

## 2. THE GREAT UTOPIA

What has always made the state a hell on earth has been precisely that man has tried to make it his heaven.

F. Hoelderlin

That socialism has displaced liberalism as the doctrine held by the great majority of progressives does not simply mean that people had forgotten the warnings of the great liberal thinkers of the past about the consequences of collectivism. It has happened because they were persuaded of the very opposite of what these men had predicted. The extraordinary thing is that the same socialism that was not only early recognised as the gravest threat to freedom, but quite openly began as a reaction against the liberalism of the French Revolution, gained general acceptance under the flag of liberty. It is rarely remembered now that socialism in its beginnings was frankly authoritarian. The French writers who laid the foundations of modern socialism had no doubt that their ideas could be put into practice only by a strong dictatorial government. To them socialism meant an attempt to "terminate the revolution" by a deliberate reorganisation of society on hierarchical lines, and the imposition of a coercive "spiritual power". Where freedom was concerned, the founders of socialism made no bones about their intentions. Freedom of thought they regarded as the root-evil of nineteenth-century society, and the first of modern planners, Saint-Simon, even predicted that those who did not obey his proposed planning boards would be "treated as cattle".

Only under the influence of the strong democratic currents preceding the revolution of 1848 did socialism begin to ally itself with the forces of freedom. But it took the new "democratic socialism" a long time to live down the suspicions aroused by its antecedents. Nobody saw more clearly than de Tocqueville that democracy as an essentially individualist institution stood in an irreconcilable conflict with socialism:

Democracy extends the sphere of individual freedom [he said in 1848], socialism restricts it. Democracy attaches all possible value to each man; socialism makes each man a mere agent, a mere number. Democracy and socialism have nothing in common but one word: equality. But notice the difference: while democracy seeks equality in liberty, socialism seeks equality in restraint and servitude<sup>1</sup>.

To allay these suspicions and to harness to its cart the strongest of all political motives, the craving for freedom, socialism began increasingly to make use of the promise of a "new freedom". The coming of socialism was to be the leap from the realm of necessity to the realm of freedom. It was to bring "economic freedom", without which the political freedom already gained was "not worth having". Only socialism was capable of effecting the consummation of the age-long struggle for freedom in which the attainment of political freedom was but a first step.

The subtle change in meaning to which the word freedom was subjected in order that this argument should sound plausible is important. To the great apostles of political freedom the word had meant freedom from coercion, freedom from the arbitrary power of other men, release from the ties which left the individual no choice but obedience to the orders of a superior to whom he was attached. The new freedom promised, however, was to be freedom from necessity, release from the compulsion of the circumstances which inevitably limit the range of choice of all of us, although for some very much more than for others. Before man could be truly free, the "despotism of physical want" had to be broken, the "restraints of the economic system" relaxed.

## 2. 伟大的乌托邦

往往让这个国家成为人间地狱的，恰恰是我们想让它成为人间天堂。

弗里德里希·荷尔德林

社会主义取代自由主义成为绝大多数进步人士所持的信条并不是简单地意味着人们已经忘记了过去伟大的自由主义思想家对集体主义后果的警示。它之所以发生，是因为他们相信了与这些思想家所作预言正好相反的东西。不寻常的是，同样的社会主义，不仅早被认作对自由的最严重威胁，而且是非常公开地作为法国大革命所代表的自由主义的反对者开始的，现在却打着自由的旗号，获得普遍接受。现在很少有人记得社会主义开始时直接说它是独裁主义。为现代社会主义奠基的法国作家毫不怀疑，他们的理想只有依靠强有力的独裁政府才能付诸实施。对他们来说，社会主义意味着通过精心重组社会等级和实施强制性的“精神力量”来试图“终结革命”。一旦涉及自由，社会主义奠基者对其意图直言不讳。他们把思想自由认作十九世纪社会罪恶之源，第一个现代计划者圣西门甚至预言，谁不服从他所提议的计划委员会就会当作“牲畜一样处理”。

只有在 1848 大革命之前强大的民主潮流影响下，社会主义才开始把自己跟各自由力量连在一起。但是，新的“民主社会主义”花了很长时间才消除其历史引起的怀疑。没有人比德·托克维尔更清楚地认识到，民主，基本上是个人的主义的制度，与社会主义有着不可调和的矛盾：

【他在 1848 年说】民主是扩大，而社会主义则是限制个人自由的范围。民主赋予每一个人所有可能的价值，社会主义仅仅将人变为一个工具、一个数字。民主和社会主义除了一个词“平等”以外，别无共同之处。但请注意其区别：民主在自由中追求平等，而社会主义在约束和奴役中追求平等。

