts. In the first place they were confronted by the problem of winning over workers who thus far had been satisfied with the bourgeois parties. This group included most of the workers in England and in the United States as well as those in Germany who belonged to the Catholic Center party. On the opposite front were arrayed the numerous workers who took the syndicalist view. These rejected the bourgeois parties but believed that no political party whatsoever could help them. Maintaining that the socialist party only became corrupted in the capitalistic parliament, they wished the working classes to abandon the parliamentary conflicts and to confine their attention to their occupational organizations, the trade unions, which should carry on the struggle for power through direct action and particularly through the general strike. Irreconcilable opponents of the socialist party, the syndicalists repudiated the trade unions dominated by socialist leaders and ideas and set up rival unions of their own. While they were comparatively weak in the Anglo-Saxon countries, the syndicalists controlled the majority of the workers in Spain and had considerable influence in France and Italy. In France, for instance, the socialist party could make little headway with the trade unions because of syndicalist resistance.

The great historical achievement of the Socialist International during the period between 1889 and 1914 consists in its having effectively raised the self-consciousness, the standard of living and the cultural level of the proletariat in all the countries where it held the leadership of the workers. At the same time, however, the Second International spread an abstract and unrealistic dogmatism that was neither clearly revolutionary nor outspokenly reformist. In times of peace such a formal radicalism was in-

nocuous enough, for the strong bourgeois political power protected it from its own consequences. But socialist parties so oriented could not withstand a serious crisis. This became apparent with the outbreak of the World War.

The collapse of the Second International in 1914 cannot be attributed to the inability of the socialists to prevent the war, since they were in a minority in all the belligerent nations and none of the war cabinets was under socialist influence. Nor can the socialist workers be condemned for participating in the defense of their country: Marx and Engels had never challenged the right of national defense. Nevertheless, when the socialist parties in Germany and France as well as in Austria and Belgium approved the war credits and established a truce with their governments and the bourgeois parties, the day-dream of radical intransigence vanished into thin air. The party members were cut adrift from their historical moorings, and the party organizations themselves in this unaccustomed situation became inert and followed meekly the dictates of their governments. In Russia, on the other hand, where the socialists had always pursued a genuinely revolutionary goal, the majority of the party opposed the government's war policy. The Socialist party of Italy also remained in the opposition; here, however, the division of the bourgeois parties on the question of entry into the war eased the problem for the Socialists. But in any case, with the German and Austrian socialists ranged behind the Central Powers and the French, English and Belgian socialists supporting the Entente, the International was shattered.

As the war continued, however, certain groups among the socialists began to oppose the truce, and the desire to resume the class struggle re-emerged. This was particularly true in Germany, where in 1915 the opponents of the truce withdrew from the majority socialists and in 1917 formed the Independent Social Democratic party. At conferences held at Zimmerwald and Kienthal in Switzerland the socialists of the neutral countries together with the Russians, the Italians and the independent elements in Germany, France and elsewhere sought to revive the International. But the Zimmerwald movement was itself lacking in unity. Whereas the majority wished to reestablish the old International on the basis of repudiation of the truce policy, Lenin, who as early as 1914 had pronounced the Second International dead, insisted upon the creation of a Third International of active revo-

lutionaries fitted to carry on the world uprising which he confidently expected would follow upon the World War. The left Zimmerwaldians under Lenin's leadership attracted only a scattered following outside of the Bolsheviks, and the Zimmerwald movement left no permanent organization.

For the German and Austro-Hungarian bourgeois revolutions, which came in 1918 as a result of the complete exhaustion of the masses, the widespread yearning for peace and the discrediting of the reigning governments, the socialists had done nothing to pave the way. Hence they were hardly able to convert them into socialist revolutions. It was purely a result of historical circumstances that after the collapse of the monarchy the leadership of the German Republic as well as of the new states of Austria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary passed into their hands. In Russia after the bourgeois revolution of February, 1917, the Mensheviks, or democratic socialists of the western European type, joined the government of the short lived bourgeois republic. With the Bolshevik revolution of October, however, the Menshevik party was annihilated.

