

THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE IDEOLOGY OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY IN CANADA

by David LEWIS

One who has been a socialist activist all his adult life knows better than to suggest that social democrats in Canada have been in the same party or movement solely because they all have the same ideological perspective. Such a proposition is especially inappropriate for one who has himself been a participant in, and sometimes at the centre of many internal ideological debates. As is usually the case with political debates, when people are determined to draw sharp lines rather than engage in painstaking analysis, the exchanges were not infrequently distinguished more by emotional rancour than intellectual rigour. But they were sparked by deeply believed differences, not only tactical but also philosophical, by loyal adherents on both sides.

These experiences in Canada, and some knowledge of similar movements elsewhere, have led me to the conclusion that social democratic or democratic socialist parties (personally I use the two terms interchangeably) are necessarily pluralistic. The unifying ideological perceptions are a composite of varying tendencies. Sometimes the composite is arrived at by simple compromise, sometimes by a semantic adjustment which changes no one, but quite often it is a genuine mixture of ideas consciously accepted by varying factions.

As I have suggested, social democratic parties are necessarily pluralistic. Their doors are open to anyone who is willing to sign an application and pay the modest dues required. Only those who are active supporters of rival and competing parties are excluded. Entrants are not put through any catechism, take no oath, are not even questioned about their beliefs. Their willingness to join is evidence of their interest, - no more is required. There is an open invitation to all who are to some degree dissatisfied with the capitalist system and wish to see fundamental change made by the democratic process. Again the limits are drawn by exclusion, namely, those who believe in violent revolution and dictatorship as the means for achieving change are not knowingly admitted. The result is, and is intended to be a mass organization of citizens who have joined together for reasons and motives as variegated as autumn colours. This occurs because the democratic process requires it, because, in fact, democracy is by definition pluralistic, whatever else it may or may not be.

With this framework in mind, I turn now to the Canadian experience. It is

important to remember that before 1932 there was no national social democratic party. Indeed, there was no effective such party on any scale, but there had for many been devoted and active socialist groups in many parts of the country. For decades there had existed numerous local socialist parties of varying temperaments. There were parties claiming Marxist origins, parties showing British influence, parties based on unions and parties under the guidance of the Christian Social Gospel. More accurately, perhaps, some or all of these characteristics could be found in all the parties.

I was myself a member of the executives of the Quebec and Montreal Labour Parties while an undergraduate at McGill University in the late twenties and the first couple of years of the depression. While the two parties were technically separate, they had the same membership and were really the same bodies. They had been formed following the 1917 Trades and Labour Congress resolution calling for the establishment of a Canadian Labour Party, as had many other provincial and local parties. It is true that the Quebec and Montreal parties were among the least effective in the land. In addition to being so small as to be hardly noticeable, they were not at all representative since they were almost entirely English-speaking. I mention them because, despite the fact that they were otherwise inconsequential, they were in my own experience, a miniature example of the mix of ideological strands which were later woven into the fabric of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Some of us claimed a Marxist approach deriving from the language of the Second International ; some were labourites pure and simple ; a few were there to translate their Christian ethics into social action. Because we were a small and intimate group, with little contact outside except for the McGill Labour Club and the Young People's Socialist League, to both of which some of us also belonged, we huddled together for spiritual warmth and debated the validity of our respective socialist approaches with passion. And despite our small size we regularly succeeded in electing a member to the Montreal City Council and were in sporadic touch with other Labour Parties.

There were such parties across the country, some of them much more effective and important. From time to time dating back some decades, labour and socialist candidates were elected to Parliament and more were elected to the Legislatures of Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba and British Columbia, particularly after the first World War. Indeed, in 1919 Labour joined with the United Farmers of Ontario to form the government of their province. In 1920 four Labour members were elected to the legislature of British Columbia and a few years later five Labour members were elected at the other end of the country, in Nova Scotia. The most important socialist electoral successes during the pre-CCF period were those which brought J.S Woodsworth and Wm. Irvine, later A.A. Heaps and still later Angus Mac Innis to Parliament

in elections between 1921 and 1930. It is interesting and relevant to note that of the four men mentioned, two, Woodsworth and Irvine, were Protestant Ministers, and the other two active trade unionists. It is also interesting to note that of the latter, Mac Innis was at the time a strong Marxist, - although an equally strong anti-communist, - and Heaps derived his ideas from the British labour movement. It is doubtful whether without these men, particularly J.S. Woodsworth, an effective social democratic party would have emerged, although other men and forces also played a crucial part.