为了缓解这些疑虑，为了将所有政治动机中最强的一个，即对自由的渴望据为己有，社会主义逐渐开始许诺“新自由”。社会主义的到来将是必然王国到自由王国的飞跃。它将带来“经济自由”，没有经济自由已经获得的政治自由“不值得拥有”。只有社会主义才能圆满完成成为自由而进行的长年累月的奋斗，在其中取得政治上的自由是、且仅是第一步。

为了使得这些观点听起来合情合理，自由一词所遭受的意义上的微妙变化很重要。对政治自由的伟大信徒们来说，这个词曾经意味着，免受胁迫，免受强权，使个人从必须服从上级命令的束缚中解脱出来。然而新自由所承诺的是，从必然中解脱出来，从不可避免地限制了所有人选择范围的环境强迫中解脱出来，尽管对某些人来说，选择比其他人多很多。在人类获得真正自由之前，必须打破“物质需求的专制”，解除“经济制度的束缚”。

<sup>1</sup> "Discours prononcé à l'assemblée constituante le 12 Septembre 1848 sur la question du droit au travail." *CŒuvres complètes d'Alexis de Tocqueville*, vol. IX, 1866, p.546.

Freedom in this sense is, of course, merely another name for power<sup>2</sup> or wealth. Yet, although the promises of this new freedom were often coupled with irresponsible promises of a great increase in material wealth in a socialist society, it was not from such an absolute conquest of the niggardliness of nature that economic freedom was expected. What the promise really amounted to was that the great existing disparities in the range of choice of different people were to disappear. The demand for the new freedom was thus only another name for the old demand for an equal distribution of wealth. But the new name gave the socialists another word in common with the liberals and they exploited it to the full. And although the word was used in a different sense by the two groups, few people noticed this and still fewer asked themselves whether the two kinds of freedom promised really could be combined.

There can be no doubt that the promise of greater freedom has become one of the most effective weapons of socialist propaganda and that the belief that socialism would bring freedom is genuine and sincere. But this would only heighten the tragedy if it should prove that what was promised to us as the Road to Freedom was in fact the High Road to Servitude. Unquestionably the promise of more freedom was responsible for luring more and more liberals along the socialist road, for blinding them to the conflict which exists between the basic principles of socialism and liberalism, and for often enabling socialists to usurp the very name of the old party of freedom. Socialism was embraced by the greater part of the intelligentsia as the apparent heir of the liberal tradition: therefore it is not surprising that to them the idea should appear inconceivable of socialism leading to the opposite of liberty.

\* \* \* \* \*

In recent years, however, the old apprehensions of the unforeseen consequences of socialism have once more been strongly voiced from the most unexpected quarters. Observer after observer, in spite of the contrary expectation with which he approached his subject, has been impressed with the extraordinary similarity in many respects of the conditions under "fascism" and "communism". While "progressives" in this country and elsewhere were still deluding themselves that communism and fascism represented opposite poles, more and more people began to ask themselves whether these new tyrannies were not the outcome of the same tendencies. Even communists must have been somewhat shaken by such testimonies as that of Mr. Max Eastman, Lenin's old friend, who found himself compelled to admit that "instead of being better, Stalinism is worse than fascism, more ruthless, barbarous, unjust, immoral, anti-democratic, unredeemed by any hope or scruple", and that it is "better described as superfascist"; and when we find the same author recognising that "Stalinism is socialism, in the sense of being an inevitable although unforeseen political accompaniment of the nationalisation and collectivisation which he had relied upon as part of his plan for erecting a classless society"<sup>3</sup>, his conclusion clearly achieves wider significance.

当然，在这个意义上，自由只是权力和财富的代名词。然而，尽管对新自由的承诺常常和对社会主义社会物质财富将会极大丰富这一不负责任的承诺紧密联系在一起，但期望经济自由并不是来自对自然吝啬的绝对征服。这个承诺真正将导致的是，不同人可选择范围之间存在的巨大差距不再存在。对新自由的需求因此不过是对财富平均分配这个旧需求的新名词。但，新名词给了社会主义者又一个跟自由主义者共同的词，他们用到了极致。并且，尽管两个集团在使用这个词时意义不同，但很少人注意到这点，更少有人自问，这两种承诺的自由能否真正地合而为一。

