A TELESCOPIC VIEW OF POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

A FEW years ago when Harry Truman and Tom Dewey were trying to convince sixty million American voters of the vast difference between Republican and Democrat, Wilfred Funk published a book entitled Word Origins and Their Romantic Stories. As for the words "democrat" and "republican," Funk observed, "in their present usage they are completely devoid of any realistic meaning; they have become useless as verbal tokens to any rational and intelligent conversation."

Today it occurs to me that the same thing might be said of the words "communist," or "fascist," or "capitalist" or "socialist," even though the terms are bandied about freely by everyone. If the man on the street is asked to define each of these words, he usually is hard put to meet the test. This is so for a variety of reasons.

First, politics is an inexact science, inexact because it deals with man and his behavior, which is unpredictable and changing. The natural sciences have an advantage in being able to label a frog or a chemical element without backtalk—but not so if we ascribe a political philosophy to a man. Moreover, political science not only deals with man, complex as he is, but it deals with the interrelations of millions of men, which further complicates the problem.

Next, political labels actually describe or should describe an entire political philosophy which has many facets and concepts; yet frequently we jump to a conclusion based upon one or two characteristics alone. This may be illustrated by such common examples as saying that a man is a communist or socialist just because he believes in government ownership

* A paper presented to the Houston Philosophical Society on April 18, 1957.
of some means of production. After all, the City of Houston owns the waterworks and the United States government operates the post office in competition with American Telephone and Telegraph and Western Union.

Again, political philosophies are never clear-cut and distinct, and frequently overlap at the edges or even halfway down the center. Many political ideologies have no clear-cut pattern of emergence and disappearance. Like the tides that ebb and flow, they rise and subside, but in the process there are an infinite number of cross-currents and swirls, and only by slow degree can we perceive a change in the shoreline. No sooner can we isolate and define a pure political philosophy than its supporters or critics give it new and different meaning.

And last, we lack a control. We cannot agree upon and isolate a “pure” political philosophy and keep it in a bottle. Without a standard or control, which remains constant to be used for comparison, the natural scientist knows he may fall into error. I have heard, for example, that some native tribes have been convinced for years that they have driven off eclipses of the sun by beating tom-toms, and in proof cite the many they have driven away. But once a political philosophy has had a characteristic changed, whether by a Supreme Court decision on “liberty” or by legislation on “social security,” it is humanly impossible to know the exact consequences had an alternative route been followed.

So much for the apology and the difficulties of political definition. Notwithstanding these handicaps we still propose to examine the leading modern political philosophies: totalitarian communism and fascism, and democratic capitalism and socialism. All these political forms have arisen in the setting of the modern state which emerged around the six-
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teenth century. It was only with the breakdown of the small self-sufficient units of feudalism, and the opening up of the economic horizons of Europe at the close of the Middle Ages, that conditions favorable to the rapid development of capitalism appeared. Then somewhat after the development of capitalism came that modern industrialization which is a part of the strength of nationalism and an ingredient in each of the "isms" as we know them today.

To include all the possible political ideologies or to deal with the splinter "isms" would require that we deal with far more than the four we have selected (totalitarian communism and fascism, democratic capitalism and socialism). For example, Louis Wasserman in his book *Modern Political Philosophies and What they Mean,* isolates eighteen. However, all except the four I have named can categorically be disposed of by saying that they are either (a) purely theoretical—such as utopianism or anarchism; or (b) they represent "twilight areas" of the major isms—such as state capitalism, guild socialism, Christian socialism, and the like.

1. Marxism and Communism

In dealing with these vastly different ideologies, I would observe with the late Justice Jackson that the best lecturer on effective fly casting would be the trout. But since we have no communists and fascists among us here tonight, I will try to be as objective as possible.

Turning first to totalitarian communism, we find some characteristics of this ideology in antiquity, especially in ancient Egypt and Sparta. But ancient cultures all condoned slavery, dealt with relatively small populations, and did not function in an industrial society and within an institutional state such as we know today. Thus it is hard to trace modern
communism back to the institutions of the ancient world. Rather, the groundwork of modern communism was laid by Karl Marx.