It is typical of Canada that one of the major forces participating in the formation of the new, national social democratic party, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, in 1932 and 1933, were strong farmer organizations from Ontario and the Prairie Provinces. Canadian farmers felt neglected by governments which seemed a mere extension of Bay and St. James Streets. They saw the golden chain of government stretch between Montreal and Toronto with only a courtesy stop in Ottawa. (In those days Montreal was still a financial centre equal to Toronto). Furthermore, they saw World War I produce great wealth and monopolistic concentrations in finance and industry, while their own condition remained insecure. Farmers continued to operate subject to costs set by the corporations which provided them with transportation, equipment, fertilizer, feed and seed and subject also to prices set by private exchanges on the world markets. Both costs and prices were beyond their control and they felt squeezed between them. Their normal apprehensions about weather, costs, prices and cash flow had been exacerbated during the war by the imposition of conscription which had left them shorthanded and angry. Conditions thus pushed the farmers toward effective protest movements in two directions : politics and producer co-operatives.

Although the ideological contours of the farmer political movements differed in many respects from those of the Socialist, Social Democratic, Labour and Independant Labour Parties of the cities, they overlapped not only in their resentment of the establishment, but also in some of their important ideas. The farmer has his own grievances as did the urban worker, but both could agree that drastic action was needed to curb monopolistic control in finance, railroads and industry, in some instances going as far as public ownership. They agreed also that Canada needed a system of welfare and social security and that neither of the established parties could be trusted to do anything about their needs.

In 1921 the United Farmers of Alberta won the government of that province with the support of Labour and in the same year the Progressive Party elected 65 members to the Parliament of Canada. Their ideas were a mixture of populist objection to party politics and a request for group representation, of demands for financial

controls to ensure security of land tenure for the farmer and of angry opposition to the big corporations which held farmers in their grip. The Progressive Party had the opportunity of becoming the Official Opposition and thus the alternative to the Liberal Government. But partly because the Progressives lacked a unifying ideological framework, partly because their election platform had condemned party government and partly because too many of them felt much more at home inside the Liberal Party than outside opposing it, eighty per cent of them were seduced back into the fold by the cunning of the Prime Minister of the day - a political seduction unmatched in Canada until very recently. However, enough Progressives resisted King's resistable charm that an eloquent and strong Parliamentary group of farmer and labour representatives was formed under the leadership of Woodsworth.

The developments briefly and inadequately sketched above occurred or sharpened as a result of the first World War. As in other countries, the devastation of a war caused, as almost everyone by then agreed, by crass competition for markets, and the economic dislocation that followed, produced protest and revolt in Canada. The Russian revolution excited Canadians as well and no doubt increased the militancy and hopes of the existing socialist and labour parties. Indeed, when one adds the fact that the pre-war immigration wave had brought large settlements from eastern Europe, particularly to the prairies, it is not hard to see that the defeat of the Czar would cause widespread excitement, even joy in their ranks, at least at first. An even more important influence was the adoption of an explicit socialist program by the British Labour Party, the news of which was brought into thousands of Canadian homes by mail and press directly from the 'old country'. The stimulus imported by the events in Europe during the twenties was evident even to a teen-ager like myself, living in an anglophone working-class district in Montreal peopled by recent newcomers from eastern Europe.

