



---

## IDEOLOGICAL WARFARE... WHO'S WINNING?

**Mortimer Adler**

**May, 1964**

Ever since I was invited to address you, I have contemplated the prospect with serious misgivings, with a growing sense of inappropriateness of having a philosopher talk on the subject of foreign policy. I have two reasons for this. One, is the very subject of today's talk which is the *Ideology of Ideological Warfare*. If you would look at the definition of an ideology as given on page 83 of the Great Decisions booklet, you will see the reason for my misgivings. As there described an ideology is a dogmatic search for positions that are not rationally presented, not rationally argued, more or less aggressively circulated and aggressively opposed. They don't represent rational thought, they don't proceed by way of rational persuasion.

Accordingly, I hope that the Great Decisions booklet is right in saying as it does on page 84, that the United States does *not* have an ideology. Let me read you this, "The United States, it is sometimes contended, is at a disadvantage in the struggle with the

Communists because it has no official ideology. There should be nothing surprising about this, for as one scholar points out, Ideology as a source of power is largely a monopoly of totalitarianism. A democracy may have goals or ideals but not an ideology since the very essence of a democracy is the principle of the right of disagreement on substantive goals. Such a nation lacks the fanaticism and uniformity which lend an ideology its coherence and drive. None the less," it goes on, "one may speak of what the United States stands for in terms of its ideals, its aspirations, etc."

### **The Conflict of Ideals**

Now that substitution is quite acceptable to the philosopher and I would be delighted to speak today on *The Ideals of the United States*, if I can also speak on the ideals of the other side of this divided world. I am, therefore, going to throw ideology out entirely. I am going to give the Russians, or the Communists, the courtesy of saying that they, too, have ideals and look at the conflict of ideals, the conflict or difference between our ideals and theirs.

Given this difference in ideals, can we persuade them to join us? Can they persuade us to join them? Can we settle our differences amicably? Or, one more question: if we differ in ideals, which of us, *they*, or *us* has the more persuasive story to tell the uncommitted nations? Again, speaking as a philosopher, I prefer to see this as winning a debate, winning an argument, not winning a war, cold or hot. My second reason for feeling out of place, talking to persons who are deeply interested in foreign policy is that a philosopher always takes the long view while most if not all foreign policy questions are concerned with the short run. In fact they become more interesting as they become more immediate. But a long view of the general drift of history has the effect of putting the damper on most of the burning issues of foreign policy. What I am going to say, I think, will illustrate this. But let me postpone that for a moment and start with the question of competing or conflicting ideals, ours, and those of the Soviet Union. If I use "us" and the "Soviet Union," I do that only rhetorically, for brevity and simplicity. I am talking about the two parts of the divided world, what we call the Western Democracies and the Communist Bloc with the third part being the uncommitted nations.

## Democracy - The American Proposition

Let us take the American proposition first. The American proposition is Democracy. Democracy as we conceive it now in the twentieth century is the *politically* classless society, a society in which all human beings are given the dignity of political status, political freedom, political rights and equality of status and rights as citizens of a republic. The American proposition needs no other statement than that given in the Declaration of Independence, in that amazing long sentence which begins the second paragraph. It is there that we have the declaration of the equality of man, their equality in natural rights including equality in freedom and the pursuit of happiness. In the continuation of that sentence we have the declaration of the principles of constitutional government, of the limited powers of government depending upon the consent of the governed. Add that to the preamble of the Constitution and you have in our American proposition the declaration of equal justice under the law with political justice achieved in the last one hundred and fifty years through universal suffrage, suffrage gradually extended until it has become universal.

Before I leave the American proposition, let me call your attention to one clause in the preamble of the Constitution, the so-called "general welfare clause." I call your attention to it so that you will understand that the words "welfare" or "general welfare", which in our time have come to describe the "welfare state" is *not* a Russian invention. The phrase "general welfare" is in the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution declares itself "to promote the general welfare."