The Bolshevik victory, with the resulting party dictatorship and inauguration of state socialism, made a profound impression upon workers all over the world. Lenin's call to the workers of all nations to abandon the disintegrated Second International and join the revolutionary Third International was received with enthusiasm. During 1919 and 1920 all the socialist parties except British Labour experienced serious internal convulsions and disturbances. The majority of the workers in Germany, France, Italy and many smaller countries were ready to adhere to the Third International, which had discarded the compromised name of socialist and called itself communist in the spirit of 1848. That the apparently impossible task of reviving the socialist parties and reconstructing the Second International was successfully performed in these circumstances must be laid to the policy adopted by the Bolsheviks themselves. The Russian leaders had no desire to create a free community embracing all workers. They wished rather to enjoy complete control of parties in other lands and to make them serve the interests of the Russian state. For this reason the Bolsheviks repelled the majority of the socialist workers originally attracted to them and were able to organize into the Communist International only a minority of the international

proletariat. Many socialist parties and groups which had at first sympathized with the Third International united to form the Vienna International, and at the Hamburg Congress of 1923 they joined the other socialist parties in the Labor and Socialist International, with headquarters now located at Zurich. The International Federation of Trade Unions, which had been established before the war under socialist leadership, was reorganized in 1919 at Amsterdam, where its central office was located until 1931. Afterward it was transferred to Berlin, and now its seat is in Paris.

In the history of the socialist parties the decade 1923-33 was marked by struggle against the communists on the one hand and against the bourgeois counter-revolutionary movements, such as fascism and national socialism, on the other. The pre-war tradition of abstract radicalism had to be abandoned by the socialists, and its perpetuation fell rather to the lot of the communist parties. In taking up the task of building a new theoretical and tactical foundation the socialists turned to pre-war revisionism for their guiding principles. It was the English socialists, carrying on the tradition of the Fabians and the guild socialists, and the Austrians, the so-called Austro-Marxists, who made the most important contributions to these theoretical developments.

The socialist parties now emphatically proclaimed their intention to attain power only through democratic means rather than through the forcible dictatorship of a minority. The use of force was said to be permissible only when a reactionary minority wrested power by violence from the democratic-socialist majority of the nation. The socialists of all lands also openly announced that they were working for reforms within the framework of the capitalist society. Recognition of a constitutional monarchy, coalition with bourgeois parties, participation on the part of socialist ministers in bourgeois governments and approval of the budgets of capitalist states, all came to be regarded as consistent with socialist theory: the decision in each case was to be made from a practical point of view. Yet despite all these compromises the parties did not renounce the objective of carrying on a definitive struggle against the capitalist economic system and setting up a socialist society.

The difficulty which the socialist parties experienced in attempting to develop a realistic and activist policy from one based on abstract slogans is particularly well exemplified by the German Social Democrats. Their abstract re-

pu diation of the old empire became transformed into an equally abstract support of the new republic, of which they assumed the leadership on November 9, 1918. They came to identify themselves with that republic and thus were swallowed up in its catastrophic overthrow in 1933. This was the more ironical because the Social Democrats had early lost their leadership of the republic. The division between majority socialists and the independents until their union in 1922 and subsequently the rivalry between communists and socialists dissipated the force of the socialist working classes. The bourgeoisie soon recouped its powers under the republic, and since 1923 except for brief intervals the German national government has been wholly bourgeois, although until 1933 the socialists continued to share in the local administrations of the states and municipalities. The Social Democrats, however, still looked upon the erection of the democratic republic as an enormous achievement, a view which in itself is entirely justified. At all times they remained ready to enter into coalitions with the bourgeois parties for the protection of the republic. As the bourgeois democratic republic, unable either to ease the economic distress or to achieve equality for Germany in foreign relations, progressively lost prestige among large masses of the population, especially within the middle classes, the mass hostility came to be directed also against the Social Democrats as the typical republican party. When the National Socialist cabinet succeeded the military government of General Schleicher in January, 1933, they were not seizing power from the socialists and republicans: one bourgeois government merely succeeded another. Hitler's government proceeded to suppress completely first the German Communist party and shortly thereafter the Social Democratic party. It is difficult at present to offer any definite judgment as to the future of German socialism.

During the post-war period the British Labour party developed from a virtually insignificant parliamentary group into a powerful organization backed by millions of supporters. British Labour had the great advantage of not having gone through the school of the Second International from 1889 to 1914. It therefore has remained free from all the peculiar contradictions springing from the official Marxist dogmas of the Second International. It suffered no embarrassment in formulating its attitude toward nation and state, the struggle for power and monarchy. At the same time it was in a better

position than most of the continental parties to offer the masses a clear and precise program of socialization with a view to the formation of a socialist society. As a result the Communist party in England is practically insignificant, while with the collapse of the Liberal party after the war Labour became and has remained the second strongest party in the land. Its amazing display of vigor in weathering its two great crises—the unfortunate general strike of 1926 and in 1931 the electoral defeat and the withdrawal of MacDonald—is added proof of its vitality.

In France the position of the socialists is virtually the same as before the war. In the struggle between the national bloc of the bourgeois right and the radicals or the bourgeois left they often hold the balance. On numerous occasions since the war the French socialists have made strategic alliances with the bourgeois left and have thus exerted an influence on the direction of national policy. Although during 1919 and 1920 most of the French workers were in the Communist camp, the socialists have since succeeded in winning back the great majority. In the course of the conflict between socialists and communists the French trade unions were split into two groups, the socialist and the communist-syndicalist.