毫无疑问，承诺更大的自由成了社会主义最有效的宣传武器，人们真正地、真诚地相信社会主义能够带来自由。但是，如果将证明，向我们承诺的走向自由之路实际上是走向奴役的高速公路，岂不更加悲惨。毋庸置疑，承诺更大自由吸引越来越多的自由主义者走上了社会主义道路，蒙蔽了他们的双眼使他们看不到社会主义与自由主义基本原则上所存在的冲突，同时常常让社会主义者得以篡用旧有自由派政党同样的名词。社会主义被大部分知识分子拥抱为自由主义传统显而易见的传承人：因此，社会主义会导致跟自由的对立的观点对他们来说不可想象，一点也不奇怪。

\* \* \* \* \*

然而，近年来，从最意料不到的角落再次大声发出了对于社会主义不可预料后果旧有的忧虑。一个接一个的观察家，尽管出发点不一样，他们都对“法西斯”和“共产主义”情况下很多方面异常相似印象深刻。当英国和其他各地的“进步人士”仍然自欺欺人地认为共产主义和法西斯代表对立的两极，越来越多的人开始自问，这些新的暴政难道不是同一思想潮流的结果。甚至共产主义者听到列宁的老朋友、马克斯·伊斯特曼的证言也肯定多少有所动摇。伊斯特曼发现他被迫承认，“斯大林主义不比法西斯好，而是更糟，更无情、野蛮、不公平、不道德、反民主、无所顾忌、无可救药”，“最好被叫做超级法西斯”；并且，当我们看到同一作者认识到“斯大林要建立一个没有阶级的社会，必须仰仗于把民族主义和集体主义作为他计划的一部分，斯大林主义是二者未曾料想但不可避免的政治附属品，在这个意义上，它就是社会主义”，他的结论显然具有更广泛的意义。

<sup>2</sup>The characteristic confusion of freedom with power, which we shall meet again and again throughout this discussion, is too big a subject to be thoroughly examined here. As old as socialism itself, it is so closely allied with it that almost seventy years ago a French scholar, discussing its Saint-Simonian origins, was led to say that this theory of liberty "est aelle seule tout le socialisme" (P. Janet, *Saint-Simon et le Saint-Simonisme*, 1878, p. 26, note). The most explicit defender of this confusion is, significantly, the leading

philosopher of American left-wingism, John Dewey, according to whom "liberty is the effective power to do specific things" so that "the demand for liberty is demand for power" (*"Liberty and Social Control"*, *The Social Frontier*, November 1935, p. 41).

<sup>3</sup>Max Eastman, *Stalin's Russia and the Crisis of Socialism*, 1940, p. 82.

Mr. Eastman's case is perhaps the most remarkable, yet he is by no means the first or the only sympathetic observer of the Russian experiment to form similar conclusions. Several years earlier Mr. W. H. Chamberlin, who in twelve years in Russia as an American correspondent had seen all his ideals shattered, summed up the conclusions of his studies there and in Germany and Italy in the statement that "Socialism is certain to prove, in the beginning at least, the road NOT to freedom, but to dictatorship and counter-dictatorships, to civil war of the fiercest kind. Socialism achieved and maintained by democratic means seems definitely to belong to the world of utopias."<sup>4</sup> Similarly a British writer, Mr. F. A. Voigt, after many years of close observation of developments in Europe as a foreign correspondent, concludes that "Marxism has led to Fascism and National-Socialism, because, in all essentials, it is Fascism and National Socialism".<sup>5</sup> And Dr. Walter Lippmann has arrived at the conviction that

the generation to which we belong is now learning from experience what happens when men retreat from freedom to a coercive organisation of their affairs. Though they promise themselves a more abundant life, they must in practice renounce it; as the organised direction increases, the variety of ends must give way to uniformity. That is the nemesis of the planned society and the authoritarian principle in human affairs.<sup>6</sup>

Many more similar statements from people in a position to judge might be selected from publications of recent years, particularly from those by men who as citizens of the now totalitarian countries have lived through the transformation and have been forced by their experience to revise many cherished beliefs. We shall quote as one more example a German writer who expresses the same conclusion perhaps more justly than those already quoted.

The complete collapse of the belief in the attainability of freedom and equality through Marxism [writes Mr. Peter Drucker<sup>7</sup>] has forced Russia to travel the same road towards a totalitarian, purely negative, non-economic society of unfreedom and inequality which Germany has been following. Not that communism and fascism are essentially the same. Fascism is the stage reached after communism has proved an illusion, and it has proved as much an illusion in Stalinist Russia as in pre-Hitler Germany.

No less significant is the intellectual history of many of the Nazi and Fascist leaders. Everybody who has watched the growth of these movements in Italy<sup>8</sup> or Germany has been struck by the number of leading men, from Mussolini downwards (and not excluding Laval and Quisling), who began as socialists and ended as Fascists or Nazis. And what is true of the leaders is even more true of the rank and file of the movement. The relative ease with which a young communist could be converted into a Nazi or vice versa was generally known in Germany, best of all to the propagandists of the two parties. Many a University teacher in this country during the 1930s has seen English and American students return from the Continent, uncertain whether they were communists or Nazis and certain only that they hated Western liberal civilisation.