Our eighteenth century ancestors, however, could not have conceived of the promotion of the general welfare, the participation of all men in welfare, in the basic economic sense, a participation in the goods of life, in the comforts, conveniences, and the decencies of living. They declared the purpose of promoting the general welfare but could not have figured out any means for doing it.

## Socialism-the Russian Proposition

Hold that for a moment and turn to the Russian proposition. If the American proposition is Democracy, the Russian proposition is Socialism. If Democracy is the *politically* classless society, Socialism is the *economically* classless society. If our proposition is expressed in the Declaration (of Independence), theirs is in the Communist Manifesto. Let me give you the best possible

interpretation of the Communist Manifesto. Leaving out all the bombast that Marx has put in it and all his wonderful eloquence, it comes down again to another document of equality. But here the emphasis is on the *economic* equality of men, on an economically classless society in which the difference between the propertied and the property-less, between owners and workers shall be abolished. Put in the highest terms, it is an equality of participation in economic welfare, a society that shall not be divided into those who have and those who have not .

If we are devoted to justice, so too are they devoted to justice. If our justice is primarily political, at the beginning at least, theirs in the Communist Manifesto is the justice that cries out against exploitation and for economic welfare spread as far as possible.

Are these two propositions stating *ideals* and taken in isolation from any specific means of accomplishing them in conflict? The answer is flatly and completely "No." There is no conflict between the ideal that I have just pulled out of the Communist Manifesto and the ideal that is there in the Declaration of Independence. The ideal of the classless society involves the elimination of both political and economic class distinctions: no division between rulers and ruled, no division between owners and workers, no division between haves and have-nots.

The great vision of this future state (which doesn't yet exist) held before us by de Tocqueville in 1835, was a vision of democracy (he used the word "democracy" for it, not "socialism") as the completely classless society defined as one in which an equality of conditions will prevail. But when de Tocqueville talked about democracy as a society in which an equality of conditions would prevail , he didn't mean just political conditions or political rights, he was talking about economic conditions as well.

If that is the ideal, then the word democracy can be used in the total sense as standing for the classless society, classless both politically and economically.

Let us return for a moment to the Communist Manifesto. What *means* are proposed by the Communist Manifesto, what *means* are dogmatically asserted by the followers of Marx as to the way of achieving an economically classless society? You know the answer. The first and central proposition is the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production, the centralization of ownership in the state. The state shall own all the instruments of production.

## A Conflict of Means

Here, then, we have a very serious conflict, a conflict on the level of means. I wish I had the time to discuss this point in full detail. I think, however, I can cover it clearly enough in brief. Once all ownership of the means of production is concentrated in the state you cannot avoid totalitarian results. You will have men, you will have the whole population, in a naked relation to the state. Private corporations are abolished. Trade unions are abolished. The absence of trade unions is just as serious as the absence of private corporations in Russia. With the total economic power concentrated in the state, men are defenseless in their relation to the state. There are no intermediate organizations or associations.

So what you have in Russia, if I may call it such, is a *totalitarian welfare state*. May I use the phrase "welfare state" for the moment, as a state trying to promote the general welfare so that all of its people can participate in its economic welfare. Taking the Russian ideal seriously, it is a totalitarian welfare state because its means for achieving that end, its means for promoting the general welfare, depend on the abolition of the private ownership of the means of production and on state ownership or control.

Can Russia become democratic in our sense of the word without giving up the central socialist dogma? Can Russia, holding on to *its* ideal of the general welfare participated by all, become democratic without giving up the central socialist dogma? I think the answer could be "yes".

Most of the socialist parties of Western Europe went on record two or three years ago. with the one exception of the socialist party in France, renouncing the dogma of the abolition of private property, the dogma that the state must nationalize the ownership of all means of production . And the reason why the socialist parties of Western Europe from the Scandinavian and Low Countries down to Italy and England did this was because they saw clearly that to achieve the ends of socialism by the Marxist method of nationalizing the means of production produces a *non*-democratic result. These are social democratic parties that want to combine socialism *with* democracy.