In the United States, Karl Marx is usually condemned without being read. Yet he is one of the most influential figures of history and has inspired one of the greatest mass movements of all time. His followers would say that just as the Bible made Judaism and Christianity great forces in history, so Marx's expressed ideas (though nowhere collected in a systematic exposition) have maintained Marxism as a great force.³

Marx's personal life left much to be desired. Born in the German Rhineland in 1818, the son of a Jewish father who had deserted the Hebrew faith, Marx was neither Hebrew nor Christian and belonged to no class. He was expelled from the University of Bonn for "nocturnal riots and drunkenness" and at thirty-two left his native Germany, gave up his citizenship, and remained for the rest of his life a man without a country. With remarkable singlemindedness, he toiled unceasingly on his master work, Das Kapital. When he died in 1883 he had written only the first volume, but the faithful Engels finished the other two volumes from Marx's notes. Four of Marx's seven children died in infancy and two of the three daughters who survived to maturity committed suicide. A romantic writer⁴ has said of his life that he had one great love, one great friend, and one great master. His one great love was his boyhood sweetheart, Jennie von Westphalen, daughter of a liberal baron, who endured forty years of poverty and squalor without defecting. She would have had ample justification for remarking (as the humorist would have us believe) that "Karl is always talking about Das Kapital, but he never brings home any."

The great friend was Frederic Engels, whom Marx met in
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Paris in 1844, and who seems to have been as mannerly and gregarious as Marx was misanthropic. Engels had the good fortune, moreover, to be the beneficiary of the capitalist system which he attacked, and as the son of a wealthy businessman he was able to fix an income on Marx. This, supplemented with some income Marx received as foreign correspondent for the New York Tribune, and from other writings, enabled him to carry out his dedicated work.

During the thirty-three years in London where Marx wrote Das Kapital, factories were expanding rapidly and Marx saw capitalism in all its ugliness. The government was dominated by businessmen and imposed practically no restrictions or regulations upon industry. The great majority of Englishmen were working for the upper classes at the lowest wage which the law of supply and demand would permit, and the labor force was growing. Parents, unable to support their families, put their children to work for seventy-two hours a week in poorly ventilated and highly dangerous factories. The sturdy country folk who were lured into town by this industrial giant were inevitably degenerating. Indeed, the condition of the working class in England as described by Engels in 1844 had sunk to a new low. He describes the feeling (or insensitivity) of the worker this way:

How much human feeling, what abilities can a man retain in his thirtieth year who has made needlepoints or filed toothed wheels twelve hours every day from his early childhood, living all the while under the conditions forced upon the proletarian? It is still the same thing since the introduction of steam. The workers' activities are made easy, but the work itself becomes unmeaning and monotonous to the last degree. It offers no field of mental activity but claims just enough of his attention to keep him from thinking of anything else. And a sentence to such work, leaving him scarcely enough time to eat and sleep, none for physical exercise in the open air or the enjoyment of nature, much less for mental activity... [cannot help] degrading a human being to the level of a brute...
Marx was disturbed by what he saw, or thought he foresaw, as the conclusion of the problem. Perhaps no one sitting here will ever read the three volumes of Das Kapital in their entirety, but the essence of Marx and his methods can probably be outlined by discussing several main ideas, namely: (1) the Hegelian dialectic; (2) the theory of surplus value; (3) the economic or materialist concept of history; (4) the theory of falling profit; and (5) the theory of class struggle and revolution.

Hegelian Dialectic.—If Marx had a great master, it was the philosopher Hegel. Hegel's peculiar dialectic was applied to a world constantly changing. Every accumulated set of forces (called the thesis) is opposed by another set (the antithesis) and from the clash emerges a new combination (synthesis) which contains the best elements of both. Perhaps one today might roughly illustrate by the example of the clash between the Union and the South in the American Civil War and the synthesis that replaced both. Again, we might cite feudalism as the thesis, the middle-class businessman as the antithesis, and today's capitalism and capitalists as the synthesis. Marx's investigations led him to the conclusion that human society would progress in this manner and he set out to prove that capitalism and the proletariat would inevitably clash and this clash would result in the synthesis of socialism.