As one would expect, when the Third International was established, a communist party was founded in Canada. I mention this because it produced a split in socialist ranks which had another important influence on the development of the social democratic ideology. The hard-nosed marxist who believed in armed revolution as the only possible or desirable culmination of the class struggle, broke away from the existing socialist and labour parties because he now had his own more congenial home. This meant that the marxism of those who remained in the older groups became a tool of social analysis rather than a blueprint for revolution, despite their rhetoric.

The story so far shows that when the Great Depression hit Canada, some of the previously unrelated and localized parties of protest had become aware of each

other's existence and of their affinity of ideas. This was true not only of the relations among the socialist and labour parties but also of the relations between them and the farmer parties. In Parliament and in some provincial legislatures representatives of both had been working together amicably and successfully for some years. The necessary human and ideological contacts had developed which the Depression promoted into a search for some sort of organizational fusion. But before this took place stirrings also occurred in the intellectual world.

Almost as soon as the crash of the Great Depression was heard, small groups of younger and young professors, with the occasional undergraduate, began to meet at the universities of McGill and Toronto not so much to study the state of the world as to discuss how young socialist intellectuals could help to change it. The two groups, together with a few from other universities, met early in 1932 to form the League for Social Reconstruction. To the everlasting glory and chagrin of Cecil Rhodes, a few of the leading founders of the L.S.R. had come into contact with the British Labour Party and the Fabian Society while Rhodes Scholars at Oxford University in England. The L.S.R. with some of the brightest university minds at the head, was excited by the opportunity to contribute to the development of the ideology and program of the new farmer-labour-socialist party which came on the scene some months later as the C.C.F. It was almost an automatic reflex that Woodsworth be made Honorary President.

It was obviously not an accident that among the intellectuals of the L.S.R. were found a number who came there through their belief that, as Woodsworth once put it, "Christianity stands for social righteousness as well as personal righteousness". Thus, in 1934 a group formed the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order and adopted a set of democratic socialist objectives similar to the L.S.R. manifesto. Indeed, some of them had taken part in the ideological discussions leading to the Regina Manifesto of the C.C.F. adopted a year earlier.

I have tried to outline briefly, more for our distinguished visitors than for my fellow-Canadians, the various strands which were woven together in the Regina Manifesto. In my opinion, they continue to be the main influences on the party's ideology today, even though the name of the party and the tone of its declarations have changed. The changes derive from social and economic developments which have changed some of the concepts, smoothed much of the anger and diminished the sense of urgency. Let me mention briefly a few of the relevant and obvious developments.

Canada has built a fairly wide system of social security in the post Second World War decades, - for which here, as everywhere else, social democrats rightly take much of the credit. The condition of the farmers is no longer as desperate, the rural population has been steadily declining and most of the farmer organizations have become quiescent and politically inactive. The influences on social democratic thinking have therefore shifted more to the cities and to the Labour Movement. And Labour's stance has also changed substantially since the prewar years, changes produced by the breathtaking technological developments and the immense economic growth. If the relative inequalities persist, as they do, they are nevertheless present on much higher economic plateaux, for the time being at least.

I say 'for the time being' because it may well be that our society is on the threshold of a revolt against the relentless assault of technology on our resources, our senses and our values. It may well be that we are on the verge of a revolt, perhaps sparked by the struggling developing nations, against the grasping hold of the multinationals which threaten to become, if they are not already, more powerful than governments. There is evidence of a widening movement to reduce the alienation suffered by workers through giving them some measure of control not only over their conditions of work but over the management, investment and other decisions which affect the quality of their lives and that of the community. No doubt the ideological concepts will sooner or later respond to the new urgency and new struggles.

There may well be an arguable case for the ideas of moral imperative and natural rights. When one is cold-bloodedly logical, one is tempted to question their existence. But when one is warm-bloodedly human, one is inclined to feel with some passion that justice, truth, decency, equality and respect for the dignity of the human being are self-evident moral obligations which give meaning to individual and collective life. Social democrats accept these as immutable objectives holding a permanent and honoured place in their ideology. But to insist that concepts relating to social analysis, and to strategies and tactics for change, are unalterable holy writ, can lead at best to stultifying error and at worst to the obscene perversions which characterized Stalinism.