Let me ask the opposite question for a moment. Can we achieve the ends of socialism, universal economic welfare and economic classlessness without abolishing private property? Most of the democratic welfare states, I mean England, the United States, Sweden (we are all democratic welfare states) have already gone

along way toward abolishing private property. We have certainly attenuated the rights of private property very seriously, invaded its rights and its earnings.

As I said a moment ago, the state is not an ideological issue or conflict, but a real issue and one in which the opponents are not very far apart. In fact, you can almost see the convergence if you look at what is happening in the western democracies which are socialist and if you look at what is happening in Russia. The difference is a very slight one. It is utterly wrong to regard the difference as black and white. Both are moving toward the middle with a difference in two greys.

### **The Democratic Welfare State**

What I am trying to say is that a nontotalitarian, a truly democratic welfare state (assuming that the word "socialism" stands for the *wrong* means and the word "welfare" stands for the *right ideal*) can be achieved by relatively slight accommodations from both sides.

This being so, let us look at the actual situation as we find it . What is the present state of affairs as far as the whole world is concerned in this competition between two views that are moving toward one another? First, let us look at the two documents. I think we have to be frank enough to admit that here the Russians have a great advantage over us. We need a stirring statement of the American ideal. We need a sixty page pamphlet as eloquent as the Communist Manifesto. You could read the Declaration of Independence out loud in the most eloquent voice to the peoples of the world and they would be unmoved. It is 18th century in its language and its imagery. It means a great deal to us as a hallmark of tradition and education, but it doesn't communicate to the rest of the world. We need someone with the genius of Karl Marx who could state the American proposition with as much force, as much persuasion, as much vigo as the Communist Manifesto presents the Russian proposition.

From the point of view of a large part of the world, our position is as revolutionary as theirs but we have not yet presented it effectively as a revolution to sweep the world. They exceed us greatly in revolutionary zeal and missionary spirit. We simply don't carry the flag as they do.

In the second place, which of the two doctrines is more exportable, or to use a vulgar word, the more saleable, the more persuasive to the uncommitted, the underdeveloped, developing or emerging

nations of the world? I think again the advantage is with them because large scale industrialization and mass education must precede democracy. You couldn't have the kind of democracy we have in this country today in the eighteenth century. This country wasn't a democracy in the eighteenth century, it was an oligarchy and had to be such under the technological and educational conditions that then existed.

### **Problem of Rapid Industrialization**

Only through 150 years of great social and institutional changes mainly on the technological side and with the industrialization that resulted, plus the slow spread of education have we gotten to the point where we could have universal suffrage. Even so it still isn't perfectly effective. But if industrialization and mass education must precede the formation of democracy, then when you turn to the new emerging nations of the world, don't you see that if they want to industrialize *quickly* and to create mass education *quickly*, they will have to do it in a manner that is undemocratic.

I remember several years ago at Aspen we had two Indian guests, both of them interested in Indian education and economics, who pointed out in a lecture that India had a very serious choice. To compete with the other nations of the world it would have to industrialize very quickly, but to do so it would have to be done in a totalitarian manner. To take a backward, agricultural country and industrialize it quickly requires centralized government and bureaucratic controls of a high order. If on the other hand, India wished to retain democratic processes and democratic institutions, it would have to pay the price in slow industrialization and slow social change. We accomplished this in 150 years. You can not expect the uncommitted nations to do it in five or ten years without foisting totalitarian or dictatorial methods on them which are inimical to democracy.

Furthermore, in addressing the underprivileged of the world, the have-nots, the economic appeal is stronger than the political. If our message is basically one of political rights, political freedoms, and the communist message is one of bread, and the beginnings of having some of the goods of life, their message has a strong appeal than ours.

