

## Lesson 1

# ADAM SMITH- POLITICAL ECONOMY

### Structure:

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Early Life
- 1.3 Adam Smith's Works
- 1.4 An Over View of Political Economy of Adam Smith
- 1.5 Rational Choice Theory
- 1.6 Minimax Approach
- 1.7 Kinds of Economy
  - 1.7.1 Free- Market Economy
  - 1.7.2 Command Economy
  - 1.7.3 Mixed Economy
- 1.8 Underlying Theory of Smith's Philosophy
- 1.9 Conception of Wealth and of Political Economy
- 1.10 Production and Distribution
- 1.11 Nature and use of Capital
- 1.12 Smith's Theory of Trade
- 1.13 Public Finance
- 1.14 Conclusion
- 1.15 Questions
- 1.16 References

### 1.0 Objectives:

1. Students would know about the Adam Smith's and his early life.
2. Students would be able to know about the political economy of Adam Smith.
3. Students would be able to learn about the types of political economy.

### **1.1 Introduction:**

Adam Smith was born on 16<sup>th</sup> June, 1723 NS (New Style), (5<sup>th</sup> June 1723 OS Old Style), in Kirkcaldy, Scotland in Great Britain. He was died on 17<sup>th</sup> July 1790 in Edinburgh, Scotland. He was Scottish citizen and considered as moral philosopher, innovator of political economy and an eminent Enlightenment personality in Scotland.

### **1.2 Early Life:**

Adam Was born in Kirkcaldy in the county of Fife, in Scotland, his father was writer to signet, a senior solicitor and also worked as the comptroller of customs. Adam was baptized into Church of Scotland on 5<sup>th</sup> June 1723, hence, this has been regarded as the date of birth. He joined the Burgh School of Kirkcaldy, as one of the best secondary schools in Scotland by Rae. He leant Latin, Mathematics, history and writing from 1729-1737.

He had his formal education from University of Glasgow, when he reached 14 years he completed moral philosophy under Francis Hutcheson, where he developed his desire for liberty, reason and free speech. He was graduate scholar in 1740 and took his post graduate studies at Balliol College, Oxford under Snell Exhibition. Adam Smith was well known for his two classic workssuch as, “The Theory of Moral Sentiments” in 1759, and “An inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations” which is otherwise regarded as his “magnum Opus” and was the first modern work of economics. Adam Smith was regarded as the “father of modern economics” and even today he is still considered as the most influential thinkers in the area of economics. Adam Smith studied social philosophy at the University of Glasgow and at Balliol College, Oxford where he was benefited by the scholarship. He became the professor of moral philosophy at Glasgow, during this time he wrote and published ‘Theory of Moral Sentiments’.

### **1.3 Adam Smith’s Works:**

Adam Smith was the person to lay the foundation of classical free market economic theory. The wealth of nations was a precursor to the modern academic discipline of economics. In this and other works, he expounded upon how rational self-interest and competition and which can lead to economic prosperity. Smith was controversial

in his own day and his general approach and writing style were often satirized by Tory writers in the moralizing traditions of William Hogarth and Jonathan Sift. The *Wealth of nations* was named among the 100 best Scottish books of all times in 2005. It is said that the former UK Prime minister Margaret Thatcher carried this book in her hand bag.

When he moved to Paris he came to know many great intellectual leaders of that time and consistently having the effect on his future writings, some of the important personalities such as Benjamin Franklin, Turgot, Jean D' Alembert, Andre' Morellet, Helvetius and most importantly Francois Quesnay who was the head of physiocratic school. Smith was very much impressed by Francois ideas and dedicated *The Wealth of Nations* to him.

#### **1.4 An Over View of Political Economy of Adam Smith:**

The politicians and the thinkers of economy have debated economic issues, but in fact they subordinated mostly to the centralized government or the attainment of more territory. But the publication of *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith in 1776, brought a new look to the economics in the modern era. Smith and others mainly stressed on the economy for its best efficiency, but they have not regarded what moral goals the economy must serve. But Smith reasoned that the best economy was the free-market economy with very little intervention of government. When the theory of Smith put into practice in Britain, the economy of the country expanded very rapidly and vast wealth was generated, though economics has changed since his time, it is fair to say that we live in Adam Smith's world of economy. It is obvious that all the governments must have and must implement sound economic policy for the nation's development, in fact there are no easy solutions for the issues of the economy. It is noted that different parts of the world have different things and the one which generates economy in one part may hurt the other part and at the same instance dealing with one problem may cause another problem. In the process of democracy, politicians who fails to repair economy- or even those who seem to be performing nothing to solve economic problems would sometimes face very angry voters. Hence it is necessary to have the attention towards the economy by the politicians.

It is observed that the money and politics often interconnect, and this is called as 'intersection political economy' by the political scientists, which means the two areas interact and affect each other in complex ways, making it difficult to tell where one starts and ends. It is expected by the country to play an important part in influencing the economy, therefore, the country affects and modifies the economy. But economy also affects the country: a country which cannot generate economy, or distribute in reasonable manner would be in deep trouble and the boom in the economy could save even incompetent or corrupt politicians.

Smith agrees that the arguments of 'Physiocrats', surplus arose due to the production fairly than in exchange. He also stated that the maintenance of the surplus product was not limited to agriculture; in fact the important role played by the industry in the form of productive and unproductive labour. Not like Marx, Smith recognised that the surplus of the economy is because of the actions of the social labour, in fact not due to the reward from the nature. This path Smith was considered as the 'first economist' to base theory of labour of value clearly on a specific examination of the nature of social relation. He continued to discover the backgrounds of property incomes in the growth of capitalism: Smith initiated with the ideal of simple commodity production, by which productivity actions were accepted on for exchange somewhat than to gratify the personal consumption wants of the producer, but in which capitalist class relations were inattentive. Smith also regarded the concerns of occurrence of capitalist class relations inside that society. Ownership of the means the production passes from the hands of producers to the possession of private minority persons. At one point of time, Smith was evolving a labour theory of value and also about the surplus value, which had airs to scientific rigour, and next moment he was simply reflecting the appearance that the price of the commodity merely the total of its cost of production.

### **1.5 Rational Choice Theory:**

Like other areas of academics, political science and economics uses dissimilar methods for research and techniques for analysis and the study of political economics takes different methods and techniques, the most important instances of this interdisciplinary blending is 'rational choice theory'. The thinkers use this rational

choice as an ideal derivative from economics, to recognise the behaviour of the people. According to this view, humans act to maximise their outcomes which means, they get most of the advantage and yield from their activities. People make conclusions realistically depending upon whatever facts they get, in other sense they act in a selfish manner by using reason to get what they want.

### **1.6 Minimax Approach:**

The minimax approach is sometimes known as rational choice, and this term minimax is comes from military, according to this approach people act to minimise their maximum losses and to maximize their minimum gains. Rational choice defines reason in a specific manner, people use reason to get what they want. The political scientists and economists do not accept that people act in this manner. Rational choice only airs at definite forms of human behaviour and making of decisions, this system has become very significant in political science. This approach has been explains great variety of behaviours, like how the members act in their home towns and districts to how individuals decided to join or not to join interest groups.

### **1.7 Kinds of Economy:**

There are different kinds of economy, and economy is considered as a structure whereby goods are produced and exchanged and lackingpractical economy state will collapse. There are three kinds of economies 1. Free market 2. Command and 3. Mixed economy. In free-market economy, Individuals and businesses make their own economic decisions, usually occur in democratic countries. The command economies generally occur in communist or authoritarian countries, the country's federal government takes all such decisions on economy. Mixed economy is combination of these two.

#### **1.7.1 Free- Market Economy:**

This type of economy is mainly capitalist economy, businesses and individuals will have liberty to follow their own economic interest, buying and selling goods on an economical market, which obviously regulates a fair price for goods and services.

The failure of the market has given rise to central planning, India started its planning from 1951. There was unprecedented economic crisis in the country. The foreign exchange reserves fallen to very low, the deficit on budget mounted up. In 1991, then government of P V Narasimha Rao, introduced new economic policy, it thought that the planning failures would damage the economy of the country, hence they preferred the free market policy. The economic concentration are to be left to the free play of market force of demand and supply, which means the economic planning is almost given a go by.

### **1.7.2 Command Economy:**

Command economy otherwise known as the 'centrally planned economy' it is due to the central or national governments devices economy. This type of economy can be observed in the communists countries, though China has been heading towards capitalist economy presently. In the communist country the central government wheels the whole economy by allotting incomes and ordering prices for goods and services. This sort of economy can be seen in authoritarian countries which controls the economy. But during the times of war, most of the countries including democratic, free-market countries- take an positive role in economic planning but not like that of communist countries. For example, during the World War II, the USA largely took control of the American economy, asking businesses to build tanks, planes and ammunition instead of normal consumer goods. Supplies were rationed in such a manner that to buy more toothpaste, people were asked to return the empty tube because metal was in short supply.

### **1.7.3 Mixed Economy:**

Mixed economy is the combination of free-market and command economy. Even in the free countries, government generally takes some action to direct economy. These changes are made for multiplicity of reasons, for instance, some policies are developed to protect definite industries or to help consumers. In the language of economics, most of the countries have mixed economy. For example, agricultural subsidies, which are present in most of the countries including USA, is the common way by which government intervenes in economy. In some cases policies are made

to keep the food prices low without bankrupting farmers. In other cases the work to protect domestic agriculture.

It can be stated that mixed economy is combination of capitalism and socialism, hence it is a cross product, it operates public and private enterprises as well some are owned by state and some private sector. In India and some other developing countries have been adopted to mixed economy pattern, the improvement of developing countries cannot be left to free enterprises. It is observed that the speeding up of economic development it is very much required to have economic planning. Therefore, in developing countries government takes the lead role in actions of economy. In fact mixed economy supports to escape the evil of the free enterprise and able working of the price mechanism, most of the capitalist countries contained the mixed economy pattern. In the countries like USA, England and France, the government intervene in the affairs of the economy and it would differ from country to the other. In the mixed economy of India, government desires to make a pattern of socialism where in the welfares of growth will increase more to the underprivileged society.

### **Important Aspects of the Mixed Economy:**

#### **1. Coexistence of public and private sectors:**

In this form of economy both these sectors performs as part of a single institution, and they coexist industries are separated into two parts, in one part industries are owned by states and in other part private enterprises functions but they are required to follow some regulations.

#### **2. The regulation of Government on Private sector:**

Private sector does not have unlimited liberty while in their functions, it govern by the state government in the interest of the society. It works under the guideline of the state, state will initiate licencing system for starting of enterprise, it will have factory laws, working condition, social welfare regulations and will observe that it will not exploit the labour.

### **3. Importance of Planning:**

To attain fast economic development it is very important to have economic planning, apart from taking the issues like development of basic key and strategic industries may govern the performance of private industries.

### **4. Control of Monopoly:**

In a mixed economy government it tries to control monopolies in India it is by the “Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practice Act” (MRTP).

### **5. Sovereignty of Consumers:**

The liberty of the consumers is safeguarded as they have the liberty to buy those commodities whichever they like and there will not be any rationing and compulsory distribution. In India, this planning was started by the first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Lal Nehru in 1951, the Industrial policy Resolution of 1956, separated industries into two types, the industries which are for the sake of public sector are placed in Schedule A and those for private sector in the other Schedule.

### **Demerits:**

In this type it has some flaws and they are as follows:

1. It is very tough to guarantee the collaboration between public and private sector. There is the risk that needless competition might take place among the two sectors.
2. Mixed economy is labelled as relating of good aspects of capitalism and socialism. It might also combine the evil aspects of both.
3. There is no assurance that public sector enterprises will work professionally, the incompetence and insignificance of managers might lead to sickness of the industry, in India, and the public sector did not perform as efficiently as it was predicted. It is due to redtapism, bureaucracy played the role in their working.
4. The state may exercise extreme authorities in the method of licence and permits, this would check the development of private sector this may also lead to corruption as well.



### **1.8 Underlying Theory of Smith's Philosophy:**

Many traditional subjects received new treatment and development by Smith, in 1759, when he published "Theory of Moral Sentiments", a treatise on ethics which won international fame as philosopher. This work presented the doctrine that the moral judgment is, in the last analysis, an expression of impartial sympathy with the motives and result of human action. From sympathy Smith derives the sense of justice, which is "the main pillar of the social structure." Smith projected, but never published, a treatise on jurisprudence and government, subjects which in his lectures had naturally followed ethics. His "Wealth of Nations," which was published in 1776, treated of political economy which in his lectures had followed the subject of government.

### **1.9 Conception of Wealth and of Political Economy:**

"The Wealth of Nations" trusts a strong grip of principles with an extraordinary facts of the knowledge of economic life, derived from reading and personal observation. Smith's overviews are generally reinforced by an appeal to the realities of economic life, and in this way he provides the work an air of truth that is missing in many economic discourses. He does not pact broadly with definitions. Without defining wealth he falls directly into the reasons of national wealth, but in the last sentence of his "Introduction" states, incidentally, that "real wealth" is "the annual produce of the land and labour of the society." Even here he simply specifies that he deliberates the 'annual income' of a society as its real wealth: whereas most economists previous to him had considered wealth as the 'accumulated stock' of durable goods which a society owns. Smith originates the discourse without contributing a definition of political economy, and the nearby method to such a definition is found in the first sentence of the fourth book: "Political economy, considered as a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator, proposes two distinct objects: first, to supply a plentiful revenue or subsistence for the people, or, more properly, to enable them to provide such a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with a revenue sufficient for the public services. It proposes to enrich both the people and the sovereign."

### **1.10 Production and Distribution:**

Negative critics have marked the organisation of “The Wealth of Nations” disorganised, but it is well apt to Smith’s drive. The first book trains the procedure by which wealth is created and then circulated amongst labourers, entrepreneurs, and landlords. It arranges the policy that the improved productivity of the industry of modern societies is owed to division of labour. The argument of this subject is an economic classic, and one must witness that Smith finds here an image of his fundamental doctrine that it is self-interest, not the action of government, that has brought about the development of economic conditions. Division of labour undertakes exchange, and so Smith naturally proceeds to consider money and price. His study of price leads to an investigation of its component parts—wages, profits, and rent; and thus Smith is led to consider fully the subject of the distribution of wealth. Smith’s theory of value, by some other later writers becomes the classical cost-of-production theory; while, given another angle, it becomes the labour theory of Marx and the socialists. His theory of wages becomes, the wage-fund theory of the classical English school by other writers. His theory of profits provided much material for his followers, mainly regarding the difference of profits in the different employments of capital. His theory of rent, or rather his three different theories, required to be rebuilt by ‘Ricardo’ before it could be added to our stock of economic principles.

### **1.11 Nature and use of Capital:**

Adam Smith explores the nature and employment of ‘capital stock’, which is the main cause for the labourers at work and makes the industry to move on, he grasps that capital which generates in saving, its main object is to maintain productive labour and it may be fixed or circulating. Private economy, due to the aspirations to enhance one’s condition, is the cause of the growth of capital and the growth of the national wealth; while government can safeguard the individual and permit him freedom to act in the way he finds most beneficial. Finally, Smith deliberates dissimilar employments of capital. Agriculture gives more employment to productive labour than manufactures, and both are superior, in this regard, to transport and

trade. Domestic trade gives more employment than foreign and foreign trade gives more than the carrying trade.

All these employment beneficial; but a country with inadequate capital to occupy in all of them will increase in wealth most speedily if it works its capital in agriculture first of all, then involves in manufactures and the home trade, and abstains from entering upon foreign commerce and the carrying trade till the normal growth of capital brands such a course beneficial. If governments simply suppress their hands, this is the course that industrial improvement will essentially trail under the free play of individual self-interest. Smith's argument at this point is exceedingly important, for it lays the foundation for his doctrine of freedom of trade.

### **1.12 Smith's Theory of Trade:**

Adam Smith provides the several policies of restriction and preference adopted by the countries of Europe, Smith in the fourth book presents the eminent polemic against the mercantile system of political economy. Smith authorises that the restrictive measures of the mercantilists inclined slightly to stop men serving each other than to encourage public wealth. He assaulted the theory of the balance of trade, much as David Hume had done. Universally he justified the structure of natural freedom, and upheld that success is not factory-made by governments but comes from "the natural effort of every individual to better his own condition." After arranging the mercantilists, Smith treats of the "agricultural system" of political economy, which thought that the net produce of the land is the sole source of national wealth. Since economists of this school had sustained that flawless freedom is the only procedure that can increase this annual produce to a maximum, Smith measured their doctrines "the nearest approximation to the truth that has yet been published upon the subject of political economy."

### **1.13 Public Finance:**

Adam Smith examines Public Finance and this chapter is about the expenses of the sovereign is the first philosophical investigation of this important subject. The second chapter offers a remarkable dealing of the subject of taxation, and arranges the eminent maxims which, possibly, have been cited often than any other paragraphs in

economic literature. Smith was particularly effective in associating his theory of taxation with his theory of the production and distribution of wealth, whereas on the practical flank he projected improvements, several of which were later adopted. The chapter on public debts, while excessively negative, appraises compulsorily the hasty financial policies followed by Great Britain and other countries during the eighteenth century. In his theory of the essential nature of a public debt Smith was undoubtedly correct.

#### **1.14 Conclusion:**

Adam Smith was born on 16<sup>th</sup> June, 1723 NS, (5<sup>th</sup> June 1723 OS), in Kirkcaldy, Scotland in Great Britain. He was Scottish citizen and considered as moral philosopher, innovator of political economy and an eminent Enlightenment personality in Scotland. Adam Smith was regarded as the “father of modern economics” and even today he is still considered as the most influential thinkers in the area of economics.

The politicians and the thinkers of economy have debated economic issues, but in fact they subordinated mostly to the centralized government or the attainment of more territory. But the publication of *The Wealth of Nations* by Adam Smith in 1776, brought a new look to the economics in the modern era. Smith and others mainly stressed on the economy for its best efficiency, but they have not regarded what moral goals the economy must serve.

Like other areas of academics, political science and economics uses dissimilar methods for research and techniques for analysis and the study of political economics takes different methods and techniques, the most important instances of this interdisciplinary blending is ‘rational choice theory’. The minimax approach is sometimes known as rational choice, and this term minimax is comes from military, according to this approach people act to minimise their maximum losses and to maximize their minimum gains. There are different kinds of economy, and economy is considered as a structure whereby goods are produced and exchanged and lacking practical economy state will collapse. There are three kinds of economies 1. Free market 2. Command and 3. Mixed economy.

Many traditional subjects received new treatment and development by Smith, in 1759, when he published “Theory of Moral Sentiments”, a treatise on ethics which won international fame as philosopher.

### **1.15 Questions:**

1. What is political economy? Why it is considered as important political subject?
2. Describe about the political economy stated by Adam Smith?
3. Write a short note about the following:
  - A. Theory of Trade B. Theory of Public Finances C. Free-Market, Command and Mixed Economy D. Rational Choice theory and Minimax Approach

### **1.16 References**

1. M C Howard and J E King, The Political Economy of Marx, Longman, Landon and New York, 1985.
2. Ronald L Meek, Economics and Ideology and Other Essays, Chapman and Hall LTD, Great Britain, 1967.
- 3 Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1983.
4. Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, Oxford University Press, New York, 2008.
5. Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations Books I-III, Penguin Books, England, 1999.
6. Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations, The Original Classic, Capstone Publishing Ltd., United Kingdom, 2010.

**Lesson -2****JERMY BENTHAM – PRINCIPLE OF UTILITY****Structure:**

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction
- 2.2 Early Life
- 2.3 Students of Bentham
- 2.4 Bentham's Proposals for Legal and Social Reforms
- 2.5 Auto-Icon
- 2.6 Works of Bentham
- 2.7 Principle of Utility
- 2.8 How to Measure the Pain or Happiness
- 2.9 Conclusion
- 2.10 Questions
- 2.11 References

**2.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Jermy Bentham
2. Students would be able to learn about principle of utility

**2.1 Introduction:**

Jermy Bentham was born on 15<sup>th</sup> February 1748 NS (4<sup>th</sup> February 1748 Old Style) in Houndsditch, London in a rich family. He was stated as child genius he was reported sitting at the desk of father and reading multi-volume history of England when he was toddler and started to study Latin at the age of three. He had one sibling named Samuel Bentham. Jermy Bentham was a British philosopher, social reformer and jurist and he was known as the founder of the modern 'utilitarianism'.

## **2.2 Early Life:**

He joined in Westminster School for his early education and later in 1760, at the age of 12 years he joined in Queen's College, Oxford. In 1763 he completed his bachelor's course and joined in master's course and completed it in 1766. After that he was trained as lawyer but he never practiced for this he was called to the Bar in 1769, he was very discouraged with the English legal code because of its difficulty, for which he gave the name "Demon of Chicanery".

Jeremy Bentham was a renowned theorist in Anglo-American philosophy of law, and he was the political radical because his ideas were persuaded the improvement of welfarism. He encouraged economic freedom including the individual liberty, he also advocated the separation of state and church, liberty of expression, the right to divorce, equal rights to women and he also advocated the decriminalizing of homosexual acts. One of his important social voice was abolition of slavery, death penalty and physical punishment for elders and those of children. He is also encouraged the animal rights in the recent times. He intensely in favour of freedom of individual legal rights, he strongly differed the notion of 'natural law' and 'natural rights' and said about them as "nonsense upon stilts".

## **2.3 Students of Bentham:**

There were renowned students of Bentham, of whom were his own secretary and collaborator James Mill, and the son of James Mill, John Stuart Mill, the legal philosopher John Austin and Robert Owen, who was one of the initiator of the utopian socialism. The university college, London defined Bentham as the 'spiritual founder' though he was played very little role in its foundation.

## **2.4 Bentham's Proposals for Legal and Social Reforms:**

Out of many proposals in the area of legal and social reforms one of the significant development was that he designed a prison building and named it "Panopticon", and he used up sixteen years in improving and refining his ideas for the building, he thought that government would adopt his plan for national Penitentiary, unfortunately the prison never built, but it left an important inspiration on the coming generation thinkers. French philosopher of 20<sup>th</sup> century Michel Foucault, said that the

Panopticon was paradigmatic of many 19<sup>th</sup> century disciplinary organizations. His effective cooperation in tackling the corruption in the Pool of London with 'Patrick Colquhoun' in 1798, which caused in the 'Thames Police Bill' and was in 1800, passed eventually and this was the first preventive police force in the UK, which created the 'Thames River Police' and it became the model for Robert Peel to do reforms after 30 years. Jermy Bentham was committed to his plans for Panopticon which had been upset by King and a blue-blooded select performing in their own interest.

He was in touch with number of influential personalities of his time, for instance Adam Smith, he was close with Mirabeau and other leaders of French Revolution and he was declared an honorary citizen of France, he in fact spoke fearlessly about the critics of the revolutionary discourse of 'natural rights'. He held personal friendship with Francisco de Miranda, Precursor of Latin American Independence. Bentham co-founded the Westminster Review in 1823, with James Mill which deals about the 'Philosophical Radicals'.

## **2.5 Auto-Icon:**

Jermy Bentham, on 6<sup>th</sup> June 1832 at the age of 84 passed away at his residence in Queen Square Place in Westminster, London, he wrote that his body may be used for dissection after his death and must be preserved as an auto-icon. Later, the skeleton and head were preserved and stored in a wooden cabinet called the 'Auto-Icon', with skeleton padded out with hay and dressed in Bentham's clothes, originally kept by his student 'Thomas Southwood Smith, and in 1850 it was acquired by University College, London.

## **2.6 Works of Bentham:**

The life time passion of Bentham was to make a "Pannomion" which means complete code of laws or subject to punishment, a complete 'utilitarian code law, he suggested number of social reform and legal reforms as well. He also illustrated an underlying moral principle on which one must be based and is known as 'philosophy of utilitarianism' took for its 'fundamental axiom' (universally recognized truth), 'it is the greatest happiness of the greatest number that is the measure of right and



wrong'. This concept was borrowed by Bentham from Joseph Priestley, he stated "the good and happiness of the members, that is the majority of the members of any state, is the great standard by which everything relating to that state must finally be determined". He understood that by happiness, a predominance of 'pleasure' over 'pain', he wrote in 'The Principles of Morals and Legislation'. From the political point of view the most significant works are in 1776, he wrote 'A Fragment on Government', in 1780, 'An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation' but it was published in 1789, and it became a major work of his life time. A collection writings known as 'The Works of Jeremy Bentham' which was published in 1838-43.

## **2.7 Principle of Utility:**

The main principle of utility was proposed by Bentham, which deals with a method to assessment of the moral status of any action, for which he named as "Hedonistic" or "Felicific Calculus". In his explanation about Hedonistic, Bentham suggested a cataloging 12 pains and 14 pleasures, by using this technique one could check the factor for happiness for any sort of action. Gerald J. Postema, in Bentham and the Common Law Tradition, he said that, "No moral concept suffers more at Bentham's hand than the concept of justice. There is no sustained, mature analysis of the notion". Hence, some critics, object, it would be acceptable to torture one person if this would produce an amount of happiness in other people outweighing the unhappiness of the tortured person. Even though, in 'utilitarianism and distributive justice: Jeremy Bentham and the civil law, as P.J Kelly discussed that, Bentham had a theory of justice that prevented such consequences. Kelly stated about for Bentham law, "provided the basic framework of social interaction by delimiting spheres of personal inviolability within which individuals can form and pursue their own conceptions of well-being". It offers safety, a prerequisite for the development of anticipations. The hedonic calculus shows "expectation utilities" to be greatly higher than usual ones, which trails that Bentham did not favour the sacrifice of a few to the benefit of the many. Bentham's disciple John Stuart Mill, later revised and expanded the Utilitarianism proposed by Bentham.

List of 12 pains and 14 pleasure stated by Jermy Bentham are as follows:

### **The 14 Pleasures are:**

1 The Pleasures of Sense 2. Pleasures of Wealth 3. Pleasures of Skills 4. Pleasures of Amity 5. Pleasures of a good name 6. Pleasures of Power 7. Pleasures of piety 8. Pleasures of Benevolence 9. Pleasures of Malevolence 10. Pleasures of memory 11. Pleasures of Imagination 12. Pleasures of Expectation 13. Pleasures dependent on Association 14. Pleasures of Relief.

### **The 12 Pains are:**

1 The Pains of Privation 2. The Pains of the Senses 3. The Pains of Awkwardness 4. The Pains of Enmity 5. The Pains of an ill Name 6. The Pains of Piety 7. The Pains of Benevolence 8. The Pains of Malevolence 9. The Pains of Memory 10. The Pains of Imagination 11. The Pains of Expectation 12. The Pains Dependent on Association.

The classical utilitarianism has three different features such as:

A. Psychological Hedonism: It emphasizes that all the humans look for maximize pleasure or happiness and minimize the pain. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, in the starting of his work he stated that, "All men are under the governance of two sovereign masters: pain and pleasure. It is for them to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do".

B. Utilitarianism suggests that, the pleasure or happiness as the absolute noble that means every person looks for pleasure as an end and not as means to some further end. Moreover, every pleasure is similarly good and there is no dissimilarity among the dissimilar types of pleasure. He says, 'quantity of pleasure being equal', he also said that, 'pushpin is as good as poetry'. For Bentham 'pleasure' means an extensive diversity of things, he also recorded pleasure of taste, touch and smell, property acquirement, power, good will for others, of seeing the pleasure of those for whom we care etc.,

C. Utilitarianism is nothing but a virtue of transition of simple logic and theory of action, he says that if pleasure is in good form then it provides good action which maximizes pleasure and minimizes pain and it is opposite for the wrong action. He

thinks that person can have right and wrong pleasure and pain are the standards which oversee what we have to do.

Bentham supports that the principle of utility is the only adequate way for determining if an action is ethically right or wrong. The principle of sympathy and antipathy, which means the feeling of inborn appreciation or displeasure for the probable concerns of an action, which is not an adequate way for adjudicating the ethical rightness or wrongness of an action. For Bentham, the principle of sympathy and antipathy is merely a disposition to approve or disapprove of an action and is not an affirmative principle of moral conduct. Bentham claims that it is a morally right principle of action for every condition, he also stated that the principle of utility can also be defined as the greatest happiness principle, in that it proclaims that the only morally right and proper goal of action is to attain the greatest happiness of all individuals whose interest is affected by the action.

