

Unit 8 : **REVOLUTION AND THE REIMPOSITION OF ORDER:**
1848 - 1870

Section A: Overview of the Times

Reading The Duties of Man- Giuseppe Mazzini
A Sterner Plan for Italian Unity: Nationalism, Liberalism, and Conservatism- Grew
German Unification- Holborn

Section B: Paris: The Specter Of Social Revolution In The West

Reading Palmer and Colton: 483 - 490

Key The February Revolution in France

Topics The June Days of 1848

The Emergence of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte

Section C: Vienna: The Nationalist Revolution in Central Europe and Italy

Reading Palmer and Colton: 490 - 497

Key The Austrian Empire in 1848

Topics The March Days

The Turning of the Tide After June

Victories of the Counterrevolution, June - December, 1848

Final Outburst and Repression, 1849

Section D: Frankfurt and Berlin: The Question of a Liberal Germany

Reading Palmer and Colton: 498 - 502

Key The German States

Topics Berlin: Failure of the Revolution in Prussia

The Frankfurt Assembly

The Failure of the Frankfurt Assembly

The Prussian Constitution of 1850

Section E: The New Toughness of Mind: Realism, Positivism, Marxism

Reading Palmer and Colton: 503 - 512
The Communist Manifesto- Marx and Engels
The Unfinished Revolution: Marxism Interpreted- Ulam

Key Materialism, Realism, Positivism
Topics Early Marxism
Sources and Content of Marxism
The Appeal of Marxism: Its Strengths and Weaknesses

Section F: Bonapartism: The Second French Empire, 1852 - 1870

Reading Palmer and Colton: 512 - 516

Key Political Institutions of the Second Empire
Topics Economic Developments Under the Empire
Internal Difficulties and War

Identifications

Terms:

February Revolution
March Days
dialectical materialism
opportunism
National Workshops
liberal nationalism
proletariate

Constituent Assembly
realpolitik
Austroslavism
Bach system
Extinction of Poverty
capital
Young Hegelians

Napoleonic Ideas
positivism
Second Empire
June Days
Frankfurt Assembly
Communist Manifesto
Napoleonic Legend

People:

Karl Marx
Pius IX
Freidrich Engels
King Charles Albert
Louis Blanc

Lamartine
Windischgratz
Giuseppe Mazzini
Emperor Ferdinand
Louis Napoleon Bonaparte

General Cavaignac
Jellachich
Louis Kossuth
Auguste Comte

Places:

Frankfurt
Schleswig-Holstein
Posen
Kingdom of Two Sicilies

Venetia
Bohemia
Lombardy
Moravia

Sudetenland
Budapest
Prague
Piedmont

The Duties of Man

Giuseppe Mazzini

Nationalism, a growing force since the French Revolution, tended to be associated with liberal and humanitarian ideals during the first half of the nineteenth century. After 1848 it became more pragmatic and conservative, as illustrated by the unification of Germany and Italy. Yet it was still based on some of the earlier ideals. These ideals are illustrated in both the life and writings of the Italian patriot

Source: Emilie Ashurst Venturi, *Joseph Mazzini: A Memoir* (London: Alexander & Shephard, 1875), pp. 312-315.

THE NATIONAL STATE, NATIONALISM, AND IMPERIALISM: 1850-1914 195

Giuseppe Mazzini (1805-1872). Mazzini was a revolutionary for most of his life and strove continuously for an independent and united Italian Republic. His revolutionary efforts in the 1830s and 1840s failed; unification was ultimately accomplished under the more pragmatic leadership of Cavour in the 1860s. But his ideas represented a strong strain of mid-nineteenth-century nationalism both in Italy and in other countries. The following is an excerpt from Mazzini's most famous essay, The Duties of Man, addressed to Italian workingmen.

Consider: The bases for Mazzini's nationalism; why these ideas might be appealing to the Italian working class; why Bismarck might approve of these ideas and whether there is anything he might reject.