### **Theory and Practice Compared**

Let us compare for a moment theory and practice in both countries. We are generally a pragmatic people. As a people we seldom

commit ourselves to basic truths even if the Declaration says there are self-evident truths. Curiously enough, these “self-evident” truths are not carried out in the tenure of the American thinking. Americans don’t like self-evident truths. In fact they are uncomfortable if anything is said to them simply and absolutely.

We like to be relativist, pragmatists. to see how things work , to give the other fellow a chance to express his opinion. Unfortunately our relativism and our pragmatism Undermines our convictions. I think Walter Lippmann was quite correct some years ago when he wrote in the Public Philosophy and tried to persuade his fellow countrymen that they had to adopt the view of the natural moral law, that if they were going to defend the American proposition there were things fundamentally right and fundamentally wrong. Our defense, our case is weakened by a lack of firm conviction in the underlying principles that make the American proposition true. In addition to that, our practice, in the eyes of the world, falls short of our ideals in glaring particulars. We need only mention the problems of the American Negro in this century to suggest what the world looks at when they ask how democracy is practiced in this country.

Now on the other side of the line, the side of the Soviet Union, if our pragmatism is a defect, their dogmatism is likewise. Their dogmatism prevents them from understanding how much of their values we have achieved without adopting their means. John Strachey, the leading intellectual English columnist and member of the Labor Government, wrote a piece recently called the *Challenge of Democracy*. It is an extraordinary document for in the course of recent years John Strachey has changed considerably from an out and out exponent of the Communist cause in England to an out and out exponent of democracy. In his first book called *The Coming Struggle for Power* he took the other side. But recently he has pointed out that Marx and Lenin as well as the Communists following them have in general made two errors in which they, themselves, are blinded by their own doctrine. One is the error of assuming that the socialization of an economy cannot be accomplished without violence. Is violent revolution necessary, asks Strachey when the west including England and the United States have socialized their economies by due process of law with no violence at all? The second is their insistence that capitalism sows the seeds of its own destruction, that it must necessarily destroy itself, that it cannot possibly raise the level of the working class or improve the conditions of agriculture. Both of these things have been done in the course of the last hundred years. Capitalism has socialized itself.



Curiously enough, the Marxists are not the only ones blinded by their doctrine. We are blinded by ours when we fail to see how far we have gone in that direction of socialism. They mistakenly think we are still old fashioned capitalists. They still write that way and talk that way. Unfortunately, most of them mistakenly think the same thing. We are not. We are both wrong.

If you speak in terms of the social ideal, we have moved I would say about ninety percent in their direction. They have moved thirty percent in ours. I am talking about the difference between capitalism in England or the United States as it existed say in 1864 and as it exists in 1964. It would help us both to take the blindfolds off and look at the facts squarely. Their practice falls as far short of their ideals as ours does.

In Russia, as Djilas pointed out in that extraordinary book *The New Class*, the governmental bureaucracy, the operators, the managers, and controllers while nominally not the owners of the capital wealth of the country are to all intents and purposes an owning class. The rest of the people are workers. There are, great economic inequalities in the Soviet system. They have their haves and have nots. Why don't we make use of these facts as they make use of our treatment of the Negro as an example of our failing in practice to live up to our ideals? Because in falling away from the socialist ideal we think they are moving in our direction. That, however, is the wrong way to look at it. It would be much better for us to criticize them for failing to live up to their ideals.

### **The Paradox of Education**

Finally, let us consider the paradox of education in the two countries. The great Russian achievement is *not* in technology or in science. It is their achievement in education. They have done something quite remarkable here considering where they began forty years ago and where they are now in achieving a mass educational system.