The main components of Bentham's Principle of Utility is as follows:

- The virtuous of the society is the quantity of happiness of the individuals in that society.
- The determination of ethics is advancement of the virtuous of the society.
- An ethical principle is perfect if and only if common traditional values it would maximize the virtuous of society.
- Common conformism to the principle of utility would maximize the good of society

Hence, the utility is nothing but it is moral principle. Nature governance and positioned human beings under two sovereign controls' pleasure and pain. It is for mankind only to plug out what they have to do, as well as to control what they intend to do. An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Bentham understood that in order to crop a code of laws, it was necessary to recognize what a single or individuated law be made up of, on the other hand he understood that he, or no one who had written before him, had correctly defined what was the concept of law, what was this which was named a law? Bentham get on astudy which created

the text previously known as of Laws in General. He argued, that “a law was an expression of will on the part of a sovereign, who in turn was the person or body of persons, or some combination of persons and bodies, to whom the community was in a habit of obedience”. At the same time, he came to the inference that the maximum operative resources of endorsing the happiness of the community would be over the introduction of a complete code of laws, or a “Pannomion”. Such a code would be “all-complete” and “rationalized”.

The actions of Bentham, actions which are ethically right incline to produce the highest potential quantity of pleasure and the minimum probable sum of pain, whereas the actions which are ethically wrong be likely to harvest whichever a minimum quantity of pleasure or a larger amount of pain than other actions which could be accomplished. The entire sum of pleasure or pain which is shaped through an action might rest on the whole quantity of pleasure or pain which is practiced by altogether individuals whose concern is affected by the action.

Bentham offers a taxonomy or classification of several types of pleasures and pains. Pleasures and pains may be produced by many varieties of sensations, thoughts, emotions, memories, expectations, and associations. Modest pleasures and pains may perhaps be united to form multifaceted pleasures and pains. Pleasure may also be produced by the release of pain, and pain might be initiated by the end of pleasure. Pleasure may be caused by the gratification of aspiration, and pain may be produced by the obstruction of wish. Jeremy Bentham clarifies that the understanding of pleasure or pain could differ between individuals, and every one may possibly answer another way to the same pleasure or pain. If plunders for good behavior or punishments for bad behavior are to be directed honestly, at that time these booties or punishments essentially reason for the alterations that might happen between persons in their sensitivity to pleasure or pain.

Jeremy Bentham also offers a taxonomy of motives for action, conversely, most of his advices for the theory, motives are ethically impartial or neutral, which not only misapplied but ethically distasteful. For instance, he deliberates that there is no variance amongst the purpose to escape punishment by expressing the fact and the

purpose to dodge punishment by expressing a white lie, since the purpose in both case is to evade punishment. He contends that there is no change among the purpose to reserve oneself from risk by assisting one more being and the purpose to reserve oneself from risk and by not assisting one more person, as the purpose in both case is to reserve oneself commencing risk. Bentham claims that there is no variance among the purpose to achieve an individual's service by showing generous so that individual and the purpose to achieve an individual's service by present unkind to the opponent of that individual, since the purpose in whichever case is to obtain the individual's service.

For Jeremy Bentham, pleasure is essentially good, whereas pain is essentially bad, the reasons the person might have for its actions either good or bad. Causes may not be essentially good or bad but the significance might differ depending upon every position and depending upon every person's feeling towards pleasure or pain. He attempts to explain the oppression of women by men by disagreeing that women could be further thoughtful to lesser pleasures and pains and that women might therefore have fewer "firmness of mind". Bentham also contends futilely that most of the women are further expected to obey their activities according to the principle of compassion and dislike, and that they are less likely to obey their activities to the principle of utility.

Jeremy Bentham divides causes or motives into two classes such as, 1. Seducing or corrupting, and 2. Tutelary or preservatory, depending upon the individual to perform wrongful acts seducing motive might take place, whereas, tutelary motives could root person by not to execute unlawful acts. The causes of tutelary might be either constant or sporadic. Constant tutelary causes might administer person's behaviour in most of the circumstances, but rarely tutelary motives may administer person's behavior in only certain circumstances. Jeremy Bentham describes morals as the art of creating the highest probable quantity of pleasure for oneself and for others. Morals are both the art of fulfilling one's duty to oneself and the art of fulfilling one's duty to others. Whereas reserved morals are apprehensive with the personal pleasure of a person, public morals and the skill of legislation are apprehensive with

the pleasure of total persons. If an act of legislation obeys to the principle of utility, then it inclines to upsurge the total pleasure of all individuals.

**Bentham tallies five modules of unlawful illegal crimes against society and that are as follows:**

1. Private crimes against persons 2. Semi-public crimes against groups of persons 3. Self-regarding crimes against the rights of the person 4. Public crimes against the community and 5. Crimes by acts of misrepresentation or by breaches of trust. He also says that private crimes contrary to persons might contain those against: 1. Person 2 Property 3 Reputation 4. Condition (by breach of duty) 5. Person and property and 6. Person and reputation. Semi-public crimes might comprise unlawful acts which threaten the happiness and safety of a specific class or group of persons. Public crimes may comprise criminal acts which threaten public security, justice, general pleasure, social harmony, economic prosperity, or national sovereignty. Jeremy Bentham talks about the sentence of unlawful crimes against society and it must be relative to the sum of damage which is instigated by these wrongdoings. Punishment of crimes is not defensible if it is unfavorable or unwanted. The total of sentence for crime must be adequate to discourage extra crimes but must not be arbitrary. He also opposes that any method of punishment for blasphemous civil or criminal laws must obey to the principle of utility. Any punishment for a wrong person must have enough ground for the infliction of ache upon that person. The aim of harshenunlawful offenses against society is not only to stop alike or larger crimes but to suggest gratification to those who have been hurt and to discipline and reform the offender.

**2.8 How to Measure the Pain or Happiness:**

Bentham defines a measure able technique or hedonistic calculus, may be to calculate the ethical rightness or wrongness of an action, giving the quantity of pleasure or pain which is formed by an action. Bentham describes that the amount of a pleasure or pain could rest on seven diverse proportions and they are as follows:

- Intensity
- Duration
- Certainty or uncertainty
- Propinquity (nearness or remoteness in time)
- Fecundity (how productive is it of extra pleasure and pains later the early ones)
- Purity of the pleasure or pain and
- Extent (in what way several people do the pleasure and pains of an action)

The fertility of a pleasure or pain may be determined by the probability of the pleasure or pain and will be trailed by pleasures or pains of the similar type. The purity of a pleasure or pain may be determined by the possibility that the pleasure or pain will not be trailed by pleasures or pains of the reverse kind.

While estimating the values of pleasure or pain situations to be taken into the account which is well-thought-out with location to a particular person, and by itself. To a person measured by himself, the significance of a pleasure or pain deliberated by itself, resolve be superior or fewer, allowing to the four following situations:

- Its intensity
- Its duration
- Its certainty or uncertainty
- Its propinquity or remoteness.

Estimating a pleasure or pain the above circumstances are to be measured in each of them by itself. However once the significance of any pleasure or pain is deliberated for the determination of valuing the predisposition of any act by which it is made, there are two other situations to be taken into consideration:

- Its productiveness, or the chance it has of being followed by sensations of the same kind: that is, pleasures, if it be a pleasure: pains, if it be a pain.
- Its purity, or the chance it has of not being followed by sensations of opposite kind: that is: pains, if it be a pleasure, pleasures, if it be a pain

However, the last two are in sternness and hardly to be believed possessions of the pleasure or the pain itself; consequently, in severity has to be reserved while interpretation of the value of that pleasure or that pain. They are in severity to be believed in possessions only of the act, or some other incident, by which such pleasure or pain has been formed; and consequently the amount of tendency has to be taken only of such act or such incident.

The procedure to evaluate the inclination of any act or incident has to take a meticulous explanation at that time, the common inclination of any act, by which the wellbeing of a community are affected. Instigate with an individual of whose interests look like utmost to be pretentious by it:

- The importance of every distinct pleasure which looks to be formed by it in the first occurrence.
- The worth of each pain which looks to be formed by it in the first instance.
- The worth of every pleasure which give the impression to be formed by it after the first. This establishes the productiveness of the first pleasure and the impurity of the first pain.
- The worth of each pain which seems to be formed by it after the first, this founds the productiveness of the first pain, and the impurity of the first pleasure.
- Totality of all the values of all the pleasures on the one side, and those of all the pains on the other. The equilibrium, if it be on the side of pleasure, will give the good tendency of act upon the whole, with esteem to the interests of that individual person; if on the side of pain, the bad inclination of it upon the complete.

## **2.9 Conclusion:**

Jermy Bentham was born on 15<sup>th</sup> February 1748 NS (4<sup>th</sup> February 1748 Old Style) in Houndsditch, London in a rich family. He was stated as child genius he was reported sitting at the desk of father and reading multi-volume history of England. There were renowned students of Bentham, of whom were his own secretary and collaborator



James Mill, and the son of James Mill, John Stuart Mill, the legal philosopher John Austin and Robert Owen. Out of many proposals in the area of legal and social reforms one of the significant development was that he designed a prison building and named it “Panopticon”. The main principle of utility deals, Bentham proposed a method to assessment of the moral status of any action, for which he named as “Hedonistic” or “Felicific Calculus”.

In his explanation about Hedonistic, Bentham suggested a cataloging 12 pains and 14 pleasures, by using this technique one could check the factor for happiness for any sort of action. Utilitarianism is nothing but a virtue of transition of simple logic and theory of action, he says that if pleasure is in good form then it provides good action which maximizes pleasure and minimizes pain and it is opposite for the wrong action. Bentham defines a measureable technique or hedonistic calculus, may be to calculate the ethical rightness or wrongness of an action, giving the quantity of pleasure or pain which is formed by an action. Bentham describes that the amount of a pleasure or pain could rest on seven diverse proportions.

### **2.10 Questions:**

1. Write about Jeremy Bentham’s early life, his list of students and proposals for social and legal reforms?
2. Describe about the Bentham’s principle of Utility in detail?
3. How to measure the pain or happiness described by Bentham?

### **2.11 References:**

1. Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, Political Thought, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
- 2 R.K Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.
- 3 David Boucher and Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, from Socrates to the Present, Oxford University Press, New York, 2009.
- 4 A Survey of Research in Political Science, Allied Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1986.

5. Jeremy Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Batoche Books, Kitchener, 2000.
6. J.H. Burns and H.L.A.Hart, *Jeremy Bentham, A Fragment on Government*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1998.

**Lesson- 3****J S MILL – LIBERTY, REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT****Structure:**

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Early Life
- 3.3 Social Reforms
- 3.4 His Works
- 3.5 On Liberty
- 3.6 Representative Government
- 3.7 Conclusion
- 3.8 Questions
- 3.9 References

**3.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the life of J S Mill.
2. Students would be able to learn about Liberty stated by J S Mill.
3. Students would be able to understand what is representative government.

**3.1 Introduction:**

John Stuart Mill was born on 20<sup>th</sup> May 1806, in Penton Ville, London, United Kingdom he was the eldest son of utilitarian social thinker and economist James Miller. He was educated by his father and he received the advice and guidance from Jeremy Bentham and Francis Place. He was British philosopher, economist and civil servant, he also worked at social theory, political theory and political economy. During the 19<sup>th</sup> century he was considered as the most influential English speaking philosopher. The beginning about the idea of liberty by J S Mill, can be widely acceptable.

### 3.2 Early Life:

J S Mill was remarkably a gifted child, he stated about his education in his autobiography, when he was 3 years old he was taught Greek, by the age of 8 he had read Aesop's Fables, Xenophon's anabasis and the entire Herodotus and was well versed with Lucian, Diogenes Laertius Isocrates and six dialogues of Plato. He was also educated history in English, learned arithmetic, physics and astronomy. He also studied political economy of Adam Smith and David Ricardo along with his father and finally completed their classical economic views of factors of production. His regular economy lessons of comptes rendus in 1821, helped his father while writing "Elements of Political economy" which was a text book to promote the views of Ricardian economics. At the age of 14 years, he stayed with the family of Sir Samuel Bentham, brother of Jeremy Bentham in France for a year, he joined the winter classes on Zoology, Chemistry and Logic of Faculte Des Sciences, and course in higher mathematics.

As an unconventional he rejected to contribute to the 39 articles of the Church of England, and was not qualified to study at the University of Oxford or Cambridge University. He started working along with his father for East India Company till 1858, later he joined University College for the lectures of John Austin in Jurisprudence, and in 1856 he was elected as the honorary member of American Academy of arts and sciences.

### 3.3 Social Reforms:

He had done great work for the women's rights, during 1865-68 he was the Member of Parliament for city and Westminster for Liberal Party, when he was the M P, he supported easing the burdens on Ireland, in 1866, he was the first M P to raise the voice for the sake of women in Parliament and demanded for the right of vote for women, he was very strong supporter of social reforms like, labour unions and farm cooperatives. On Representative Government he advocated for many reforms of Parliament and voting mainly "Proportional Representation", the "single Transferable Vote" and extension of 'suffrage'.

### 3.4 His Works:

The most important works of J S Mill include, "On Liberty", "Utilitarianism", and "Considerations on Representative Government". His one of the works on women was earned well fame the book in 1861 he wrote "The subjection of Women" it was published in 1869. Mill wrote mainly to save the utilitarianism of Bentham and James Mill from the charge brought against it by Carlyle and others: that the philosophy which is so highlighted quantitative happiness is a doctrine worthy only of swine. After some introductory remarks, he stated the following conclusion of utilitarianism:

"The creed which accepts as the foundation of morals, Utility or the Greatest Happiness principle, holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness, I intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness is intended pain, and privation of pleasure".

### 3.5 On Liberty:

The opinions of John Stuart Mill about 'liberty was influenced by Joseph Priestly and Josiah Warren. According to him, liberty means the person must be free to do whatever he or she wishes unless they causes harm to others in the society. Individuals have sufficient logic while they make decisions about their good, at the same time government must interfere when it is for the security of the society. JS Mill stated that, the only end for which men folk are justified, independently or mutually, in meddling with the liberty of action of any of their number, which is self-protection. The only determination for which power can be lawfully work out over any member of a civilized community, against his will, and is to avert injury to others. His own good, whichever physical or moral, is not adequate permit. He cannot correctly be constrained to do or refrain because it will be better for him to do so, because it will make him more contented, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise, or even right...The only part of the conduct of anyone, for which he is agreeable to society, is that which concerns others. In the part which just concerns him, is his independence, of right, absolute. Over himself over his body and mind the individual is sovereign. Mill also stated that: "Despotism is a legitimate mode of government in dealing with barbarians, provided the end be their improvement, and the means

justified by actually effecting that end. Liberty, as a principle, has no application to any state of things anterior to the time when mankind have become capable of being improved by free and equal discussion”.

One of the most renowned book of J S Mill is “On Liberty”, and it stayed as the most read book till today. In this classic book he stated about the liberal individualism it shaped more of stir during his time than any other of his writings. J S Mill stated that, liberty is required to follow our own good in our own way providing that we do not hinder other people's determinations to do that even it be a government or individual, has the right to stop speech publication or behaviour of anybody for any reason other than to stop harm to other people; and by harm Mill meant practical and quantifiable harm. The harm principle is good to deal easier to state than it is to apply is a problem of which Mill looked unconscious. He also stated that, no one has the right to stop anyone from harming himself. It is observed that it is virtuously self-interested activities as different from social activities do not permit meddling from others.

Mill explains his concept of individual freedom within the context of his ideas on history and the state. On Liberty rest on the impression that society improves from lower to higher phases and the advancement ends in the advent of a method of representative democracy. It is within the background of this form of government that Mill envisages the progress and advance of liberty.

J S Mill describes civil liberty as the boundary that need be fixed on society's power over each person. Mill assumes a historical evaluation of the concept of liberty, starting with ancient Greece and Rome and continuing to England. Previously, liberty meant mainly to guard from tyranny. Over the periods, the meaning of liberty altered alongside with the part of rulers, who came to be seen as servants of the people rather than masters. This evolution brought about a new problem: the tyranny of the majority, it powers a democratic majority's will on the minority. This state of affairs can work out a tyrannical power even outside the political dominion, when forces such as public opinion suppress individuality and rebellion. Mill sees liberty can be separated into three categories, each one must be known and esteemed by any free society. First one is, the liberty of thought and view, the second one is the liberty of

tastes and pursuits, or the freedom to plan our own lives and the third one is the liberty to join other of one mind individuals for a mutual aim that do not hurt anybody. Every one of these liberties contradicts society's inclination to force obedience.

He also stated about the examples where society can lawfully border the personal liberty. Mill discards the concept of the social contract, because people has to accept to be a portion of society and identify that society can suggest definite methods of security although requesting for definite methods of obligations. Yet, he did propose that, society deals security, people are obliged to act in a definite way, and every member of society need to shield and defend society and all members from injury. In short, society necessarily be given power to restrain conduct that harms others, but certainly not more.

The main concept of "On Liberty" is that liberty is vital to guarantee succeeding growth, for both the individual and the society, chiefly because the society becomes more significant than the state. The affairs of the state would be achieved in the form of representative democracy where the opposition between the rulers and the ruled vanishes, where the rulers only signify the interests of the ruled. That type of democracy would make the liberty of the individual likely, but it would not assure it. When society develops free of the restraints of government, it initiates to establish the interests of few top quality and powerful individuals, which intimidates individual liberty in a novel method. J S Mill contends with the difficulty of envisaging of society developing in such a way as to stop the suppression of the individual by the authoritative and self-confident majority. The progress of the society can only take place if its restrictions are positioned on individual liberty, but it also requires the liberation of the individual from such restrictions.

J S Mill avoids this problem by investigating about moral theory, where the most significant thing of individual is happiness and such happiness might be achieved in a civilized society, and people are permitted to involve in their own welfares, with all their abilities and competencies and they have established and improved through the good method of education. Accordingly, J S Mill pressures the essential worth of individualism of individual improvement, equally for the individual and society for

future development. According to J S Mill, a civilized person is the one who performs on what he or she comprehends and who does all in his or her power to know. J S Mill advocates individual initiative over social control, he emphasizes that things completed by individuals can be done better than those completed by governments. Besides, separate action progresses the mental education of that person, and government action cannot do, for government action at all times positions a danger to liberty and necessarily be observed sensibly.

### **3.6 Representative Government:**

It is all about an argument for representative government, where J S Mill proposed and the perfect system of government according to his view, he put very worthy ideas and stated that it is not the main job of the of the government representatives to make legislation but he advises that the bodies of representatives like, Parliaments and Senates are best suited to be places of public debates on different views held by the population and to perform as the watchdogs of the professionals who create and administer laws and policy. He stated it as, “Their part is to indicate wants, to be an organ for popular demands, and a place of adverse discussion for all opinions relating to public matters, both great and small; and, along with this, to check by criticism, and eventually by withdrawing their support, those high public officers who really conduct the public business, or who appoint those by whom it is conducted”.

J S Mill said that the representative government is the best form of government, for those who are civilized and cultured enough and capable to take accountability for its own matters. While he was talking about representative government which meant by him was parliamentary government where the representatives are elected and they are very much accountable to the parliament, by doing so they are responsible to the people. J S Mill thought that there are some concessions where criminals, incompetent and uneducated backing them, he believed that all adult, male or female must have at least one vote, he emphasised the necessity to include to vote otherwise it would be illogical, and as it would be to eliminate the male who have red hair. J S Mill opined that the representative government is the best form of



government because it inspires and replicates the criticism, it also encourages the participation and accountability by the common citizen. At the same time the government such as despotic brands such thing to inactive and apathetic and such government attend to create self-reliant, tough- minded persons, alert, and moreover, society with such type of people is assured to be one in which order, where development and steadiness displays. But the government of representatives is also liable to infirmities and dangers.

Whereas, JS Mill was very anxious and worried about the dominance of tyranny, he thought that if the government rest on the wish and will of few members then cultivation and enlightenment would be certainly conquest by the mediocrity or unevenness and illiteracy and unawareness. It will also be certain that government will make such policies that would satisfy the majority in the assembly whatsoever be the inherent advantages of such policies. Therefore, he stressed that the political empowerment must work hand in glove with political education. It might be ridiculous to have entirely empowered electorate whose members are too unaware to cast their vote sensibly. J S Mill thought that there must be a method for plural voting connected to educational achievement and a system of public examinations for which people may pass in order to deserve that they ask for extra votes. He was the first supporter of proportional representation as a means of acquiring the operative representation of minorities. In 1859, Thomas Hare, an eminent lawyer based at London developed a multifarious method that he preferred. J S Mill stylish prose every now and then covered illogicality and superficiality of thought he was, during the course of his life, he was the target of his own extreme policy and unbending education; but he is considered as one of a many syndicate of writers, fellow members being John Rawls and Robert Nozick whose involvement to political thought lies as much as anything in the discussion and image that their works have inclined to sponsor.

In the brief it is obvious that it is a testimony to his mental constitution that, after the childhood described in his autobiography, 'The Adults', it was observed that he was able performs intellectually. He himself agreed that he is a complex personality he

completed his education by the system crippled him emotionally, however, filled with a number of strong, intellectual and not always steady desire. JS Mill not once reasonably bring himself to reject utilitarianism; nor, yet, can he fight reinventing it in a way that makes desire mean the kind of activities of which Mill supports. J S Mill always favoured unlimited freedom, but at the same time he took it for granted that unlimited freedom will harvest the results that he appreciated rather than disorderliness and disarray. He highly praised the representative government which ethically stimulating outcome that he understands it would have on ordinary citizens, but he desired to organize substances so as to safeguard the constant effect of an intelligent and ethical choice.

Some of the Important Quotes Stated by J S Mill about Representative Government, which indicates that how much he was involved and much desired to have such government because it will be accountable to the parliament and at the same time to the people as well.

1. JS Mill, in his book Representative Government, he stated about Representative Government as: "To think that because those who wield power in society wield in the end that of government, therefore it is of no use to attempt to influence the constitution of the government by acting on opinion, is to forget that opinion is itself one of the greatest active social forces. One person with a belief is a social power equal to ninety-nine who have only interests".
2. He also gave an elaborate measures of a good form of government for this he said that the government must have to observe the following things, "We need not understand that when power exist in an exclusive class, then that class will knowingly and deliberately sacrifice the other classes to themselves: it suits that, in the absence of its natural protectors, the interest of the left out is always in danger of being ignored: and, when looked at, it is seen with very different perceptiveness from those of the persons whom it directly worries".
3. He also asserted about the democracy where it could be true or false democracy he stated about it as, "In a really equal democracy, every, any section would be represented, not disproportionately, but proportionately. ... Unless they are, there is not equal government, but a government of inequality and privilege: one part of the people rule over the rest: there is a part whose fair and equal share of influence in

the representation is withheld from them, contrary to all just government, but, above all, contrary to the principle of democracy, which professes equality as its very root and foundation”.

### **3.7 Conclusion:**

John Stuart Mill was born on 20<sup>th</sup> May 1806, in Penton Ville, London, United Kingdom he was the eldest son of utilitarian social thinker and economist James Miller. He was educated by his father and he received the advice and guidance from Jeremy Bentham and Francis Place. J S Mill was remarkably a gifted child, he stated about his education in his autobiography, when he was 3 years old he was taught Greek, by the age of 8 he had read Aesop’s Fables, Xenophon’s anabasis and the entire Herodotus and was well versed with Lucian, Diogenes Laertius Isocrates and six dialogues of Plato. He had done great work for the women’s rights, during 1865-68 he was the Member of Parliament for city and Westminster for Liberal Party, when he was the M P, he supported easing the burdens on Ireland, in 1866, he was the first to M P to raise the voice for the sake of women in Parliament and demanded for the right of vote for women. The most important works of J S Mill include, “On Liberty”, “Utilitarianism”, and “Considerations on Representative Government”.

According to him, liberty means the person must be free to do whatever he or she wishes unless they causes harm to others in the society. Individuals have sufficient logic while they make decisions about their good, at the same time government must interfere when it is for the security of the society. JS Mill stated that, the only end for which men folk are justified, independently or mutually, in meddling with the liberty of action of any of their number, is self-protection. The main concept of “On Liberty” is that liberty is vital to guarantee succeeding growth, for both the individual and the society, chiefly because the society becomes more significant than the state. The affairs of the state would be achieved in the form of representative democracy where the opposition between the rulers and the ruled vanishes, where the rulers only signify the interests of the ruled.

About representative government, It is all about an argument for representative government, where J S Mill proposed and the perfect system of government according to the his view, he put very worthy ideas and stated that it is not the main job of the of the government representatives to make legislation but he advises that the bodies of representatives like, Parliaments and Senates are best suited to be places of public debates on different views held by the population and to perform as the watchdogs of the professionals who create and administer laws and policy. J S Mill said that the representative government is the best form of government, for those who are civilized and cultured enough and capable to take accountability for its own matters. While he was talking about representative government which meant by him was parliamentary government where the representatives are elected and they are very much accountable to the parliament, by doing so they are responsible to the people.

### **3.8 Questions:**

1. Write about the J S Mills early life, education and his important writings?
2. Describe about liberty stated by J S Mill?
3. Discuss about the representative government described by J S Mill?

### **3.9 References:**

1. Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, Political Thought, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
2. R.K. Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.
3. David Boucher and Paul Kelly, Political Thinkers, from Socrates to the Present, Oxford University Press, New York, 2009.
4. Thomas Landon Thorson, A History of Political Theory, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1973.
5. John Stuart Mill, On liberty, United Kingdom, 1859.
6. John Stuart Mill, Considerations on Representative Government, 1861.

## Lesson 4

# F. A HAYEK – ON LIBERTY

Structure:

4.0 Objectives

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Early Education

4.3 His Works

4.4 F. A Hayek- Liberty

4.5 Conclusion

4.6 Questions

4.7 References

### 4.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of F. A Hayek.
2. Students would be able to learn about Liberty stated by F.A Hayek.

### 4.1 Introduction:

F.A Hayek was born on 8<sup>th</sup> May 1899 in Vienna, Austria-Hungary, in a supposedly Roman Catholic family that had been ennobled towards the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century. He was won the Noble prize, and was a great economist. His family produced a number of prominent intellects working in the areas of Statics and mainly in the field of Biology. F.A Hayek's father Dr. August Hayek was an eminent Botanist and Physician, who published major botanical dissertation while working as a medical doctor. F.A Hayek was not best of students, he gained a name for his laziness and ill-discipline though he proving clear capability. He was embarked upon studies of his own in vide variety of fields such as botany, palaeontology and drama, he become conversant with economics, evolutionary theory and psychology and he studied them very for a short time in 1916.

### 4.2 Early Education:

Before completing his secondary education, to join in the army in March 1917, he lied about his age, almost three years after the beginning of the First World War,

during that time in the army he earned 'decoration' for bravery and because of this experience of coordinating communication for his unit in the multi lingual Austro-Hungarian army and that spun his attention to social science and political ideas. After being cleared from the army, in October 1918, he was certain to follow his academic career and he joined in Arts Faculty in the University of Vienna.

#### **4.3 His Works:**

He devoted his entire time to exploring the theories of money and capital in 1930s, one of his famous book, "On Trade and Cycle" appeared in English in 1933 as "Monetary Theory and Trade Cycle". His lectures in Geneva were published as "Monetary Nationalism and International Stability" in 1937, he wrote "Profits, Interest and Investment", and the other essay on the theory of "Industrial Fluctuations" came in 1939. In the year 1941, he wrote, "Pure Theory of Capital", but his writing and his well-known work being "The Road to Serfdom", he also wrote "Freedom and Economic System".