The economic or materialist concept of history.—Man today is acutely aware of his dependence on his fellow man, and almost everyone living in an urban community is sensitive to the material necessities required to keep body and soul together. When one dwells on this and minimizes all else, he is a pure materialist. But by and large, western man is a moral being who feels that he does not live on bread alone. Marx, however, was a materialist not influenced by any reli-
gious convictions. To him the “mode of economic production” —or the way men make their living—was the total basis on which all society has risen. Concepts of God, religion, love, compassion, ethics, justice, law, and the like, were minimized by the dialectic materialist who saw that man then, and throughout history, has plotted his course by economic incentive alone and that such concepts as morals, politics, religion, and law rest and are dependent upon an economic foundation. This superstructure had been raised by the ruling classes to make tighter their grasp of power and the only way the superstructure could be changed was by a political shakeup of the state in order to change its economic foundation.

Surplus value.—In all his writings, Marx continually harps upon what he calls the “surplus value”—the profits of the capitalist. If a laborer takes a free good worth $5 (for example, crude metal) and fashions it into a plow selling for $25, the laborer should get the $20 difference, according to Marx, but instead he usually gets much less, for the bourgeois capitalist takes a share for overhead and then a share for himself. It was unnatural, Marx thought, for any individual to hire another to work for him twelve hours a day and to pay him wages which amounted to the selling price of the product of only six hours of his labor. The difference between the value of production of six hours’ labor and that of twelve hours’ labor was the “surplus value” (after deducting all overhead expenses) and this should go into the pockets of the laborer and not of the capitalist. As to the re-investment of capital in labor-saving machinery whereby the workers could make a finished product by punching a button, that came about through the investment of ill-got gains and should be the problem and ownership of the state and not of any profit-
The state should distribute products and, of course, surplus values. Marx also saw rent and interest as a part of the surplus value.

Theory of falling profits.—Marx felt further that after its initial stages of expansion, capitalism would fall into a succession of crises, one of which would be overproduction and competition, and the process would cause the capitalist to take less and less for his goods and therefore his profit would constantly fall. For a while capitalism could exploit new markets, but when all markets become saturated, there is widespread displacement of workers, unemployment, decrease in production and further exploitation of the workers which results in the inevitable class struggle.

Class struggle and revolution.—As Marx saw it, our forces of production and scientific know-how outstrip our relations of production or man's social wisdom. To illustrate: when under the feudal system new productive forces developed, social revolution ensued because the feudal system could not accommodate them. The capitalist system has now run its cycle and shows the same tendency toward rigidity, according to Marx; the new system of productive relations will be through public ownership of all means of production. Economic classes are organized on the basis of their participation in wealth production, and each class seeks to obtain for itself a larger portion of the income produced, with the dominant owning class always arrayed against those who threaten its property. In the beginning, the struggle is confined to the economic field, but once the dominant class is victorious, the political state and other institutions are consolidated by it. The outmoded economic class invariably refuses to surrender these institutions, and the emerging class is finally compelled to seize political power by forcible means. What
is more, within capitalism itself, Marx saw the seeds of its own destruction because, as the pace for profits quickens, more and more capitalists fail to meet the test and fall into the proletarian group. Inevitably there will be a polarization of the classes, and the proletariat will become bottom-heavy until the predominance of the proletariat is so strong that it will seize all means of production and set society aright by fashioning the political house to its choosing. The working class instead of any other group should do this, because it is most numerous and occupies the strategic position to paralyze industry. The resistance of the ruling class is so obstinate, however, that revolution is inevitable. Marx's notion of how the political transformation from capitalism to communism would come about is not clear and on an occasion or two he even stated that in some countries like the United States and possibly England and Holland the workers could obtain their objective by peaceful means.7

More than a theorist, Mark also participated in regimenting labor into a striking force. In 1847, when Marx was twenty-nine, he joined with Engels and drew up the Communist Manifesto—labor's call to action. He was also an active, though not the leading figure, in many of the communist International Congresses held in European capitals during the twenty-five years following the close of the American Civil War.

The revolution came in Russia in 1917. Lenin and the professional revolutionaries under his leadership infiltrated existing social, political, and labor organizations and the military forces. No one would deny that they have met with much success. Beginning in 1928, a series of five-year plans have brought about the industrialization of Russia and the collectivization of farming in a manner that has made Russia
one of the two great world powers. Her industry is geared to power, not consumer welfare. Her leaders have been recruited from the masses, but once their leadership has been established, they ruthlessly compel conformity.