A book that Mr. Hutchins and I edit annually called *The Great Ideas Today* and which will be published in October will include five papers on America by five European commentators. One of them is Alexei Adzhubei, Khrushchev's son-in-law, who formerly was editor of Pravda and is now editor of Izvestia. Discussing the difference in "consumption" in the United States and Russia, the consumption of, *cultural values*, he says, "It is clear that in this area, we have left you behind a long time ago. We think that you now could learn from us how to comprehend and create cultural

values, learn in the same way we in our time learned technical progress from you. In the Soviet Union, every third person is studying in primary and secondary schools, in specialized secondary educational institutions, in colleges and universities, in one or another course of advanced training, in factory training schools, etc. We graduate three times as many engineers each year as the United States. We have more theaters, and the Soviet people read many times more books than the Americans." This, I am afraid is true. They have more opportunities to engage in sports instrumental music, singing, dancing, etc. Adzhubeu is not speaking vainly, he is correct. The amazing thing about this educational achievement in Russia, paradoxically, is that it may be Russia's undoing as Strachey points out, I think quite accurately: "The genuine mass education which is going on in the Communist countries will only give them a commanding position in the world if in the end it corrects all their other ghastly mistakes. I believe that it will do so. For well educated men and women will not, in the end, tolerate living under the now unnecessary constraints and hardships of the present day Communist countries. Above all, well educated men and

and women will not tolerate indefinitely the lack of personal and political liberty which there prevails. They will insist on establishing political institutions which will give them some control of their government and this will be democracy."

What Strachey is saying is that as Russia prompted by the need for the technical schools of a modern country increases education, it will have to liberalize education and as it liberalizes education, it will also liberate men's minds and produce a ferment that will move Russia toward Democracy. That is the paradox of the Russian achievement.

And what is the paradox of the American situation in education? Where Russia has succeeded in mass education and will and will undo itself by its success, so we have failed in mass education and will undo ourselves by failure. Our failure is as remarkable as their success. Their success is not a success of liberal schooling. It needn't be. It is a highly specialized technical education. But our country, a democracy where all men are citizens, should be one in which liberal schooling should prevail from bottom to top. It is here that we have failed and failed dismally. We have failed to solve the problem of educating all our people as free men should be educated. This may be the paradox, this may be the undoing of democracy. Because we shall have to have more and more bureaucracy in the operations of government, less and less

participation of the people who are uneducated for the purpose of participating in government.

What is the future? What is the long view in this divided world? Leaving blind ideologies aside, let me repeat that there is no conflict of ideals here at all, no conflict of aspirations. Each side dogmatically denies that the other has any ideals worth considering but this I say is just blind dogmatism. A democratic welfare state is possible, a democratic welfare state combining the two ideals is possible. It will come. de Tocqueville's prophecy that the future belongs to such a democracy will be fully realized. As we move toward this future for all men everywhere, because I assure you it is one that concerns the whole of mankind, all the nations that are now emerging as well as those that are at the top of the pile, only three real problems remain to be solved. The first is the problem of property, the problem of private property and private corporations that prevents totalitarianism, property in the means of production so managed that conflict between propertied and property-less is eliminated. I am saying that we must keep our eye on the welfare goal but achieve it by capitalist means, by the means of private property and free enterprise. We must not give up our part of the ideal of universal participation in economic welfare. In the "Capitalist Manifesto" which I wrote with Mr. Kelso, we stated the simple proposition that we have to increase the diffusion of the ownership of private property and capital. If the slogan of democracy is every man a citizen, then the slogan of the democratic welfare state is everyman a citizen and a capitalist, too.

### **Problem of Mass Unemployment**

The second problem, closely connected with the first is the problem of technology, mass unemployment, and the problem of free time. You may have read in Life several weeks ago the prediction that within twenty-five years two percent of the population would be able to do all the work necessary. The other ninety-eight percent would be unemployed. If Life is extreme here, let the figure be twenty or even twenty-five percent it is still a very striking thing to look forward to. We will face this problem sooner than Russia, but Russia will face it too and when a socialist or totalitarian state faces the problem of mass unemployment it has a problem far more serious than ours.