Your first duties—first as regards importance—are, as I have already told you, towards Humanity. You are *men* before you are either citizens or fathers. If you do not embrace the whole human family in your affection, if you do not bear witness to your belief in the Unity of that family, consequent upon the Unity of God, and in that fraternity among the peoples which is destined to reduce that unity to action; if, wheresoever a fellow-creature suffers, or the dignity of human nature is violated by falsehood or tyranny—you are not ready, if able, to aid the unhappy, and do not feel called upon to combat, if able, for the redemption of the betrayed or oppressed—you violate your law of life, you comprehend not that Religion which will be the guide and blessing of the future.

But what can each of you, singly, *do* for the moral improvement and progress of Humanity? You can from time to time give sterile utterance to your belief; you may, on some rare occasions, perform some act of *charity* towards a brother man not belonging to your own land;—no more. But charity is not the watchword of the Faith of the Future. The watchword of the faith of the future is *Association*, and fraternal co-operation of all towards a common aim; and this is as far superior to all charity, as the edifice which all of you should unite to raise would be superior to the humble hut each one of you might build alone, or with the mere assistance of lending and borrowing stone, mortar, and tools.

But, you tell me, you cannot attempt united action, distinct and divided as you are in language, customs, tendencies, and capacity. The individual is too insignificant, and Humanity too vast. The mariner of Brittany prays to God as he puts to sea: *Help me, my God! my boat is so small and thy ocean so wide!* And this prayer is the true expression of the condition of each one of you, until you find the means of infinitely multiplying your forces and powers of action.

This means was provided for you by God when he gave you a country; when, even as a wise overseer of labour distributes the various branches of employment according to the different capacities of the workmen, he divided Humanity into distinct groups or nuclei upon the face of the earth, thus creating the germ of Nationalities. Evil governments

have disfigured the divine design. Nevertheless you may still trace it, distinctly marked out—at least as far as Europe is concerned—by the course of the great rivers, the direction of the higher mountains, and other geographical conditions. They have disfigured it by their conquests, their greed, and their jealousy even of the righteous power of others; disfigured it so far that if we except England and France—there is not perhaps a single country whose present boundaries correspond to that design.

These governments did not, and do not, recognise any country save their own families or dynasty, the egotism of caste. But the Divine design will infallibly be realized. Natural divisions, and the spontaneous, innate tendencies of the peoples, will take the place of the arbitrary divisions sanctioned by evil governments. The map of Europe will be redrawn. The countries of the Peoples, defined by the vote of free men, will arise upon the ruins of the countries of kings and privileged castes, and between these countries harmony and fraternity will exist. And the common work of Humanity, of general amelioration and the gradual discovery and application of its Law of life, being distributed according to local and general capacities, will be wrought out in peaceful and progressive development and advance. Then may each one of you, fortified by the power and the affection of many millions, all speaking the same language, gifted with the same tendencies, and educated by the same historical tradition, hope, even by your own single effort, to be able to benefit all Humanity.

O my brothers, love your Country! Our country is our Home, the house that God has given us, placing therein a numerous family that loves us, and whom we love; a family with whom we sympathise more readily, and whom we understand more quickly than we do others; and which, from its being centred round a given spot, and from the homogeneous nature of its elements, is adapted to a special branch of activity. Our country is our common workshop, whence the products of our activity are sent forth for the benefit of the whole world; wherein the tools and implements of labour we can most usefully employ are gathered together: nor may we reject them without disobeying the plan of the Almighty, and diminishing our own strength.

A Sterner Plan for Italian Unity: Nationalism, Liberalism, and Conservatism

Raymond Grew

During the first half of the nineteenth century, nationalism was most often connected to liberalism. After the revolutions of 1848 there were increasing ties between nationalism and conservatism, particularly in the movements for national unification. In the following selection Raymond Grew, an advocate of comparative history from the University of Michigan, analyzes the relationships among nationalism, liberalism, and conservatism in a comparative context.

Consider: How nationalism could appeal to both liberals and conservatives; why, during the second half of the nineteenth century, liberal ideals were often sacrificed in the name of nationalism; using this and the preceding document, the bases on which nationalism might have been opposed.