Along with some successful predictions made by Marx should also be measured his errors. Rigorous examination of his ideas reveals a mixture of the true, the vague, and the false. Here at least are some notable failures: (1) There has been no polarization of the classes in all countries; instead a great "middle class" has arisen. (2) The workingman’s lot has improved. (3) There has been a wider, not narrower, economic participation of all people through stock ownership. (4) There has been wider social and political influence through universal suffrage. (5) The revolution did not occur in a highly industrialized society but in a relatively backward agrarian state. (6) History is as much a testimonial to class cooperation as it is to class struggle. (7) The notion that all labor, even including reflective thinking, can be reduced to a common factor is unrealistic.

Marx’s was a monistic theory in quest of total solutions. If it had been pluralistic and had given ethics, religion, law, and the like their due, even while recognizing the importance of economics, many feel he would have made a more nearly correct analysis. In brief, we might note the Marx “scoreboard.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARX SCOREBOARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predictions Correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopolistic tendencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycles of boom and depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of science on industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of labor force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of new problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No polarization of classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement of labor economically and politically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regenerative power of capitalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolution did not occur in an industrialized state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No state withering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rise of fascism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversimplification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2. Totalitarian Fascism

Fascism is the second revolt against the western liberal way of life. It is the totalitarian organization of government and society by a single party dictatorship and it is intensely nationalistic, militaristic, and imperialistic as exemplified in Italy in 1922, Germany in 1933, Spain in 1939, Japan in 1930, and Argentina in 1943. I hope we should not add Egypt in 1956.

Communism has usually been associated with the poor, underdeveloped nations, whereas fascism has hit the richer, more advanced ones. Fascism is post-democratic and post-industrial. Democratic methods and experience have been used to muster mass support, and the more terroristic fascist movements have been the most popular and strongest.

In dealing with the problems industrialization brings about, fascism either overlooks or denies them, or it resolves all differences by force.

In practice, fascism has appealed to industrialists and landowners, some of whom have paid heavily to the government. Support has also come from the lower middle classes, who dread the prospect of rejoining the proletariat, and fascism therefore propagandizes them. This “salariat” (as it is now sometimes called) is jealous of big business and fearful of big labor, but labor has organized into unions and union progress has been relatively faster than that of the white-collar salariat. The military and the unemployed are other groups favoring fascism. Fascism gives a sense of “belonging.” Those who suffer from unemployment and failure frequently are not hurt by the economic fall as much as they are by a fall in prestige and by being nobodies in the lonely crowd. Fascism solves this by glorifying the state and frequently by putting a uniform with bright buttons on the forgotten unemployed man.
Fascism cuts across social groups; it does not look to a polarizing of classes. Fascists are nationalistic and chauvinistic, jingoistic and desirous of empire and conquest. Fascism appeals to all of the insecure and the resentment-ridden from all walks of life.

Professor Ebenstein in his recent book *Today's Isms* lists several traits of the individual who subscribes to the various political philosophies. He sees the fascist as one with emotional rigidity, limited imagination, tending to conform to orthodox practices, showing excessive concern for status and strength, and strong loyalty to incumbents and vehement hatred for the outsiders, with stress on discipline and obedience instead of freedom and spontaneity.11

Elements of fascist doctrine include: (a) a distrust of reason with dogmatic taboos and a denial of those western foundations based upon Greek reason, Jewish monotheism, and Christian love; (b) a denial of basic human equality with men regarded as superior to women, soldiers superior to the civilian, and the party member above the non-party member; (c) a code of behavior often based on violence and encouragement of annihilation of the enemy, which stands in sharp contrast to Britain's "loyal opposition" whose leader is paid a salary for opposing Her Majesty's government; (d) a government by the elite—justified by the belief that people as a whole are not capable of governing themselves; (e) totalitarianism, imperialism, and racism—as we saw in Nazi Germany where the Nordic type was glorified and the Jews ostracized and even exterminated.

Fascism is not so all-absorbed with the economic interpretation of history as is communism. If capitalism would give the state strength, then the fascist would endorse it. In practice, however, syndicalism has been encouraged by the
organization of syndicates or unions so that neither the workers nor the state will control the means of production, but the syndicate, or the union, of each particular industry.