In Italy the entire socialist party entered the Third International after the war, but as the result of a dispute with Moscow the majority of the party later withdrew. The Italian socialists had a tragic fate. While they appeared revolutionary enough to arouse the apprehensions of the bourgeoisie, they were not sufficiently so to carry through the actual seizure of power. This was but a recurrence of the old dilemma of the pre-war Second International. Hence both socialism and communism in Italy have been annihilated since 1920 by the Fascists. Only small groups of Italian socialist and communist émigrés remain.

In the United States the numerical influence of the socialists is no greater than before the World War. Socialistic ideas have undoubtedly become diffused to a certain extent among the intellectuals of the country; but at the presidential election of 1932, which came at the height of the economic crisis, only a small percentage of the voters supported the Socialist candidate. The Communist party is even weaker, while the Farmer-Labor party has also collapsed except within the state of Minnesota. Nevertheless, the ideas and achievements of the Roosevelt ad-

ministration may open the way for a stronger socialist influence.

In Spain following the establishment of the republic in 1931 the socialists participated in the coalition government until the end of 1933. Their position, however, is difficult, since the majority of the Spanish proletariat still sympathize with the syndicalists. The socialist parties have a greater influence in the Scandinavian countries, in Belgium and Holland, in Switzerland and in Czechoslovakia. In Austria the socialists successfully controlled the administration of the city of Vienna from 1918 until 1934. They struggled hard to protect the democratic national constitution against the powerful bourgeois groups of Christian Socialists, National Socialists and the Heimwehr. But in February, 1934, after an armed uprising of workers, the Austrian Socialist party was suppressed.

In the industrialized countries where socialism has won over the majority of the industrial workers, the combined vote of socialists and communists during the last decade has ordinarily averaged about 30 or 40 percent of the total number of ballots cast. This was true in England, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Belgium, Denmark, Sweden and in Germany so long as there were free elections. The striking uniformity of this percentage reveals the fact that the socialists have failed to attract any sections of the population outside of the working classes. In the modern industrialized nations the majority of the population consists of employees but not of factory workers alone. Among other types of employee groups—clerks, civil servants, craftsmen and agricultural workers—socialism has had slight success. Judging by past experience it is virtually impossible for the socialists to grasp control of the state if they must rely solely on the industrial proletariat. The Bolshevik revolution in Russia was able to succeed only through an alliance of workers with peasants.

In Asia the leadership of the working class movement after the war fell into the hands of the communists, but in the last few years the Communist International has declined in Asia as well as elsewhere. Although it is still impossible to predict the future of the labor movement in the leading Asiatic countries, significant socialist tendencies are to be found in Japan, particularly among the intellectuals. In Australia the opposition to the bourgeoisie is the powerful Labour party, which belongs to no international. Similar smaller but also influential Labour parties are

found in New Zealand and South Africa as well in Ireland.

Argentina has long had a socialist party, and military and revolutionary leaders in the other South American countries have not infrequently professed adherence to socialism. It is, however, difficult to ascertain to what extent such declarations really emanate from a labor movement. Mexico is controlled by a powerful workers' and peasants' movement which is carrying out a revolutionary reconstruction of society but which does not belong to any international.

The communism of the Moscow variety is today politically powerful only in Russia. The only other country where the Communist party still has some influence is Czechoslovakia. Socialism is at present suppressed in Russia, Italy, Germany and Austria, but the parties in France, England and the smaller European countries and the prospects in Asia and America make it still a significant international power. Present day socialism represents a continuation of the pre-war Second International only in a formal sense. Actually the International under English and French direction is quite different from the old International controlled by Russians and Germans. A socialist international of the English and French type may be expected to depart further and further from the stereotyped Marxist dogmas, which never gained a foothold in England and exerted very slight influence in France. This does not imply that it will renounce true Marxism, which is thoroughly undogmatic and realistic. The socialist parties will in fact become more truly Marxist as they abandon the traditional dogmas of the official Marxists. In Russia the dynamic Marxism of the revolutionary period has long since been reduced to an inflexible grammar of authoritarian politics. The future of socialism thus rests with the democratic and intellectually independent parties of the West.

ARTHUR ROSENBERG

See: SOCIALISM; COMMUNIST PARTIES; LABOR PARTIES; LABOR MOVEMENT; TRADE UNIONS; BOLSHEVISM; SYNDICALISM; CLASS STRUGGLE; PROLETARIAT; MASSES; INTELLECTUALS; REVOLUTION AND COUNTER-REVOLUTION; GENERAL STRIKE; SOCIALIZATION; GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP; LABOR LEGISLATION AND LAW; RUSSIAN REVOLUTION; COMMUNE OF PARIS; CONFÉDÉRATION GÉNÉRALE DU TRAVAIL; PARTIES, POLITICAL.