#### **4.4 F. A Hayek- Liberty:**

The political writings of the Hayek are also rarely got an attentive thought and they in fact ask for to be. Most of the thinkers have either praised or attacked him on his liberal position. The outcome of this was that the significance about this branch has unseen with the ideological responses which are either favourable or adverse has been shaped. He has been seen as the advocate of the laissez-faire, who was very hostile about the public provisions of social services. Hayek has been regarded as liberal, but to enlighten about the liberty there are different kinds of liberalisms and philosophies. According to Hayek, man has, "liberty" or "freedom", he uses to change them accordingly, he never matter about the compulsion of the uninformed will of other individual she stated that, the liberalism is a policy which highlights the limitation to a least of the intimidating power of the government. He differentiates his use of 'liberty', with the three other meanings of it, and he states, liberty as "the involvement of men in the choice of their government, in the procedure of legislation, and as the controller of administration"; and the other meaning according to him, about freedom as "the degree to which a person is directed in his activities by his own measured will... somewhat than by brief impulse or condition" and this known

as 'inner freedom'; and the other meaning of liberty according to him, "the power to content our desires, or the amount of the choice of substitutes open to us" which is called as 'liberty of power'. According to Hayek, he forced that other freedoms are not situations of the similar type as that of his 'individual liberty', and must be quite different.

Meanwhile, the non-democratic command might be accommodating and the democratic command is precautionary, he says that political liberty is neither essential nor an adequate circumstance of personal liberty. Whereas, the inner liberty stands opposed and not to force by others but to moral weaknesses or the influence of passing emotions. He thought that the liberty is in the sense of power, he also claims that it is a dynamic variance between non-interference with another's performances and an individual's actual power to entertain. An individual might capable doing what he might not do lawfully, or incapable of doing what no one is demanding to stop him from doing. Hayek has stated that, it is uncertain whether one must bear the use of "liberty" in the sense of 'power'.

The main conception of the liberty as power can be regarded as the noble inspiring of the intellectuals, which consist of philosophers like, Hume, Locke, and Dewey. The displeasure of Hayek for this idea of liberty could be agreed partly of his aspiration to reserve the actual meaning of the term and to improve the effectiveness by systematically limiting the claim of it. It is to note that his will power is the fundamental value of freedom by the communist must not misused to explain the quantity of involvement of the state. He says that if freedom can be observed as the power, then in such case there would no stop to the legislative actions which can be secure variety of choice of persons. In such case the outcome would be the damage of the personal freedom in the name of a false conception of freedom. Hayek never denied that the necessities of the government are very imperfect and likelihoods are necessary; he also stated that such actions must not signified as encouragement of liberty.

In the USA the present trend is that, in the name of liberalism is totally different from the views of Hayek, he stresses that, if freedom is restricted by the state then it stand in similar traditions like that of Madison, and with the views of Tocqueville and Acton

the prominent contemporary American liberals, as the involvement of and functioning of top quality and are nearer to the “constructivist rationalism” of Voltaire and Rousseau. Hayek put very severe restriction and he was very doubtful about the powers of the government, currently the liberalism of America notices to the interventions of the democratic government for the sake of distributive justice and social development. At the same time his views are like that of Bernard Mandeville and Adam Smith, who emphasizes the helpful of the social properties of evolution and impulsive instruction, and the liberals of America wants a radical limitation of the society on the grounds of thoughtful strategy.

Currently number of the Americans demand that the place of Hayek, as the “conservative” type, but he never accepts such notion and he says that it is misgiving and he can be considered as the ‘Liberal’. This misgivings are because of his liberalism, which stands slight similar to any political involvement and was given that name and because partly due to the great difference that separates his place and placed as, “rationalistic continental liberalism”. Hayek has so many reasons not to call himself as conservative even though he is regarded as the liberals by some of the conservative scholars. He states that, ‘true conservatism’ cannot by its very nature proposes a substitute to the current way of drive, while liberalism, exactly has directorial philosophies and certain objectives, identifies where it needs to go. Reference of Hayek, “the complacency of the conservative towards the action of established authority” and to “his prime concern that this authority be not weakened rather than that it probably kept within bounds”. In linking with the anti-democratic approach distinctive of conservatives, he comments that “it is not democracy but unlimited government that is objectionable”. Hayek additionally disapproves conservatives for their “lack of understanding of economic forces”, for their theology and traditionalism, for their aggression to nationalism and for their wistful desire for the past.

There are number of quotations given by him among them the two quotations are important as one can observe that, the essence of his specific type of liberalism: which he states, “Liberalism... derives from the discovery of a self-generating or spontaneous order in social affairs... an order which (makes) it possible to utilize the



knowledge and the skill of all members of society to a much greater extent than would be possible in any order created by central direction, and (reflects) the consequent desire to make as full use of these powerful spontaneous ordering forces as possible". And second quotation stated by him as, "The central concept of liberalism is that under the enforcement of universal rules of just conduct, protecting a recognizable private domain of individuals, a spontaneous order of human activities of much greater complexity will form itself than could ever be produced by deliberate arrangement, and that in consequences the coercive activities of government should be limited to the enforcement of such rules..."

To understand Hayek's liberalism, it is very much significant to note that, not like other majority of the political philosophers before to Hegel, Hayek did not dealt with certain conceptions of the human, they are necessary qualities and requirements. According to him nature of the human is importantly unspecified, and it will be in the course of creation, and it would be exposed to impulsive alteration in several dissimilar plans. He says that, if the nature of the man is exposed no one could assume the correct order of the society from its theoretical loyalties, even if one can trust that type of process may be logical.

A state which observes liberalism would perform very extensively to encourage race by rejecting all measures to curb trade and by revealing loss of all activities which are planned to impose them. According to Hayek the forced powers of the government must be restricted to impose the universal instructions of just behaviour, he also stressed repeatedly the significance of the non-coercive service which must be purposes of the government. The machinery of the market does not offer or provide sufficiently, for all the requirements and government has to intervene so that all the wealth may be allowed and pay in such a way so that everyone particularly those who are unable to earn minimum income. To obtain such things, the government have some sort of necessities such as, government must not have a monopoly in the requirements of welfare and at the same time it must not attempt to make the market itself to serve some ideal of distributive justice. It does, then it would merely reduce the total wealth in which all can share.

Hayek stated about the social progress as, “an advance towards a known goal”. He also continues that, it would be more correct to think of progress as a process of formation and modification of the human intellect, and a process of adaptation and learning in which not only the possibilities known to us but also our values and desires continually change. It is obvious that the growth cannot be prearranged and ensures automatically and result in accumulative stages of satisfaction or delight. The enjoyment is derived by achieving one’s ends and this will be more widespread in a changing society than in a stationary society, but he states that, the “assured possession may give us little gratification”.

The most significant component according to Hayek, is about the growth and its achievement and use of knowledge. It is by no means sure that the main stream of the individuals want everything and in such cases, then they do not contribute in progress is which is unavoidable. While Hayek talked about the means of personal liberty it turn out to be progressively simple, liberty matters mainly because of its influence to progress and it is agreed as the collective progress of information. Considering that if there are well-informed man then there would be very slight scope for the freedom. Freedom is important in order to leave room for the unanticipated things and at the same time it is changeable. According to Hayek Liberty can be appreciated not from the position of the individual in the society, he states as, what is important is not what freedom but what freedom some persons may need to do things beneficial to society. Moreover, the worth of any specific liberty is not to be adjudicated by totalling heads, the importance of liberty is to do a specific thing which has nothing to do with the amount of individuals who want to do it and this is due to the fact that, liberty is important in the social development may not extensively required.

Hayek claims that the liberty relished by a segment of society and it would be benefited to everyone because it is considered as the productive basis of material growth. Whereas, those who are disadvantaged of liberty would no hesitation to favour an indiscriminating suppression and with good reason. The principle quality needed for the interpretations of Hayek about the rule of law are generality, certainty and equality. He stated that laws need to be common in nature, comprising no

mention to details of any caring and relating every time defined situations are gratified. This looks like the Rousseau's insistence that, Rousseau says about it as, "The law always considered the subject in the round and actions in the abstract and never any individual man or one particular action". He stated that, laws should be identified and be sure, and by saying certainty which worth that, people are able to forecast the choices of the court to a substantial extent even though thorough probability can be achieved. It is also necessary that the law must be applied equally to all the persons in the society, which may be seen as the quality of the generality, he also stated that, the principle of equality can functional partly because classification is really inevitable. There are various other things which Hayek states about his uniform rules of Law.

The query of relationship between the rule of law and personal freedom has not so far actually measured stated by Ronald Hamowy about Hayek in his paper. It was specified before that for Hayek an individual is allowed when he is not matter to compulsion by the uninformed will of other individual. He says about the rule of law, which would look to suggest that a person is able when he follows laws which take the common qualities essential by the rule of law. The opinion of the Hayek appears to be established when he writes: "The conception of freedom under the law ... rest on the contention that when we obey laws, in the sense of general abstract rules laid down irrespective of their application to us, we are not subject to another man's will and are therefore free". He further stated that "even general, abstract rules, equally applicable to all, may possibly constitute severe restriction on liberty". Since he deliberates it improbable that they will ban greatly that anyone might sensibly desire to prepare. However, the option rests and in the circumstance of common implementation of religious opinions is acknowledged by Hayek and have been understood. The personal opinions of Hayek about majority decision making, he thinks that uncertainty will be evaded in this way. About liberalism, he writes in 'The Constitution of Liberty' as, "Accepts majority rule as a method of deciding, but not as an authority for what the decision ought to be". In a specific society, majority of women and men might support or uninterested about legal incapacities upsetting the female sex alone, but this fact would not bear on the question of sexual discrimination.

#### 4.5 Conclusion:

F.A Hayek was born on 8<sup>th</sup> May 1899 in Vienna, Austria-Hungary, in a supposedly Roman Catholic family that had been ennobled towards the end of 18<sup>th</sup> century. He was won the Noble prize, and was a great economist. His family produced a number of prominent intellects working in the areas of Statics and mainly in the field of Biology. F.A Hayek's father Dr. August Hayek was an eminent Botanist and Physician. Before completing his secondary education, to join in the army in March 1917, he lied about his age, almost three years after the beginning of the First World War, during that time in the army he earned 'decoration' for bravery and because of this experience of coordinating communication for his unit.

The political writings of the Hayek are also occasionally got a vigilant consideration and they in fact deserves to be. Most of the thinkers have either praised or attacked him very fast on his general liberal position difficulty to worry about it and supported. The outcome of this was that the actual significance about this branch has hidden with the ideological responses either favourable or adverse has been crated. According to Hayek, man contains, "liberty" or "freedom", he uses change them accordingly, he is not matter to compulsion by the uninformed will of another, he stated that, the liberalism is a policy which highlights the constraint to a least of the intimidating power of the government.

The main conception of the liberty as power can be regarded as the noble inspiring of the intellectuals, which consist of philosophers like, Hume, Locke, and Dewey. The displeasure of Hayek for this idea of liberty could be agreed that partially of his aspiration to reserve the actual meaning of the term and to improve the effectiveness by thoroughly limiting the claim of it. He thought that the liberty is in the sense of power, he also claims that is a dynamic variance between non-interference with another's performances and an individual's actual power to entertain. A state which observes liberalism would perform very extensively to encourage race by rejecting all measures in curb of trade and by revealing to loss all activities planned to impose them. According to Hayek the forced powers of the government must be restricted to impose the universal instructions of just behaviour, he also stressed recurrently the significance of the non-coercive service purposes of the government.

**4.6 Questions:**

1. Write about the early life of F. A Hayek?
2. Discuss about the Hayek's Liberty?

**References:**

1. Hansjoerg Klausinger, Collected works of F.A. Hayek, e book, 2012.
2. Lawrence H. White, F.A. Hayek Capital and Interest, e book, 2015.
3. Milton Friedman, The Road to Serfdom, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1991.
4. F.A. Hayek, The Constitution of Liberty, University of Chicago Press, US, 1960.

**Lesson 5****ROBERT NOZICK- MINIMAL STATE****Structure:**

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Early Life and Education
- 5.3 Writings
- 5.4 Minimal State
- 5.5 Nozick Reply to Anarchist Test
- 5.6 Conclusion
- 5.7 Question
- 5.8 References

**5.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to learn about Robert Nozick's early life.
2. Students would be able to understand about his Minimal state.

**5.1 Introduction:**

Robert Nozick was born on 16<sup>th</sup> November 1938, in Brooklyn, New York, United States Of America, he died on November 26<sup>th</sup> 2002. He was a renowned American philosopher, he was worked as Professor at Harvard University and he was more prominent during 1970s and 1980s. His famous works are "Anarchy, State and Utopia".

**5.2 Early Life and Education:**

His father was Jewish entrepreneur from Russia who was born by name Cohen. He studied at Columbia in 1959, later he did his Ph.D. from Princeton in 1963 under Carl Hempel, and Oxford as a Fulbright Scholar from 1963-64.

### 5.3 Writings:

He became very famous personality for his book, “Anarchy, State and Utopia” which was written in 1974, it is and libertarian answer to John Rawls’ ‘A theory of Justice (1971)’. His other works such as ‘Decision Theory and ‘Epistemology’. For his writings such as Anarchy, State and Utopia in 1974, got a national Book Award in Philosophy and Religion category. In this book he argues that the, the minimal state only can “limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, fraud, enforcement of contracts, theft and so on” and it can be justified without violating the rights of the people. According to him, by free exchange the goods can be dispersed between agreeable adults from just starting position, even they have big dissimilarities consequently develop from the process. Nozick drew to the Kantian notion that the people must be treated as ends which he means ‘separateness of persons’ not simply as a mean to some other end.

In 1993, he wrote ‘the Nature of Rationality’, which deals about the theory of practical reason which tries to elaborate extremely about Spartan Classical Decision Theory, in 1997 he wrote ‘Socratic Puzzles’ which is a collection of papers range in topic from Ayn Rand and Austrian Economics to animal rights.

### 5.4 Minimal State:

The theory of “Anarchy, State and Utopia” is to deal about the minimal state, and he justifies his minimal state. According to Nozick, minimal state, is that it would perform importantly as a ‘night watchman’, to safeguard the citizens against the violence, theft and fraud. He pursues to disprove the anarchism, and this has been disprove by any of the state in the world, and he says that it is required to have a minimal state to perform for the sake of citizens. He also disproves about the latest kinds of liberalism and also he disproves socialism too along with the ideologies of leftists. He stated that the state’s power is like that of night watchmen, and at the same time state must have authority to control the economic actions of citizens so that state can redistribute the wealth in the path of superior equality and so that it can improve the social services like education, and health care.

In contrast to anarchism, Nozick asserted that, minimal state is actually justified because “will ascend instinctively among the people existing in the imaginary or hypothetical ‘state of nature’ over the dealings that will not contain the violation of anybody’s natural rights”. Later, in the 17<sup>th</sup> century English philosopher John Locke, Nozick accepts that everybody contains natural rights to lead the life, liberty, and most importantly property, the right to entitle property as the result of one’s labour and the same person has the right to dispose property whenever he feels, if that in performing so no one interrupt the right of any other person. Every person has the right to punish those who violate or challenge to violate others natural rights. Guarding the individual’s natural rights in a state of nature will be tough for any person to perform individually, persons will group composed to form ‘protection associations’, followers will work composed to defend the right of every one and at the same time they can punish those who violates. Ultimately, some of these associations may grow into private business offering guard and the service of penalty for fee. The abundant significance that the persons will assign to the services which would offer the main safety of firms as natural modest benefit, and finally one firm or association of firms may regulate all the security and punishment of business in the community. So that, the firm or firms may have monopoly of power in the area of the community, and it is due to the fact that, it will safeguard the rights of every person existing there, it will establish a minimal state in the form of libertarian and also due to the fact that, minimal state will originate devoid of violating the natural rights and at the same time state is justified with authority.

In contrary to the liberalism and ideologies of lefts beyond to that, Nozick states that, not more than a minimal state is justified it is due to the fact that, any state with extensive authority will violate the rights of its citizens. Hence, the state will not have the authority to regulate the prices or to set the minimum wage for its working class, because by performing such action it may violate the natural rights of the citizens so that they can sell off their property, as well as their labour when they are equally suitable. Intended for the same purposes, the state must not have the authority to found public education or health care over the taxes which are compulsory on the citizens. According to Nozick any compulsory taxation is necessary so that state can



endowment services or welfares other than those constitutive of the minimal state is unjust, such kind of taxation would result in 'forced labour' and every one must pay the tax for the sake of state.

Though, the minimal state that Nozick search for is to protect, only not matter to the first of these challenges. Nozick's minimal state do not levy taxation, even for the sake of funding its rights and to protect actions. The minimal state of Nozick do ban the persons who cooperate with its customers from suitable clients of rival agencies that are not subject to supervision and constraint by the minimal state. Nonetheless, it do not need anybody to contribute to its services. Righteous anarchists and even persons who have faith to able trip on the minimal state's complete conquest of rights harms are ethically have liberty to take their probabilities.

Roth Bard, an anarchist also stated about the establishment and preservation of the minimal state would violate the important rights in two directions, such as, firstly, though the minimal state come into existence and stands by the help of levying taxes, secondly, though minimal state existed, by the help of forcible suppression or govern by challenging protective institutions. However, the minimal state of Nozick pursues to shield merely gives the impression of contradiction, Nozick minimal state do not levy taxation. Though, to being the state or even the minimal state, any organisation need to have some monopoly on the use of force on the large area, a caring institution must have to take care efficiently to meets the desires which could be suppressor of other persons who are engaging the rights as shielding force. Therefore, to develop for the statehood, a shielding institution has to work for close down or has to work to control over the some other non-outlaw institutions. It looks like in brief, it has to work for those institutes who are competitors of outlaw in a way that Nozick will announce to be not agreeable between the competitors in the distribution of service. He need to overcome the other challenge of the anarchist, he stated that, the leading shielding institutions formation of monopoly in the services of protection services varies from the usual regulation of competitors.

### 5.5 Nozick Reply to Anarchist Test:

Though, the entitlement about the tendency aimed at the 'virtual' monopoly to rise inside the rights to protect the business is only planned by Nozick to clarify the advent of a leading shielding connotation; it is not planned to clarify that the allowable dominance or control of association and its lasting non-outlaw contestants. Nozick admits the anarchist argument is that it is for an organization to increase or to withstand this one as a state, the necessity to overpower or regulate definite or potential non-outlaw contestants. To encounter the challenge of anarchists, he groups out to display how the dominant connotations suppress or regulate non-outlaw contestants which is not an abuse of the rights of those contestants even though they are non-outlaws.

According to Nozick, there will not exact reply to the question of how the dominant association must act toward the mediators in the center of the group, if the association had to select among orthodox suppression and safeguarding the voluntary consensus of the mediators who stop or revise the processes. However, luckily, act is obtainable to the dominant connotation, like overpass the limits to defend those unsatisfactorily unsafe processes whereas they are suitably reimbursing the matters of those crossings. It may be protested that moreover one has the right to prohibit these unsafe action of the people. If one does, then no need to reimburse the people for doing to them what one has the right to do; and if one did not... one must just to stop the forbidding,... . Then the problem is, "whichever you have a right to prohibit it so that you need not reimburse, or you do not have a right to prohibit it so you must halt".

How it ensures the principle of reimbursement and get us to the minimal state? According to Nozick, the necessary misunderstanding over the provisions of others defensive facilities of the association and train sufficiently of a monopoly over the delivery of those facilities to become an extreme minimal state. Nevertheless, below the principle of reimbursement, the dominant interference of association with temperately dangerous independents who are underprivileged by this interfering will be allowable only if the connotation reimburses those independents for those

weaknesses. Nozick foresees that reimburse men obviously captivating the procedure of the extreme minimal state if free or funded protective facilities to those who will be underprivileged by its interventions. When the extreme minimal state safeguards the acceptability of its monopoly and misunderstanding by given free or funded defense to those who are otherwise underprivileged by its oversee then it becomes a legitimate minimal state.

The minimal state of Nozick offers free or funded protecting facilities to some parties. To pay those free or funded services, the minimal state charges those who are the paying consumers, this might seem to be compulsory relocation; but it is not. In its place, the extra supervisions suffered by the remunerating customers of the minimal state that are required to fund reimbursement that must be paid if the mistake which is forced on behalf of the safety of the clients is to be allowable.

It is by this time noted that minimal state of Nozick varies from mutual representations of the minimal state since it ensures it will not levy taxation on finance its facilities. It is more like a business enterprise than a state. The rulers are not exist, there is no legislative body, no political elections, no competing parties and citizens. There is no sovereignty and no state territory. In its place, executives, board of directors, shareholders, customers, and the possessions of the enterprise. But the sail in the enterprise is relieve from the absenteeism of modest market restrictions on the price or the excellence of the facilities accessible by the monopoly. It seems that the only alternative approach to retain this monopoly in order to crisscross would be done by some sort of political constitutional constraints. Though, Nozick did not give any reference to these. A defensive association in chase of consumers may pledge itself to constitution on the choices and behavior as a manner of encouraging possible customers.

Nevertheless, Nozick ensures to be dedicated to the opinion of the legality for the real minimal state that may rise and it would rest on its climbed over allowable way and the rights about actions and it appears to be a problematic. Think through a minimal state that derives into presence when certain hostile persons snatch the supervisory body of a powerful forced device which has been constructed over many

years. On the other hand direct experience would change into careful libertarians. As soon as they can, then those persons pass on the forcible authority at their disposal from the hostilities against life, freedom, and property to suppress of rights abuses by non-violating worth. It appears that our decision about the legality of this minimal state must go chiefly on how it behaviors that one and not on the acceptability of the activities that clue to its survival.

Some of the significant feature of the minimal state suggested by Nozick as follows:

1. He states that the legitimate use of authority by the state is restricted by stopping scam or by the practice of power. It prepares not to comprise the authority to tax or to seize property. Opposing to the anarchist state of nature, he states, that state do not have the right to care for its security, Nozick answers: the state do not break up rights of person, in the meantime the anarchic state would progress rapidly into a minimal state condition anyhow, people would hire others to protect their rights, and the resilient safety organization will be the state.
2. To finance the projects state will levy the tax, other than security, and it provides rights.
3. According to him both socialism and liberalism demand for reorganizing the wealth: to attain 'justice' state will levy a outline on the delivery of goods, and such a form overlooks the history of how goods have come for distribution by the trade, labour, purchases, gifts, etc. To take away such goods form the people would be unjust, as far as the primary procurement of the goods was just for instance, one's own labour, inheritance. The state has the responsibility to safeguard one's property and to punish those who violate property rights. Only a limitless capitalism can crop a just society.

## 5.6 Conclusion:

Robert Nozick was born on 16<sup>th</sup> November 1938, in Brooklyn, New York, United States Of America, he died on November 26<sup>th</sup> 2002. He was a renowned American philosopher, he was worked as Professor at Harvard University and he was more

prominent during 1970s and 1980s. His famous works are “Anarchy, State and Utopia”. His father was Jewish entrepreneur from Russia who was born by name Cohen. He studied at Columbia in 1959, later he did his Ph.D. from Princeton in 1963 under Carl Hempel, and Oxford as a Fulbright Scholar from 1963-64. He became very famous personality for his book, “Anarchy, State and Utopia” which was written in 1974, it is an libertarian answer to John Rawls’ ‘A theory of Justice (1971)’. His other works such as ‘Decision Theory and ‘Epistemology’.

The primary function of Anarchy, State and Utopia is to deal about the minimal state, and he justifies his minimal state. According to Nozick, minimal state, he states that it would perform importantly as a ‘night watchman’, to safeguard the citizens against the violence, theft and fraud. He pursues to disprove the anarchism, and this has been disproved by any of the state in the world, and he says that it is required to have a minimal state to perform for the sake of citizens. To finance the projects state will levy the tax, other than security, it provides right and those who violate individual rights to decide how one's property is disposed of. Therefore, unconsented taxation is like forced labour. To finance the projects state will levy the tax, other than security, it provides right and those who violate individual rights to decide how one's property is disposed of. Therefore, unconsented taxation is like forced labour.

### **5.7 Question:**

1. Write about the early life and his writings?
2. Discuss about the minimal state?
3. Discuss about the Nozick’s reply to Anarchists?

### **5.8 References:**

1. Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State, and Utopia, Press of Harvard University, New Jersey, 1974.
2. Robert Nozick, Philosophical Explanations, Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data, USA, 1981.
3. Robert Nozick, The Nature of Rationality, Princeton University Press, 1994.



## Lesson 6

# JOHN RAWLS – THEORY OF JUSTICE

### Structure:

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2 Early Life
- 6.3 His Works
- 6.4 An Over View on Justice
- 6.5 Justice
- 6.6 Role of Justice
- 6.7 The Main Idea of Theory of Justice
- 6.8 The Issues of Distribute Justice
- 6.9 Procedural Justice
- 6.10 John Rawls Impartiality of Justice
- 6.11 Theory of Justice – Rawls Limitations
- 6.12 Communitarian Criticism
- 6.13 Feminist Criticism
- 6.14 Conclusion
- 6.15 Questions
- 6.16 References

### 6.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of John Rawls.
2. Students would be able to learn about the theory of Justice.

### 6.1 Introduction:

John Bordley Rawls was born on 21<sup>st</sup> February 1921, in Baltimore, Maryland in United States of America, and he died on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2002. He was an American political philosopher and moral philosopher as well, he worked as Professor, James Bryant Conant University at Harvard University and he got Fulbright Fellowship at Christ Church, Oxford. He also got Schock prize for his Logic and Philosophy and in 1999, he received National Humanities Medal which was presented by President Bill

Clinton, in recognition of how Rawls's work "helped a whole generation of learned American revive their faith in democracy itself".

## **6.2 Early Life:**

John Rawls was born to William Lee Rawls who was the most eminent attorneys in Baltimore and Anna Abell Stump Rawls. His two brothers died in childhood because they had contracted fatal illness from him. In 1928 he suffered from diphtheria, later from pneumonia, his biographer Thomas Pogge calls the loss of his brothers the "most important events in John's childhood". John Rawls started his early education with a school in Baltimore for little span of time before transferring to Kent School, an Episcopalian preparatory school in Connecticut. He completed his graduation in 1939, later he attended Princeton University, graduating summa cum laude and was accepted into 'The Ivy Club' and the American Whig-Closophic Society. He became very much concerned with theology and its doctrines during his last two years with Princeton, he considered attending a seminary to study for the Episcopal priesthood. He completed his Bachelor degree in Arts in the year 1943, and enlisted Army in February 1943.

## **6.3 His Works:**

In the year 1971, his important works like "Magnum Opus", "A Theory of Justice" which are considered as the most significant book since the World War II and now regarded as "one of the primary texts in political philosophy". The political philosophy of his dubbed Rawlsianism, is the beginning point the disagreement that, "the most reasonable principles of justice are those everyone would accept and agree to form affair position". He has employed number of thought experiments and challenges to govern the principles of 'social justice' like important 'original position' in which every person is fairly positioned as equivalents after a 'veil of ignorance'. He is regarded as one of the main thinkers in the tradition of liberal political philosophy. According to Jonathan Wolff, an English philosopher who claims that, "while there might be a dispute about the second most important political philosopher of 20<sup>th</sup> century, there could be no dispute about the most important: John Rawls".



## 6.4 An Over View on Justice:

It is observed that justice as a trait of law in our daily life, if look at closely one can understand that every law is not just. In reality, number of political social and political movements have been stressed upon opposition to unjust laws, for example movement against child marriages and freedom struggle in India. It is very obvious that in the Indian cinema, in the court scene, they project the statue of Goddess of justice, which indicates about the impartiality and fairness of justice. In the ancient times also from Plato and Aristotle they discussed about the justice, in republic, Plato attempts to institute the true nature of the justice and he also developed the ideal state which is embedded his thought of justice. Plato said that justice was one of the four principles of virtue, the other three being temperance, wisdom and courage, the Ideal state contains the aspect of justice.