As I have already mentioned, the first statement of philosophy as well as program pronounced by the first effective national social democratic party, the C.C.F., was the Regina Manifesto in 1933. It was thus written, debated and adopted at the bottom of the Great Depression. What emerged was a composite mainly of four ideological approaches : marxism, rural revolt which was deeper than the populism in the United States although influenced by it, the British Labour Party, Scandi-

navian socialism and the Christian Social Gospel. It was not revolutionary but it was a ringing document of indignation and commitment to social change. It could be nothing less at a time when the social fabric was deteriorating and unemployment and despair stalked the land.

It was marxist in some of its analysis of the capitalist order : it condemned class exploitation and capitalist concentration of wealth and power. But there was nothing remarkable about that. Most reputable thinkers had by then adopted some of the marxian methodology and social criticism. The Manifesto did not speak of surplus value, of historical materialism or of the class struggle. On the contrary, it spoke the language of peaceful change and of compassion for the weak. It found it necessary to assert that "We do not believe in change by violence", despite heated opposition by some marxists.

According to many of my colleagues who were present in Regina, the debates at the Convention were always heated and at times distressing. There seemed to be no way of bridging the differences between the radical marxists from British Columbia and the conservative farm spokesmen from Ontario and Manitoba, for example. But the influences of British moderate socialism and of Christian ethics prevailed. The times demanded a positive result ; it was unthinkable that men and women all of whom agreed that the existing system had caused and was causing inhuman hardships should refuse to unite their forces to do something about it. All sides made concessions.

The final document was more practical than dogmatic, even if it still lent itself to serious misrepresentation aimed at frightening Canadians about the menace of socialist regimentation, one of the more frequent formulations by powerful opponents. Woodsworth, as the natural president, expressed the conviction that "We may develop in Canada a distinctive type of socialism". Earlier in the same sentence he had described himself as having inherited "the individualism common to all born on the American continent" and described his "political and social ideals" as "profoundly influenced by British traditions and so-called Christian idealism". Having worked with Woodsworth and admired his pedagogic techniques, I have never had any doubt but that in these words Woodsworth was also describing the dominant influences which he hoped had guided the group collectively.

Some highly regarded Canadian scholars like Walter Young and Leo Zakuta have argued that the C.C.F. was a movement at first and only later became an electoral party. Others have charged that some of us had weakened its soul by reshaping it into a mere party. My hope to live long enough to understand the relevance of the distinction for a purely political organization grows dimmer as the years pass before

me, but in any case the Manifesto made very clear that it was the statement of a democratic electoral party. It stated :

This social and economic transformation can be brought about by political action, through the election of a government inspired by the ideal of a Co-operative Commonwealth and supported by a majority of the people. We do not believe in change by violence. We consider that both the old parties in Canada are the instruments of capitalist interest and cannot serve as agents of social reconstruction, and that whatever the superficial differences between them, they are bound to carry on government in accordance with the dictates of the big business interests who finance them. The CCF aims at political power in order to put an end to this capitalist domination of our political life. It is a democratic movement, a federation of farmer, labor and socialist organizations, financed by its own members and seeking to achieve its ends solely by constitutional methods .

I would have thought that a statement so clear could not possibly be misinterpreted except wilfully. But I was wrong. Once again I underrated the human capacity for obfuscation even, or perhaps particularly, in academia, when a fond theory is in need of living colour.

It was because the CCF was always, as the NDP is today, a political party hoping to be elected to power by the free vote of the people that the semantic concessions to the marxists became serious obstacles. This, it was felt , required specific recognition of a mixed economy and assurance that private business which continues to exist in the cooperative commonwealth, would "be given every opportunity to function, to earn a fair rate of return and to make its contribution to the nation's wealth". This was stated as early as 1944, again after fierce debate.

