

SOCIALISM

The word **socialism**, coined in the early 1800s, referred to an ideology arguing that citizens are best served by policies focused on meeting the basic needs of the *entire* society rather than on serving the needs of individuals *as individuals*. From its inception, socialism has been critical of competing ideologies (such as classical liberalism) that rank individualism above the common good in terms of political priorities. Henri de Saint-Simon (1760–1825), Robert Owen (1771–1859), and Charles Fourier (1772–1837) were early socialists who taught that competitive individualist societies destroyed the possibility of collective harmony. Individuals are capable of living cooperatively, they insisted, and the socialist society would prove it.⁵⁰ Saint-Simon envisioned socialism as a large, complex social system in which scientific planners would coordinate economic activity to ensure that goods were produced in exactly the proper quantity and distributed evenly throughout society so that neither waste nor shortages occurred. Owen and Fourier believed in small self-sufficient cooperative societies in which socialism consisted of living in such a manner that all community members shared both the responsibility of laboring and the wealth produced by it.

Although the term *socialism* is of recent origin, the roots of socialist ideology are ancient and varied. You can find some of the oldest inspirations for socialist ideas in the Judeo-Christian tradition.⁵¹ In the Book of Deuteronomy, for example, you can read in chapter 15 about the year of release from debt. In this chapter, God commands that, after every seven years, debts be forgiven and property be given to any poor living within the community of God's people. If someone resists following these commandments, preferring to keep his or her individual property and/or insisting that any debts owed to him or her be paid, God's response is unambiguous. Resistance to this release of debt is considered an act of sin. Likewise, in the Book of Acts, in chapters 4 and 5, you can read about early Christians selling their individual possessions and then contributing the proceeds to a common stock from which all lived. When one individual, Ananias, decided to hold back some of his property for himself rather than contributing to the common stock, he fell dead. Similarly, you can look into the First Book of Timothy and find the apostle counseling against the pursuit of self-gratification and worldly riches as meaningless but powerful distractions that tempt women and men from the more noble lives of righteousness, prayer, and good deeds.

Although biblical teachings are subject to as many interpretations as there are readers, you can see how socialist-oriented readers find insight in these passages. A recurring theme emerges in these passages: Individual needs may be called on to be sacrificed for the well-being of all. Consider, for example, how a Lockean might fare during the year of the release. A Lockean, seeing him- or herself as an autonomous individual, would likely argue that individuals have the natural right to be self-governing and decide for themselves how to dispose of their properties. A Lockean would not find economic inequality to be intrinsically problematic. Both a classical liberal conservative and a modern liberal would likely agree that Ananias has the right to make his own decisions about holding on to his personal possessions. Yet the biblical teachings in the passages just cited lead to outcomes different from those sanctioned by liberal and conservative ideas. In these passages,

Box 5.3 Socialism: Marxism-Leninism and Social Democracy

Marxism-Leninism Teaches That

- Society needs a centralized, vanguard party, and does not need multiparty competition through peaceful, lawful political participation.
- Imperialism has shaped the development of capitalism and altered the terms of revolutionary struggle from those outlined by Marx; namely, revolutions are more likely in less developed capitalist economies, contrary to Marx's theory.

Social Democracy Teaches That

- Socialism and democracy are consistent with each other.
- Economic oppression is no less harmful than political oppression, and therefore government should promote economic equality no less than political equality.
- Socialism should be brought about through peaceful, lawful, democratic means.

social obligations prevail over individual desires. The duties to God and God's people are more important than the preferences of any single individual.⁵²

Marxism

The contributions to socialist ideology made by German theorist Karl Marx (1818–1883) are so vast and complex that his theory of socialism has come to be known specifically as Marxism. Marx was well versed in political theory and completed a doctorate in classical Greek philosophy from the University of Berlin in 1841.⁵³ Marx was greatly influenced by German philosopher Georg W. F. Hegel (1770–1831), who believed that historical development takes place through a series of dramatic changes producing increasingly comprehensive systems of knowledge. With each epoch of historical development, new and old ideas clash and compete. New ways of thinking and conceptualizing reality emerge from the conflict, according to Hegel. One finds in Marx's work many parallels with Hegel, not the least of which is the notion that history moves forward from the push and pull of conflict and that each new period of history is a creative response to what has gone before. As abstract as this sounds, these ideas are important in providing glimpses of some of the most concrete dimensions of Marx's theory. For example, Hegelian influences are discernible in Marx's understanding of class conflict and social change.⁵⁴

Although Marx is known as a socialist, the majority of his writings focus on analyzing capitalism. This is not surprising when one realizes that Marx lived under a capitalist system and, as a student of politics, wrote primarily about what he could observe. With his friend and collaborator Frederick Engels (1820–1895), Marx published *The Communist Manifesto* in 1848. In this and other works, Marx analyzed many facets of capitalist society. The better one understands capitalism, Marx contends, the more clearly one sees the rational basis for socialism.