Insofar as politics was the public battle of ideas and interests, then nationalism was a denial of politics. For in stressing the values of unity, loyalty, and duty, nationalism saw political dispute as a source of weakness. It denied that there was conflict in the true interests of classes, groups or regions. The effect of nationalism was therefore inherently conservative in that it provided reason for supporting anyone thought to wield the power of the state effectively in behalf of national unity and strength, Disraeli or Gladstone, Napoleon III or Bismarck. Since order and unity, the cry of the political conservative, are essential to a strong state, and since, to the nationalist, most worthy ends required that strength, the nationalist was always tempted under pressure to move toward the political right, to sacrifice liberty to unity, discussion to authority, ends to means.

Yet the origins of nationalism were usually liberal and reformist; for everywhere it was a demand for change, the doctrine of the modernizers who, while they had too much to lose to want a social revolution, were self-consciously aware that theirs was an "underdeveloped" country. Nationalism could make its denial of politics effective because its ends were so clear, so easily defined in the model of the modern state. For the French that model had been England; for the Italians it was England and France. Italian nationalists were usually liberals, but their liberalism was primarily an admiration for the achievements of the liberal state. Because their model already existed, they looked directly to it, anxious to achieve an efficient bureaucracy, a responsible government, a progressive economic structure, all based on accepted and universally applied laws. Nationalism was a program to obtain these things quickly, not to evolve toward them but, if necessary, to superimpose them. The hurry to achieve these goals where nationalism itself was seriously opposed made a doctrinaire concern for means appear pedantic and unrealistic. Italian nationalists needed nothing so brutal as cynicism to justify "postponement" of controversy or the choice of practical means, though often this meant whittling away at the practices necessary to viable liberalism.

German Unification

Hajo Holborn

As in the case of Italy, nationalism in Germany during the first half of the nineteenth century was closely connected to liberalism. This was particularly so in the early stages of the revolutions of 1848. But with the failure of liberal nationalists to gain the concrete changes they strove for, steps toward unification over the next two decades followed a different path. In the following selection, Hajo Holborn, a noted historian of Germany, analyzes the significance of that path for German history until the outbreak of World War I in 1914.

Consider: The ways in which liberalism was sacrificed during this period; how the relation between liberalism and nationalism was affected by the position of different social groups in Germany; how Bismarck's social policies support Holborn's interpretation.

The achievement of German unity gave Bismarck the power to force the German liberals to decide whether they were more eager to see unity or liberty achieved in Germany. The majority of them proved willing to compromise with Bismarck. Since centralization went rather far under the new constitution he needed the liberal movement to some extent to counterbalance the particularistic German forces represented chiefly by the German princes. The constitution of the new German empire was, therefore, a bit more centralized and more liberal than Bismarck wished, but he maintained control of the crucial policy-making positions. No decisive power over military and foreign affairs by the constituted popular bodies was allowed in the second German empire. Bismarck made all sorts of concessions in the field of social and economic reform but was absolutely adamant with regard to the powers of the parliament. The direction of foreign and military matters remained a privilege of the Crown.

The pseudo-constitutional character of the new German empire was even more accentuated when in 1878 Bismarck decided to give up free trade and imposed a policy protecting the interests of the Prussian *Junker* agrarians against the importation of cheap Russian and American grain while at the same time introducing tariffs benefiting the growing German iron industries. Just as in 1866 and 1871 the German liberals had had to sacrifice the core of their political faith, so they were forced to jettison the major part of their economic program after 1878. The leading industrial groups of German society readily accepted a protectionist trade policy, and the unity of the liberal *bourgeoisie* crumbled. Thirty years after German liberalism had burst into existence in the Revolution of 1848, it ceased to be an independent political movement. Thereafter the majority of the German *bourgeoisie*, if they did not, like the higher *bourgeoisie*, become absolute supporters of the regime, were driven to further concession and compromise. The appearance of a powerful socialist workers' movement extinguished the last remaining fervor for reform among the liberal *bourgeoisie* and made them take cover under the wings of the established government. The second German empire was founded "by blood and iron" and socially stabilized by "iron and grain." For more than fifty years the German political scene was overshadowed by the alliance of the "barons of the halm" and the "barons of the smokestack," who maintained the army and bureaucracy in power.