Consult: FOR GENERAL DISCUSSION: Sombart, Werner, *Der proletarische Sozialismus "Marxismus,"* 2 vols. (10th ed. Jena 1924); Beer, Max, *Allgemeine Geschichte des Sozialismus und der sozialen Kämpfe* (6th ed.

Berlin 1929), tr. by H. J. Stenning as *Social Struggles*, 5 vols. (London 1922-25); Drahn, Ernst, "Sozialdemokratie" in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, vol. vii (4th ed. Jena 1926) p. 510-66, with very exact bibliography, and *Bibliographie des wissenschaftlichen Sozialismus, 1914-1922*, Systematische Bibliographie der wissenschaftlichen Literatur Deutschlands, Supplementary volume (Berlin 1927); Laidler, H. W., *A History of Socialist Thought* (New York 1927); Markham, S. F., *A History of Socialism* (London 1930); Herkner, Heinrich, *Die Arbeiterfrage*, 2 vols. (8th ed. Berlin 1922); Zinovev, Grigori, *Der Krieg und die Krise des Sozialismus* (Vienna 1924).

FOR INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL PARTIES: Bergsträsser, Ludwig, *Geschichte der politischen Parteien in Deutschland*, Verwaltungsakademie, Berlin, Schriftenreihe, vol. iv (6th ed. Mannheim 1932); Neumann, Sigmund, *Die deutschen Parteien* (Berlin 1932), with bibliography on German social democracy; Mehring, Franz, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, 4 vols. (12th ed. Stuttgart 1922); Lipinski, Richard, *Die Sozialdemokratie von ihren Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (Berlin 1927-28); Rosenberg, Arthur, *Die Entstehung der Deutschen Republik, 1871-1918* (Berlin 1928), tr. by I. T. D. Morrow (London 1931); Mommsen, W., and Franz, G., *Die sozialistischen Parteien von den Anfängen bis 1918* (Leipzig 1931); *Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiter-Bewegung*, ed. by E. Bernstein, 3 vols. (Berlin 1907-10); Reibel, A., *Aus meinem Leben*, 3 vols. (9th ed. Berlin 1930), vols. i-ii abridged translation (London 1912); Marek, Siegfried, *Sozialdemokratie* (Berlin 1931); Prager, Eugen, *Geschichte der U. S. P. D.* (Berlin 1921); Frölich, Paul, *10 Jahre Krieg und Bürgerkrieg*, vol. i- (Berlin 1924-); Martov, L., *Istoriya russitkoi sozialdemokratii* (2nd ed. Moscow 1923), tr. by A. Stein with supplement by T. Dun as *Geschichte der russischen Sozialdemokratie* (Berlin 1926); *Obshchestvennoe dviženie v Rossii v nachale XX-go veka* (The social movement in Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century), ed. by L. Martov, P. Maslov, and A. Potresov, 4 vols. (St. Petersburg 1909-14) vol. iii, p. 535-643; Rosenberg, Arthur, *Geschichte des Bolschewismus* (Berlin 1932), tr. by I. T. D. Morrow (London 1934); Brützel, Ludwig, *Geschichte der österreichischen Sozialdemokratie*, 5 vols. (Vienna 1922-25); Bauer, Otto, *Die österreichische Revolution* (Vienna 1923), abridged tr. by H. J. Stenning (London 1925); Louis, Paul, *Histoire du socialisme en France de la Révolution à nos jours* (Paris 1925); *Histoire socialiste (1789-1900)*, ed. by J. L. Jaurès, 13 vols. (Paris 1901-09); Delevsky, J., *Les antinomies socialistes et l'évolution du socialisme français* (Paris 1930); Weill, G. J., *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852-1924* (3rd ed. Paris 1924), and "Die sozialistische Partei (Parti socialiste) in Frankreich, 1920-1928" in *Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung*, vol. xiv (1929) 67-87, tr. from French ms. by Emil Grünberg; Zévats, Alexandre, *Le parti socialiste de 1904 à 1923*, *Histoire des partis socialistes en France*, vol. xii (Paris 1923); Kalken, F. von, *La Belgique contemporaine (1780-1930)* (Paris 1930); Pierard, Louis, *Belgian Problems since the War*, Williams College, Institute of Politics, Publications (New Haven 1929) chs. iii-vi; Michels, Roberto, *Il proletariato e la borghesia nel movimento socialista italiano* (Turin 1908), *Sozialismus und Faschismus als politische Strömungen in Italien*, 2