How does Marx analyze capitalism? He begins by noting that capitalism is an economic system in which most people come to be members of one of two large

classes. This division of people into two basic classes contrasts with the more complex class systems of antiquity and feudalism, in which numerous classes existed.⁵⁵ The two prominent classes under capitalism are the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The proletariat is the class that lives primarily by selling its labor power (laboring ability) for a wage. The bourgeoisie is the class that lives primarily by purchasing the labor power of others and using this labor to operate the factories and businesses owned by the bourgeoisie. Thus, generally, the proletariat consists of people who work for wages and the bourgeoisie consists of people who own businesses and hire employees. Very importantly, Marx was aware that many members of the bourgeoisie also work; indeed, business owners often have interminable workdays and remain at the office longer than any single employee. However, if an individual's economic position is premised on the ability to hire workers and run a business through the employees' labor, then this individual is a member of the bourgeoisie. At the same time, a member of the proletariat might supplement his or her income by taking in boarders, growing his or her own food, and so forth. If, however, an individual needs his or her wage in order to live, then the individual is a member of the proletariat.⁵⁶

Notice what is absent from Marx's discussion of class. He has not defined class in terms of income levels. He has not come up with a formula for determining how much money one needs in order to qualify as rich or poor. Rather, he has defined class in terms of *functions*. If person A functions in society by selling her labor power in return for a wage, she is a member of the proletariat, regardless of how high or low her wage may be. In contrast, if she functions as someone who operates a factory by employing wage laborers, she is a member of the bourgeoisie, whatever her income level. This point is crucial to remember, for, when Marx later speaks of abolishing class, it is necessary to remember how he defines class. Because he does not define class in terms of income levels, he does not define the abolition of class in terms of eradicating income differentials.

According to Marx, under capitalism conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is inevitable. This is the case because both classes are rational. Both pursue what is in their respective interests. Consequently, the bourgeoisie and proletariat clash over the price of wage labor. It is in the interest of the bourgeoisie to lower the price of labor, whereas it is in the interest of the proletariat to raise it. Neither class can afford to abandon its interests, according to Marx. For example, if a capitalist pays a higher wage than that paid by rival capitalists, the generous capitalist will be unable to compete with his or her peers and will be ruined. Thus the rational capitalist will pay subsistence wages to the employees. Subsistence wages are defined by Marx as the lowest possible wage for inducing sufficient numbers of capable workers to fill job openings. That is, the rational capitalist will pay only so much as he or she must, in order to recruit qualified workers to come into the business and do the jobs. All capitalists will be motivated to compete successfully with their peers, so each will be inclined to pay subsistence-level wages. For the proletariat, of course, this means that every possible employer is operating according to an identical logic, one that is not exactly favorable to the proletariat.

Moreover, unless a capitalist holds back a part of the value created by employees through their labor, the capitalist will have nothing for him- or herself. Therefore, the capitalist keeps some of the value created by workers; this value is called

surplus value (it exists as a surplus above and beyond what is returned to the workers in the form of wages) or profit. Yet the existence of profit is testimony to the fact that the workers have created a value in excess of that paid to them in wages. They are creating more worth than the amount reflected in their paychecks, and, because their existence depends on their ability to earn these paychecks, their lives are insecure as long as wages are meager. As you can see from just this short discussion, both proletarians and capitalists live or die by the decisions surrounding the price of wages.