Everywhere all person would be correct to his nature, certain men being logical and intelligent, and others good, workers are artisans and so on. In a just state every one would accomplish his responsibility thoroughly (unnecessary to add women hardly believing Plato's system of things). According to Aristotle, justice lies in integrating apprehensions of equality, proportionality and maintenance of the balance in the society. Therefore, in Aristotle one can find an alteration away from the idea of hierarchy that informed the Platonic concept justice.

Justice presented by Greek philosophy, there was a common silence on his subject, either divinity or God were appealed, or the ideal of natural justice or else customs and agreements, firm the ideas on justice with the gradual secularization of life in Europe. Justice came to be situated as a notion inflexibly within the secular frame work of the modern nation state. Whatever it meant and how it was to be maintained suggested different answers, but it was perfect that justice was no longer seen as religious principle or as founded on customary social practices.

## 6.5 Justice:

According John Rawls, the starring role of justice in social cooperation and with a short-term description of the key subject of justice, the elementary construction of the society. Condense of the society is substituted by an early that integrates definite

practical restrictions on opinions intended to lead to an original agreement on principles of justice. The main object is to find out a theory of justice that is a feasible substitute to these doctrine which have long dominated philosophical customs.

Rawls's first work which was published in 1971, which was expected to resolve the seemingly competing claims of liberty and equality. The position of Rawls's resolve took, conversely, was not that of a matching act that negotiated or debilitated the moral claim of one value equated with the other. Rawls's concentrating, reasonably, was to show that ideas of liberty and parity could be combined into a unified agreement he called "justice as fairness". By elucidating the correct viewpoint we must take when thinking about justice, Rawls hoped to show the thought encounter between liberty and parity to be illusive.

### **6.6 Role of Justice:**

It is obvious that justice is the first quality of any social organisation, as fact is the method of thought. A theory however it may be well-designed and economical must be disallowed or reviewed if it is incorrect; similarly laws and organisations does not matter how competent and well-organized must be reformed or eradicated if they are unfair. Every person owns blessedness originated on justice that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot dominate. For such reason justice denies that the loss of freedom for some is made right by greater good shared by others. It does not permit that the sacrifices forced on a few are outweighed by the larger sum of benefits enjoyed by many.

### **6.7 The Main Idea of Theory of Justice:**

The chief purpose of John Rawls is to present a conception of justice which take a broad view and transports to a greater level of concept the conversant theory of the social contract as found, for example, in Locke, Rousseau and Kant. In order to do this one must not think of the original contract as one to enter a specific society or to set up a specific form of government. Reasonably, the controlling notion is that the principles of justice for the elementary edifice of society are the purpose of the original agreement. These are the principles that free and cogent persons concerned to further their own interest would agree in primary position of equality as significant

the fundamental terms of their association. These principles are to control all additional agreements they identify the types of social cooperation that can be arrived into and the methods of government that can be established. This way of concerning the principles of justice he called 'justice as fairness'.

In justice as impartiality is the novel position of equality match up to the state of nature in the customary theory of the social contract. This novel position is not, of course thought of as real historical state of affairs, much less as a basic situation of culture. It is assumed as a purely hypothetical condition characterized so as to lead to a definite conception of justice. Among the important features of this situation is that no one identifies his place in society, his class position or social status, nor does anybody identify his fortune in the distribution of natural assets and capabilities, his intelligence, strength and the like. He expected that the parties do not know their conception of the good or their special psychological tendencies. The principles of justices are selected behind a veil of ignorance. This safeguards that no one is privileged or underprivileged in the choice of principles by the result of natural chance or the possibility of social conditions.

### **6.8 The Issues of Distribute Justice:**

Politics is to a great amount about what, why who gets it, it is seen in our country that the accessibility of school, the availability of safe drinking water, toilets, health care and many other important things are not attainable by citizens. It is to propose that reward or punishment that a man or women receive, or is exposed to, are a concern of their effort and actions. The benchmarks for merit also alike, which means commendable must be rewarded. If one is living in a world of plentiful resources, then the question of justice would not have come.

Political theorists split their responses to these questions into two wide groups 1. Procedural and 2. Social. There are visibly various differences with in these theories, but there are some chief aspects that could be shortened. In procedural theories, strains of justice are fulfilled if definite rules are monitored. The consequences of these ways are not appropriate to the evolution of justice, justice is only belongings of single behaviour and cannot be a feature of the society. Persons are assumed as independent and cogent organisms who create their specific self-determining

selections and are, thus, the accountable for the concerns of their movements. In the theories of the social justice, justice can be seen a feature of the society, so assessment is done in positions of not what a person get or do not get, but in positions of how just or unjust a society or state of affairs is according to particular approved principle. Those theories would be far more probable to believe the use of the state to uphold the principles of justice.

### **6.9 Procedural Justice:**

The elementary idea which is noteworthy about the procedural justice is that, those theories do not make dissimilarity between production and distribution, which means each person is on his/ her own and prerogatives that are distinct in character and not reliant on any abstract principle of distribution that proceeds the whole society into justification. It suggests that the state would have no expert witness to obstruct in the matter of individual rights; it would be awfully unjust if the state was to do so. Founded on a sturdy presence of individualism these theories do not accept that societies have any “ends” or purposes that need to be mutually make an effort for. It is really, a very gorgeous notion and brands the individual very influential, self-directed and totally in control of his/her life, and also completely answerable for the achievement or disappointments that he/she may come across.

### **6.10 John Rawls Impartiality of Justice:**

The noted book of John Rawls, ‘Theory of Justice’, offers a very healthy defence of the idea of justice which is created on the elementary policies of procedural theory, which means, justice needs a detailed following of rules. Even though, the theory of Rawls, maintain to answer to the shared criticism leveled against procedural theory- in spite of following rules systematically. The theory of Rawls justice is premised upon the requirement for equality, he assembles his theory by conveying individual from their social and economic competition in debts what he says is the ‘veil of ignorance’. Individual behind this veil are ignorant of who they are and what their interests, skills, needs and so on. Normally people are stopped from continuing off-air principles focused because they are by their selfish interests. In this context Rawls stated a hypothetical condition called the ‘original position’, these people would have basic information of economics, psychology and what he calls ‘a sense

of justice'. They would have no specific idea about the establishment of the good life but would be concerned to make best use of their primary liberty, opportunity, income, wealth and self-respect and having no possibility for bitterness. Henceforth, they would select principles which would maximize the location of the worst-off, presumptuous that when the veil is detached, they themselves try out to be the worst-off.

Rawls select the following principles of justice:

1. Every person is to have the same right to the widest freedom well-matched and similar freedom to others.
2. Social and economic disparities are to be organized so that they are both:
  - i. To the utmost benefit of the of the least privileged, and
  - ii. Devoted to offices and positions exposed to all under circumstances of just equality and opportunity.

Rawls organized these principles in a precise order and are matter to significant rule. The first principle need always come before the first, and 2 (i) has to before 2 (b). Therefore, there is no danger of individual liberty being bargained for the liberty of others. It also safeguards that any disappearance from the principle of equality carries extreme benefit to the least privileged, which means disparity necessarily be so organized that they benefit the worst-off.

### **6.11 Theory of Justice – Rawls Limitations:**

C.B Macpherson in his book 'Democratic Theory': 'Essay in Retrieval' Suggests that Rawls's theory of justice is really a graceful defence of what is really a liberal-democratic capitalist welfare state. Rawls agrees that in spite of equality of opportunity and education, inequalities would remain because of the institution of the family. To explain this idea he compare the variance between the son of member of the entrepreneurial class and the son of an unskilled labourers. He states that in the economy with those dissimilarities generate alterations in the outlooks by which incentives will be delivered to economy resulting well-organized and create good

wealth which will give benefits to everyone in the society including those who are the worst-off.

Therefore, he debate that, nothing would obtained by making attempts to iron out such dissimilarities, it is a defence of such a dissimilarity that Macpherson discovers unpredictable, given Rawls primary notion of equality. Inevitability of class divisions based on income and wealth has been agreed by Rawls whereas Macpherson states that, such dissimilarities may have adverse effect on the freedom of every person by making inequality of power in the society. The argument of Macpherson that Rawls did not in fact given a generalized account of justice instead he rationalizes values of liberal beliefs. Rawls agrees that his theory is mainly grounded on the presence of a specific type of individual who is free and equal, and occupies a pluralistic society that has no mutual contract about social organisations and ends, towards this they have to work. Hence, Macpherson states that, far away from existence general account of justice is appropriate to all rational human-beings, Rawls theory is traditional particular and suitable only for those who are liberal democratic society which has direction of welfare.

#### **6.12 Communitarian Criticism:**

The principal emphasis of communitarian assessment of Rawls about the notion that the people in the novel situation select a fixed principles that develop the groundwork of allegedly general notions of justice. The key argument of communitarians is that, the individuals can only be recognized as members of pre-existing social institutions which means that whatsoever thoughts both men and women ought to come out of the society and the community they represent. Communitarians matters to the notion that individuals preoccupied from their social, economic and traditional background could brand selections, they also deliberates that, such a 'striped-down' individual would be incapable to make selections. In the meantime Rawlsian veil of ignorance retains individuals out of a actual social background, communitarians deliberates that, individuals are strong-minded by their communitarian settings and the selections they categories are determined by their view of what is good. This idea of good is not in their belief a significances of individual reasonableness and

determination but is made and held together by what the community –to which the individual belongs-thinks of as being the good.

In the book of 'Spheres of Justice', Michael Walzer, discussed about the case of the communitarians against Rawls. The primary point of Michael Walzer, is that no method of justice could be appraised as characteristically just or unjust; and said about the likelihood of evaluation only on the grounds of the social meanings devoted to the goods at stake. The instances that given by the Michael is of the society mainly grounded on the caste system, where cleanliness and pollution are determined by birth. Therefore, birth chooses admission to a diversity of goods for example, land, water, education. Michael also deliberates that, as long as all the members of the society part the social values and maintenance the principle of delivery that follows from it. Therefore, the distribution of goods cannot be unquestionable without considering the precise significances of those goods which are socially created and surrounded in the community, its performs and organizations somewhat in individual actions and opinions. Hence, Michael propose that the goods that need to be dispersed are social goods because their meaning and values are produced socially.

### **6.13 Feminist Criticism:**

There is some criticism from feminist as well, in her book, 'Justice, Gender and the Family' by Susan Moller Okin, points out that most grand and philosophical works on justice merely consider the working of the family as being significant for any discussion on justice, she said Rawls is not different person he also tried the same. Okin contends that any theory which does not deal with inequalities within the family is an imperfect theory, if at all in such families the development of the young people in the families of injustice where they accept, concealed as it does in the take hold of either qualities like "nobility", "sacrifice", and "patience" or "nature", they can barely be anticipated to obtain a sense of justice and Rawls is misplaced this and she finds a fault in that.

The scheme presented by the Rawls, is that only the heads of the households are assumed men only who are agreed to accept the principles of the justice. Rawls admits that the family as the elementary arrangement of society for which the

principles of justice being preferred. But he never thought that it is required to consider about the injustices within the family. The advice of Okin while recalling the Rawlsian essence is to disagree people in the original locus any information of whether they are men or women and then maintains that they commence a progression of the family, for it is part of the elementary edifice of the society. Thus, she claims that, will result in an assessment of the injustices within the family and hence, a truly humanist idea of justice could be developed.

Specific feminists contends that it is the model of self-centered, independent, rational and peculiar person is a characteristic male conception and leaves slight possibility for values and practices like caring, cooperating, nurturing and empathy that are characteristic characters of female. Therefore, feminists contend that the female qualities are not correctly represented by Rawls, and the other argument is that, the stress given by Rawls, on impersonality, rationality and universality is primarily grounded on male norms of moral reasons; women style of moral cognitive is dissimilar ascending as it does out of seeing the specific requirements of every individual. Hence, the person in the novel situation is a man and Rawls theory should have little importance to women and exact situations and backgrounds.

#### **6.14 Conclusion:**

John Bordley Rawls was born on 21<sup>st</sup> February 1921, in Baltimore, Maryland in United States of America, and he died on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2002. He was an American political philosopher and moral philosopher as well, he worked as Professor, James Bryant Conant University at Harvard University. In the year 1971, his important works like “Magnum Opus”, “A Theory of Justice” which are considered as the most significant book since the World War II and now regarded as “one of the primary texts in political philosophy”.

It is observed that justice as a trait of law in our daily life, if look at closely one can understand that every law is not just. In reality, number of political social and political movements have been stressed upon opposition to unjust laws, for example movement against child marriages and freedom struggle in India. In the ancient times also from Plato and Aristotle they discussed about the justice, in republic, Plato attempts to institute the true nature of the justice and he also developed the ideal



state which is embedded his thought of justice. Plato said that justice was one of the four principles of virtue, the other three being temperance, wisdom and courage, the Ideal state contains the aspect of justice. The chief purpose of John Rawls is to present a conception of justice which take a broad view and transports to a greater level of concept the conversant theory of the social contract as found, say, in Locke, Rousseau and Kant. In order to do this one must not think of the original contract as one to enter a specific society or to set up a specific form of government.

The noted book of John Rawls, 'Theory of Justice', offers a very robust defence of the notion of justice created on the rudimentary doctrines of procedural theory, which means, justice needs a thorough succeeding of rules. C.B Macpherson in his book 'Democratic Theory': 'Essay in Retrieval' Suggests that Rawls's theory of justice is really a graceful defence of what is really a liberal-democratic capitalist welfare state. There is some criticism from feminist as well, in her book, 'Justice, Gender and the Family' by Susan Moller Okin, points out that most grand and philosophical works on justice merely consider the working of the family as being significant for any discussion on justice, she said Rawls is not different person he also tried the same.

#### **6.15 Questions:**

1. Discuss about the justice stated by Rawls about role of justice and main idea of theory of justice?
2. Write about the Issues of the distributive justice, procedural justice and Rawls imparity of justice?
3. Discuss about the limitations of Rawls theory of justice, and discuss about the criticism of communitarians and feminists?

#### **6.16 References:**

1. Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, Political Thought, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
2. R.K. Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.

3 Rajeev Bhargava and Ashok Acharya, Political Theory An Introduction, Pearson, New Delhi, 2012.

**Lesson 7****SAINT SIMON – SOCIALISM****Structure:**

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 Early Life
- 7.3 His Writings
- 7.4 His Views on Socialism
- 7.5 New Christianity – Saint Simon
- 7.6 Conclusion
- 7.7 Questions
- 7.8 References

**7.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Saint Simon.
2. Students would be able to learn about the Socialism.

**7.1 Introduction:**

Saint Simon was born on 17<sup>th</sup> October, 1760 in Paris France and he lived till 19<sup>th</sup> May 1825. He was also known as Claude Henri De Rouvroy, comete de Saint Simon and he was also called as Henri De Saint Simon. He was a French political and economic theorist, he was an eminent business personality and had played a significant role in influencing economics, sociology, philosophy of science and politics. He developed a political and economic ideology which is regarded as 'industrialism' which appealed that the requirements of the industrialists for which he called as 'working class' mandatory to be accepted and satisfied so that it can have an active society and well-organized economy. Many of the thinkers had the conception of manual labour only, he added all people engaged in the process of productivity and involved in the society, which means he added all the business people, scientists, bankers, managers including the manual labourers.

## 7.2 Early Life:

As he was born in Paris in an aristocratic family where he was from the younger branch of the family of the duc de Saint-Simon. It was stated that, when he was young man, having a restless disposition... he went to America and joined the American Service and took part in the siege of Yorktown under the leadership of General Washington. Since the childhood he was very ambitious person, he had some schemes where first one to connect Atlantic and Pacific oceans by a canal and the other to build a canal from Madrid to the sea. He joined the Army at the age of 17 years, served for four years in the American Revolutionary war and later involved in French revolution.

In 1789, at the starting of the French Revolution, he authorized the revolutionary ideals of 'freedom, fraternity and equality'. During the period of French Revolution, Saint Simon dedicated himself in establishing a huge industrial organisation so that he can found a school for the development of science. For this he wanted to raise the funds to attain his objectives, this could possible in the first few years of the revolution because of the instability and developing political conditions in France. Saint Simon was imprisoned in the "Terror Period", because of the suspicion of engaging revolutionary actions, he was released in 1794 at the end of Reign of terror. Later he was involved in political studies and research.

## 7.3 His Writings:

The first important writing of his was on scientific and political issues and it was "Letters d'un Habitant de Genève" which came in the year 1802, later in 1817, treatise entitled "L'Industrie" to propound his views on socialism, which he later in 1819, improved in L'Organisateur", it was a periodical on which Auguste Comte and Augustine Their work together. The first publication caused a sensation, later he found himself tumbledown and was required to work for his living. He got the financial support from Diard who was his former employee, and published his other book "Introduction aux travaux scientifiques du XIX siècle, in the year 1821, "systeme industriel" and in 1823-24 he produced "Catechisme des industriels".

#### 7.4 His Views on Socialism:

Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon was the famous social philosopher of France and was the main founders of the industrial socialism and evolutionary sociology. When he was imprisoned during 1793-94, and missed the execution this experience left on him a deep impact and opposed to revolutionary violence. From the beginning of 1802 to the chaotic years of Napoleon rule and the Bourbon restoration, he improved in wide range of programmes for the restructuring of Europe, his writings are eminent by their combination of enlightenment of standards, the acquisitiveness of bourgeoisie and stress on spiritual harmony characteristic of era of restoration. A model reminiscent of Hegel's contemporaneous writings and subsequently extended by Auguste Comte the famous disciple of Saint Simon.

Since the 15<sup>th</sup> century it was stated by Saint Simon that the Europe had been in a transitional crisis and during the medieval order which is grounded on feudalism and Catholicism began to give the route for a new method founded on industry and science. He wrote and suggested about the new method asking the influential leaders to hasten its inception as the only way to restore the stability. His last work which was written in 1825, *Le Nouveau Christianisme*, which inspired the Christian socialist movement known as "Saint Simonians, who were ardent to a secular gospel of economic progress and human brotherhood. After his demise, his ideas were reworked by followers into a famous book "Doctrines de Saint Simon". This book deals with socialism and is regarded as the first book of 'industrial socialism' and it had great impact on social democratic movement, catholic reforms and Marxism.

The last book of Saint Simon foretells about federation of the nations of Europe and ideas of socialism, later he was popularized by some of the young men such as Barthelemy Prosper Enfantin and Saint-Amand Bazard, who recognized a series of lectures, which was published between 1828-30, as "*L'Exposition de la doctrine de Saint-Simon*", where they entitled for the elimination of individual inheritance rights, public control of means of production and gradual empowerment of women.

In 1817 Saint-Simon published a manifesto in 1817 and named the "Declaration of Principles" in his work titled "*L'Industrie*" ("The Industry"). It deals about the principles

of an ideology which is known as 'industrialism', which is for the formation of an industrial society controlled by people within what he defined as the industrial class. For the industrial class, he also stated as the working class, which includes all people engaged in productive work that contributed to society. He understood the main risk to the wants of the industrial class from the lazing class which included talented people who chosen to be parasitic and benefit from the work of others while looking for avoid undertaking work. He considered the roots of this parasitic action by idlers as existence related with what he/she regarded as the natural idleness of humankind. Simon considered the chief economic characters of the government for instance protecting that productive action in the economy is unimpeded and falling idleness in society, in the Declaration Simon powerfully condemned any development of government interference into the economy further than these two principal economic characters. He said that when the government drives away from these roles then it turn out to be a "Tyrannical enemy of Industry" hence, the industrial economy will degenerate as a significance of such extreme government interference.

Simon was greatly prejudiced by the nonexistence of social privilege which was seen by him in the United States of America, Saint-Simon rejected his aristocratic title and came to approve a system of meritocracy (intelligence plus effort), and he was persuaded that the key to development was science and that it would be conceivable that the society can be improve founded on unbiased scientific principles. He also appealed that the society of feudalism either in France or elsewhere required to be disbanded and altered into an industrial society. He designed the beginning of industrial society. The views and ideas on economics was very much influences of Adam Smith, whom Saint-Simon intensely respected, and mentioned to him in praise as "the immortal Adam Smith". He also joined with Smith with the faith that taxes desired to be greatly condensed from what they were then in order to have a more just industrial system, Saint-Simon also wanted the minimization by the interference of government into the economy and to avoid disturbance of productive work, he also highlighted further forcefully than Smith that state administration of the economy was usually parasitic and aggressive to the requirements of the production. Similar to

Adam Smith, the ideal of society contend with by Saint-Simon by the scientific approaches of astronomy, and believed “The astronomers only accepted those facts which were verified by observation; they chose the system which linked them best, and since that time, they have never led science astray”.

Saint-Simon appraised the French Revolution and he considered it as a turmoil compelled by economic modification and in class struggle. In his investigation he thought that the explanation to the difficulties that directed to the French Revolution would be the formation of an industrial society where hierarchy of merit and respect for productive work would be the foundation of the society, whereas, positions of inherited and armed grading would diminish the significance in society since they were not skilled to lead a productive society. Even Karl Marx also recognized Saint-Simon as being amongst whom he called them as “utopian socialists”, and yet historian Alan Ryan esteems firm admirers of Saint-Simon, reasonably than Saint-Simon himself, as being answerable for the increase of utopian socialism that mainly founded on the ideas of Saint Simon.

He also opposed to the feudal and military system where the former feature of which had been reinforced by the reestablishment, he supported a system of technocratic socialism, by which chiefs of the industries must govern the society. It was also seen that in domicile of the medieval church, spiritual direction of society must fall to the men of science, those men who are formfitting to establish society for productive labour are permitted to rule the society. The battle between labour and capital was highlighted by well along socialism is not existing in Saint-Simon’s work, but then again it is expected that the industrial chiefs, to whom the mechanism of production is to fall, intend to rule in the interest of society. Later on, the reason of the poor obtains superior care, until in his utmost work, “The New Christianity”, which took the kind of a religion, this expansion of his thoughts caused his final quarrel with Comte.

The lives of Saint Simon and his followers were very rosy and often strange, which was noticed by the inclination of Fourier. One of his follower was very eminent person known as Duc de Saint Simon, who used to record the everyday affairs in the court of Louis XIV. Throughout his career, Saint-Simon battled together with

Lafayette and the American revolutionaries, and, returning to France, narrowly missed the execution. During the years he earned wealth and importance which he lost later, after the death of Saint Simon, the religious cult of Saint-Simonian developed and declaring the beginning of a new time, which is known as the “New Christianity”, while some others preached sexual freedom. Between 1850s-60s by the time of Second French Empire, most of the bankers, industrialists and prominent officials from government declared respect for the views of Saint Simon and the Saint Simonians.

The position of Saint Simon in the society was associated to the experience of either Fourier or Owen, which was never put him in touch with the facts of individualism. The experience of Saint Simon under the Directory is not worthy in this regard, he flourished because of his financiers and speculators. He was also like the persons who disliked by Fourier or Babeuf, and they saw corruption and an almost absence of wicked concern for the common person, Saint-Simon saw skill and enterprise. Wherever they had looked to capitalist growth with a suspicious eye, Saint-Simon welcomed it. Where they disliked England and its social system, he was a passionate “anglophile” which means the one who likes England. And wherever they were resisted by the wrongness and wrongdoing of Parisian society, Saint-Simon appreciated the company of excellent artists, scientists and men of affairs whom he come across at the fashionable barbershops.

For certain times Saint Simon looked to be a classic liberal aristocrat, who used to talked about the favourable language to the developing liberal and progressive middle class. However, he was something consistently more than a liberal and more than simple minder defender of ‘Laissez-Faire capitalism which means ‘let them do’. When his belief became more polished he became more worried about the risks integral in uncontrolled individualism. Either Owen or Fourier, Saint-Simon professed the complications of the novel industrialism of his own time and he tried to put his insights into a wide theoretic background. He perfected productivity, institute, efficiency, invention and scientific finding, though, this does not mean that these ends could be attained in a free market economy.



Although, Saint-Simon joins the working classes into his vision of the future, but the workers does not perform a leading or even significant place. Whereas, the physical labour would be respected and the parasitical orders could be forbidden, what would differentiate the new method was that the not so much of labour then again restructuring of labour and the request of skill to it. Therefore, the uppermost places of respect and power would be expected by a meritocratic, which means intelligence and effort, elite of intelligence and creativity. Saint-Simon was unquestionably exclusive, he did not see any reason to accomplish that manual labourers could on their own, establish and run well-organized and rational new order. They had the requirement of the power and route of an elite team of technocrats.

The views of Saint-Simon borrowed themselves to many re-interpretations. By way of 1830, five years after his death, his supporters divided into numerous factions and those who were proceeding in a socialist path constructed upon his refusal of individualist selfishness and rationalism and his distress for social solidarity and interdependent accountability. They promoted views of Saint-Simon and tried to brand them further eye-catching to the working classes. In pursuing superior backing, amongst the Saint-Simonians group of socialists also started to enquiry the organization of private property, particularly from the viewpoint of legacy laws whereby the children of the rich parents got wealth without individual worth or service to society. At the same time, Saint-Simon shielded private property as the compensation for accomplishment but he did not opinion it as a blessed or natural right: private property was slightly more than an organization which is useful in the institute of industrial productivity. The Saint-Simonians put this outbreak on the rights of inheritance into the background of a freedom of the utmost abundant class, and as part of a package to increase output. The end of inheritance was not a step toward communist egalitarianism.

In the past examination a significant impact of Saint-Simon and the Saint-Simonians was to associate socialism firmly with the idea of improvement by industrialization. This took the outcome of breaking away from the recessive viewing inclinations communism of Babeuf and the propensity to consider socialism as best attained in remote agricultural communities, and the credentials of socialism with the working

class and this could be a principal theme of the 1830s and 40s, moving Utopian Socialism away from its primary diverting predisposition on the way to an combination into historically imbedded activities and tangible social and economic actualities. In other words, the thoughts of the Utopian Socialists initiated to get into the working classes themselves, and particularly their socialist representatives among them.

Saint Simon, within the present industrial society, tried to lessen mass sorrows, compensate exploitation and wanted to alleviate property. To this his assistances are as follows: a. understanding of the likelihood of unlimited growth of science and technology b. understanding that the unlimited natural resources of the globe could be tapped and used and c. approval of the full flowering of human capabilities leading to excellence and removal of fight was likely in the industrial society. It was seen that there were some diversities between Marx and Simon about thoughts, firstly, Simon examined industrial society, whereas, Marx divided capital society. Secondly, Simon was more apprehensive about the post -revolutionary society but Marx was for historical unavoidability of the socialist revolution. Thirdly, Simon unlike Proudhon, thought that political organization was essential in a society and it must not be centralized, but Marx differed from it he wanted to have transitional state.

### **7.5 New Christianity – Saint Simon:**

The New Christianity, 1825, states as, “the more society us perfected morally and physically, the more its intellectual and manual efforts are subdivided; thus, in the ordinary course of life, the attention of men is fixed more and more upon objects of special interest, corresponding to the extent that the fine arts, science and industry progress”.

### **7.6 Conclusion:**

Saint Simon was born on 17<sup>th</sup> October, 1760 in Paris France and he lived till 19<sup>th</sup> May 1825. He was also known as Claude Henri De Rouvroy, comete de Saint Simon and he was also called as Henri De Saint Simon. He was a French political and economic theorist, he was an eminent business personality and had played and

significant role in influencing economics, sociology, philosophy of science and politics. As he was born in Paris in an aristocratic family where he was from the younger branch of the family of the duc de Saint-Simon. It was stated that, when he was young man, having a restless disposition... he went to America and joined the American Service and took part in the siege of Yorktown under the leadership of General Washington.

The first important writing of his was on scientific and political issues and it was "Letters d'un Habitant de Genève" which came in the year 1802, later in 1817, treatise entitled "L'Industrie" to propound his views on socialism, which he later in 1819, improved in "L'Organisateur", it was a periodical on which Auguste Comte and Auguste Thierry work together. Claude Henri de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon was the famous social philosopher of France and was the main founders of the industrial socialism and evolutionary sociology. When he was imprisoned during 1793-94, and missed the execution this experience left on him a deep impact and opposed to revolutionary violence. From the beginning of 1802 to the chaotic years of Napoleon rule and the Bourbon restoration, he improved in wide range of programmes for the restructuring of Europe, his writings are eminent by their combination of enlightenment of standards, the acquisitiveness of bourgeoisie and stress on spiritual harmony characteristic of era of restoration.