The Communist Manifesto

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels

Although initially only one of many radical doctrines, Marxism proved to be the most dynamic and influential challenge to industrial capitalism and middle-class civilization in general. Its most succinct and popular statement is contained in the Communist Manifesto, written by Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) and first published in 1848. Karl Marx was born in Germany, studied history and philosophy, and entered a career as a journalist, writer, and revolutionary. For most of his life he lived in exile in London. His collaborator, Friedrich Engels, was also born in Germany and lived in England, but there he helped manage his family's cotton business in Manchester. Their doctrines directly attacked the middle class and industrial capitalism, presenting communism as a philosophically, historically, and scientifically justified alternative that would inevitably replace capitalism. They saw themselves as revolutionary leaders of the growing proletariat (the working class). The following is a selection from the Communist Manifesto.

Consider: The appeal of the ideas presented here; the concrete policies advocated by Marx and Engels; the historical and intellectual trends reflected in the Manifesto.

A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German police spies.

Where is the party in opposition that has not been decried as Communist by its opponents in power? Where the opposition that has not hurled back the branding reproach of Communism, against the more advanced opposition parties, as well as against its reactionary adversaries?

Two things result from this fact.

I. Communism is already acknowledged by all European powers to be in itself a power.

II. It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of the Specter of Communism with a Manifesto of the party itself.

To this end the Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following manifesto to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish and Danish languages.

*

In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties.

They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own by which to shape and mould the proletarian movement.

The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat, independently of all nationality. 2. In the various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.

The Communists, therefore, are on the one hand, practically, the most advanced and resolute section of the working class parties of every country, that section which pushes forward all others; on the other hand, theoretically, they have over the great mass of the proletariat the advantage of clearly understanding the line of march, the conditions, and the ultimate general results of the proletarian movement.

The immediate aim of the Communists is the same as that of all the other proletarian parties: formation of the proletariat into a class, overthrow of the bourgeois supremacy, conquest of political power by the proletariat.

The theoretical conclusions of the Communists are in no way based on ideas or principles that have been invented, or discovered, by this or that would-be universal reformer.

They merely express, in general terms, actual relations springing from an existing class struggle, from a historical movement going on under our very eyes. The abolition of existing property relations is not at all a distinctive feature of Communism.

All property relations in the past have continually been subject to historical change, consequent upon the change in historical conditions.

The French revolution, for example, abolished feudal property in favor of bourgeois property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

In this sense the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.

We have seen above that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class; to win the battle of democracy.

The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie; to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State, *i. e.*, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible.

Of course, in the beginning this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production; by means of measures, therefore, which appear economically insufficient and untenable, but which, in the course of the movement, outstrip themselves, necessitate further inroads upon the old social order and are unavoidable as a means of entirely revolutionizing the mode of production.

These measures will, of course, be different in different countries.

Nevertheless in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries: gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc., etc.

When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another. If the proletariat during its contest with the bourgeoisie is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class, if, by means of a revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such, sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have abolished its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old bourgeois society with its classes and class antagonisms we shall have an association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.

The Unfinished Revolution: Marxism Interpreted

Adam B. Ulam

Critical analyses of Marx and Marxism abound and from almost all points of view. From the historian's perspective, one of the most useful ways to approach Marx and Marxism is to place both in their historical context. This is done in the following excerpt from The Unfinished Revolution by Adam Ulam, a professor of government at Harvard who has written extensively on the history of Marxism and the Soviet Union. Here he attempts to explain aspects of both the content and the appeal of Marxism by pointing to intellectual traditions affecting Marx and social realities conditioning those who accepted it.