According to Marx, the state plays an important role in preventing the conflict between the classes from erupting into daily riots and rebellions. If workers rise up and attempt to take over a factory and demand higher wages, the state's law enforcement officers will suppress their rebellion. The state's judicial officers will prosecute, and the state's legislative officials may even respond by writing new laws to prevent future rebellions. In short, the state will work to prevent class conflict by enforcing law and order, which, under capitalism, indirectly supports the bourgeoisie's continued pursuit of profit through the payment of subsistence wages to workers. Logically, Marx points out, one can see that the class that benefits most from the status quo also gains most from the state's protection of the status quo.⁵⁷

For Marx, however, capitalism is an entire social system. It involves more than states, wages, and profits. Capitalism also includes certain ways of thinking about the world and psychologically responding to it. For example, Marx believed that life under capitalism became an emotional ordeal for many proletarians/workers. *Alienation* is a term he used to describe the emotional, cognitive, and psychological damage done to the proletariat by capitalism. Alienation means loss. According to Marx, workers are vulnerable to different kinds of alienation. One type of alienation is alienation from the self. A worker alienated from his or her self has lost a sense of self-awareness and identity. Such a worker may go through the workday "on automatic pilot," barely aware of him- or herself as an individual with a mind, with thoughts, with a history, with feelings. Workers such as this live through the day, but they don't *experience* the day any more than the machines in the factories experience it. Proletarians are also likely to suffer alienation from the work process, from other workers, and from society, according to Marx. The creative, productive, and collaborative dimensions of working and living are lost to the proletarian, who has become almost as lifeless as the tools he or she uses. Not only has life become joyless, but the alienated worker doesn't even know any more that it's not supposed to be this way.⁵⁸

Just as capitalism affects the psyche, it also influences the intellect. Marx asserted that intellectual systems (ideologies, for example) are shaped by the political and economic systems in which they arise. In other words, the existence of capitalism makes some ideas useful and, therefore, renders them means of obtaining and holding power.⁵⁹ As Marx put it, each political-economic system needs its own ideology to justify itself as moral and "natural." In a capitalist society, the prevailing ideology will be one that proclaims private property as natural (because the bourgeoisie can use this idea to help legitimize its class power). The prevailing ideology will also uphold individual freedom as a fundamental right. The idea of individual freedom is useful to the bourgeoisie, because it allows the bourgeoisie

to argue that making profit is simply an element of individual freedom. In addition, the bourgeoisie can always justify paying the proletarians less than the value created by the proletarians, by proclaiming that if the proletarians do not like working for them, the proletarians have the individual freedom to quit and find other jobs. That is, the ideology of individual freedom is used to distract attention away from questions about fairness, social needs, and basic economic equality. Ideology is used to justify the economic dominance of the bourgeoisie.⁶⁰

As a student of Hegel, Marx saw in all these dimensions of capitalism evidence of tension and strain, but also eventual progress. On the one hand, capitalism is inherently contradictory, according to Marx, and thus doomed to fall apart as a consequence of its own clashing pressures. For example, as capitalists pursue their self-interest and pay workers subsistence wages, they set in motion a logic whereby most people (wage earners) are paid so little that they cannot purchase the goods and services produced by capitalism itself. *Underconsumption* is a danger and forces capitalists to compete for foreign markets.⁶¹ On the other hand, however, capitalism is much more than a system in which contradictory forces threaten disorder and chaos. Capitalism, according to Marx, is also progressive. It has given humanity many wonderful gifts and has inspired innumerable positive developments. Has Marx begun to contradict himself in praising capitalism like this? Absolutely not, he assures his readers; he is merely viewing capitalism in all its complexity.

What is positive and beneficial about capitalism? In promoting the pursuit of self-interest (for example, high profits for the bourgeoisie), capitalism pushes people to be extremely competitive. Out of this competition come technological advances, scientific discoveries, mechanical inventions, and productive innovations, all of which contribute to the creation of an abundance of goods and services. Every capitalist is driven to discover the most efficient way to produce the best-selling, most appealing product, in order to become the next billionaire. This best-selling, most appealing product, in order to become the next billionaire. This competitive drive for profits encourages the rise of expanding cities, huge corporations, and centralized banking, each of which facilitates producing and selling at unprecedented levels by bringing workers, know-how, technology, and money together in close proximity for maximum use. The drive for profits further stimulates international trade and cross-cultural contact, as the bourgeoisie traverse the globe in order to sell more goods. Society becomes more worldly and sophisticated, as urban centers and international communications expose people to ways of living and thinking beyond those taught by their own local traditions. Old-fashioned loyalties weaken; traditional notions of religion, family life, relations between men and women, and the like begin to die out, because capitalism forces people to adjust to technological innovations and adapt to incredibly diverse ways of interacting with people and products. Marx applauds these developments as spectacular by-products of economic development.⁶²