伊斯特曼先生的例子可能是最著名的，但他绝不是第一个也不是唯一一个对俄罗斯的实验表示同情、作出类似结论的观察者。几年前，威廉·亨利·张伯伦，作为一个美国记者他在俄国呆了十二年，见证了他所有的理想被摔得粉碎，用这样一句话总结他在俄国、德国和意大利的研究“社会主义，肯定会被证明，至少在初期，‘不’会走向自由，而是走向独裁与反独裁，走向最惨烈的那种内战。通过民主手段实现并维持社会主义看起来绝对属于乌托邦。”类似地，英国作家，弗里德里克·奥古斯塔·沃伊特，作为外国记者，经过对欧洲发展多年的近距离观察，得出结论“马克思主义导致了法西斯和纳粹，因为其全部精髓就是法西斯和纳粹。”怀特·李普曼博士也最终信服：

我们所属的这一代人现在正在从经验中学习，当人类放弃自由退而对社会事务实施强制性组织时所发生一切的经验。尽管他们决心下追求更加丰富的生活，实践中却不得不放弃；随着组织管理的增加，目标的丰富多样必须让位给千篇一律。这是有计划的社会和人类事务中独裁原则对他们的报应。

在近年来的出版物上可以挑选出很多更相似的说法，都是由有资格评判的人给出的，特别是那些作为极主义国家公民经历过变革、被现实逼得修改曾抱有的诸多信仰的人。我们再举一个例子，引用一个表达同样观点的德国作家，可能比上述引用更公正。

【彼得·德鲁克先生写道】对通过马克思主义能够取得自由和平等的信念完全崩溃，已经迫使俄国走上与德国曾经同样的道路，走向一个独裁、纯粹消极、不自由、不平等的非经济社会。不是什么共产主义与法西斯主义本质上是一样的，法西斯是共产主义被证明是幻想之后所到达的那个阶段，共产主义在斯大林的俄国以及希特勒之前的德国都同样被证明了是幻想。

同样重要的是许多纳粹和法西斯领袖的个人思想史。每一个看到过这些运动在意大利或者德国发展的人，都对从墨索里尼往下（不排除拉瓦尔和基斯林），开始是社会主义者，后来成了法西斯或者纳粹分子领导人的数量之多感到震惊。并且，领导人如此，下属从众更是如此。在德国，众所周知，特别是两党宣传部门更能了解，年轻的共产主义者比较容易转成纳粹分子，反之亦然。在英国 1930 年代很多大学教师从欧洲大陆返回来的英国或者美国学生，只能肯定他们仇视西方自由文明，却不能确定他们到底是共产主义者还是纳粹分子。

<sup>4</sup>W. H. Chamberlin, *A False Utopia*, 1937, pp. 202-3.

<sup>5</sup>F. A. Voigt, *Unto Ccesar*, 1939, p. 95.

<sup>6</sup>*Atlantic Monthly*, November 1936, p. 552.

<sup>7</sup>*The End of Economic Man*, 1939, p. 230.

<sup>8</sup>An illuminating account of the intellectual history of many of the Fascist leaders will be found in R. Michels (himself an ex-Marxist Fascist), *Sozialismus und Faschismus*, Munich 1925, vol. II, pp. 264-6, and 3 11-1 2.

It is true, of course, that in Germany before 1933 and in Italy before 1922 communists and Nazis or Fascists clashed more frequently with each other than with other parties. They competed for the support of the same type of mind and reserved for each other the hatred of the heretic. But their practice showed how closely they are related. To both, the real enemy, the man with whom they had nothing in common and whom they could not hope to convince, is the liberal of the old type. While to the Nazi the communist, and to the communist the Nazi, and to both the socialist, are potential recruits who are made of the right timber, although they have listened to false prophets, they both know that there can be no compromise between them and those who really believe in individual freedom.

Lest this be doubted by people misled by official propaganda from either side, let me quote one more statement from an authority that ought not to be suspect. In an article under the significant title of "The Rediscovery of Liberalism", Professor Eduard Heimann, one of the leaders of German religious socialism, writes:

Hitlerism proclaims itself as both true democracy and true socialism, and the terrible truth is that there is a grain of truth for such claims — an infinitesimal grain, to be sure, but at any rate enough to serve as a basis for such fantastic distortions. Hitlerism even goes so far as to claim the role of protector of Christianity, and the terrible truth is that even this gross misinterpretation is able to make some impression. But one fact stands out with perfect clarity in all the fog: Hitler has never claimed to represent true liberalism. Liberalism then has the distinction of being the doctrine most hated by Hitler<sup>9</sup>.