The post-war years did not bring another depression like the thirties nor did they see the widespread dislocation that all of us had expected. Instead, there was economic advance, exciting scientific and technological developments and the beginnings of a serious system of social security. Capitalism was still motivated by the same forces, concentrations of wealth and power were still in control, only more of them were in foreign hands. But the angry and unqualified language of 1933 and the demand for large-scale socialization did not sound as true. Hence the Winnipeg Declaration of 1956 for the CCF and the moderate shape of the ideology of the NDP.

Although the economy was on a down-turn in 1961, when the New Democratic Party was founded, the underlying post-war trends continued. The economic

and social program adopted by the Founding Convention was a comprehensive document which dealt with every aspect of Canada's life. A couple of points are particularly relevant to our discussion.

The document mocked the "superstition" of "free enterprise" and undertook to "expand public and co-operative ownership for such purposes as the operation of utilities, the development of resources, the elimination of monopoly concentrations of power, and the operation of major enterprises immediately and directly affecting the entire nation". Elsewhere it condemned the "unemployment, waste, political corruption and commercialization of taste and values" and dedicated the N.D.P. to "carry forward to new levels of achievement the best objectives of the farmer and labour, co-operative and social democratic movements. . .".

The language is less strident, less desperate and, perhaps, less urgent, but the ultimate objective of a society which is socialist as well as democratic, free as well as collectivists, is clear.

Critics shot at those responsible for the revisions the ultimate insult: we were accused of being concerned about winning votes. Imagine socialists being attracted to such bourgeois, not to say effete activities. Admittedly I have exaggerated the attitude of the critics and I apologize to them. It would be more accurate to say that the accusation was that we were anxious to win, whatever the cost. But the exaggeration was deliberate to dramatize what I believe to be an important theoretical error.

I suggest there is no virtue and, perhaps, no meaning in an ideology which remains pure because no one, or almost no one, wants to touch it. This is much closer to being utopian, if it is anything other than self-indulgence by people who are frustrated by the constraints of the democratic process and are either too timid or too intelligent to opt for revolution and totalitarianism. There is simply no more virtue in socialist fundamentalism than there is in close-minded rigidity in any other area of intellectual inquiry.

I do not want to enter into the seemingly endless argument as to what constitutes ideology as distinct from other categories of ideas about society. I merely wish to stress that, in my opinion, unless an ideology is a relatively consistent cluster of ideas about society which are intended to guide and are capable of evoking effective action to preserve or to transform the status quo, it is irrelevant no matter how touchingly articulated or how passionately held. I have a suspicion that in this formulation I am more marxist than some of the critics, since elaborate but ineffectual propositions were cardinal sins in Marx's eyes.

It is self-evident that within the framework of the ideology, there is room for discussion and argument as to the pace at which one wishes to see desirable results. There is always room for differences which derive from more or less experience in implementing objectives, more or less audacity, more or less courage, more or less passion, more or less commitment, above all, more or less wisdom. If one had to, I suppose one could place in the left column those with more audacity and greater passion and in the right column those with more caution and greater equanimity. I have strong objection to this kind of exercise because it takes too much time and effort to arrange and rearrange the columns, since the perception of left and right tends to change with many substantial issues.

In Canada today there is not much sense talking about something called the working class aware of itself and of its alleged revolutionary role, although there is a great deal of sense talking about working people and their democratic power. The fact is that the farmers and white collar workers do not see themselves as members of the working class. Yet for effective socialist action farmer support is essential in some parts of the country and the support of office and professional workers is crucial everywhere.

Indeed, not many blue-collar workers think of themselves consciously as of the working class. I have often thought that Lenin's hard-headed realism consisted largely in the fact that he abandoned the idea of a class-conscious working class rising spontaneously in revolt and opted, instead, for a professionally selected and trained revolutionary organization which he fitted into the Marxist frame by calling it the vanguard of the working class. In any case, to win power by the electoral process, it is necessary to persuade people of the validity and reliability of the party's approach and that means avoiding, whenever possible, concepts and words which close people's minds and frighten them away.