The challenge of socialism, according to Marx, is to find a way to build on the positive features of capitalism while eradicating the negative ones. Marx's solution is as follows: The socialist society will abolish class and thereby end the conflict between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, and will distribute the abundant resources created by capitalism in a way that addresses social needs. Abolishing class entails ending the distinction between selling and purchasing labor power. That is,

under socialism, all able-bodied adults will work and share ownership of the goods and services produced. These goods and services will be publicly managed, at first by state officials and later by local citizens themselves. Public managers will centrally plan how goods and services will be produced and managed, Marx argues, so that they can examine the society as a whole and see what is needed, where it is needed, and how much is needed in order to most efficiently fulfill the needs of all. Credit, communications, manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, and other crucial industries will be operated and monitored by these state planners, so that no individual can sabotage the collective good by demanding that his or her individual rights and needs take priority above the needs of society. Once class distinctions have been completely eradicated (and all people recognize that their interest is in working to ensure the welfare of the society as a whole), monitoring by state planners will be unnecessary and the state, no longer having any function to serve, will fall into disuse, according to Marx.⁶³

Meanwhile, capitalism has created so much abundance that state planners have a wealth of goods and services to distribute to the population. Moreover, capitalism has done such a wonderful job of inspiring inventions and discoveries that the socialist society possesses the technological skill to continue producing goods and services for the fulfillment of future needs. In addition, by forcing people to give up old-fashioned and narrow-minded traditions, capitalism has prepared individuals to be forward-looking in their thinking and capable of adjusting to the new requirements of the socialist society.

Implicit in Marx's discussion is the notion that capitalism is an important precursor of socialism. Indeed, in Marx's discussion of the transition to socialism, he contends that capitalism is a significant contributing element to the formation of socialism. Although he explored the possibility of organizing socialism in societies that had not already developed capitalism, Marx emphasized throughout his writings the fact that socialism will construct itself in relation to a pre-existing capitalism. For example, in explaining his theory of how socialism will be brought into being, Marx writes that violent revolution will be necessary for destroying capitalism and instituting socialism in most societies. He writes of the socialist revolution as a majoritarian movement, involving massive numbers of workers. Notice the assumption behind this statement: Capitalism is needed because it creates an economic structure in which the majority of people are wage laborers. In addition, Marx argues, in some societies—Great Britain and the United States—peaceful organizing for socialism may work to bring socialists to power. Here, the capitalist democratic structures of society are so well developed that socialists may be capable of campaigning openly for socialism without suffering violent repression and being forced to fight for socialism outside the legal structures. Note, again, however, how the presence of capitalism is presented as a variable conducive to the eventual movement toward socialism.⁶⁴

Marx followed the political events of his time closely, and he found what he took to be many encouraging signs pointing to the soundness of socialist ideology. He welcomed the northern victory in the U.S. Civil War as a progressive historical development.⁶⁵ He participated in the International Workingmen's Association, in which French, Swiss, Polish, English, Italian, and German workers

organized in opposition to the bourgeoisie.⁶⁶ Marx was ecstatic when, toward the end of his life, he saw his writings gaining influence in Russia.⁶⁷

Marx's ideological legacy is a complex one. Since Marx's death in 1883, socialists have disagreed about the implications of Marx's theories. They have also disagreed about how best to advance socialism itself. Marxism-Leninism and social democracy are two forms of post-Marx socialism that have greatly influenced ideological debates.

Marxism-Leninism

Marxism-Leninism is a form of socialism articulated by Russian theorist and revolutionary Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov, whose revolutionary name was Lenin (1870–1924). Lenin took certain ideas from Marx and added some of his own to create Marxism-Leninism, often referred to as communist ideology. Lenin's life was fascinating and dangerous. He was exiled in 1895 to Siberia for his opposition to the Russian czar, worked with socialists in western Europe prior to World War I, and returned to Russia during World War I to assume leadership of the Bolshevik revolution, which led to the establishment of the Soviet Union. As the Soviet Union's first leader, Lenin worked toward socialism (as he defined it) by enacting policies whereby the state assumed extensive control over industry and by creating a political framework of one-party government.