How can this problem be solved? It can't be solved, I assure you, if a large portion of the population remains wage earners. If earning a living by wages remains the only way by which most men can earn a living, then how are we going to handle the great majority of the

people who will be unemployed in the relatively near future? If you handle it in the totalitarian way, you do so by hand-outs from the state to support the unemployed .

The only other way I can see of handling this extraordinary problem that will soon be upon us is to have income come to individuals and families from the earnings of capital as opposed to the earnings of labor, the dividends of capital instead of the wages of labor and this can only be accomplished by the widest possible diffusion of the ownership of capital. In other words only the capitalist welfare state can solve the problem of unemployment. The totalitarian welfare state will not solve it.


Finally, the problem of education. It is the same problem both here and in Russia and ultimately everywhere in the world as we move toward the future. It is the problem of educating men for a life of economic unemployment, for citizenship, and for the uses of free time and leisure, not play, not indulgence, not fun and games, but the serious activities of leisure. This is the problem that we all face. Within another 150 years most men will have the greater part of their lives occupied with free time. For I am sure that for the few who will work, the work life will not last longer than from age twenty-live to fifty, and we will all live to be one hundred, and this, this great mass of free time we shall have to seriously occupy or drive ourselves out of our wits.

### **Problem of War and Peace**

I come finally to the problem in which we all are concerned, the problem of war and peace. We know, or should know, now that a hot war can no longer be won . With thermo nuclear weapons any war is a war lost for all sides. We ought, I think also to understand that the cold war can not be won, precisely because in the cold war we have a conflict of ideologies, a conflict between half truths and opposite blindnesses. If we won the cold war in that sense of the term, it would be a disservice to the world. If the Russians won the cold war, in that sense of the term, it would be a disservice to the world.

One further point. Among the dogmas of Communism is the false notion that war has its basic roots in capitalism. Both Marx and after him Lenin predicted that as long as there were capitalistic countries trying to exploit underdeveloped countries and competing with one another for foreign markets we would have war. The notion that war is a function of capitalist exploitation and competition is as absurd as saying that only tyrannies and

dictatorships can get along together or that if all countries were equally democratic there would be no war. We know that China and Russia, that Albania and Yugoslavia could be at each others' throats and that they are all Communist countries. We know that the facts of history are against the supposition that if countries are republics, or democracies, they don't go to war. The facts stand against both misleading notions. War would exist in a world of separate Communist states, war would exist in a world of separate capitalist states, war would exist in a state of separate dictatorships, or separate democracies. For the only root cause of war is the existence of separate sovereign states.

As Mr. Strachey says very succinctly at the end of his paper, the cause of war seems to be simply the existence of separate sovereign states, whether capitalist, socialist, feudal, or any other kind. It is the fact that the world is organized, or rather disorganized into over one hundred sovereign states, that is the cause of war and if so as I firmly believe it is, the only remedy as some of us have been saying for over twenty years is World Federal Government. But let me add a point here. World Federal Government is not feasible in a world divided as our world is. We could not have the Communist states and the western states federate together, because they are still acting as if they disagree about fundamental aims and ideals. But world federal government may become, will become, more feasible, I think, in the next fifty years to the extent that both sides of our divided world come to see that all mankind must move toward one and the same ideal, namely that of the democratic welfare state, a welfare state and a democratic state, one that involves not the state ownership but the private ownership of the means of production, nevertheless a welfare state in which the economic welfare of every man is the concern of the state . If this comes about, who will have won the present conflict? Neither the East nor the West will have won, but mankind will have won. 

*We welcome your comments, questions, or suggestions.*

---

---

## THE GREAT IDEAS ONLINE

is published weekly for its members by the

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE GREAT IDEAS

Founded in 1990 by Mortimer J. Adler & Max Weismann

Elaine Weismann, Publisher and Editor

Phone: 312-943-1076 Mobile: 312-280-1011

David S. Peterson, Managing Director

A not-for-profit (501)(c)(3) educational organization.

Donations are tax deductible as the law allows.