Fascism stresses equality of classes, but not individuals. A self-constituted elite should rule the state and the state would speak for a unified people and none will oppose it. Humanity en masse cannot rise high except by the expert mind and leadership. Heroic virtues of discipline and sacrifice are emphasized more than economic forces, and private enterprise is encouraged or permitted because it best serves the state.

3. Democratic Capitalism

The Greeks originated the expression "democracy" as the rule of the many as opposed to monarchy or aristocracy, the rule of one or the rule of the few. However, the Greeks recognized and employed the institution of slavery; hence democracy to them meant participation in the government only by the free male citizens of the state. Rome also accepted this republican approach to government (even, in theory, under the Empire), but with the fall of Rome there was an intellectual decline in Western Europe and democracy fell back.

Far in the lead in developing democracy as the New World knows it today was England, but even there it took over five hundred years to evolve. As early in 1215, Magna Carta made it clear that even a king was subject to some law and the concept of constitutionality was thereby recognized and was thereafter to be maintained; but at this time only the barons shared power with the king and it was almost four centuries more before the crown and the nobility lost their controlling power. By 1688 it was definitely established that
Parliament, composed of the Lords and Commons (elected by the people, albeit by a few), was superior to the king.

But even into the nineteenth century, British ideology was still far from pure democracy and the upper middle class ran the government. Then, beginning in 1832, a series of reform acts greatly extended the suffrage from some four percent in 1832 to virtually universal adult suffrage by 1927. Parliament ceased to be the exclusive organ of businessmen and landed barons, and for the past one hundred years there has been an outpouring of social legislation aiming generally at the greatest good for the greatest number. In the United States, Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, in particular, put into action governmental programs designed also for the benefit of the common man and not only the privileged classes.

To the Western World, democracy has come to mean a variety of things, all putting emphasis on the freedom and dignity of the individual. It has confidence in man and opposes all doctrines of caste; it regards gains of humanity as mass gains, attributable to the efforts of the many and not of the few, and hence believes such gains should be diffused as promptly as possible among the populace. It likes decisions arrived at by common counsel and not by arbitrary decree. Democracy means freedom of speech and press, and of religious worship, and many other civil rights; it means freedom of thought, and equality before the law, and the right to oppose government, to unionize and to move freely about. To paraphrase Judge Learned Hand’s statement on liberty, it is a spirit not too sure that it is right; it seeks to understand the minds of other men and women and the interests of all without bias; it envisions a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side
with the greatest. It likes logic, but it prefers experience; it places primary emphasis on the individual and accepts the state as his helpful instrument. It encourages voluntary associations of its citizens into groups of their own choosing. It emphasizes the means by which results are accomplished, and not just the results. It recognizes a "higher law" than that made by man. It believes in free discussion and broad tolerance of unorthodoxy.

In our own country, democracy has progressed under capitalism—its basic tenet being private ownership of property and its impelling force being the profit motive. It has developed a free market with competition serving as the prime regulator, with the state intervening to help to regulate more and more in the twentieth century. Its material success is unparalleled in all history, and it has successfully met the test of two great wars.

In the past quarter-century particularly, democratic capitalism in America has supported the welfare state. With minimum wage laws, workmen's compensation, the breakup of large estates through taxation, social security and health programs, our form of government today bears considerable resemblance to Britain's form of socialism.^13

4. Socialism

The term socialism is sometimes used to describe various beliefs in the communal use and ownership of property stretching back as far as the Greeks and in this usage is synonymous with communism. This is an anachronistic usage now, however, and today we associate the term with those who opposed the social pattern which emerged after the Industrial Revolution. In its totally unregulated beginnings, this revolution brought rapid wealth to the owners of new
factories, but created living conditions for workers which were sordid and disease-ridden. Forward-looking persons turned their thoughts to a social reorganization based on peaceful and evolutionary means.

Among these reformers none is more interesting than Robert Owen—an apprentice at the age of ten, owner of his own business at eighteen, and at twenty-eight a part-owner of the great New Lanark Mills in Scotland (and, incidentally, married to the former owner's daughter). At New Lanark, he set out to prove that his plant would operate more efficiently if the employees worked fewer hours. He improved housing and enforced new standards of cleanliness. The company store was turned to a non-profit basis and schooling was expanded. Education was the main hope of his program. Along with other monetary reformers, Owen thought that currency should be based on labor and that all costs should have a labor-time denominator. Crowned by encouraging success in his early program, he greatly expanded it at New Harmony, Indiana. There the community was housed in buildings forming a large rectangle with a common dining room and recreation room; outside the rectangle were the workshops and the fields; and all property was vested in the community. For a couple of years there was harmony, but then individualism filtered through and after another year the colony was dispersed into five smaller units, after which Owen had lost most of his fortune, and bade the colony farewell. He had left a career of certain success in business for his social experiments; but his atheism and belief in free divorces lost him prestige, even though his general influence has been lasting.