Simon was greatly prejudiced by the nonexistence of social privilege which was seen by him in the United states of America, Saint-Simon rejected his aristocratic title and came to approve a system of meritocracy, and he was persuaded that the key to development was science and that it would be conceivable that the society can be improve founded on unbiased scientific principles. Saint-Simon appraised the French Revolution and he considered it as a turmoil compelled by economic modification and in class struggle. In his investigation he thought that the explanation to the difficulties that directed to the French Revolution would be the formation of an industrial society where hierarchy of merit and respect for productive work would be the foundation of the society, whereas, positions of inherited and armed grading would diminish the significance in society since they were not skilled to lead a productive society. Saint Simon by any definition cannot be regarded as socialist in

fact the word socialist is linked with him because of his disciples, known collectively as the Saint-Simonians who became socialist at later period. The lives of Saint Simon and his followers was very rosy and often strange, which was noticed by the inclination of Fourier. One of his follower was very eminent person known as Duc de Saint Simon, who used to record the everyday affairs in the court of Louis XIV.

### **7.7 Questions:**

1. Write about the early life of Saint Simon and his writings?
2. Discuss about his views on socialism?

### **7.8 References:**

1. Subrata Mukherjee, Sushila Ramaswamy, A History of Socialist Thought From the Precursors to the Present, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2000.
2. B N Ray, Political Theory, Authors press, Delhi, 2006.
3. Arthur John Booth, History of Socialism in France, Longmans, London, 1871.

**Lesson 8****ROBERT OWEN – SOCIALISM****Structure:**

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Early Life
- 8.3 Social Philosophy, Reforms and Influences
- 8.4 Socialism- Robert Owen
- 8.5 Owenism-Raise and Fall
- 8.6 Reasons for not Success
- 8.7 Conclusions
- 8.8 Questions
- 8.9 References

**8.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Robert Owen.
2. Students would be able to learn about the Socialism.

**8.1 Introduction:**

Robert Owen was born on 14<sup>th</sup> May 1771, Newtown, Montgomeryshire, Wales, in United Kingdom. His father was also named Robert Owen and his mother Anne Williams. He was the sixth child out of seven children, his father had small business as a saddler and ironmonger, his mother was from prosperous family of farming family. He was Welsh social reformer and well known founders of 'Utopian Socialism' and 'cooperative movement'. Robert Owen came to America in 1824, and he invested in an experimental 1,000 member colony on the banks of Wabash River in Indiana which is known as "New Harmony". New Harmony was to be a utopian or ideal/ perfect society.

## 8.2 Early Life:

Robert Owen perceived his early education and completed by the age of 10 years. He worked in Draper's shop for some years from 1787, later he settled in London. He left for Manchester and worked at Satterfield's Drapery in St. Ann's Square. He became the manager of a mill when he became 21 years in Manchester at Chorlton Twist Mills. He had very good entrepreneurial spirit, management skills and progressive moral thoughts, he was elected as a member of the Manchester Literary and Philosophical Society in 1793. Here the thoughts of reformers and philosophers of the enlightenment were deliberated, he became the member of the committee of the Manchester Board of Health as well, which was started by Thomas Percival, to improve the working conditions and health of the factory workers.

When he visited Glasgow, Owen fell in love with Caroline Dale who was the daughter of David Dale, who was the owner of the New Lanark Mill. He influenced his partners to buy the mill, he married Caroline in September 1799 and lived there. He was greatly inspired by his success in the management of cotton mill in Manchester, he hoped to conduct New Lanark on higher principles and focus less on commercial principles. In New Lanark, mill was started by David Dale and Richard Arkwright in 1785. The Hydro power was provided by the falls of the river Clyde. There were 2,000 people attendant with the mills, out of which 500 were children who were between five to six years of age from the poor houses and charities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, though the children had been treated very well by the Dale the general situation of the people was very disappointing. Most of the workers were in the lowermost planes of the inhabitants, thefts, drunkenness and other badness were very general; education and sanitary situations were totally ignored; and the piety condition was that most of the families lived in one room. Some of the respected country people rejected to stand up to long hours and discouraging labour of the mills.

A lot of employers functioned the 'truck system' and paid workers in part or completely by tokens. These tokens had no value outside the mill owner's 'truck shop'. The owners may possibly provide inferior goods to the truck shop and charge highest prices. A chains of such shops were stopped this abuse by an act called

“Truck Acts” in between the years 1831-1887. The Acts made believed that it as a crime if the employees not paid in common currency. At that time Owen started a store where the people can buy goods of complete quality at little more price than the wholesale cost but he engaged the sale of alcohol under stringent control. He traded superior goods and accepted on the savings from the wholesale buying of goods to the workers. These principles became the foundation for the cooperative shops in Britain that remain to trade in the present day. His utmost achievement was in the sustenance of the youth, to whom he paid extraordinary consideration. He was the originator of infant childcare in Great Britain, especially in Scotland. Although his reform thoughts look like European reform thoughts of the time, he was not influenced by the foreign opinions; his thoughts of the perfect education were his individual.

### **8.3 Social Philosophy, Reforms and Influences:**

Most of the workers did not have confidence in him in the beginning but later he won the confidence of his workers and which gave the success in the commercial side at the same time some of his schemes were very luxurious which made his partners to displeasure. He brought new investors like Jeremy Bentham and Quaker William Allen allowed his philanthropy. In the same year, Owen first authored quite a few essays in which he explained on the principles behind his education philosophy.

Owen had been initially a supporter of the classical liberal and utilitarian Jeremy Bentham, and he was believer of free markets, it had the will of the workers to select his employer and it would allowed the workers to take out unnecessary power by capitalists. The principal ideas in his philosophy were that human character is planned by conditions over which he has no control, hence, men cannot be correctly praised or blamed. These principles is the sign to the deduction that the unlimited secret in the right development of the charisma of gentleman is to put him under the appropriate impacts such as physical, moral and social from his earliest years. The principles of the carelessness of man and of the outcome of early impacts are the significant to Owen’s system of education and social enhancement. They are alive in his first work, “A New View of Society” or “Essays on the Principle of the Formation of Human Character”, in the year 1813. Owen’s opinions theoretically be appropriate

to a very old system of philosophy, and his novelty is to be found only in his compassionate application of them.

The behaviors of the children, carried up under his system, were attractively elegant, friendly and unrestricted; health and satisfaction succeeded; drunkenness was almost unidentified; and illegitimacy was exceptionally rare. Owen's association with the workers continued outstanding, and all the processes of the mill continued with the greatest silkiness and uniformity. The most significant reforms of Robert Owen raised in 1810, was the claim for a ten hour a day and introduced it in his socialist enterprise at New Lanark. By 1817 he had conveyed the goal of the eight hour a day and coined the slogan: "Eight hours labour, Eight hours recreation, eight hours rest". Robert Owen is considered as the "Father of British Socialism".

He planned that people of about 1,200 persons must be established on land from 1,000 to 1,500 acres (4 to 6 km<sup>2</sup>), and he said that all can breathe in one large square building, with public kitchen and mess-rooms. Every family must have its own private apartments and the whole care of the children till age of three, after that they must be brought up by the community; their parents would have entree to them at meals, though, and at all other appropriate times.

#### **8.4 Socialism- Robert Owen:**

Owen is still known in the Europe and across the channel, however he is regarded as one of the universal personality in his own country Britain. It is considered that the Communist Manifesto, criticized Saint-Simon, Fourier and Owen, perfectionist and anti-revolutionary socialists of the middle class people, even though it is about the 'scientific socialism' and particularly Robert Owen, was the first person to criticize the faults in the capitalism, and rejected to see the labouring class as simply as working class. It is known that the Marxist are not the only in holding such undecided views towards Owen. He was concentrated and outdated in his own lifetime by Communists and Chartists Owen's idea, or Owenism, which has been tolerated and been applicable in numerous methods. There is certainly a convinced sentiment of restlessness as concerns the features of his principles which are regarded as the most utopian, however, he measured as a founding father, he is also a forerunner of



popular education and is considered as one of the initial councils of an exactly British branch of socialism that developed earlier to Marxism and thus, be obliged nothing to it. A custom now sustained by the New Labour Movement, these explanatory uncertainties are quite revealing.

It appears that the challenging speeches of those who have required to extend his memory have sunk out the existence of the man, as a result, his importance rests both indefinable and inconsistent. Hence, it is very much essential to reconsider the theory of Owen from historiographical fact of assessment, first, in relation to a likeness on the roots of socialist idea, one need to look back to pre-Marxian tradition of assistance and communitarianism. One need to examine the multifaceted inheritance of thoughts of Owen beside the background of present disaster of the British left, uncertain between Old and New Labour and observing back to its non-Marxian past to redefine itself. Lastly, we required to recognize how and why utopian socialism and its ill-framed uncompromising implications came to be seen as the beginning of the British socialist movement.

### **8.5 Owenism-Raise and Fall:**

From New Lanark to his entire life he was persistently encouraged his doctrine by the means of publication of number of books and establishments of different communities in Britain and United States of America. After coming back from America he found small number of followers who used to name themselves as “Owenites” or “Socialists”. The important factor of communists was violent actions and revolutionary principles for which he was very strongly conflicted. Owen and his Owenites started their communities with exception care and they followed it very carefully and they also thought that the race of human beings would gradually even progressively change to their doctrine. All these communities unsuccessful because of financial crunch and disagreements among themselves. It was the reality that there was a forever gap of widening between the approach of Owen and the New Lanark legacy and a minority of more radical followers. During the time of Great Reforms Act debates, Owen maintained a defiant approach towards the working class according to him they were too much likely to occupy in revolutionary actions under adverse situations. He connected democracy with the dictatorship of the

working class, which would only substitute the current type of dictatorship, that of aristocrats and capitalists. Besides he thought that the working classes unable to govern themselves, they had to be taught to do so from the above, which means by themselves. By the increase of trade unions and labour movements, Owenism was gradually observed outdated. Their flagship community of Queenwood, Hampshire were bankrupt in 1844, and was the end of the Owenism as an organized political movement.

Owen was not in favour of the modern system of factories, therefore, he wanted to revolutionize them. The method of the factory inspired the social accountability, damaging opposition and cruel individualism, in disparity, the pre-industrial society was categorized by a pervasive social conscience, by giving confidence by the higher order that they had to take care of the poor and unlucky, it has the strong logic of the community amongst the working class. In the works of “A New View of Society” in 1813, he suggested a plain, simple, practical plan which would not enclose the very smallest risk to any person, or to any part of the society, and it had the aim to promote the poor persons and making them self-reliant. In this context Owen had got the backing of the anti-modernizers, it shortly became apparent that his thought and practices had more in general with democratic-radical customs than to maintain the status-quo. The characteristic way of 18<sup>th</sup> century he also disallowed the customs and the Christianity and observed to the exclusive direction of reasons and nature. Owen debated that human nature could be altered: since we are all yields of our environment, one need only alter the environment to change man. This environmentalism of Owen’s became a foundation of all socialist theories and programs of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

Owen also disagreed the democratic-radical stress on the exertion of individual competition it is due to the fact that, the personal experience convinced him that he had fortunate consequence, Owen was not afraid of Thomas Paine. He also deliberated that the greatest happiness of the greatest number must be the examination of any process but, not like Adam Smith and Jeremy Bentham, he did not trust that the best method is to guarantee the happiness of the human beings is mainly by the increase in the productivity of the free market system. He also stated

that, the symphonic preparation and cooperation would lead to more production in the interest of the society. The primary plans of Owen to launch a utopian community which looks like that of Fourier, but it was without the dynamics of the 'theory of passionate attraction'. For these settlements he stated as the 'Villages of Cooperation' and these villages were self-reliant communities of agriculture in which unemployed can find employment. He was very sure that, these villages grow very fast firstly, due to the fact that they are mainly grounded on the cooperative labour, secondly, they can produce more than private enterprise. Nevertheless, it did not see any sea change in Britain and could not get sufficient capital from the government even he did not get adequate support from the private sector. Because of this the private sector workers started looking him very suspiciously, though he was the owner of the Mill. The village constantly on the profits but unfortunately for him the idea did not spread, the one probable reason might be the location of New Lanark. It was totally relies on water power rather than that of steam and was complete with workers who were brought from other places. New Lanark was working under situations that were characteristic of the early phases of textile production, situations which were actual and very speedily overwhelmed by the speedily progressing Industrial Revolution.

Owen projected mutual ownership and cooperatives for handling the crisis causing from over production. He decided that mechanization ran to an upsurge in production but unless consumption kept pace, unemployment and industrial crises could not be avoided. This meant that social welfare somewhat than private profit had to be the objective of the industry. He was influenced that the substitute to the capitalism and private enterprises was mutual ownership. Owen in the social system took up a comprehensive communist position eradicating the institution of private property, for that could promote overall happiness of all persons. Concerned to understand his principles in practice, he obtained the rapist community at harmony, Indiana in the USA. Owen also persuaded of the notion of the joining trade unions and cooperative societies into one single institution with the goal of converting them in a communistic logic so as to place the whole country on a cooperative basis. Owen foresaw cooperative societies consisting of trade unions which switched their goods through labour connections.

### **8.6 Reasons for not Success:**

It is obvious that the experiment of New Lanark was not correct social experiment on the first hand, in fact he and his partners are the masters of the mill and he did not gave proper democratic view or involvement of the workers. The motive to achieve profits and the private ownership stayed even though, of the excessive humanistic actions which had been approved by him. Hence, the failure of the model of New Lanark was not the end of the socialist model and the failure of New Lanark was due to the failure of the authoritarian humanitarianism of Owen. It had to be noted that the kind of workers who were brought to New Lanark was of a homogeneous kind in nature, which are Scottish workers of Calvinist upbringings who were persuaded to discipline , uncomplaining labour.

In 1820, he was very much frustrated and wanted to start a community in America, hence, in 1824, travelled to America and went to Washington where he was received with fanfare. He went to New Harmony, Indiana and bought a big land, it was the first and very renowned sixteen Owenite communities which came during 1825-1829. None of them lasted for long years as full-fledged social communities, New Harmony was collapsed because one of his partner ran off with the profit, and the other problem was motivational, most of the workers came to New Harmony as thoughtful supporters of Owenism and other came to dance, sing and play. Owen understood that he was not working with hardworking and self-satisfied workers of Scotland, the American amongst the Owenites, were from the democratic customs and have the hesitations about surrender to the authority of Owen whether paternalist or not. He did not stayed for long in New Harmony, when opposed with disagreement he advised the colonists to think about what they were doing, by doing so they find the error of their ways and become rational. In the end, nevertheless, the eternal principles which were claimed by Owen to have discovered were not enough to keep New Harmony intact. He gave up his American experiment and returned back to England in 1828, he started organizing the working classes.

### **8.7 Conclusions:**

Robert Owen was born on 14<sup>th</sup> May 1771, Newtown, Montgomeryshire, Wales, in United Kingdom. His father was also named Robert Owen and his mother Anne

Williams. He was the sixth child out of seven children. Robert Owen perceived his early education and completed by the age of 10 years. He worked in Draper's shop for some years from 1787, later he settled in London. He left for Manchester and worked at Satterfield's Drapery in St. Ann's Square. He became the manager of a mill when he became 21 years in Manchester at Chorlton Twist Mills. Robert Owen came to America in 1824, and he invested in an experimental 1,000 member colony on the banks of Wabash River in Indiana which is known as "New Harmony". New Harmony was to be a utopian or ideal/ perfect society.

When he visited Glasgow, Owen fell in love with Caroline Dale who was the daughter of David Dale, who was the owner of the New Lanark Mill. He influenced his partners to buy the mill, he married Caroline in September 1799 and lived there. There were 2,000 people attendant with the mills, out of which 500 were children who were between five to six years of age from the poor houses and charities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, though the children had been treated very well by the Dale the general situation of the people was very disappointing. Chains of such shops were stopped this abuse by an act called "Truck Acts" in between the years 1831-1887. The Acts made believed that it as a crime if the employees not paid in common currency. At that time Owen started a store where the people can buy goods of complete quality at little more price than the wholesale cost but he engaged the sale of alcohol under stringent control.

The most significant reforms of Robert Owen raised in 1810, was the claim for a ten hour a day and introduced it in his socialist enterprise at New Lanark. By 1817 he had conveyed the goal of the eight hour a day and coined the slogan: "Eight hours labour, Eight hours recreation, eight hours rest". Robert Owen is considered as the "Father of British Socialism".

### **8.8 Questions:**

1. Write about the early life of Robert Owen his philosophy, reforms and influences?
2. Describe about the socialism of Owen and Owenism?

3. Write about the rise and fall of Owenism and the reasons for not succeeding in New Lanark?

### **8.9 References:**

1. Subrata Mukherjee, Sushila Ramaswamy, A History of Socialist Thought From the Precursors to the Present, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2000.
2. B N Ray, Political Theory, Authors press, Delhi, 2006.
3. Robert Owen, Report to the County of Lanark a New View of Society, Penguin books ltd,1970.
4. Owen, Robert, New View of Society, Littlehampton book Service ltd,1973.
5. Owen, Robert, A New View of Society( Revolution & Romanticism), Woodstock Books, 1991.

## Lesson 9

# KARL MARX – CRITIQUE OF CAPITALISM, REVOLUTION

### Structure:

- 9.0 Objectives
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 Early Life
- 9.3 Early activism and Hegelianism - 1836-43
- 9.4 Influences on Karl Marx
- 9.5 Critique of Capitalism
- 9.6 Theory of Surplus value
- 9.7 Revolution
- 9.8 Conclusion
- 9.9 Questions
- 9.10 References

### 9.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Karl Marx.
2. Students would be able to learn about the critique of capitalism.
3. Students would be able to state about his revolution.

### 9.1 Introduction:

Karl Marx was born on 5<sup>th</sup> May 1818, Trier, Kingdom of Prussia in Rhineland, German Confederation, and he died on 14 March, 1883 in London. He was very renowned German philosopher, sociologist, journalist, economist and most importantly was revolutionary socialist. He was born in a rich middle class family, he completed his education in the universities of Bonn and he got the interest in the philosophical ideas of the “Young Hegelians”. When completed his education he started writing for a radical newspaper in ‘Cologne’ and stated to work on the theory

of 'materialist conception of history'. In 1843, he moved to Paris where he started working for the radical newspapers and later he met Friedrich Engels, who became his close associate throughout his life. He was later exiled and he moved to London in 1849 along with his family and there he continued his writings and framed his theories about social and economic actions. He canvassed for the socialism and became an important personality in the 'International Workingmen's Association'. The works of Marx in economics gave the position on the roots of the present understanding of labour and its relation to capital, and successive economic belief. He is regarded as one of the founders of sociology and social science, he published number of books in his life time but most noteworthy books are 'The Communist Manifesto' which was written in 1848, and the "Das Kapital" was written from 1867-94.

## **9.2 Early Life:**

About the early life of Karl Marx was known very little, he was the third child out of nine to Heinrich Marx and Henrietta, in August 1824, he was baptized into Lutheran Church. He was educated privately by his father Heinrich Marx until 1830, later he joined in Trier High School the Head master Hugo Wytttenbach was the friend of his father. The most of the teachers in the school were 'liberal humanists' Wytttenbach suffered the anger of the local conservative government as a result school was raided in the year 1832, and founded that the literature backing political liberalism was circulated among the students. Seeing such material distribution was a seditious act (rebellion act), the government introduced reforms and replaced most of the staff.

At the age of 17, in the year 1835, Karl Marx joined in the "University of Bonn" in order to study 'literature and philosophy', anyhow, his father claimed to join in law because it is more practical field. Because of his weak chest he was excused from the duty of Army when he became 18. Marx associated with the poets' club when he was in the Bonn University, the club consisted of group of radicals who were consistently monitored by the police. Marx also joined the Trier Tavern Club drinking society which is known as 'Landsmannschaft der Treveraner', he was involved in some of the disputes which turned to be very serious: he joined in a duel with a member of the university's Borussia Korps, though he got good grades in the first



term, they were worsened soon, this led his father to force a transfer to much serious about his academics later he joined in “University of Berlin”.

### **9.3 Early activism and Hegelianism - 1836-43:**

Karl Marx became more serious about the studies and his life, he was engaged to ‘Jenny von Westphalen’, an educated personality, a ruling class of Prussia and was known to him since childhood, their relationship was socially controversial because of the differences between their ethnic and origin of class, but he was so friendly with her father also who was a liberal aristocrat, known as ‘Ludwig von Westphalen, to whom he later dedicated his thesis to him. Though he was doing law but he was charmed by philosophy and he searched to combine these two, he said that, “without philosophy nothing could be accomplished”. Karl Marx had been influenced by the German philosopher G.W.F Hegel, the ideas of Hegel were very much discussed in the Europe’s philosophical personalities. In Stralau, during a rehabilitation he joined the Doctor’s Club, where a group of students debated about the views and thoughts of Hegel, in 1837, by them he associated with a group of radical thinkers who are called as “Young Hegelians”; they gathered around ‘Ludwig Feuerbach and ‘Bruno Bauer’, through them Marx developed a close friendship with ‘Adolf Rutenberg’. Along with Karl Marx the other young Hegelians were also very critical about the ‘Metaphysical Assumptions’ of Hegel, but they adopted his ‘dialectical method’ so that they can criticize established society, politics and religion from the perspective of leftists. The other significant contribution to Marx’s revision of Hegelianism was from the book of Engels “The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844”, which led Marx to observe as the historical dialectic in standings of class conflict and to see the modern working class as the most liberal force for revolution.

His philosophy and political thought, was polemic with other thinkers often occurred through critique, and hence, he has been called as ‘the greatest user of critical method in social sciences’. He criticized speculative philosophy, equating with ideology. He adopted the above methods by doing so, he tried to differentiate the important findings from ideological biases, and this gave him a special position among different contemporary philosophers.

### 9.4 Influences on Karl Marx:

The thoughts of Karl Marx proves the influences of many thinkers and most prominent among them are as follows:

- George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, his philosophy
- Adam Smith and David Ricardo, the classical Political Economy
- French socialist thought, in particular the thought of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Henri de Saint Simon, Pierre Joseph Proudhon and Charles Fourier
- Earlier German Philosophical materialism, particularly that of Ludwig Feuerbach, the working class analysis of Friedrich Engels.

### 9.5 Critique of Capitalism:

The classic book by Karl Marx in 1867, Das Kapital, it is generally known as the “The Bible of the Working Class”, which is a critical analysis of political economy which deals about the patterns of economy which focuses the capitalist way of production. In this he suggests the inspirational force of capitalism is nothing but mistreatment of labour, the surplus value results in profit is mainly because of the unpaid works of the labour, and they have detailed meaning for Karl Marx. The employer always talks about the rights for his profits because he/she owns the productive capital assets which means production and these are being safeguarded by the capitalist states by means of ‘property rights’, the historical segment displays how this right was attained in the first place mainly by stolen goods and overthrow and the actions of the merchant and middleman. While creating ‘capital’ (money) and ‘commodities’ (goods and services), the workers of organization put their labour constantly to generate the economic positions. Capital suggests and clarification of the ‘laws of motion’ about the method of capitalistic economy from the roots of its origin during its course of future, it is by the forces at work building up the capital, in this process increase of wage labour, the transformation of the work place, the concentration of capital, commercial competition, the banking system the decline of profit rate, in of the, land rates etc., are regarded as the main concerns.

The economic theory is lacking of moral and conceptual arguments, being mainly continued fight about fundamental catastrophe lying nature of the capital system. In

the later works of Marx, did not give up, like Capital, his previous notional deliberations of the character of human isolation and the meaning of liberation; fairly he silences the philosophical measurement and intensifies the specific experiential and theoretical analysis of capitalism in order to improve a model of capitalist crisis and social transformation. In the German edition of 1873, Marx, concisely condenses the dialectic process and highlighting its alterations from idealism of Hegel and Marx methods has three important aspects, they are:

1. It undertakes the unavoidable downfall of the present social order.
2. It understands each social system as exist in watery drive, identifying the historical origins of modern social actuality.
3. Finally, it 'lease's nothing levy upon it', presence of radical in essence and focused on the integration of theory and praxis.

Marx accomplishes by presenting that capitalism is a self-contradicting manner of making. The growth of capital, he has claimed, inevitably makes a great form of unemployed workers as the organic arrangement of capital changes, substituting variable capital (wages) with continuous capital (plant and tools). The result of the Marx's dialectic process is the conclusion that capitalism cannot continue, loaded as it seemingly is with serious and enduring flaws.

The capitalist assumption, is the outcome of the capitalist style of production and it crops capitalist private property. This is the first denial of individual private property, as established on the labour of the proprietor. But capitalist making causes with the inevitability of a law of nature, its own denial. This does not regenerate private property for the producer, but it gives him inseparable property founded on the attainments of the capitalist period: which means on assistance and development in common of the land and of the means of production. The alteration of distributed private property ascending from individual labour, into capitalist private property is obviously a procedure, excellently more protected, ferocious and difficult than the alteration of capitalist property, previously almost resultant on socialized productions, into socialized property. In the case of former, we had the expropriation of the mass of the people by the forthcoming usurpers; in the latter, we have the expropriation of a few usurpers by the mass of the people.

## 9.6 Theory of Surplus value:

Surplus value is the main principal idea of the critique of political economy by Marx, he did not coined the word of surplus value, he established this term from the German word “Mehrwert”, which means ‘value added’ form this notion he developed the idea and used the term ‘surplus value’. Usually, value-added is identical to the total of sum of gross wage income and gross profit income. But Marx used this concept in divergent way, for him, Mehrwert, means to the yield, profit or return on the production capital invested. Which means amount of the increase in the value of the capital. Therefore, the word used by him was interpreted as ‘surplus value’ and differentiating it from the ‘value added’. Marx, stated in this theory, the surplus value is identical to the new value generated by workers in addition of their own cost of labour, which is assumed by the capitalist as the profit while products have been sold. He thought that from 19<sup>th</sup> century, the increase in the population and wealth was because of the competitive endeavours to attain maximum surplus value from the employment of the labour, which ensues in the increase in the productivity and capital resources and it was at the level that, gradually the economic surplus is exchangeable into money and spoken in the form of money, accrual of wealth is likely on a larger scale.

The cause explain by Friedrich Engels, about the source of surplus value as mentioned below:

“Whence comes this surplus-value? It cannot come either from the buyer buying the commodities under their value, or from the seller selling them above their value. For in both cases the gains and the losses of each individual cancel each other, as each individual is in turn buyer and seller. Nor can it come from cheating, for though cheating can enrich one person at the expense of another, it cannot increase the total sum possessed by both, and therefore cannot augment the sum of the values in circulation. (...) This problem must be solved, and it must be solved in a purely economic way, excluding all cheating and the intervention of any force — the problem being: how is it possible constantly to sell dearer than one has bought, even on the hypothesis that equal values are always exchanged for equal values?”.

The solution to this was by Marx was, to differentiate between the time labour worked and power of the labour. According to him, a worker who is adequately productive and he can produce an output value greater than what it costs to hire him. Though his wage appears to be founded on hours he worked, in an economic sense this wage does not reveal the full value of what the worker produces. Efficiently it is not labour which the worker sells, but his capacity to work.

If a worker is hired for one hour and paid \$10. When the capitalist employ him, the capitalist asks him operate a boot-making machine and by using which the worker produces \$10 worth of work every fifteen minutes, then in each hour, the capitalist obtains \$40 worth of work and capitalist pays the worker only \$10 and by doing so the capitalist earns the remaining \$30 as gross revenue. When the capitalist has subtracted fixed and variable operating costs for example, say \$20 for leather, depreciation of the machine, etc., still he gets \$10. Therefore, for an expenditure of capital of \$30, the capitalist obtains a surplus value of \$10; his capital has not only been replaced by the operation, but also has increased by \$10. At the same time the worker unable to get this benefit directly because he has no claim to the means of production, which means he does not have the boot-making machine or to its products, and the capacity of the worker to bargain over wages is controlled by laws and the supply and demand for wage labour. Therefore, the rise of trade unions came into existence and they are targeted to make a more favourable negotiating position through cooperative act of the workers.