Consider: Why Marxism is most appealing during the early period of industrialization; how Ulam would explain the apparent failure of Marxism to take hold in twentieth-century nations such as the United States; what Ulam means when he calls Marx a child of rationalistic optimism; how a more pro-Marxist scholar might respond to this interpretation.

Here, then, is a theory attuned even more closely than other parts of Marxism to the facts and feelings of an early period of industrialization. The class struggle is the salt of Marxism, its most operative revolutionary part. As a historical and psychological concept, it expresses a gross oversimplification, but it is the oversimplification of a genius. The formula of the class struggle seizes the essence of the mood of a great historical moment—a revolution in basic economy—and generalizes it into a historical law. It extracts the grievances of groups of politically conscious workers in Western Europe, then a very small part of the whole proletariat, and sees in it the portent and meaning of the awakening of the whole working class everywhere. The *first* reaction of the worker to industrialization, his feelings of grievance and impotence before the machine, his employer, and the state which stands behind the employer, are assumed by Marx to be typical of the general reactions of the worker to industrialization. What does change in the process of the development of industry is that the worker's feeling of impotence gives way to class consciousness, which in turn leads him to class struggle and socialism. Marx's worker is the historical worker, but he is the historical worker of a specific period of industrial and political development.

Even in interpreting the psychology of the worker of the transitional period, Marx exhibited a rationalistic bias. The worker's opposition to the capitalist order is a total opposition to its laws, its factories, and its government. But this revolutionary consciousness of the worker is to take him next to Marxist socialism, where he will accept the factory system and the state, the *only* difference being the abolition of capitalism. Why shouldn't the revolutionary protest of the worker flow into other channels: into rejection of industrialism as well as capitalism, into rejection of the socialist as well as the capitalist state? It is here that Marx is most definitely the child of his age, the child of rationalistic optimism: the workers will undoubtedly translate their anarchistic protests and grievances into a sophisticated philosophy of history. They will undoubtedly realize that the forces of industrialism and modern life, which strip them of property, status, and economic security, are in themselves benevolent in their ultimate effects and that it is only capitalism and the capitalists which make them into instruments of oppression. The chains felt by the proletariat are the chains of the industrial system. The chains Marx urges them to throw off are those of capitalism. Will the workers understand the difference? And if they do, will they still feel that in destroying capitalism they have a "world to win"?

MEASURES OF SOCIALISM

Some reformers who blamed factory abuses, unemployment, and depression upon capitalism urged adoption of a new political and economic system, *socialism*.

SOCIALISM	CAPITALISM
1. The government as representative of the people owns and operates the means of production (farms, mines, and factories) and distribution (transportation and retail stores).	1. Private individuals and corporations own and operate business enterprises. The government maintains law and order, encourages private industry, and prevents abuses.
2. The government determines the needs of the people and provides goods and services for the people's use.	2. Private owners provide the people with goods and services in order to make a profit.

UTOPIAN SOCIALISM (EARLY 19TH CENTURY)

The Utopian Socialists believed that capitalists, once convinced of the merits of socialism, would discard private ownership and the profit motive. Therefore, these reformers were considered dreamers, or *Utopians*.

1. Robert Owen, a wealthy British cotton manufacturer, created a model industrial community in Scotland at *New Lanark*. Contrary to general practice, he paid high wages, reduced working hours, provided sanitary factory conditions, built decent homes for workers, established schools for their children, and permitted the workers to share in management and profits. Owen's New Lanark community prospered, but he was disappointed that other manufacturers ignored his enlightened example.

In 1825 in the United States, Owen established a model agricultural-industrial community at *New Harmony*, Indiana. This venture failed.

2. Claude Saint-Simon, a Frenchman, envisioned an ideal social order. He taught that the wealthy and educated classes should devote their energies to the benefit of the lower classes.

3. Charles Fourier, a French reformer, advocated the establishing of ideal, or Utopian, communities. Here, he believed, members working together for the common good would demonstrate the superiority of socialism. His followers established several experimental communities, which proved unau-

...the well-known but short-lived community in Massachusetts at *Brook Farm*.