For similar reasons there is, in my opinion, no validity in continuing to talk about wholesale socialization as socialists did during the Depression. Then almost everyone experienced and therefore perceived the failures of so-called private enterprise. Today, in the era of consumerism and of glittering affluence, perception of the failures of capitalism requires much more sophisticated observation and analysis. Furthermore, we have learned that total or even large scale public ownership may be dangerous if the concomitant power is exercised by an arrogant government or, even more serious, by an insensitive bureaucracy. We have also learned from experiences in Canada and elsewhere that successful public ownership requires not only appropriate legislation, - much the easiest part - but massive capital for massive enterprises, as well as managerial, technological, market and productivity know-how. And we

have only in recent years learned to appreciate that changing ownership from private to public changes little unless the workers in the enterprise, from the manager to the sweeper, share the power of decision-making through some regime of worker participation. In short, we learned that nationalization is not the panacea we thought it to be nor as simple as we hoped.

This does not by any means argue for the abandonment of the idea of public ownership. On the contrary . The social democrat is still committed to the proposition that an economy planned and run by public bodies to serve human need as the first priority is morally and socially superior to an economy planned and run by private corporation for the purpose of maximizing their profits and expanding their private empires. He continues to strive not only to reform but to transform the capitalist system into a co-operative and collective one. But it does mean adapting important elements of the ideology to the evolving economic, social and political environment. Thus it is more relevant and meaningful to speak of a struggle for equality of condition for women as well as men, for natives and blacks as well as whites, for francophones as well as anglophones and for working people in every region, than to speak of a classless society in a context where it is not too difficult to identify the ruling class but not at all easy to identify the working class.

Before moving to the last section of my presentation, I want to say a few words about the fact that two elements were almost ignored in the Regina Manifesto and for years thereafter. I refer to the place of the French fact in Canada and to the foreign domination of large sectors of our economy. I do so, first, because to omit mention of these aspects of Canada's reality would leave a large gap in the presentation. Secondly, however, I also wish to suggest that one of the reasons for the omission of these areas for years from philosophic discussion and practical program was a doctrinaire application of the ideas that nationalism is evil and that a capitalist is a capitalist, whether domestic or foreign.

First as to French Canada and the CCF. Unfortunately, the French in Canada had no part in the steps that led up to Regina in 1933 and the only Quebecers present at the birth of the CCF were English-speaking. There was neither any organization nor any tradition of social democracy among the French Québécois. The result was a huge gap in the ideological framework of the Regina Manifesto and most subsequent CCF statements. There was no understanding of the French fact and no recognition of the special position of Quebec or of the Quebec people working for English-speaking bosses and disadvantaged by the fact that most of the workers could hardly speak English.

The Regina Manifesto satisfied itself by dealing with the subject obliquely in the section on the constitution. The section advocated greater centralization, which was itself in contradiction with the aspirations of the Québécois, and promised that there would be no "infringing upon racial or religious minority rights or upon legitimate provincial claims to autonomy". Exactly the same approach was taken in the Manifesto for the 1945 general election, which dealt with the Canada to be built after the war. And the Winnipeg Declaration of 1956 does no more than express pride in "our country's origins in the British and French traditions" and mention the need to "protect the traditions and constitutional rights of the provinces".

It is relevant to note that after a year or two the CCF did attract French-speaking activists in Québec, some of whom were well-trained and impressive in their knowledge of Québec and in their leadership qualities. They participated in the drafting of the later declarations. Yet they did not seem any more aware of the developing national problems than the anglophones. It was not until the debates which led to the founding of the New Democratic Party that reality of the French collectivity in Québec and the linguistic duality of Canada became important elements in the ideological discussions and statements of the party.

I cannot take the time to attempt an explanation except to point out that the change in the perceptions about Canadian and Québec society in the CCF-NDP coincided in time with the change in other political parties and even in Québec itself.

The point with respect to foreign economic control is simpler but no less myopic. There is much evidence in the CCF-NDP record that leading spokesmen from Woodsworth on were aware early of the growth of foreign investment and expressed concern about its threat to Canada's independence. But until the emergence of a new spirit of Canadian nationalism in the sixties, the party's ideological cluster did not reflect the concern. Indeed, as I said earlier, the governing assumption was that there was no difference whether the capitalist was Canadian or American. The result of this static ideological concept was near neglect of an increasingly important part of Canadian reality.