**Definition:**

The economy is that, the total surplus value, whereas, Marx states to the mass or volume of surplus value, is chiefly identical to the sum of net dispersed and undispersed profit, net interest, net rents, net tax on production and different net receipts connected with royalties, licensing, leasing certain honorariums etc. The kind of basic profit income is earned and achieved in social accounting may vary slightly from the approach an individual business does that.

The debate of Marx chiefly focuses on profit, interest and rent, mostly overlooking taxation and royalty type fees which were equivalently very small modules of the

national income when he lived. From the last 150 years, the role of the state in the economy has been increased in almost every country in the world. Around 1850, the average share of government spending in GDP in the advanced capitalist economies was around 5%; in 1870, a bit above 8%; during the World War I, just under 10%; before the outbreak of the World War II, around 20%; by 1950, nearly 30%; and today the average is around 35-40%.

The surplus value can be seen in five ways and it is as follows:

1. As a component of the new value product, to which he defines as identical to the sum of labour costs in respect of capitalistically productive labour (variable capital) and surplus value. In making, he claims, the workers produce a value equal to their wages plus an additional value, the surplus-value. They also transfer part of the value of fixed assets and materials to the new product, identical to economic depreciation (consumption of fixed capital) and intermediate goods used up (constant capital inputs). Labor costs and surplus value are the monetary valuations of what Marx calls the required product and the surplus product or paid labour and unpaid labour.
2. The Surplus-value can also be observed as a flow of net income assumed by the owners of capital in quality of ownership, containing both dispersed individual income and undispersed business income. In the entire economy, this will comprise of both income directly from production and property income.
3. The Surplus value can be observed as the source of the accumulation fund or investment fund of the society; a portion of it, is reinvested, but portion is assumed as individual income, and used for consumption purposes by the owners of capital assets, in extraordinary situations, part of it might also be saved in some way. In this background, surplus value can also be measured as the increase in the value of the stock of the capital possessions done an accounting period, earlier to distribution.
4. The Surplus value can be seen as a social relation of production, or as the monetary valuation of surplus labour - a kind of "index" of the balance of power between social classes or nations in the course of the separation of the social product.

5. The Surplus value can, in a developed capitalist economy, be seen also as a pointer to the level of social productivity that has been touched by the working population, which means, the net amount of the value can produce with its labour in surplus of its own consumption desires.

### **Absolute VS Relative:**

Marx stated that the, absolute surplus value can be attained by the increase in the quantity of time worked per worker in an accounting period. Marx debates mostly about the span of the working day or week, but in modern times the concern is about the number of hours worked per year.

In many parts of the world, where the productivity is on rise, the working classes made compulsory to reduce in the workweek, from 60 hours to 50, 40 or 35 hours; but casualization and flexibility of working hours also authorizes higher paid workers to work less. (an element of concern to statesmen who concern about international competitiveness, means if we don't work harder our country will lose business)

The relative surplus value can be attained by:

1. By decreasing wages— this can only go to a definite point, because if wages drop below the capability of workers to obtain their means of existence, they will be incapable to reproduce themselves and the capitalists will not be capable to find adequate labour power.
2. By decreasing the cost of wage-goods by different means, so that the wages upsurge can be restricted.
3. Increasing the productivity and intensity of labour primarily by the help of mechanization and rationalization crops better output per hour worked.

Critique of the political economy of capitalism:

1. The commodity is considered as the basic 'trade unit' or 'cell-form' of the capitalist society, but at the same time capitalism is noted from the other types of production based on commodities in that here labour becomes a commodity like any other one. Besides, commerce is the activity of the

human, and it is also understood that the morality does not play a role in buying and selling of goods and services, the growth of the market system made separate entities of the economic, moral, and legal domains of actions of human in the society; therefore, it would be obvious that the subjective moral values are different from the objective economic values. Consequently, 'political economy' is not 'mere distribution of wealth' and 'political arithmetic' about the taxes but they are three different areas of human activity: Economics, Law and Ethics, politics and economics are separated.

2. 'The procedure of natural history is the formation of economic society', therefore, it is conceivable for a political economist to study the objectives of the scientific laws of capitalism, the growth of market system of commerce had realized human economic relations; to utilize the money (cash nexus) which cancelled the religious and political impressions about economic value and replaced them with 'commodity fetishism', the confidence is that a commodity has natural value. It is due to the fact that, societal economic creation is a historical procedure, any one person unable to direct or control it, by which create a global complex of social connections amongst capitalists; therefore, the economic creation or individual commerce of a society leads the human administration of an economy which is organized economy.
3. The operational or structural ambiguities of a capitalist economy, pronounce about the movements of ambiguities which are rooted from the two-fold character of labour and the 'class struggle' which is between the labour and the capital, the wage labour and the owner of the wealth production. These capitalist economic contradictions operate "behind the backs" of the capitalists and the workers, the outcome of their activities however, persist instant observations as men and women as social classes.
4. The economic crises which is known as 'recession; and 'depression' etc., that are embedded in the ambiguity appeal of the economic value of the commodity (cell-unit), of a capitalist society and these are the exact situations that propitiate 'proletarian revolution'; which is the "Communist Manifesto" which is recognized as armament, counterfeit by capitalists which the working class "turned against the bourgeoisie itself"



5. In a capitalist economy, the development of technology and the following are amplified the production augment the amount of 'material wealth' (use value) in the society, whereas, it lessens the economic value of the same wealth at the same time, by doing so it reduces the rate of profit. A inconsistency characteristic of economy crisis in a capitalist economy is poverty in the midst of plenty consequent to over production and under consumption.

After two decades of economic study and preparatory work, specially related to the theory of surplus value the first volume came in 1867, as 'the Production Process of Capital'. In 1883, after the death of Marx, Friedrich Engels familiarized, from the manuscripts and the first volume he developed Volume II; "The Circulation Process of Capital in 1885; and later in 1894, Volume III, "The Overall Process of Capitalist Production". These three volumes jointly called as "Das Kapital".

In the Volume I, of Capital (1867), did a deep critical examination of political economy, in this he discloses the ambiguities of the 'capital manner of the production', how it did pioneer of the socialist manner of production and he also dealt with the class struggle embedded in the capitalist social associations of production. On 14<sup>th</sup> September, 1867, the first of three volumes of Das Kapital, which is known as Critique of Political Economy, was published and it was dedicated to 'Wilhelm Wolf', this was the only volume published in Marx's time. Political Economy has commonly been satisfied to take, just as they were, the positions of commercial and industrial life, though effortlessly attentive that both profits and rent are subdivisions, remains of that unpaid part of the product which the labourers has to supply to his employer (its first appropriator, however not its final select proprietor)

The Volume II, was by Friedrich Engels was known as "The Process of Circulation of Capital", which was published in 1885, from the manuscripts of Karl Marx. It is divided into three parts such as, 'The Metamorphoses of Capital and Their Circuits', "The Turnover of Capital", and "The Reproduction and Circulation of the Aggregated Social Capital". It dealt with the chief views behind the market place, how the value and the surplus can be understood. It does not deals with much about the worker and owner like that of Volume I, but it talks about the money owner and money

lender, the wholesale merchant, the trader and entrepreneur or the functioning capitalist'. Besides, in this volumes workers are dealt as purchasers of consumer goods and, hence, as venders of the product labour power, relatively than producers of value and surplus-value. The importance to understand the theoretical edifice of entire deliberation of Karl Marx. Marx had exactly clarified this area in letter sent to Engels on 30<sup>th</sup> April 1868: he stated it as, "In book I... we content ourselves with the assumption that if in the self-expansion process £100 becomes £110, the latter will find already in existence in the market the elements into which it will change once more. But now we investigate the conditions under which these elements are found at hand, namely the social intertwining of the different capitals, of the component parts of capital and of revenue (= s)". This linking, considered as an undertaking of commodities and of money, allowed Marx to work out at least the important features, if not the conclusive form of a clear theory of the trade cycle, which is founded upon the predictability of periodic imbalance between supply and demand below the capitalist manner of production (Mandel, 1978, Intro to Vol. II of Capital). Volume II of Capital has certainly been not only a "sealed book", but also an elapsed one. To a big degree of amount, it rests so to this very day.

Coming to the Volume III of Capital, "The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole" was arranged by Friedrich Engels from the left over notes of Karl Marx which was published in 1894. It appears in seven parts and they are as follows:

- The Conversion of surplus Value into Profit and Rate of Surplus Value into the rate of Profit
- Conversion of Profit into average Profit
- The Law of the Tendency of the rate of Profit to Fall
- Conversion of Commodity Capital and money Capital into Commercial capital and Money Dealing capital Which is Merchant's Capital
- Revenues and Their Sources

The best known work of part three, in which summarizes that as organic fixed capital requirements of production rise as a result of advancement primarily and by which the rate of profit inclines to fall.

## 9.7 Revolution:

Marx gave a new look and mainly new interpretation to the word 'revolution', he said in his Theses on Feuerbach, "philosophers have so far interpreted the world, the question is how to change it", Engels said about Marx as, he was revolutionist and that the actual mission of his life was to contribute in one way or another to overthrow the capital society and the organisations of the state and which they had brought into existence so that it contribute to the freedom of the modern waged people. It was the Karl Marx for the first time, stressed that the social revolution would occur when the present relations of production have begun to perform as a fetter on the further improvement of the forces of production. Therefore, for Marx, the chief political revolutions of the modern times till the present day are to be clarified as the outcome of long term improvements of social and economy and by which novel types of economic exploitations and property ownership progressively grow. The impact of this is that was stated by Ralph Miliband, as "a political revolution is a social revolution when it involves the conflict of social classes".

The key change in the resources of the production subsequent in the consistent alteration in the relations of production brands a revolution. The end of slave society by the feudal society, was a revolution. It is because of this Marx lauds the beginning of capitalism over the remains of feudalism as a great occurrence for which he said 'bourgeois revolution' or otherwise called as 'middle class revolution'. He also stated that, the bourgeois revolution, contains, "The displacement of one minority class rule by that of another, 'feudal rule' by 'bourgeois rule': the use of state power to remodel political and legal structures to suit the interests of the new ruling class: while the ruled majority either aids the rising class or remains passive but acquiescent". Therefore, Marx bursts that the 'bourgeois revolution' where it conquered by the middle class that grew inside it and a new state is generated as the result of the 'bourgeois rule'. This class had developed new type processes of production and distribution of goods, which gave rise to the new types of transport and communications, installs units of industry for the sake of the employment for those we can invest their labour power, and invents a novel material for the production of goods and novel markets to distribute those products for the more gains. The

workers make use of transport, communication and education and training to get more acquainted, these sort of bonds crop to motivate the waged people (proletariat) to organize and then to conquer the capital system so that it can free itself from the claim of law of growing unhappiness and deprivation are according to him could the reason for the 'socialist revolution'.

According to him socialist revolution is said to proceed when waged people seizes state power and pivotal creative forces are focused in the hands of proletarians. Not only this, it is also required that the forces of response are by force crushed so that no remains of danger and counter revolution occur. It is also to observe that the views, thoughts, opinions, traditions and the process of life of the people are altered so that to brand them to follow the standards of socialist system. By doing so, a traditional revolution to be launched for the sake of brainwashing the people is an integral part of the socialist revolution exploitation and oppression would go with the establishments of a 'class society'. Marx in his "The Struggles in France" recognizes the uniqueness of the determination of the revolution and stated as, "The declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as a necessary intermediate point on the path towards the abolition of class differences in general, the abolition of all social relations which correspond to these relations of production, and the revolutionizing of all ideas which stem from these social relations".

It is important to note that the ideas about the revolutions by the Marx was followed and further developed by adding their own ideas. For example, Lenin followed his ideas and added and developed them according to his own ideas, Lenin's theory of revolution which created the possible revolution in any of the countries of the globe. If the leadership of the Communist party is capable of doing that. Lenin, removed Marxian revolution as a possibility only in advanced capitalist societies and placed it with the realm of possibility for virtually any country provided a revolutionary situation preset and revolutionary party was existed that would drive the society on the path of socialism. Far more development in the classical theory of revolution of Marx, can also be observed in the views and strategies of the Chinese Communist leader Mao

and also followed the revolutionary ideas of Marx and he refined according to his views and perceptions.

### **9.8 Conclusion:**

Karl Marx was born on 5<sup>th</sup> May 1818, Trier, Kingdom of Prussia in Rhineland, German Confederation, and he died on 14 March, 1883 in London. He was very renowned German philosopher, sociologist, journalist, economist and most importantly was revolutionary socialist. He was born in a rich middle class family, he completed his education in the universities of Bonn and he got the interest in the philosophical ideas of the “Young Hegelians”. He was educated privately by his father Heinrich Marx until 1830, later he joined in Trier High School the Head master Hugo Wytttenbach was the friend of his father. At the age of 17, in the year 1835, Karl Marx joined in the “University of Bonn” in order to study ‘literature and philosophy’, anyhow, his father claimed to join in law because it is more practical field. Because of his weak chest he was excused from the duty of Army when he became 18. Marx associated with the poets’ club when he was in the Bonn University, the club consisted of group of radicals who were consistently monitored by the police. Marx also joined the Trier Tavern Club drinking society which is known as ‘Landsmannschaft der Treveraner’.

Though he was doing law but he was charmed by philosophy and he searched to combine these two, he said that, “without philosophy nothing could be accomplished”. Karl Marx had been influenced by the German philosopher G.W.F Hegel, the ideas of Hegel were very much discussed in the Europe’s philosophical personalities. In Stralau, during a rehabilitation he joined the Doctor’s Club, where a group of students debated about the views and thoughts of Hegel, in 1837, by them he associated with a group of radical thinkers who are called as “Young Hegelians”. The classic book by Karl Marx in 1867, Das Kapital, it is generally known as the “The Bible of the Working Class”, which is a critical analysis of political economy which deals about the patterns of economy which focuses the capitalist way of production. In this he suggests the inspirational force of capitalism is nothing but mistreatment of

labour, the surplus value results in profit is mainly because of the unpaid works of the labour, and they have detailed meaning for Karl Marx.

Marx gave a new look and mainly new interpretation to the word 'revolution', he said in his Theses on Feuerbach, "philosophers have so far interpreted the world, the question is how to change it", Engels said about Marx as, he was revolutionist and that the actual mission of his life was to contribute in one way or another to overthrow the capital society and the organisations of the state and which they had brought into existence so that it contribute to the freedom of the modern waged people. According to him socialist revolution is said to proceeds when waged people seizures state power and pivotal creative forces are focused in the hands of proletarians. Not only this, it is also required that the forces of response are by force crushed so that no remains of danger and counter revolution occur.

It is important to note that the ideas about the revolutions by the Marx was followed and further developed by adding their own ideas. For example, Lenin and Mao followed their ideas and added and developed them according to their own ideas.

### **9.9 Questions:**

1. Write about the Karl Marx early life, early activism and Hegelianism?
2. Discuss about Marx critique of capitalism?
3. Write about the Marx's revolution theory?

### **9.10 References:**

1. Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, Political Thought, Oxford University Press, New York, 1999.
2. R.K. Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.
3. Eric J. Hobsbawm, The History of Marxism, Selectbook Service Syndicate, New Delhi, 1982.

4. Irfan Habib, On Socialism, Aligarh Historians Society, Tulika Books, New Delhi, 2009.
5. Ben Agger, Western Marxism: An Introduction, Goodyear Publishing Co., INC, Santa Monica, California, 1979.
6. J.C. Johari, Contemporary Political Theory, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1993.
7. Peter Calvert, Revolution, Macmillan, Great Britain, 1970.
8. Thomas Landon Thorson, A History of Political Theory, Oxford & IBH Publishing Co., New Delhi, 1973.

## Lesson 10

# ANTONIO GRAMSCI – CIVIL SOCIETY AND HEGEMONY

### Structure:

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Early Life
- 10.3 His Thoughts
- 10.4 Civil Society
- 10.5 Gramsci- Hegemony
  - 10.5.1 Pressure and agreement
  - 10.5.2 The Foundation of Leninist
  - 10.5.3 The Concept Established for Hegemony
  - 10.5.4 The Relation of Forces
  - 10.5.5 National Popular
  - 10.5.6 Passive Revolution
  - 10.5.7 Intellectual and Moral Reforms
  - 10.5.8 The nature of Power
- 10.6 Conclusion
- 10.7 Questions
- 10.8 References

### 10.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Antonio Gramsci
2. Students would be able to learn about the civil society
3. Students would be able to state about hegemony

### 10.1 Introduction:

Antonio Gramsci was born on 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 1891, in Ales, Sardinia, in Kingdom of Italy. He was regarded as one of the most important Italian Marxist theoretician and politician. He was the founding member and one time leader of the Communist Party of Italy, during the times of Benito Mussolini, the fascist who ruled Italy, he was



imprisoned by him. It is noteworthy to mention about is well known for his theory of 'cultural hegemony', in which he dealt about the how to use cultural institutions to maintain power in capitalist societies.

He wrote many books of which "political theory", "sociology", and "linguistics are most important.

### **10.2 Early Life:**

He was born on the islands of Sardinia, as fourth son out of seven sons of Francesco Gramsci and Giuseppina Marcias, his father was a low level officer in Gaeta, and his father had troubles, financial problems and difficulties with the police, which made them to move from one village to other in the island of Sardinia and finally settled in "Ghilarza". His father Francesco was convicted of 'embezzlement' which means stealing money from employer or theft, in the year 1898, and was imprisoned which made the family to reduce and to face hardship. The young Antonio could not attend the school because of the problem until the release of his father from the jail in 1904. Antonio Gramsci suffered from health problems mainly a malformation of the spine which arrested his development, he was only five feet of height in adult stage which gave him hunchback. For many years it was stated that his particular condition was because of accident in his childhood when his nanny dropped him. But it was stated recently that it was due to the fact that he was suffered from 'Pott disease', which is a kind of tuberculosis which caused the deformation of the spine, he was overcome by many internal disorders in his entire life.

Gramsci, completed his secondary school in 'Cagliari', where he stayed with his elder brother Gennaro who was ex-soldier and on the mainland he was made a military socialist. Antonio's grievances then was not with the socialism but was for the underprivileged peasants and the miners of the Sardinia, they perceived their total mistreatment as the outcome of privileges enjoyed by the quickly industrializing North and they have inclined to turn to 'Sardinian Nationalism' as a reply.

Gramsci, won the scholarship so that he can study at the University of Turin in the year 1911, he studied literature and he developed intense interest in linguistics and

later he studied linguistics under 'Matteo Bartoli', when he was in Turin it was the period when the fast industrialization was going, and the Fiat cars and Lancia factories were started and they were recruiting workers from the poorer regions. During that time trade unions established and first industrial conflict began to develop. Gramsci visited socialist circles and related with Sardinian emigrants, the worldview which shaped due to his previous involvements in Sardinia and his environment on the mainland. In the late 1913, he joined in the "Italian Socialist Party".

Even though he was shown talent in his studies, he had financial crunch and poor health conditions which made him to give up his education in early 1915, by that time he had enormous knowledge of history and philosophy. During his university times he came to meet the thoughts of people like "Rodolfo Mondolfo", "Antonio Labriola", "Giovanni Gentile" and very significantly "Benedetto Croce" who was very commonly esteemed Italian intellectual of his time. Those thinkers adopted a brand of 'Hegelian Marxism' and Labriola had called it as "philosophy of praxis", however, Gramsci later use this phrase to escape the prison censors and the relationship with present thought was unclear in his entire life time.

He started writing for a socialist newspaper from 1914, newspapers like, "Il Grido del Popolo" which brought status of renowned journalist, in the year 1916 he became the coeditor of the newspaper "Piedmont" edition of "Avanti", which is regarded as the Socialist Party official organization. He was communicative and creative writer of political theory, he also proved that he was a challenging commentator, who wrote on all features of Turin's social and political life. He was also participated in the education and organisation of Turin workers, in the year 1916, he talked in the public for the first time and also gave topics like, 'Romain Rolland, 'The French Revolution', 'The Paris Commune' and 'The Emancipation of Women'. In the year 1917, the Socialist Party leaders were arrested and that followed the revolutionary riots of August, Antonio elected to the party's Provisional Committee and later became one of the foremost leaders of socialists, he became the editor of Il Grido Del Popolo later.

In April 1919, he along with Togliatti, Angelo Tasca and Umberto Terracini started a weekly newspaper known as “L’Ordine Nuovo” which means The New Order, though it being separated into different hostile faction in October 1919, the Socialist Party moved by a huge majority to join the “Third International”. The L’Ordine Nuovo group was looked after by Vladimir Lenin as the closest in orientation to the Bolsheviks and it received his backing against the anti-parliamentary programme of the extreme left ‘Amadeo Bordiga.

### **10.3 His Thoughts:**

Gramsci was regarded as one of the most significant Marxist thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and a predominantly important thinker in the development of ‘Western Marxism’, while he was in jail, he wrote more than 30 notebooks and 3000 pages of history and analysis. These writings are called as, ‘the Prison Notebooks’ which consists of findings of Gramsci of ‘Italian History’ and about the ‘Nationalism’ and more over some of the views in ‘Marxist Theory’ ‘Critical Theory’ and ‘Educational Theory’ were linked with his name like:

1. Maintaining and legitimizing the capital state as means of Cultural Hegemony
2. The requirement for general worker’s education and to inspire the improvement of intellectuals from the working class.
3. An investigation of the new capitalist state that differentiates between the political society, which take over openly and coercively, and civil society where management is established by worth of agreement.
4. Complete historicism
5. A criticism of economic determinism that compete with negative explanations of Marxism
6. A criticism of philosophical materialism

### **10.4 Civil Society:**

An ephemeral examination of the civil society from the natural philosophers to the Marx, according to Gramsci, his concept of civil society is exactly in the individuation of the nature of the civil society and its location in the organization, the theory which

was presented by Gramsci, is a thoughtful improvement with admiration to the entire Marxist custom. Civil society in Gramsci not fixes to the structural moment, but to the super structural one. According to Gramsci, the civil society of middle ages is church which is understood as "... the hegemonic apparatus of the ruling group. For the latter did not have its own apparatus, i.e. did not have its own cultural and intellectual organisation, but regarded the universal, ecclesiastical organisation as being that". To rewording of Marx, quoted above it would be enticing to say that for Gramsci civil society comprises not "the whole of the material relationships", but the entire ideological-cultural relations; not 'the entire commercial and industrial life', but the complete spiritual and intellectual life. Gramsci derives his own concept of civil society not from Marx, but openly from Hegel with unilateral clarification of his thought. There are two significant aspects of Gramsci's civil society, 1. Gramsci claims that his concept of civil society is from Hegel 2. The concept of civil society of Hegel as assumed by Gramsci is a super structural concept.

Gramsci states that, "the historical unity of the ruling class is realized in the state", so far the state is also affected by the class fights and by current democratic struggles; so that he places it in the note on the relations of powers the life of the state is a constant course of creation and overriding of unbalanced equilibrium. Even though hegemonic class predominates in the state, it cannot ask the state to merely enforce its interests on other classes. The life of the state has 'relative autonomy' from the ruling class it is due to the result of the steadiness of the powers, for which he did not gave the word 'relative autonomy' which has come into use since his time, but it states his personal thought on the state.

The state in the narrow sense called as government, where as he separated government between 'political society' which includes, the police, the army, legal system etc. where it reins the political organizations and legal constitutional control. The other was 'civil society', which includes, the family, trade unions, the educational methods, etc. generally observed as the 'private' or 'non-state' domain arbitrating between the state and economy. He emphasizes, the separation is mainly conceptual and that the two, in certainty, frequently overlay. The capitalist state which was deliberated by Gramsci, which rules through power plus agreement:

political society is the kingdom of force and civil society is the kingdom of agreement or consent.

The main difficulty of the state is the kind of the command applied by a ruling class upon the other classes, for the personality of the radical approach which is suitable for a class pointing to attain state power will rest on the thought extended by that class on the type of power how and what type of power is applied. For this Gramsci stated as, 'little understanding of the state means little class consciousness. He also stated that the state cannot be understood without the proper understanding of the civil society. The one who orates the passages in the 'Selection from the Prison Notebooks' which were composed by the editors under the heading 'state and civil society' is probable to discover them very inspiring but also puzzling. They were transcribed at diverse times and Gramsci never had the chance to put them into a clear form. This thing was emphasized by the primary role Gramsci gives to 'civil society' contrasted with political society, which is problematic to realize because it is never evidently defined.

Gramsci offers that in modern capitalism, the bourgeoisie could sustain its economic control by permitting assured difficulties prepared by trade unions and mass political parties within civil society to be met by the political province. Therefore, the bourgeoisie involves in 'passive revolution' by going away from its immediate economic interests and permitting the kinds of hegemony to alter. Gramsci suggests that the movements like 'reformism' and 'fascism', 'scientific management' and 'assembly line' are the approaches of Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford individually and they are the instances for this.

Representation from Machiavelli, he claims that the 'Modern Prince' is about the revolutionary party, is the power that would permit the working class to improve organic intellectuals and substitute hegemony inside civil society. On behalf of the Gramsci, the compound nature of the modern civil society means that a 'war position', accepted by the revolutionaries over political anxieties, the trade unions, progression of proletarian (working class) culture, and the other ways to create an opposing civil society which was necessary alongside a 'war of maneuver'- a direct

revolution- so that, for a successful revolution without the risk of a counter revolution or degeneration. Although his statement that lines between the two may be unclear, he discards the state worship that would outcome of recognizing political society with civil society, as Jacobins and Fascists did it, he trusts that the historical assignment of the working class is to generate a 'regulated society' and to define the 'withering away of the state' as the full improvement of the capability of the civil society so that it can individually govern. He stated that the civil society is the province where the capitalists, workers and other who are involved in the political and ideological battles and where political parties, trade unions, religious bodies and great diversity of establishments come into presence. He stated that it is not only struggle of provinces; it is also provinces of all general democratic battles which ascend out of the dissimilar means in which people are come together by religion, race, sex, generation, local community, nation etc. Hence, the battle for hegemony can be observed in the civil society amongst the two important fundamental classes' takes place. Gramsci, states that, the civil society is either ethical or moral but in the civil society the hegemony of the dominant class can be seen by the means of political and ideological battles.

Gramsci developed the civil society and political society from the ideas of Hegel, whom he had studied just as Marx and Engels did; he altered the concept of civil and political society of Hegel like that of Marx and Engels altered other concepts of Hegel. In the method of Hegel the civil society was to entitle the province of economic relations, which can be observed in the Britain and France in 18<sup>th</sup> century. But the Marx and Engel when they established the theory of historical materialism and the concepts of forces and relations of production, they abandoned the word civil society. Therefore, it is very obvious for Gramsci, to give a novel meaning and understanding to the term which has become obsolete, although, it took time to use in Britain, where the term 'civil servant' is used for those who are in official service in the state.

The society devoid of state, which Gramsci calls 'regulated society', derives from the expanding of civil society and hence, of the moment hegemony, till it eradicates complete space which is engaged by political society. The state which have

occurred until now are a dialectical union of civil society and political society, of hegemony and domination.

### **10.5 Gramsci- Hegemony:**

The word Hegemony was earlier used by the Marxists like Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, to represent the political leadership of the working class during the democratic revolution, he actually expanded the concept and improving the important examination how both the ruling class and bourgeoisie creates and retain the control. It is to note that the conventional Marxism had foreseen that the revolution of socialism was predictable in the capitalist society, till the 20<sup>th</sup> century no revolutions had happened in the advanced countries. About the Capitalism, Gramsci recommended that to preserve and control not by the violence and political and economic pressure but by the help of his ideology. The hegemonic culture was established by the bourgeoisie, which spread its own values and norms to be the common sense value for everyone. It was observed that the people from the working class recognized their individual good with the good of the bourgeoisie, and helped to maintain the status quo instead of revolting.