LOUIS BLANC AND NATIONAL WORKSHOPS

Louis Blanc, a French Socialist, believed that (1) every man has a right to a job, and (2) the state should provide work for the unemployed in government-financed factories, or *national workshops*.

Blanc organized a workers' party and played a major role in the French Revolution of 1848. For a while, the provisional government provided the unemployed with work: digging ditches and improving parks. However, as the middle class regained control, the government ended the work program and suppressed the subsequent workers' revolt. (During the depression of the 1930's, Blanc's ideas were applied in the United States when the government sponsored an extensive public works program.)

Blanc is considered more practical than the Utopians, since he looked for reform, not to capitalists, but to workers and the government.

"SCIENTIFIC" SOCIALISM

Karl Marx (1818-1883), German writer and economist, founded modern socialism. Exiled from Prussia after the failure of the 1848 Revolution, Marx settled in England.

Karl Marx wrote the following important works: (1) *The Communist Manifesto* (co-authored by *Friedrich Engels*), 1848, was a pamphlet outlining his socialist ideas in a simple, propagandistic style. (Marx used the term "communist" to distinguish his views from those of the Utopian Socialists, whom he scorned as dreamers.) (2) *Das Kapital* was a detailed study critically analyzing the capitalist system and expounding his theories of socialism. These works present the basic ideas of *Marxian socialism*, or *Marxism*.

1. Economic Interpretation of History. Marx argued that economic conditions determine the course of history. The class that possesses economic power controls the government and social institutions. In an industrial society based on private ownership, the capitalist class rules.

2. Class Struggle. Marx also viewed history as a struggle between conflicting economic classes, between the "have nots" and the "haves." In ancient Rome, plebeians battled patricians; in feudal society, serfs opposed lords; under private enterprise, workers (the proletariat) clash with capitalists (the

bourgeoisie). This "class struggle," Marx predicted, would continue until the workers triumph and establish a socialist "classless" society.

3. **Surplus Value.** Capitalists exploit (take advantage of) workers by paying them just enough wages to keep them alive, that is, just above the subsistence level. The difference between their wages and the price of the goods the workers produce, Marx called *surplus value*. Although the capitalists contribute nothing to production, according to Marx, they take the surplus value as profit. Consequently, workers lack sufficient income to purchase all the goods produced, and this, in turn, Marx claimed, leads to depression.

4. **Inevitability of Socialism.** Marx predicted that capitalism would destroy itself as depressions became more and more serious. In time, he said, wealth would concentrate in fewer and fewer hands, while workers' conditions steadily deteriorate. Eventually the workers would be driven to overthrow the capitalists and establish a socialist state. (Marx did not make clear whether the overthrow of capitalism would come by peaceful means or by violence. However, he was certain that socialism would first come to industrial nations, not agricultural nations.)

Thus, Marx believed that socialism would be achieved not by appeals to the capitalist class, but by the working class as an inevitable result of the above "scientific" economic laws. Marxism, therefore, is known as "scientific" socialism.

CRITICISMS OF "SCIENTIFIC" SOCIALISM

Defenders of capitalism attack Marxian economics and warn against a socialist economy as follows:

1. **Marxian Errors.** Opponents of Marxism point out: (a) The economic interpretation of history neglects the vital role of noneconomic factors—for example, religion and nationalism. (b) The interests of capitalists and workers often coincide—for example, increased production makes possible both higher wages and greater profits. (c) Capitalists are entitled to profits, since they risk money and manage industry. (d) Under capitalism the conditions of workers have improved steadily, instead of worsening, as Marx expected.

2. **Predicted Defects of Socialism.** Opponents predict that under socialism (a) the individual will lose his incentive to work and progress, (b) the government, exercising economic as well as political power, will become a dictatorship controlling every phase of the citizen's life, (c) the government will place the needs of the state ahead of the needs of the people, and (d) the

government will have great difficulty in managing a complex economic system and will commit serious errors in planning.