In one form or another, during the past fifty years, nearly all of the European nations have had a socialist government
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for at least a few years. Frequently, as in New Zealand, Australia, and the Scandinavian countries, it did not arise in opposition to capitalism, but rather to place capital under government planning instead of under corporate directors. Generally speaking, socialism has grown up in countries with democratic capitalist backgrounds, so that socialism represents a rebellion of the child against the father, and not stranger against stranger; it stresses collective ownership of property where capitalism stresses individual ownership. In a democratic setting, it has sought to provide opportunity for the underprivileged classes; to end inequality at birth; to open education to all; to eliminate discrimination because of race, color, or religion; to maintain full employment; to regulate and reorganize the economy; to provide social security for the aged, sick, and infirm; and to build new cities.

Socialism differs from communism in that it is evolutionary whereas the latter is revolutionary; the communists work on one class, namely organized labor, whereas the socialists work on all classes, including the intelligentsia. The socialists are willing to experiment whereas communists tend to support a definitive and irrevocable plan. Socialism does not consider public ownership of property an end in itself but simply a means to an end. Communism has its temporary elite or ruling class, whereas socialism utterly rejects the idea.

Socialism has no manifesto and has developed differently in different countries. It has generally encouraged cooperation, not struggle, between men as brothers. It recognizes the inevitability of change, and would accomplish it through peaceful planning.

Socialists have accomplished much of their original program and today face something of an impasse. The welfare
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state has stolen much of their thunder, and over-nationalization of industry is admittedly a danger to production. Eugene O. Golob, in a book on the “isms,” gives three major reasons why socialism has not become a significant political movement in America. First, the American economy has been sufficiently prosperous to prevent the formation of a large and continuously depressed proletariat; next, the rising demands of American labor have been increasingly met; and again, American culture has always been extremely hostile to theories.

Conclusion

The remarks offered here regarding these four major “isms” are briefly presented in the accompanying chart (see pp. 66-67). Such a “charting of the isms” offers an opportunity to note at a glance how dangerous it is to label any one set of characteristics as being specifically “communist,” “socialist,” “fascist,” or “democratic.” All of these political philosophies have some things in common and it is only by considering all aspects of any one of them that it can be fully understood. A realization of the complexity of this material and the dangers of oversimplification has been the purpose of this paper.

And finally, since political scientists throughout history have been dogged by persistent error, there is discouraging precedent for trying to reach conclusions. At this date, however, this much may be safely observed. With the defeat of Germany, Italy and Japan, and the eclipse of Peron’s power in Argentina, the fascist state has lost much ground during the past quarter-century. It need not necessarily have been so, for if Hitler’s scientists had developed the atomic warhead as soon and as well as they developed the V-2 rocket,
it is entirely possible, or even probable, that the fascist state would have won out in Europe and conceivably in America.

With the decline from first-rate leadership of England, it can also be safely said that socialism, which gained much ground in the past fifty years, has fallen back at mid-century.

The obvious fact is that two giants have emerged, one under totalitarian communism and the other under democratic capitalism. Neither has maintained the purity of its form, and much could be said as to how the welfare state has copied a great deal from socialism and how communism has found it necessary to employ capitalistic incentives to make its system work. The struggle between the giants has become intense, and the post-war gains of the communist state have been frightening. China and Japan, emerging from a sort of oriental medievalism, have been drawn into opposing camps. The Middle East is at the crossroads. And yet a real dilemma haunts the Kremlin, as has been made manifest by the uprisings in Hungary and the stirrings in Poland, caused by the contradictions between liberty and repression. In the nuclear age, Soviet science and industry must match our pace, and it is probable that to do this will require imagination and freedom which may sharpen the contradictions to the point of crisis. The tightly organized police state of Stalin cannot remain so tight if Soviet scientists are to be stimulated by contact with the outside world. To regiment or suppress the scientists may cause them to fall behind in progress and "gravitate into the quiet backwaters out of the main stream of useful work."15