#### **10.5.1 Pressure and agreement:**

The important viewpoint of the Gramsci's concept about the hegemony is that a particular class and their representatives would use power over the subordinate class by the help of combination of pressure (coercion) and persuasion. He suggests the mythical Greek centaur of half animal and half human, as the representation of the 'dual perspective' in the political action, which indicates the levels of power and agreement (consent), authority and hegemony, violence and civilization. He stated hegemony is a relation, not of domination by means of force, whereas, the consent means about the political and ideological leadership. He used the words such as 'direzione' for leadership, direction, which is interchangeably with 'egemonia' means hegemony. One has to understand and must not take the original meaning of Greek, because he used this word differently.

#### **10.5.2 The Foundation of Leninist:**

In fact that the concept of the hegemony was established by the Vladimir Ilyich Lenin based on the Russian labour movements. It was stated by Perry Anderson, that the word hegemony was first used in 1880, by Plekhanov and some other Russian Marxists to signify the requirement for the working class to tip an association with peasantry for the takeover of Tsarism. He said that the working class must grow a national method, battling for the freedom of all oppressed classes and groups. This concept was established by Lenin.

### **10.5.3 The Concept Established for Hegemony:**

According to Lenin, hegemony was a plan and was accepted by the working class and their representatives must approve to earn the support of the majority of the people. Gramsci, improves a novel aspect to this by spreading it to contain the practices of a capitalist class or its representatives in attainment of power in the state. And to retain the power once they achieved. Gramsci differentiated both domination (coercion) and intellectual and moral leadership. Therefore, he alters the hegemony from the concept of the Marxists of forces and relationship production to classes and of the state, is the device to understand society to change it. Gramsci, established a view of leadership and its exercise as a situation for attaining power of the state into his own concept of hegemony. He stated hegemony as 'relation between classes and other social forces'. He asserted that, a class of hegemony, or fragment of a class, is one which advances the consent of other classes and the social forces over making and upholding a method of associations by the worth of political and ideological battle.

### **10.5.4 The Relation of Forces:**

The idea of constructing up a method of association is principal to the concept of hegemony, the notes he wrote at his arrest, he mentioned as, The waged people can develop the principal and the leading class to extent that it prospers in making a method of associations which permits it to activate the majority of the population against capitalism and the bourgeois state. To improve the working class in



hegemonic class, essential to proceed in explanation the interests of other class and social powers and discover the means of uniting them with its own interests.

#### **10.5.5 National Popular:**

According to Lenin hegemony means, primarily in terms of a coalition of classes or parts of classes. To this Gramsci, added a significant novel element a concept of 'national popular', in which a class cannot attain national leadership, and develop hegemonic, if it limits itself only to class interest; it should take reason of the general and democratic problems and battles of the people which do not have class character. The instances such as, radical and popular battles for civil liberties, movements for national freedom, women's movements etc.

#### **10.5.6 Passive Revolution:**

In examining the war of location carried on by the two fundamental classes for hegemony, Gramsci, appeals a rudimentary difference between the strategy engaged by the capitalist class and that which is suitable for the working class. The strategy of bourgeois has a special superiority known as 'passive revolution'. He established this concept from his study of the Risorgimento, the movement for unification of Italy in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. He proposes that a policy of passive revolution is the characteristic reply of the bourgeois every time its hegemony is extremely endangered and retain of wide reorganisation is needed in order to regenerate hegemony.

#### **10.5.7 Intellectual and Moral Reforms:**

For the working class, the job of passing from the economic corporate stage to the hegemonic stage needs an alteration in the political consciousness of the working class and also of the members of other classes and groups whose support is desirable for the wide alliance. Ideology acts as the cohesive force which binds together a bloc of varied classes and social forces.

### **10.5.8 The nature of Power:**

Marxism-Leninism has inclined to take the opinion that power is focused in the state, and that the purpose of revolutionary policy is the seizure of power. Only after the seizure of the power by the working class can the building of socialism begin. Gramsci, advocate that power is best assumed as a relation. The social relations of civil society are also relations of power, so that power is dim all over civil society as well as embodied in the forced devices of the state.

### **10.6 Conclusion:**

Antonio Gramsci was born on 22<sup>nd</sup> Jan 1891, in Ales, Sardinia, in Kingdom of Italy. He was regarded as one of the most important Italian Marxist theoretician and politician. He was the founding member and one time leader of the Communist Party of Italy, during the times of Benito Mussolini, the fascist who ruled Italy, he was imprisoned by him. It is noteworthy to mention about is well known for his theory of 'cultural hegemony', in which he dealt about the how to use cultural institutions to maintain power in capitalist societies. Gramsci was regarded as one of the most significant Marxist thinkers of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, and a predominantly important thinker in the development of 'Western Marxism', while he was in jail, he wrote more than 30 notebooks and 3000 pages of history and analysis. These writings are called as, 'the Prison Notebooks' which consists of findings of Gramsci of 'Italian History'.

Gramsci states that, "the historical unity of the ruling class is realised in the state", so far the state is also affected by the class fights and by current democratic struggles; so that he places it in the note on the relations of powers the life of the state is a constant course of creation and overriding of unbalanced equilibrium. Even though hegemonic class predominates in the state, it cannot ask the state to merely enforce its interests on other classes.

The word Hegemony was earlier used by the Marxists like Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, to represent the political leadership of the working class during the democratic revolution, he actually expanded the concept and improving the important examination how both the ruling class and bourgeoisie creates and retain the control.

It is to note that the conventional Marxism had foreseen that the revolution of socialism was predictable in the capitalist society, till the 20<sup>th</sup> century no revolutions had happened in the advanced countries.

### **10.7 Questions:**

1. Write about the early life of Gramsci his and his thoughts?
2. Discuss about the civil society of Gramsci?
3. Write about the Hegemony stated by Gramsci?

### **10.8 References:**

1. Chantal Mouffe, Gramsci and Marxist Theory, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1979.
2. Norberto Bobbio, Which Socialism?, Polity Press, Great Britain, 1987.
3. Subrata Mukherjee, Sushila Ramaswamy, A History of Socialist Thought From the Precursors to the Present, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2000.
4. R.K. Misra, An Introduction to Political Thought, Pearson, Delhi, 2012.
5. Roger Simon, Gramsci's Political Thought, Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1982.

## Lesson 11

# EDUARD BERNSTEIN – REVISION TO MARXISM

### Structure:

- 11.0 Objectives
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.2 Early Life
- 11.3 His Views
- 11.4 Revisions to Marxism
- 11.5 History
- 11.6 Conclusion
- 11.7 Questions
- 11.8 References

### 11.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Eduard Bernstein.
2. Students would be able to state about his revision to Marxism.

### 11.1 Introduction:

Eduard Bernstein was born on 6<sup>th</sup> January 1850, at Schonberg, (which is the part of Berlin now) in Germany. He was very renowned German social democratic political theorist and politician, he was the member of Social Democratic Party (SPD), and was the founder member of evolutionary socialism, social democracy, and revisionism. He had very close friendship with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, he observed some faults in the thinking of Marxism and he openly criticised the ideas put forward by Marxism, while he was examining he challenged the 'materialist theory of history of Marxism, he disallowed some important parts of Marxist theory which was based on 'Hegelian metaphysics'; he also discards the dialectical perspective of Hegel. He clearly differentiated previous Marxism as being its undeveloped kind, as established by 'The Communist Manifesto', when Marx and Engels were young, he battled for what he observed as its forceful 'Blanquist' inclinations; but later Marxism being a mature kind so he accepted. The mature form

of Marxism was when Marx was mature, recognized that socialism could be attainable by the peaceful means through legislative reform in the democratic societies. Bernstein indicated that ethics can be reinstated to socialism in a capitalist method, with the state as a vital strength to the workers.

### **11.2 Early Life:**

Bernstein was born in Schonberg to the Jewish parents, who were very active in the Reform Temple on the Johannistrasse, where services were done on Sundays. His father was a locomotive diver. After he left the school (1866-78), he joined in the bank as the clerk. When he joined in Socialist Party his political career started in the year 1872, and he became known as an activist.

### **11.3 His Views:**

In the year 1899, *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, was the most important work of Bernstein, he was primarily worried with disproving expectations of Marx about the forthcoming and unavoidable end of capitalism and the takeover of Marx, Laissez Faire policy which conflicting ameliorative social interferences before the end. He showed modest truths that he deliberated to be evidence that Marx's predictions were not being borne out: he renowned that the concentration of capitalist industry, while noteworthy, was not becoming whole scale and that the ownership of capital was becoming more, and not less, diffuse. The faith of the Marx is about the vanishing of middleman, As to Marx's belief in the disappearance of the middleman, Bernstein stated that the entrepreneur class was actually progressively employed from the waged people class or preliterate, and consequently, all settlement actions, such as the state guideline of the hours of labour, necessities for old age pensions, and so on, must be stimulated. For this reason, Bernstein advised the labouring classes to take alively interest in politics. Bernstein also specified what he measured to be some of the flaws in the labour theory of values of Karl Marx.

Bernstein was criticised by the 'orthodox Marxists, under the leadership of 'Rosa Luxemburg' about the revisionism, Bernstein persisted, though, very much a socialist, even though an unconventional one: he understood that socialism would be attained by capitalism, not by damage of the capitalism (as the rights were slowly

won by workers, their source for complaint would be reduced, and therefore, so moreover would the inspiration for rebellion). During the intra-party discussions about his thoughts, Bernstein clarified that, for him, the final goal of socialism was nothing but development toward that goal was everything.

Rosa Luxemburg stated about Socialism, has its end in social revolution. She said about the revisionism, 'amounts in practice to the advice... that we abandon the social revolution—the goals of social democracy—and turn social reforms from a means of the class struggle into its final aim'. She also stated that Revisionism has lost sight of scientific socialism and reverted to Idealism and therefore, lost its predictive force. Since he underestimates the anarchy of capitalism and says it has 'adaptability' and 'viability', which means that the flaws of capitalism will not of historical requirement drive it to its destiny.

Even though Marx would claim that the free trade would be the fastest contentment of the capitalist system, and therefore its end, Bernstein measured protectionism as helping only a selective few, being anti-progressive, for its adverse effects on the masses. The protectionism of Germany, Bernstein claimed, was founded only on political convenience, separating Germany from the world, especially from Britain, creating an 'autarky' (A Greek word means Self-sufficiency) that would only result in battle between Germany and the rest of the world. The opinions of Bernstein on Jewish matters progressed. He never recognized as a Zionist, however after primarily preferring a wholly assimilationist solution to the Jewish Question, his approach toward Zionism became significantly more concerned after World War I. Bernstein is also noted for being "one of the first socialists to deal sympathetically with the issue of homosexuality".

#### **11.4 Revisions to Marxism:**

Within the Marxist drive, the word revisionism is used to mention to numerous thoughts, principles and theories that are founded on an important revision of fundamental Marxist evidences. The word is most regularly used by those Marxists who trust that such revisions are unnecessary and signify a 'watering down' or

neglect of Marxism. As such, revisionism frequently carries disapproving associations. Those recognized as “revolutionists” have condemned orthodox Marxism for having overlooked Marx’s opinion of the requirement of evolution of capitalism to attain socialism by replacing it with an either with capitalism and socialism; for ignoring stress of Marx on the role of parliamentary democracy in attaining socialism; as well as condemning Karl Kautsky for his idea of state socialism.

### **11.5 History:**

This word has been used in various situations to mention about the various revisions of Marxist Theory and this revisionism was otherwise also stated by the thinkers of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century as the ‘Democratic Socialist’, and those thinkers such as, Eduard Bernstein and Jean Jaures. They were very eager to revise the views of the Karl Marx of the transition to socialism and demanded that the socialist society could not be attained by applying force. With such ideas both Bernstein and Jaures gave to a new theory known as ‘reformist theory’, and stated that the socialism can be attained by the help of steady reforms from within a capitalist system. The International Left Opposition was led by ‘Leon Trotsky’ from 1920s to 1930s and this had been disqualified from the Communist International and suspected the leadership of Comintern and Soviet Union for revising the international principles of Marxism and Leninism to please the ambitions of the bureaucratic elite group which came into power in the Soviet Union. The followers of Trotsky known as Trotskyists had observed the budding Stalinist bureaucracy as the bottleneck in the way of socialist revolution of proletariat, and to the unstable policies of the Comintern, they stand for the Marxist theory of ‘Permanent Revolution’. At the same time the authorities of branded the Trotskyists as ‘revisionists’ and finally excluded them from the Communist party of the Soviet Union, later they started their Fourth International.

Within the international Communist movements in 1940s and 1950s, revisionism was the word used by Stalinists to label the communists who were motivated on consumer goods production as an substitute of heavy industry; recognized national changes in its place of indorsing ‘proletarian internationalism’; and stimulated liberal

reforms instead of lasting correct to well-known doctrine. Revisionism charges were leveled at Titoists as punishment for their quest of a comparatively sovereign communist ideology, amidst a series of post-World War II. After the 'Secret Speech' in 1956, that condemned Stalin, several communist activists, surprised and depressed by what they saw as the betrayal of Marxist-Leninist philosophies by the same people who had created them, resigned from western communist parties in protest. These losers were sometimes blamed about revisionism by those communists who continued in these parties, though some of these similar stalwarts also divided from the same communist parties in the 1960s to become the New Left 'anti-revisionists', demonstrating that they, too, were disappointed by the movements of the Soviet Union by that fact in time. Most of those who left in the 1960s most of those people started supporting themselves with Mao Zedong, who also opposed the Soviet Union.

Later in the beginning of 1960s, the Communist party and the Mao Zedong recharged the word revisionism so that they can attack 'Nikita Khrushchev' and the Soviet Union to on different philosophies and the political issues which resulted in the 'Sino-Soviet Split'. The Soviets are called by the Chinese as the 'modern revisionists' in 1960s. Maoist group divided themselves from the communist parties in the world and in 1978, Sino-Albanian division also happened and they condemned the Maoism as revolutionists.

The Bernstein theory of evolution is different from Marxism and it became leading one in Germany in the circles of German socialists, Russia was regarded as an economically underdeveloped society, the important ground for economy was due to agriculture and the its workers which consist of primarily peasants who were very poor till recently who were working on the fields belong to feudal persons. For them Marx had stated painful comments about the 'stupidity of rural life', he thought that the forecast of a liberal revolutions were very hazy in a dominant agriculture society. Even though, certain Russians trusted that though imaginable and needed historically unavoidable revolution came to Russia. The philosopher from Russia, namely Georgi Plekhanov, who was quite influenced by the Engels's materialist altering of Marxian theory, and he in turn influences the young Vladimir Ilyich who



was popular for his revolutionary pseudonym, Lenin. Lenin recognized that Russia appeared to be immature for revolution in a number of ways. Firstly, because Russian workers were largely agricultural reasonably than industrial workers; they are in fact similar to economy of Russia, they were backward and they inclined to be doubtful, superstitious and extremely religious. Therefore, Lenin claimed that, what was required was a tutelary 'frontline' party to teach and inform the workers to their actual or correct class benefits, because at the same time Russia was politically backward and it was ruled by an autocratic and run mainly by edits and police detectives, this frontline party had to be unimportant and firmly join in its organization and private and conspiratorial in its processes. It was democratic in the sense that it functioned allowing to the policy of 'democratic centralism'; which is, members were allowed to discuss and differ over political and strategic queries. But when a conclusion had been completed and approved, then no one has power to quarrel or ignore it. This party was to be prepared up mostly of middleclass intelligentsias because they thought that only such people will have the theoretical knowledge and insight compulsory to apprise and teach the workers. Lacking of such a party, then the workers were certain to make incorrect choices and to perform incorrectly. Lenin also stated about the imperialism and what did happened after the outbreak of World War I, the workers of England and Germany agreed to fight each other rather than joining to fight the ruling working class. Because these workers invested in the countries like Africa, Latin America and Asia, and they had huge profits so that they can pay higher wages to their workers and by doing so the standard of living had been increased. This notion was explained by the Lenin and created willingness among them to fight so as to achieve super profits.

### **11.6 Conclusion:**

Eduard Bernstein was born on 6<sup>th</sup> January 1850, at Schonberg, (which is the part of Berlin now) in Germany. He was very renowned German social democratic political theorist and politician, he was the member of Social Democratic Party (SPD), and was the founder member of evolutionary socialism, social democracy, and revisionism. He had very close friendship with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, he observed some faults in the thinking of Marxism and he openly criticised the ideas

put forward Marxism. The *Die Voraussetzungen des Sozialismus*, was the most important work of Bernstein, he was primarily worried with disproving expectations of Marx about the forthcoming and unavoidable end of capitalism and the takeover of Marx, Laissez Faire policy which conflicting ameliorative social interferences before the end.

Within the Marxist drive, the word revisionism is used to mention to numerous thoughts, principles and theories that are founded on an important revision of fundamental Marxist evidences. The word is most regularly used by those Marxists who trust that such revisions are unnecessary and signify a 'watering down' or neglect of Marxism. Within the international Communist movements in 1940s and 1950s, revisionism was the word used by Stalinists to label the communists who were motivated on consumer goods production as an substitute of heavy industry; recognized national changes in its place of indorsing 'proletarian internationalism'; and stimulated liberal reforms instead of lasting correct to well-known doctrine.

Eduard Bernstein and Jean Jaures. They were very eager to revise the views of the Karl Marx of the transition to socialism and demanded that the socialist society could not be attained by applying force. With such ideas both Bernstein and Jaures gave to a new theory known as 'reformist theory', and stated that the socialism can be attained by the help of steady reforms from within a capitalist system.

### **11.7 Questions:**

1. Write about the early life and his views?
2. Discuss about his theory of revisionism?

### **11.8 References:**

1. K.K. Das Gupta, *Marxism and Political Economic of Socialism*, Sterling Publishers Private Limited, New Delhi, 1989.
- 2 Dasgupta, K.K. *Essentials of Marx's Capital*, Sterling, Delhi, 1984.

- 3 E.H. Carr, Bolshevik Revolution, Macmillan, 1978.
- 4 Michael Rosen and Jonathan Wolff, Political Thought, Oxford University Press,  
New  
York, 1999.

## Lesson 12

# HERBERT MARCUSE – CRITICAL THEORY

### Structure:

- 12.0 Objectives
- 12.1 Introduction
- 12.2 Early Life
- 12.3 His Philosophy and Opinions
- 12.4 Critical Theory
- 12.5 First Generation Critical Theorists
- 12.6 About the Frankfurt School
- 12.7 Main Concept of Critical Theory of Marcuse
- 12.8 Conclusion
- 12.9 Questions
- 12.10 References

### 12.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Herbert Marcuse.
2. Students would be able to state about his critical theory.

### 12.1 Introduction:

Herbert Marcuse was born on 19<sup>th</sup> July, 1898, Berlin, German Empire, he was one of the famous German American philosopher, sociologist and political theorist connected with Frankfurt School of critical theory. He was very significant personality even in Berlin. He condemned 'capitalism', 'modern technology', and the culture of the entertainment, disagreeing that they represent new types of social control.

### 12.2 Early Life:

Herbert Marcuse, born in Berlin, he was later joined at Freiburg Universities, and he was awarded his Ph. D, from same University. He was very important figure in Frankfurt based institute, known as 'Institute for Social Research', and the same

institute later become the 'Frankfurt School'. In the year 1924, he married to Sophie Wertheim, who was a mathematician.

In the late 1960s and 1970s, after his studies he was considered as the prominent theorist of the New Leftism and the student movements of Germany, France and USA. Herbert Marcuse also worked in USA Government service during 1943-1950, which actually helped to write his book 'Soviet Marxism': A Critical Analysis" which was written in 1958, he was also regarded as the 'Father of the New Lefts'. The best prominent works are 'Eros and Civilization' which was written in the year 1955 and in 1964, he wrote 'One-Dimensional Man'. The scholarship which he got from Marxist, stimulated number of intellectuals from radicals and activists from the political groups during 1960s and 1970s both at USA and even globally.

In the year 1928, he returned to Freiburg to study with 'Edmund Husserl' and he wrote a book along with Martin Heidegger 'Habilitation' and it was published in 1932 as 'Hegel's Ontology and Theory of Historicity'. This particular study has been written in the back ground of the Hegel renaissance because in Europe it was taking place with as stress on the Hegel's ontology of life history, idealist theory of spirit and dialectic. By the rise of 'Third Reich his academic career was obstructed. In 1932, Marcuse joined the 'Institut Fur Sozialforschung, (Institute for Social Research), which is generally called as the 'Frankfurt School'. Marcuse, in the year 1933, published and review, the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, of Marx, in his review he revised the interpretations of the Marxism from the standpoint of the works of the early Marx. In fact this review helped him, so that the entire world can observe as the most promising theorist of his generation. Whereas, a member of the Institute of Social Research, Marcuse established an ideal for critical social theory, which shaped a theory of the new stage of state and monopoly capitalism, in this he pronounced the relationships between philosophy, social theory, and cultural criticism, and delivered an analysis and critique of German fascism. Marcuse worked closely with critical theorists while at the Institute.

### 12.3 His Philosophy and Opinions:

'Repressive desublimation', was his well-known concept which deals with his disagreement that of postwar mass culture, with its abundance of sexual incitements, which helps to strengthen political repression. If the people are worried with false sexual stimulation, the political energy of such persons would be 'de-sublimated', as an alternative to this performing constructively will change the world, by doing so, they can continue to repressed and uncritical. He look forward about the prewar thought of 'critical theory' headed for a critical account of the 'one dimensional' nature of bourgeois life style in Europe and America. Hence, his critique can be considered as an improvement of the fears of the previous liberal thinkers. It is important to discuss about his two significant works, firstly about his usage of language which is more familiar from the critique of Soviet or Nazi regimes so that he describe the improvements in the enhancement in the field of industry in the world. Secondly, his foundation of critical theory was specific use of psychoanalytic understanding, both of these aspects of his thoughts have been frequently misinterpreted and this have given rise to critiques of his work that miss the fact of his goal.

### 12.4 Critical Theory:

The Frankfurt school also recognized as the Institute of Social research, which is considered as social and political philosophical movements of thought which is situated in Frankfurt Main in Germany. It is the unique source of 'Critical Theory' and in the year 1923, this institute was created with the donation from Felix Weil for the improvement of Marxist studies in Germany. After 1933, the institute ultimately created a precise school of thought when the Nazis enforced it to close and they transfer to USA, where it found cordiality at Columbia University, New York. The academic impact of the 'critical' system is distant attainment in terms of educational institutions in which such custom is taught and in term of the problems it addresses. Some of the important issues which deals about the critique of modernity and capitalist society, the definition of social empowerment. The critical theory delivers a particular clarification about the philosophy of Marxism and clarifies some of its vital

economic and political ideas such as commoditization (treat as commodity), reification (to regard or treat), and critiques of mass culture.

### **12.5 First Generation Critical Theorists:**

The most important personalities of the first generation critical theorists are, Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Walter Benjamin, Friedrich Pollock, Leo Lowenthal and Eric Fromm. The second generation of critical theorists are from 1970s, and it is led by the Jurgen Habermas, who involved in the development of dialogue between 'continental' and 'analytical' custom. The third generation of critical theorists are characteristically represented in Germany by the prominent work of Axel Honneth. In the 21<sup>st</sup> century the fourth generation of critical theorists also developed and they are merged with Rainer. The first generation scholars were hugely occupied with the functional and conceptual re-qualification of dialectics of Hegel. After Habermas, preference was been given to the understanding of the conditions of action coordination through the underpinning of the conditions of validity for speech acts.

Customary theory is mainly concerned only with the thoughtful or explaining about the society, whereas, the critical theory is dissimilar and it deals with the social theory which is concerned towards criticizing and changing the society totally. The critical theory offers the expressive and normative bases for social review which is targeted at diminishing domination and growing liberty and all their procedures. The critical theory has broad and narrow meaning as well in the history and philosophy of the social sciences. In the narrow sense it designates many generations of philosophers from Germany and social theorists customary Marxist from the Western European such as Frankfurt School, like Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse etc. this narrow conception of the critical theory was generated in the Frankfurt School, and this can be observed among the current social scientist.

These theorists states that, a theory is critical to the level that it search for human empowerment according to Horkheimer, "to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them". These theories mainly targets to clarify and

convert very conditions that dominate human beings, several of 'critical theories' in the broader sense have been established, such as, world system theory, feminist theory, Critical race theory, postcolonial theory, critical media studies and queer theory.

### **12.6 About the Frankfurt School:**

The Frankfurt School mainly considers as a group of German-American theorists who established commanding investigations of the alteration in Western capitalist societies that ensued since the theory of Karl Marx. Every philosopher realized and common with Karl Marx's theory of Historical Materialism and they accustomed to Marxism with his additions or fix. Then they castoff fixed Marxist theory measure modern society required to see these concepts derived to be identified as 'Critical Theory'.

### **12.7 Main Concept of Critical Theory of Marcuse:**

The important concept of the critical theory is that, it must be focused at the entirety of society in its historical specificity which means, how it derived to be arranged at an exact point in time. The critical theory must advance accepting of the society by participating all the chief social sciences which includes sociology, history, political science, economics, psychology and anthropology. The normative location of the critical theory, must be in the practice of critical social review, which specifies the alteration of capitalism into "a real democracy".

If the critical theory is sufficient then it has to have three important principles and they are 1. It should be descriptive, means it has to clarify what is incorrect with the present social reality 2. It should be very practical, means, identify the performers to alter it. 3. It should be normative, which means, it has to offer both the perfect standards for criticism and attainable practical objectives for social alteration. To prove that the critical theory is adequate it has to satisfy all the three criteria at the same time.

Critical theory is powerfully predisposed by philosophies of dialectics by Hegel, as well as theory of economy and society by Marx and the bounds of bourgeois philosophy of Hegel. Critical theory has in fact extended the Marxian criticisms of



capitalist society, by framing arrays of social empowerment strategies. But Hegel found that rationality had finally come to terms with reality through the birth of modern national state, Marx maintained on the requirement of reading the growth of reasonableness over history as a fight of social classes. The final stage of this struggle would have seen the political and economic empowerment of the proletariat. The theorists of critical theory in turn rejected both the metaphysical apparatus of Hegel and the eschatological a Greek word means 'regarding the ultimate destiny of mankind and world' aspects connected to Marx's theory. On the conflicting, Critical Theory analyses, focused on to the understanding of the society, keen rather to the need of starting open systems of analysis founded on an inherent form of social criticism.

Some of the scholars in trying to clarify the influences of Marcuse, have accused that, he demands to an undeveloped inability for withstand the demands of current civilization, that he proposes an expressive departure from moral and political accountability. One is not worried with the psychology of intelligent influence, one will respect and reflect the assertions of Marcuse to suggest somewhat very dissimilar. He starts to display that suggestions for moral and political existence over piece meal, constant supervision of problems caused by civilization are unsustainable, and for that suggestions miscalculate or misstate the forces at work. And he offers coherent advices on behalf of radical changes. On the other hand understanding and measuring his work are obscure by a situation which has joined deliberations of civilization all over.

In the meantime, presentations of Marcuse are powerfully predisposed by such deliberations a methodical assessment would appear to need principal consideration of the debates of philosophical system and epistemology. At such a course is not only very tough- demanding as it prepares honestly to expands action of fundamental philosophical customs- nonetheless, also fairly probably unfulfilling, since, there is some reason to trust that Marcuse functioning technique is not alike with his methodical replications of his technique. Marcuse admits the liberal importance on 'individuation' and 'rationalization' but he rejects that these procedures- at least in the arrangements they have expected in what he succeeds

as bourgeois or technological civilization- donate to the creation of the moral behavior, as the liberal writers symbolized.