Marxist-Leninist ideology argues that socialists should organize their struggle against capitalism by creating a vanguard party to lead the revolution against capitalism. The Marxist-Leninist party is to serve as the vanguard, or leader, of the proletariat, according to Lenin. Lenin envisioned the vanguard party as highly structured and centralized, with each member scrupulously upholding the party's policies.⁶⁸ To make sense of Lenin's ideas on the party, it is necessary to realize that he formulated his theory with pragmatic considerations in mind. Like Marx, Lenin believed that working-class movements would be susceptible to repression by hostile governments. To survive this repression, Lenin asserted that socialists needed to be united among themselves and sufficiently organized to endure long periods of antisocialist activity. Not only was the tightly controlled vanguard party designed to survive governmental attacks, but it was also organized to instruct and teach. Party leaders were to educate workers in the intricacies of socialist ideology and guide them through a learning process whereby they would come to understand the necessity of overthrowing capitalism through violent revolution. The vanguard party was a necessary element in the process of socialist organizing, for it brought to the revolutionary movement the expertise, discipline, and leadership needed to create socialism, according to Lenin.⁶⁹

Once the revolution was successful, according to Lenin, the vanguard party would manage society in the interest of the workers. The party would suppress any opposition forces, as well as manage the economy.⁷⁰ In these arguments, we find elements of the ideological basis for the repression of potential opposition forces carried out by the former Soviet Union.

Marxist-Leninist socialism is also associated with the theoretical concept of *imperialism*. Lenin's concept of imperialism is important in explaining two ways in which Lenin developed socialist theory beyond Marx's original contributions.

First, Lenin used the concept of imperialism to explain why older capitalist societies had survived into the 1900s, despite Marx's arguments that they were beset by internal contradictions. Second, Lenin's theory of imperialism provided an explanation for why the prospects of socialist revolution in societies lacking capitalist traditions were so promising.

Lenin defined imperialism as a stage of capitalism. Specifically, it is a stage at which capitalists begin to export capital and use this capital to build industries abroad. In searching out a site for new industries, capitalists choose a location most conducive to their interests (making large profits). A location in a developing country in which cheap labor is abundant is especially attractive to capitalists. Capitalists go into this location, hire employees from the local pool of low-cost labor, and make enormous profits. Profits are brought back to the capitalists' home country, where the capitalists spend lavishly. Refunneling of this money into the home economy spurs economic growth and development, the benefits of which raise the standard of living of all groups. As living standards improve, even the proletariat of the home country notice a higher quality of life. This point is crucial, according to Lenin, because it means that the workers in the home country to some extent become middle class and status quo-oriented in their outlooks. Such workers lack revolutionary zeal and see themselves as beneficiaries of capitalism. Imperialism thus boosts the well-being of capitalist societies and enables them to fend off, at least temporarily, the destructive consequences of their own internal contradictions.

Workers in the foreign country, however, are suffering. Their low wages make the capitalists superrich, Lenin argues. Such workers have an interest in opposing capitalism. These workers, living in the country sought out by the imperialist-minded capitalists, possess a revolutionary potential. Logically, therefore, Lenin saw revolutionary possibilities in a developing society—a society into which capital had been invested but that had not yet developed long-standing capitalist processes in which the proletariat had become complacent as a result of comparatively high living standards.⁷¹

Lenin's theory was appealing to some socialists who hoped to organize socialist movements in developing countries. For example, Mao Zedong (1893–1976) could find in Lenin's work an ideological rationale for socialist revolution in China, despite the fact that China was not a capitalist society and lacked the sizable proletariat discussed by Marx in Marx's theory of revolution. Mao became communist leader of the People's Republic of China in 1949 and governed until his death in 1976.⁷²

Social Democracy

Social democrats (also known as *democratic socialists*) reject Marxism-Leninism. They see Marxism-Leninism's advocacy of a vanguard party as authoritarian. Social democrats believe in integrating socialism and democracy. Unlike Marxist-Leninists, social democrats support peaceful, legal efforts to work toward socialism, and they believe in multiparty competition and civil liberties. They view socialism as a way of organizing society so that all groups are guaranteed some level of social well-being and economic security. They propose to distribute

society's riches among all sectors of the population by enacting public policies very similar to those advocated by modern liberalism. Indeed, social democrats support extensive welfare programs. Such programs, they contend, can promote economic self-determination, just as democracy promotes political self-determination.⁷³ Historically a party of social democracy, the Labour Party of Great Britain has moved toward liberalism under the leadership of centrist Labour leaders like Tony Blair. In fact, the Party's 1997 general election program omitted the word *socialism* altogether.⁷⁴