What I have been trying to do is to define the content and tone of the ideology of Canadian social democracy by reference to its development in the changing environment. As one would expect, similar developments have taken place in similar parties in other countries. Permit me to illustrate this point by citing some short excerpts from a profile of democratic socialism written by a great British socialist leader. In 1952, after some years in government, Aneurin Bevan published a personal politi-

cal statement in a book titled "In Place of Fear". Toward the end of the book he said the following in the chapter headed "Democratic Socialism".

The capacity for emotional concern for individual life is the most significant quality of a civilised human being. It is not achieved when limited to people of a certain colour, race, religion, nation or class . . . There is no test for progress other than its impact on the individual. If the policies of statesmen, the enactments of legislatures, the impulses of group activity, do not have for their object the enlargement and cultivation of the individual life, they do not deserve to be called civilised (pp. 167-8).

And a little later :

The philosophy of democratic socialism is essentially cool in temper. It sees society in its context with nature and is conscious of the limitations imposed by physical conditions. It sees the individual in his context with society and is therefore compassionate and tolerant. Because it knows that all political action must be a choice between a number of possible alternatives, it eschews all absolute prescriptions and final decisions . . . It accepts the obligation to choose among different kinds of social action and in so doing to bear the pains of rejecting what is not practicable or less desirable.

Democratic socialism is a child of modern society and so of relativist philosophy. It seeks the truth in any given situation, knowing all the time that if this be pushed too far it falls into error. It struggles against the evils that flow from private property, yet realises that all forms of private property are not necessarily evil. Its chief enemy is vacillation, for it must achieve passion in action in the pursuit of qualified judgments. It must know how to enjoy the struggle, whilst recognising that progress is not the elimination of struggle but rather a change in its terms (pp. 169-170).

I have cited from Bevan partly because he states with simple eloquence what I have been trying to say for many years. But I have also cited these passages because they bear witness to the changes in ideology or, at least, in ideological temper which an open mind and sensitive spirit shaped in response to changing conditions. The Nye Bevan whom I met and knew in the early thirties, and to whose outpourings I listened often, would have rejected much of what I have just read. Any suggestion at that time that a socialist should serve or be concerned about members of any class other than the working class would have been scorned as typical bourgeois softness

or, if he was in a tougher mood, condemned as betrayal. And statements which urged caution and suggested, in effect, that the socialist struggle may not lead to a conclusion which would require no further struggle would have called forth the kind of biting scorn for which Bevan is justly famous.

The trouble with such ideological revision is that they take some of the bite and drama out of the socialist ideology and bring it closer to other but non-socialist ideologies. It is much easier to strike sparks when the good guys confront the bad guys in vivid contrast. This has troubled social democratic leaders and is no doubt partially responsible for the factional debates which regularly explode in social democratic parties, but, in my view it is the price of ideological relevance and political progress.

The loss of drama in ideological revisions may also be the reason why continental European social democratic parties have retained much of the Marxist rhetoric, although a more important reason is the fact that Marxist categories and analysis are much more meaningful and acceptable to the people of their countries than they are to our people. But whatever the rhetoric, all social democratic parties act along similar lines in practice. They do so because they are committed to retain the democratic process, because they value freedom from political oppression and intellectual deprivation as much as or more than freedom from capitalist exploitation. They do so because, in Bevan's words, "their object (is) the enlargement and cultivation of the individual life".

The democratic road to socialism means that the socialist society will not arise full-blown with the sun one fine morning. In a sense it will never rise full-blown because it involves continuing struggle and a continuing process. The alleged socialism which confines, if it does not exclude, political, intellectual and cultural rights is rejected by the ideology of the NDP in Canada and by similar parties everywhere. History has shown that we cannot have armed revolution and a free society. A socialist must choose.