It should be added that this hatred had little occasion to show itself in practice merely because, by the time Hitler came to power, liberalism was to all intents and purposes dead in Germany. And it was socialism that had killed it.

\* \* \* \* \*

While to many who have watched the transition from socialism to fascism at close quarters the connection between the two systems has become increasingly obvious, in this country the majority of people still believe that socialism and freedom can be combined. There can be no doubt that most socialists here still believe profoundly in the liberal ideal of freedom, and that they would recoil if they became convinced that the realisation of their programme would mean the destruction of freedom. So little is the problem yet seen, so easily do the most irreconcilable ideals still live together, that we can still hear such contradictions in terms as "individualist socialism" seriously discussed. If this is the state of mind which makes us drift into a new world, nothing can be more urgent than that we should seriously examine the real significance of the evolution that has taken place elsewhere. Although our conclusions will only confirm the apprehensions which others have already expressed, the reasons why this development cannot be regarded as accidental will not appear without a rather full examination of the main aspects of this transformation of social life. That democratic socialism, the great utopia of the last few generations, is not only unachievable, but that to strive for it produces something so utterly different that few of those who now wish it would be prepared to accept the consequences, many will not believe till the connection has been laid bare in all its aspects.

当然，的确，1933 年之前的德国，1922 年之前的意大利，共产主义者跟纳粹分子或者法西斯之间的冲突比他们跟其他党派之间冲突更频繁。他们争夺同一类人才的支持，把对异端的仇恨留给对方。但他们的行为显出他们关系有多接近。对他们二者而言，真正的敌人，与他们毫无共同之处、他们无望说服的人，是老牌自由主义者。对纳粹分子来说是共产主义者，对共产主义者来说是纳粹分子，对二者来说则是社会主义者，是跟他们同样材料制造的潜在招募对象。尽管他们听信不靠谱的预言家，但他们两家都知道他们和真正相信个人自由的人毫无妥协可言。

为了避免受到被任何一方官宣所误导的人质疑，让我再引用一个不应被怀疑的权威的说法。在一篇标题醒目“再现自由主义”的文章中，德国宗教社会主义领袖之一，爱德华·海曼教授写道：

希特勒主义自称既是真正的民主也是真正的社会主义，糟糕的真相是，这个说法包含些微的真理——确切的是，小的不能再小的真理，但无论如何足以支撑那一绝妙的曲解。希特勒主义甚至进一步声称是基督教保护者的角色，糟糕的真相是，如此严重的歪曲也能给人留下些好印象。但所有这些弥天大谎中凸显出的一个清晰事实就是：希特勒从来没有声称过他代表真正的自由主义。自由主义因此独树一帜，是希特勒最憎恨的学说。

补充一点的是，这憎恨没有什么机会付诸实践，仅仅因为希特勒上台之时，在德国自由主义实际上已经全面死绝。正是社会主义消灭了自由主义。

\* \* \* \* \*

对那些就近观察过从社会主义到法西斯转变的很多人来说，二者的联系日益明显，而在英国，大多数人仍然相信社会主义和自由主义能结合起来。毫无疑问，英国的大多数社会主义者仍然深深地相信自由主义中自由理想，如果他们确信实现他们的纲领就意味着自由的毁灭，他们是会回头的。这个问题还暴露得如此之少，最矛盾的思想仍轻易得以共存，以致我们听到“个人主义者的社会主义”这样自相矛盾的术语仍会被一本正经地加以讨论。如果这是使我们滑向新的世界的思想现状，那当务之急是我们要认真研究其它地方所发生的演变的真正意义。尽管我们的结论只不过证实他人已经表达过的担忧，但不对社会生活变革各主要方面进行相当全面的检视，就不会了解不能把该发展变化视作偶然的原因。因果关系全面暴露之前，很多人不会相信，民主社会主义，过往几代人伟大的乌托邦，不仅不能实现，而且为之奋斗会产生大相径庭的结果，现在那些祈愿它的人没几个做好了接受其后果的准备。

<sup>9</sup> Social Research (New York), vol. VIII, no. 4, November 1941.—It deserves to be recalled in this connection that, whatever may have been his reasons, Hitler thought it expedient to declare in one of his public speeches as late as February 1941 that "basically National Socialism and Marxism are the same" (Cf The

Bulletin of International News published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, vol. XVIII, no. 5, p. 269.)