Defenders of capitalism assert that we can retain the full advantages of the free-enterprise system while remedying its defects.

BRIEF HISTORY OF SOCIALIST PARTIES

Marx's followers founded *Socialist*, or *Social Democratic*, parties to achieve (1) as the *immediate objective*, greater democracy and improved labor conditions, and (2) as the *ultimate objective*, a socialist state. During the 19th century they employed peaceful methods to gain control by the ballot.

In 1889, to coordinate world Socialist activities, the various Socialist parties formed the *Second International*. (The *First International*, founded by Marx in 1864, had been short-lived.) The Second International proclaimed the unity of all workers, regardless of nationality. Nevertheless, in World War I, most Socialist parties ignored their international ties and supported the war efforts of their respective countries. After World War I, Socialists kept their parties from being absorbed by the more aggressive Communist movement.

Since World War II, Socialist parties have exercised considerable influence in West European countries: Sweden, Norway, Italy, West Germany, France, and England. For example, the British Labor party, in office from 1945 to 1951 and from 1964 to 1970, nationalized the Bank of England; electric power; civil aviation; railway, bus, and truck transport; the steel industry; and coal mines. (With the British Conservatives in office after 1979, certain nationalized industries were returned to private ownership.)

BRIEF HISTORY OF COMMUNIST PARTIES

In Russia before World War I, the left-wing Socialists broke with the moderate Social Democrats and formed their own organization, the Bolsheviks, later called the *Communist party*. In 1917 the Bolsheviks, led by *Vladimir Lenin*, seized control of Russia by revolution (see pages 349-350). This accomplishment encouraged left-wing Socialists in other countries to establish their own Communist parties.

In 1919, to further world revolution, Russia linked the various Communist parties by the *Third International*, or *Comintern*. During World War II, to foster unity with her British and American allies, the Soviet Union dissolved the Comintern.

Today, Communist parties control Russia, many central European nations, China, Mongolia, North Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and Cuba. Also Communist candidates poll substantial votes in France and Italy.

COMMUNISTS VS. SOCIALISTS

Although both Communists and Socialists claim to follow Marxian ideas, they disagree on the following points:

Communists	Socialists
1. Communism can be achieved only by <i>revolution</i> —a violent overthrow of the capitalist government and economy.	1. Socialism can be achieved by <i>evolution</i> —a peaceful and legal gaining of control by publicity and the ballot.
2. To protect the revolution, a Communist government must at first be a "dictatorship of the proletariat." It must suppress, by all available means, any movement considered procapitalist or counterrevolutionary.	2. A Socialist government, assuming power by consent of the people, must always be a democracy. It must retain the people's support by providing political liberty and economic justice.
3. Communism requires government ownership and operation of all the means of production and distribution—without exception.	3. Socialism requires nationalization only of the major industries. Small farms, small factories, and retail stores may remain under private ownership.

CHRISTIAN SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Many devout Christians took a strong interest in social legislation but opposed "scientific" socialism, holding its economic interpretation and its doctrines of class struggle to be irreligious. Instead, they urged reform based upon religious principles, especially the Golden Rule. This movement was encouraged by religious leaders. (1) *Pope Leo XIII* in 1891 advised employers to treat workmen in a Christian manner, and appealed to workers to form Catholic labor unions. (2) *Pope Pius XI* in 1931 proposed that workmen share in the management and profits of industry. (3) *Pope John XXIII* in 1961 deplored low wages that condemned workers to "subhuman conditions of life." He urged that labor receive a greater share of the fruits of its industry, and preached the responsibility of society for the well-being of all its members. (4) *Pope Paul VI* in 1967 deplored the abuses of unrestrained capitalism. On behalf of the poor, both individuals and underdeveloped nations, the Pope urged a major effort to overcome misery, hunger, disease, and ignorance. (5) Some *Protestant religious leaders* called for economic and social justice.

Today the *Christian Democrats* in Italy and the *People's party* in Austria are political parties that command a considerable following for their program of protecting Catholic interests and advancing social reform.