The Finnish Social Democratic Party embraces democracy as well as economic policies designed to improve the social and economic positions of workers. The party rejects communism (Marxism-Leninism) in favor of free elections. It calls for economic reforms such as shorter workdays, flexible working hours, low interest rates, and full employment.⁷⁵ In like fashion, the party of Catalonia's socialists specifically links socialism and democracy together and views the two as mutually reinforcing means of creating conditions of both fairness and liberty.⁷⁶

Social democrats take from socialism a commitment to serving the needs of the entire society. They share Marx's dissatisfaction with the inequities in the bourgeoisie-proletariat relationship whereby the bourgeoisie ends up with profit while the proletariat suffers alienation and makes subsistence wages. These socialists have a vision that can be traced back to the story of the year of the release of debts in the Book of Deuteronomy. Property should be redistributed so that it is shared by all, they argue. As the Catalanian Social Democratic Party puts it, a socialist society is one where nobody sees his or her basic needs overlooked.⁷⁷

What would democratic socialism look like in the United States? The Socialist Party of America believes it would include support for racial equality, gender and sexual equality, the rights of citizens to participate in corporate decision making, public ownership of many businesses as a means of reducing economic inequality, and environmental protection. To see how the party spells out these positions, go to the document entitled "Where We Stand," at its Web page (<http://www.dsusa.org>).

The debates between Marxist-Leninists and social democrats illustrate that socialist ideology is varied and diverse. In looking at Marxism-Leninism and social democracy in the context of historical questions in the field of political theory, one finds that both forms of socialism have a complex relationship to previous political philosophies. Both Marxist-Leninists and social democrats believe that society should aspire toward more than a Hobbesian blueprint for survival. They tend to share with Plato a commitment to organizing society so that a larger vision of justice is realized. The Marxist-Leninists also share with Plato a view supportive of elite (philosopher-kings or vanguard parties) decision making. Marxist-Leninists and social democrats decry the inequalities of capitalism and look to socialism as a more egalitarian system than capitalism. In addition, Marxist-Leninists reject Madison's argument for intentionally weakening state power through a system of checks and balances; however, social democrats often support such measures as consistent with democratic decision making. In terms of debates between fundamentalism and Millian individualism, Marxist-Leninists are opposed to both sides. They reject religious fundamentalism outright, but also reject individualism if individualism is used to weaken the decision making of the vanguard party and,

with it, progress toward socialism. Social democrats reject fundamentalism, but, as noted earlier, try to reconcile individualism, democracy, and socialism.

SUMMING UP

- **Liberalist** ideology includes the **classical liberalism** of John Locke and Adam Smith and the **modern liberalism** of T. H. Green. Classical liberals stress the rationality of human beings and the desirability of limited government, whereas modern liberals believe that **interventionist government** can reform society and expand the very meaning of individual liberty (**expansive liberty**) itself. In response to the emergence of modern liberalism, classical liberals came to describe themselves as classical liberal conservatives.
- **Conservative** ideology includes **classical liberalism** (the ideas of Locke and Smith) as well as Burkean **traditional conservatism**. Burke-inspired conservatism stresses the need to preserve and uphold traditional morality. Classical liberal conservatives and Burkean traditional conservatives disagree on many issues involving contemporary politics, as seen in the divergent paths conservatism has taken in leading the formation of the Christian Coalition and the Log Cabin Republicans.
- **Socialism**, like the preceding two ideologies, is not one-dimensional. Greatly influenced by Marx's theory of the inherently flawed but progressive nature of capitalism, socialists today include advocates of **Marxism-Leninism** and **social democracy**. The former rejects democracy, whereas the latter sees socialism and democracy as logically reinforcing.

STUDY QUESTIONS

1. Compare and contrast classical and modern liberalism on matters of liberty and government.
2. What do classical liberals such as Locke and Smith teach about economic inequality?
3. What did classical liberals start calling themselves after modern liberalism came into being?
4. Compare and contrast classical liberal conservatives and Burkean traditional conservatives.
5. Identify a contemporary conservative group that embraces classical liberal conservative ideas. Identify a contemporary conservative group that calls for Burkean traditional conservatism.
6. How did George W. Bush's 2000 presidential campaign become an occasion for conflict between different conservative groups?
7. What is a religious source of socialist ideology? Explain.
8. Why did Marx believe that capitalism necessarily generated class conflict? What role did government play in this conflict?
9. Did Marx see anything positive in capitalism?
10. How do Marxist-Leninists and social democrats differ in their application of socialist ideology?