Russia, however, has apparently developed a well equipped educational system putting heavy emphasis on technology, science, and research. In broadening the educational system, however, the critical mind must also develop and the
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ism</th>
<th>Historical</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Economic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totalitarian</td>
<td>Economic Interpretation of History</td>
<td>Anti-religious</td>
<td>Ownership of means of production by proletariat (but by state in Soviet Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fascism</td>
<td>History used to glorify the state</td>
<td>Religion used to glorify the state</td>
<td>Private ownership of production under strict regulation of state (workers and industrialists organized into syndicates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Critical of excessive governmental intervention</td>
<td>No fixed attitude but tending to be religious (and in U.S. separate from state)</td>
<td>Private ownership of means of production Laissez-faire (free market)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialism</td>
<td>Belief in the inevitability of change whether parliamentary or revolutionary</td>
<td>No fixed attitude (Christian Socialists emphasize religion)</td>
<td>Ownership of means of production for society’s best welfare; some by state—some by cooperatives—some privately owned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Of the ISMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Psychological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classless society (but in Soviet Union a society which tends to stratify on ability to produce)</td>
<td>Strong party organization to promote the cause of the proletarian revolution</td>
<td>Fanatical devotion to party dogma which replaces religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Party &quot;leader&quot; with tendency to be a dictator</td>
<td>Semi-deification of leaders in Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denial of civil liberties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing elite dominate over rest of society</td>
<td>Dictatorship (usually acquired by unconstitutional or extraconstitutional means)</td>
<td>Excessively patriotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military bias</td>
<td></td>
<td>Semi-deification of leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial bias in Italy and Germany</td>
<td>Totalitarian</td>
<td>Expansionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No civil liberties</td>
<td>Excessively nationalistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social position determined by personal achievement and wealth</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>General confidence in the ability of fellow citizens to participate intelligently in government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive civil liberties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tendency toward welfare state in 20th century</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctions created by wealth tend to be levelled by taxation</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Emphasis on brotherhood of man and liberalism; confidence in political ability of citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extensive civil liberties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Socialization through parliamentary procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
educated may try their wings on new ideology. Freedom engenders freedom and creates a mounting demand for more; if set strongly in motion in the Soviet state, freedom could bring about its complete downfall. So it remains to be seen whether the Soviet state can permit the freedom necessary to gain technological superiority or equality and yet keep that freedom in bounds so as to maintain the ideological basis of communism.

C. M. HUDDSPETH

NOTES

4. Hubert Kay in an article entitled “Karl Marx” written for *Life* which appeared in 1948.
8. Compare the statements quoted above in the text from Engels’ *Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844* with the labor situation prevailing in June, 1955, when the United Auto Workers won from Ford Motor Company and General Motors such benefits as: $2.10 an hour for the common worker, the right to become a stockholder through periodic investment with the company matching 50¢ for the worker’s dollar in its acquisition; a guaranteed wage whereby the worker would receive over 60% of his regular pay for a period of 26 weeks by means of the creation of a giant fund to insure its workability; pension benefits for retirement at 65; group insurance benefits up to $6,400.00; hospitalization and surgical programs; time-and-a-half for Saturday work with guaranteed costs-of-living wage increases and with half-day holidays (in addition to the regular ones) on Christmas and New Year’s Eve thrown in for good measure.
A View of Political Ideologies

9. Ben Fairless, President of United States Steel, pointed out that the workers could gain control of the company by applying just their wage increase toward cost of stock acquisition for a period of seven years. The Daily Worker, unimpressed, hinted darkly he was trying to make a killing on some stock.

13. The changing attitude toward the role of the American government toward the economic life of the nation can be illustrated by the following two examples.

“Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the people by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties—by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment—by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the State. Let the Government do this—the people will assuredly do the rest.” (Charles A. Beard, “The Myth of Rugged Individualism,” Harper’s Magazine, Vol. 164 [December, 1931], pp. 13-22.)

“... The Congress hereby declares that it is the continuing responsibility of the federal government ... to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining ... maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.” (Employment Act of 1946 cited in Bailey, Samuel, and Baldwin, Government in America [New York, 1957].)