During the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, Marcuse stated that the, political and social organisations recognized in the most civilized countries unable to succeed the social straining produced by civilization, in spite of dissimilar arrivals. This apparently liberal and democratic administration shows to dock an indirect despotism and continuing itself in significant portion by abolishing the very civilization it significances to protect. Surface appearances of civilization flourish, but the motivating principles are methodically corrupt. According to Marcuse, the novel brutality of modification raised up in place of the principles and they cannot withstand in the long path, not even a deliberately despotic rule reinstating to tyrannical methods. Sporadic political crises- rebellions and images- promise and foretell the final failure of the manifest. In the end the system opinions exposed as more fierce war of all against all; and the center cannot grip.

Marcuse on dominations says that, to dominate, it is very much essential to have natures agreed to the outside demands which are coming from the method of supplies and which generates the supply needs, whether these stresses come in the process of commands or in the process of suggestions or in the process of opportunities. He also stated that, domination will be comprehensive when persons abandon the volume of opposition or resistance. Devoid of the resistance, there is no way in which persons can express their power. By this way Marcuse, read between the lines, the extensively commented, the failure of political battle during the 1950s and in the early 1960s, and he rejects that, it has whatsoever to do with consensus in any sense of that term applicable to liberal conceptions of consent. By mentioning the argument of Marcuse in the older language, one can say that for him domination has, at its essential the corruption of civic feature.

Marcuse proposes an analysis of modern civilization as corrupt tyranny, this actually rest on a conception of domination which condenses and immaterial of various ordinary concepts of the political theory. He stated that, the domination is a situation of the primitive structure, and is shaped under dissimilar conditions, by several diverse sort of social and political measures. Similarly, freedom contains a

revolutionary rearrangement of human replies, even though, Marcuse advocates that the primitive source for socialism, which relocates a second nature forced by traditions and coercion.

### **12.8 Conclusion:**

Herbert Marcuse was belongs to 19<sup>th</sup> century and he was a German, he was one of the famous German American philosopher, sociologist and political theorist connected with Frankfurt School of critical theory. He was very significant personality even in Berlin. He condemned 'capitalism', 'modern technology', and the culture of the entertainment, disagreeing that they represent new types of social control. He was very important figure in Frankfurt based institute, known as 'Institute for Social Research', and the same institute later become the 'Frankfurt School'. In the year 1924, he married to Sophie Wertheim, who was a mathematician.

The best prominent works are 'Eros and Civilization' which was written in the year 1955 and in 1964, he wrote 'One-Dimensional Man'. The scholarship which he got from Marxist, stimulated number of intellectuals from radicals and activists from the political groups during 1960s and 1970s both at USA and even internationally. Marcuse, in the year 1933, published and review, the Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, of Marx, in his review he revised the interpretations of the Marxism from the standpoint of the works of the early Marx. In fact this review helped him, so that the entire world can observe as the most promising theorist of his generation.

Repressive de sublimation, was his well-known concept which deals with his disagreement that post war mass culture, with its abundance of sexual incitements, which helps to strengthen political repression. If the people are worried with false sexual stimulation, the political energy of such persons would be 'de-sublimated', as an alternative to this performing constructively will change the world, by doing so, they can continue to repressed and uncritical. He look forward about the prewar thought of 'critical theory' headed for a critical account of the 'one dimensional' nature of bourgeois life style in Europe and America.

Customary theory is mainly concerned only with the thoughtful or explaining about the society, whereas, the critical theory is dissimilar and it deals with the social theory which is concerned towards criticizing and changing the society totally. The critical theory offers the expressive and normative bases for social review which is targeted at diminishing domination and growing liberty an all their procedures. The critical theory has broad and narrow meaning as well in the history and philosophy of the social sciences.

The important concept of the critical theory is that, it must be focused at the entirety of society in its historical specificity which means, how it derived to be arranged at an exact point in time. The critical theory must advance accepting of the society by participating all the chief social sciences which includes sociology, history, political science, economics, psychology and anthropology. He profounder of the theory known as critical theory

### **12.9 Questions:**

1. Write about the early life of Herbert Marcuse?
2. Write about the philosophy and his views?
3. Discuss about his critical theory in detail?

### **12.10 References:**

1. Dr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Contemporary Socialist Thought, A Critical Study, Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1990.
2. Tim Luke, 'Marcuse's Phenomenological Marxism' in Political Science Review (Jaipur), Vol.XX, N0.2, April- June 1981.
3. Herbert Marcuse, One Dimensional Man, Boston, 1964.
4. William Leiss, ' Appendix: Technological Rationality: Marcuse and his Critics' The Domination of Nature, Boston, 1974.
5. George Kateb, 'The Political Thought of Herbert Marcuse', in Perspective on Political Philosophy Vol.3, James V. Downton, Jr., and David K. Hart, eds. Hinsdale, 1973.

6. E. Andrew, 'Work and Freedom in Marcuse and Marx', The Canadian Journal of Political Science, June 1970.
7. Subrata Mukherjee, Sushila Ramaswamy, A History of Socialist Thought From the Precursors to the Present, Sage Publications, New Delhi, 2000.
8. Dr. Vinay Kumar Malhotra, Contemporary Socialist Thought, A Critical Study, Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1990.
9. Anthony de Crespigny and Kenneth Minogue, Methuesn & Co, London, 1976.

## Lesson 13

# HERBERT ERNESTO LACLAU – POST MARXISM

### Structure:

13.0 Objectives

13.1 Introduction

13.2 Post-Marxism

13.3 Conclusion

13.5 Question

13.6 References

### 13.0 Objectives:

1. Students would be able to know about the life of Ernesto Laclau
2. Students would be able to state about his Post-Marxism

### 13.1 Introduction:

Ernesto Laclau was born on 6<sup>th</sup> October 1935, Buenos Aires in Argentina, he was an Argentine political theorist and popularly known as 'Post-Marxist'. He was educated in History in Buenos Aires and later in 1964, he completed his graduation from 'Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires' and after that in 1977, he did his Ph.D. from the 'University of Essex'. In the same university he worked as the Professor of Political Theory, since 1986. He was founded and involved in the for number of years for the graduate programme in ideology and Discourse Analysis, and in the 'Center for Theoretical Studies' in the department of Humanities and Social Sciences. He actually given the direction for this Ideology and Discourse Analysis programme so that it excelled in the areas of research and for the development of a separate type of discourse analysis that attracts on post-structuralist theory. This theoretical and analytical orientation is currently called as the "Essex School of Discourse Analysis". He gave many lectures in number of universities in North America, South America,

Western Europe and South Africa, He also worked for SUNY Buffalo and Northwestern University of USA.

From 1969, he was involved with Socialist Party of the National Left (PSIN), later he closed his links with the founder of PSIN, Jorge Abelardo Ramos, because of his entry into Oxford University and he was supported by Eric Hobsbawm'. The works of Laclau was influenced by Althusserian Marxism because they were related to Neo-Marxist of 1970s, which contains about the role of the State, dynamics of capitalism beyond reductionist models, the importance of Gramsci's theory of hegemony etc. The most significant books written by him and Chantal Mouffe are: 'Hegemony and Socialist Strategy' and the ideas of them generally regarded as the 'Post-Marxist'. From 1960s they were very active politically and socially from their student movements, therefore, they attempted to connect new developing trends in politics with a democratic social imagination. They never accepted the 'Marxist Economic Determinism, and the idea of 'Class Struggle', as they both work opposite to each other. In its place they preferred plurality of antagonisms operating in the society, and they also brought up a project called as, 'radical and plural democracy'. In 2008, his views were well projected in an interview given to 'Intellectum' journal.

Some of the important works of him are as follows;

1. Politics and ideology in Marxist theory which was written in 1977, 2. Hegemony and Socialist Strategy along with Chantal in 1985, 3. New reflections on the revolution of our time in 1990, 4. Making of political Identities in 1994, 5. Emancipation (9S), in 1996, 6. Contingency, Hegemony, Universality with Judith and Slavoj Zizek in 2000 7. On populist reason in 2005 and 8. The Rhetorical Foundations of Society in 2014.

### **13.2 Post-Marxism:**

The dared and scared view of social relations by declaring the importance of social antipathies like struggle of class, was stated by Marx. Even though the limits of the class and the image might undoubtedly just as put into query, the importance of the aggressive moment had been misplaced its significance as well. It is necessary and correct that the novel attentiveness of what is intricate in hostile relation and

particularly, a thought about the relation which did not inferior to the exact positions allocated by the objectivist origin. This is the opening opinion of our Post-Marxism. Thus, how to regard what is an opponent relation is? In place of the objectivist beginning this was completely lesser amount of important issue, since the reasoning of the history approved over however, it was not established by ill feeling. Nevertheless, if the later was realized as chiefly constitute of social fabric, the willpower of their ontological position converts a dominant theoretical subject. On Hegemony and Socialist Strategy, he referred to the Kantian dissimilarity among the actual disagreement and illogicality, nobody who saw as existence clever to hold what is intricate in a social antipathy. Contradiction piercing by Kant can take place among concepts.

That is why an idealist philosopher such as Hegel, which diminishes the actual concept, and it could consider of antipathies as ambiguities; however, as the school in Italy named Della Volpian School piercing out as it is mismatched with a materialist philosophy of Marxism, which declares the extra-mental character. Nevertheless, he approved on this opinion with the Della Volpian and he did not follow them, according to him social antagonisms must be regarded in terms of the Kantian real opposition, for the modest motive that actual oppositions are not in the smallest opposed. Neither the ambiguity nor actual opposition has the right identifications to hold it intelligently. This was the opinion in which a method took a radical go. Whereas, combined contradiction and real opposition are objective relations between conceptual things in the first case, between and actual things in the second—antagonisms, they are not objective relations but a type of relation in which the bounds in the structure of any impartiality is exposed. From the lookout of each of the two incompatible forces, its foe is not an impartial occurrence, concluding the completeness of one's own individuality, but it characterizes accordingly, on the differing with it, which makes impossible to reach with such a completeness. This means that, as far as one stay inside the viewpoint of every single of the two antagonistic forces and specifies the impracticality of the society in reaching a full impartiality.



To consider antagonisms as objective would need the perspective of an impartial witness, and would realize in them an appearance of a deeper impartiality evading the awareness of the two forces when they are in conflict. This is the assignment executed by the cunning reason of the Hegelian. But, precisely the offer that we have to struggle if one has to understand antagonisms as constitutive and not derived.

While coming back to the query and switch over from Marxism to Post- Marxism, and the preliminary opinion as it has specified and the final unsuitability among the two principles which established the ground of classical Marxism. The idea to fuse the illogicality amongst the improvement of industrious powers and the different methods of relations of creation and a growth which was positioned by needed laws; and the idea of an importance of class struggle and the likelihood of dependent results. If the nature of these two contrary principles persisted and covered for a long time and it was due to the method by which they were spoken in Marxist dialogue, the module of the objectivist had the greater influence and recognize restrictions to the full growth of the reason of implied idea of social antagonism. One can only reason for the group of historical necessity engage in the thoughts of Marxism of the Second International to understand the restrictions and which put on political imagination and thoughts.

When the confidence was damaged in the historical necessity then the barriers characterized by Marxist doctrines were broken in each way. To plug out that this was not a breakdown or failure but it was rather, an arranged overflow: it was merely the growth of the probable confined to the importance of class struggle as engine of historical change, when it was not limited for long by the principle of an accurately resolute boundary, the movement from Marxism to Post-Marxism is, to a great amount, is, maybe, inconsistent because the first loss in this transition was the view which had prepared it to conceivable: The reason is to establish in the innermost heterogeneity which have been originate as residing view of social antagonism. If antagonism may perhaps have been clarified in a dialectical way, there would have been no difficulty. But he previously clarified the motives of a dialectical change is fundamentally weak to clarify.

While observing the heterogeneity that has initiated at the heart of this antagonistic relation, if the two poles are not from the same place of representation then in such case there is no way to root the view of fight to a specific social group such as class. Let us realize the factual scopes of a varied relation. There is no way to find the moment of radical heterogeneity in a dialectical transition, for example, the idea of the capitalist relations of production is characteristically antagonistic. The dialectical formation which may decrease antagonism to contradiction, the first job must be to discover a homogeneous topography inside by which the contradiction might appear. To do this the capitalist must reduce to an economic category, buyer of labour power, and the same case with the worker, who is the seller of labour power. The assumption was that this relation is essentially antagonistic since, the capitalist removes surplus value from the worker, but this assumption is unjustified. The relation only becomes antagonistic if the worker battles for the removal of surplus value, but to analyze the classification of seller of labour power as much as like and still be incapable to sensibly originate from the group of 'resistance'. How could an antagonism occur among workers and capitalists, it is because of the approach of the worker is established external to the relations of production. Then in such case the conflict is not intrinsic to the relations of creation but among the relations of production and the social agents. It is obvious that the two spaces of representation which means the workers and the capitalists are radically heterogeneous hence, the territory within which a dialectical arbitration could have been occurred. When it was decided that an antagonism assumes of two heterogeneous places of symbol which are not dialectically arbitrated there is no cause to accept the places within the relations.

The improvements of Capitalist makes many others, like ecological disasters, inequities between diverse areas of the economy, imperialist misuse, etc. In such case the matters of an 'anti-capitalist' fight could be possible and it cannot be condensed to a group like that of a class. Fights in the society are incline to multiply as we move into a globalized era, but in fact there are less class struggles. In the 19<sup>th</sup> century Marx believed in an internal inclination to simplify the structure of society, because of which society is proceeding near a condition in which we would have as the final confrontation of history. To proceed with an ephemeral look on

contemporary societies and what happens in there, is sufficient to meet this protest devoid of extra excitement.

The significance of the analysis is that to declare the supremacy of the politics in the structure of social gaps. The speeches on politics is surely limited and practices in the social field are residual, but at the same time the social automatism of the later have a reducing effect while in shaping the structure of the communities in the world wide, and these effects can be seen clearly again of globalization. The other significance is that performers of politics are continually going to be current performers. It was observed that the combined performer resultant of the consistently accumulation of a multitude of demands all over the place by nodal point or unfilled significant person. The first one can be connected to the demands of the social sectors and at the same time, heterogeneity can be connected to social antagonisms and it can never create limitless consistently restraints to except during the times of organic disasters. In that method the writing of a 'populist' request is at all times successful to discover the limits and would differ. For example, a trade union, can perform as a uniting fact for a diversity of extra social stresses, at the same time the concerns of the workers has to protect inside by an exact organized background which can perform like a chain to the desires of its hegemonic way.

The entire dialectic of Gramsci which is among the class of 'corporative' and 'hegemonic' is the finest picture of this strain. It has been mentioning so far about the potentials and problems while in making an anti-system utilization. The other significant worries of the opposite movement which is the response to antagonistic enlistments of the people in power and their common politics can be reviewed in one formula and to discharge the loser. The change of anti -politics considered as superiority contains in attaining a position by which the interest become corporative and this would stop the creation of a people. According to the formula of Saint Simon, 'from the government of men to the administration of things' which is regarded as the obvious manifestation of this type of inclination.

There is also possibility to have power from populism, every time a main creativity relating to extreme variations in the method of organization which needs a general deployment. At this opinion, if one observe the history of Marxism, to understand

how the moments of institutionalism and the populist were united in making uncertain political things. To jump with, Marxism can be considered as the essence of the rejection to approve any caring populist combination. The perspectives of revolution was maintained, and it is because just focused on the interests of the workers and leasing the 'required laws of history' so that it can do the rest, they would end up signifying the massive population when the procedure of proletarian had touched a convinced level. The mixture amid the deceptive appeal of this extrapolative and the real politics which made it likely and the protection of the corporative interests of the workers which had paralyzed the possessions of politics.

By the division in the movements in the working class and the advent of the Komintern, which is the poverty of pure 'classism' was revealed even more clearly, and a crisscross fluctuation among the adventurism of ultra-leftist and resourceful space with the status quo was the trade mark of Communist politics. In 1920s, the 'Bolshevization' of the Communist parties, closed the intention of this anti-hegemonic direction basically. It was seen in few circumstances where the philosophy and Post-Marxism of Stalinist regulate relaxed and certain Communist activities achieved to convert themselves as the nodal facts of a broader national and popular shared result was other than a catastrophic downfall. The long march of Mao and Tito, the partisan combat were maybe the two chief winning involvements to construct a broader popular individualities and also presented the restrictions of a clean plan of a 'class struggle'. The theorization of Gramsci, placed on the views of 'hegemony' and 'collective will', and the chief appearance of a substitute policy which originate by insufficient groups.

Within the topography of Marxist, there have been two foremost ideas of ideology and which must be disallowed. The first idea of 'false consciousness'; and the second, one about the ideology as an essential glassy of every social development. The first one is connected with the likelihood of a real awareness by a submissive nature of humankind with itself and in some of its forms, ideology is divergent to science. The essentialism of this dream has completely disgraced it. As for the second one is worried, it is also related to the view of a realistic organization being reflected in one-sided notions in the mind of the people so that to have any purchase

for current theorization. Though, unwilling to abandon completely about the idea of ideology and it can be preserved. In conclusion it is unavoidably topological, which worth that those broad procedures that concept a prospect of entire likely symbol within a firm background, which found the restrictions are going to be essentially figurative. As Hans Blumenberg called them, 'absolute metaphors'.

### **13.3 Conclusion:**

Ernesto Laclau was born on 6<sup>th</sup> October 1935, Buenos Aires in Argentina, he was an Argentine political theorist and popularly known as 'Post-Marxist'. He was educated in History in Buenos Aires and later in 1964, he completed his graduation from 'Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires' and after that in 1977, he did his Ph.D. from the 'University of Essex'. From 1969, he was involved with Socialist Party of the National Left (PSIN), later he closed his links with the founder of PSIN, Jorge Abelardo Ramos, because of his entry into Oxford University and he was supported by Eric Hobsbawm'. The works of Laclau was influenced by Althusserian Marxism because they were related to Neo-Marxist of 1970s, which contains about the role of the State, dynamics of capitalism beyond reductionist models.

The dared and scared view of social relations by declaring the importance of social antipathies like struggle of class, in the words of Marx. Even though the limits of the class the image might undoubtedly just as put into query, the importance of the aggressive moment had misplaced its significance as well. It necessary and correct that the novel attentiveness of what is intricate in hostile relation and particularly, a thought about the relation which did not inferior to the exact positions allocated by the objectivist origin. This is the beginning opinion of our Post-Marxism. On Hegemony and Socialist Strategy, he referred to the Kantian dissimilarity among the actual disagreement and illogicality, nobody of which saw as existence clever to hold what is intricate in a social antipathy. Contradiction which is piercing by Kant can take place among concepts. Within the topography of Marxist, there have been two foremost ideas of ideology and which must be disallowed. The first idea of 'false consciousness'; and the second, one about the ideology as an essential of every social development.

**13.5 Question:**

1. Write about the early life of Ernest Laclau and his writings?
2. Discuss about his Post Marxism in detail with references?

**13.6 References:**

1. Ernest Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards A Radical Democratic Politics, Verso, 2014.
2. Ernest Laclau, Emancipation(S), Verso, London, 1988.
3. Ernest Laclau, On Populist Reason, Verso, London, 2005.

**Lesson 14****RECENT TRENDS IN SOCIALIST THEORY****Structure:**

- 14.0 Objectives
- 14.1 Introduction
- 14.2 Definition of Socialism
- 14.3 Early Socialism
- 14.4 Beginning of Marxism
- 14.5 Social Democracy VS Communism
- 14.6 Rise of Soviet Union
- 14.7 Years of Cold War
- 14.8 Top Ten Socialist Thinkers
- 14.9 Social Democracy redefined by Tony Blair
- 14.9.1 Experiment of Mitterrand
- 14.10 Conclusion
- 14.11 Questions
- 14.12 References

**14.0 Objectives:**

1. Students would be able to know about the what is socialism.
2. Students would be able to state about the beginning of the socialism and its rise.
3. Students would be able to learn about the recent trends in Socialist theory.

**14.1 Introduction:**

From the starting of the 1980s the socialist countries had shown much varied that socialism would mean the entire mixing of views of socialism into the society of democracy or reasoning for the domination of political power in a highly colossal and frequently by the representative regime. In the Western part of the world particularly in West Europe, the movements of the democratic-socialist, had given a new look

and attained not only the political actions of the country but it had shown domination over the politics. The triumph of the democratic socialism and at the arrival of a novel generation of leaders after the death of Stalin, in fact enabled the acclimation of Western Communists to the democratic process.

In the 16<sup>th</sup> century the beginning of the socialism can be observed and the world of the economy in the Europe began to change. The system which was very complicated of rights and duties which was the part of feudal system had begun to substitute by a market economy planned on the grounds of personal gains. This gave new liberty but at the same time it also gave hard ships to social life and which resulted in new social order. The political philosophers, starting with Sir Thomas More, struggled to understand the nature of a just, stable, and efficient society, by doing so they put the practicalities for the later thoughts of socialism.

#### **14.2 Definition of Socialism:**

Socialism talks about the broad display of political movements that predict a socio-economic system in which the state or by the representatives of the state will determine the ownership of the industry and the disbursement of wealth to the people. In this socialism one can observe that it look for the prosperity for all and the general cause for all the people in the society, which can be done without force in religious and utopian communities. But it mainly concentrates on the use of state force and disbursement of wealth.

In fact this Socialism has established in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as a political ideology, because of the reply to industrial injustice, exploitation of labour and unemployment in Europe. Karl Marx actually founded and define the modern theory of socialism, the problems of the society which were based on the economic system and rested on the private ownership of the property, and the most significantly the wealth which happened to be in the hands of rich at the cost of the labourers whose hard labour earned them the wealth. Marx promoted working class revolution which lead to collective ownership of the means of production 'property and capital'. Presently, there are different types of views have been stated to 'socialist' from forms of 'market socialism', by the support of this the economic justice can be attained by the way of taxation and disbursing throughout the state with welfare programmes. For



committed communists, supports to govern the entire property and the economy by the state, in the Asian context it is exclusive and modified form known as 'socialism with Chinese characteristics'.

It is seen that the socialism frequently, used as the slogan by dishonest leaders who want to have political power, they are the victims of frustration and injustice of low paid or unemployed people. It was obvious that in Germany, the National Socialism under the leadership of Hitler and in the Soviet Union under the Lenin, in Soviet type were established and the successors of Lenin later become totalitarian states because the personal liberty was denied to the citizens. This totalitarian political system did not have any sort of checks and balances on power, and it was understood by the mankind that it is very much required to control human inclination to take more than what one produces.

It was observed that as the system of economy, the command economy was unsuccessful due to the fact, it did not understand the nature of mankind and incentives of economy and reasonably organized persons as the fragments of the huge machine. People are not motivated properly and they were not in a passion to give whatsoever asked by the state and agree to take whatsoever was given by the state. At the diverse phases of the development, it was seen that there was no unified plan of rational disbursement of goods and services or for intellectual or biological dissimilarities. Therefore, the command economy unable to understand what every person's requirements are so that it can give real economic justice. Hence, in the mid-1980s Russia and China gave up such trials with command economy. In recent times, some of the socialists suggest selective nationalization of main industries within the outline of mixed economy. Whereas, some other suggest market socialism in which social regulation of economy laid on an outline of market economics and private property.

### **14.3 Early Socialism:**

The aspects of socialism has been observed since the early times of Plato and Aristotle and Thomas More, one can see that socialism was dealt in Plato's Republic, Aristotle's Politics and Thomas More's, Utopia. The theories talks about all the person will live together with the prosperity, peace and justice in the society. In

the Christian communities as well seen the social ideal of a caring and committed to the body of Christ, have attained the triumph upon the Roman Empire by the concern of love for each other.

The word 'socialism' was first coined in the background of early 19<sup>th</sup> century in the Western Europe, because of the crisis they faced without employment and were starting to develop by the production of goods by the help of industrialization. The ideas of social experiments were linked with the thinkers of British and French such as, Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Louis Blanc, Pierre Joseph Proudhon, and Saint Simon. All of these men were talked about the poverty and inequality at that time, and they suggested about the equal disbursement of wealth to all its citizens. Whereas, the thinkers like, Saint Simon and Robert Owen wanted to construct the socialism on the grounds of the calculated utopian community.

#### **14.4 Beginning of Marxism:**

It was observed that in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the aspect of socialism was converted into a political idea and it was mainly established by the Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, they were encouraged by their disagreement by using a materialist interpretation of the dialectic philosophy of Hegel, which was one of the primary rationale for revolutionary activities against governments, which were sacrosanct. They both arranged their theory of socialism as an outcome of a revolutionary class battle among the working class (Bourgeoisie) and the proletariat (waged class). In fact they have applied scientific methods to the socialism aspect to give more authenticity, therefore they are regarded as, 'scientific socialists' and they can be differentiated from the other 'utopian socialists' of the earlier phase. The Marxists observes the socialism as interim phase in the mankind history particularly in the social improvement which was categorized by state ownership and the autocracy of proletariat. They claim that it would be the alteration between the capitalism and present perfect communist society. According to Marx, the last phase of the socialism will be seen all 'camaraderie', which means friendship, of the social class and he defined in the concept of the primary human society which was present and improved of tools and a method of private property. Marx stated about the camaraderie (friendship) was observed between the labourers in Paris. He also

stated that the human kind would develop into higher phase of the society by the help of communism, this technical differentiation which was used by Marxists, made much confusion. For instance, the Soviet Union has not claimed that it was a Communist country, though it was ruled by the Communist party.

#### **14.5 Social Democracy VS Communism:**

The International Workingmen's Association was started by Karl Marx in the year 1864, or called as 'First International', and in 1866, the first congress was held in Geneva, the First International was a forum where they can give declaration about the communist doctrine, but the socialist differ on the policy for attaining their aims. Socialist thinkers flourished over the variation and battles and it was due to the diplomatic skills were very little in Marx and he could not compromise, in reality his personal uncooperative way was the one of the cause for the fall of First International. Although, there most of the people talks about the socialism as an international power, these socialist progressively attentive on the nation-state in their politics, which was the main aspect to hold the power. It was also seen that the socialism was well involved with the trade unions and mass political parties while in assembling the working class voters in the states. The most important to state about the Social Democratic Workers' Party of Germany (presently known as German Social Democratic Party SDP), and it was started in 1869. These groups sustained different policies from trade unions to radical, revolutionary programmes of Marx and Engels. Whereas, Karl Kautsky, who led the orthodox Marxist Party, primarily engaged the Marxist theory of revolution as the indorsed guideline of the party, but in reality and in preparation, SPD became more reformist.

In Germany, the socialists became more realistic, as the victory of their programme which is rest on progressively on the agreement of the middle and property-owning classes, who mainly engaged in regulate the bureaucratic mechanism of the state. Under Kaiser Wilhelm, the allowance of universal male suffrage and the commencements of the modern welfare state began and slowly reached to the rest of Europe and the United States of America, through the economists such as, Johns Hopkins, economist Richard T. Ely and social gospel and preachers like Washington Gladden and Walter Rauschenbusch. Eduard Bernstein, after the death of Engels, in

1895, expected leadership of the socialist movement, was primarily a solid supporter of the Marxist policy. Though, the social and economic predictions for Germany by the Marx was a failure and the fall of capitalism did not happen, Bernstein in his major work 'Evolutionary Socialism in 1899, stated about the important faults in the thoughts of Marx and he stated that the socialism attained perfectly by the democratic political process. At the same time, a strong opposition social democracy was happened from the revolutionary socialists in the countries like Russia, in which neither parliamentary democracy nor capitalist industrial infrastructure or theoretical forerunners to socialism were present. The revolutionary Russian leader Vladimir Lenin, who supported the Marx, and stated that, the capitalism was stayed because of the imperialism and he mentioned that revolution was the only way to socialism. On the other hand, the anarchists and supporters, of the substitute viewers of socialism stressed the need for the small-scale communities and agrarianism, which co-occurred with more influential flows of Marxism and social democracy of Bernstein and it was led by Mikhail Bakunin, who was a Russian, who trust that the capitalism and states cannot be separated and it is unable to ban without the other.

In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in the Western European intelligentsia, the social democracy became very powerful and in 1884, in British middle class intellectuals established the Fabian Society and they helped in making the ground for the political organisation known as the Labour Party which came into existence in 1906. Whereas, in France, in 1905, Françoise de l'Internationale Ouvriere (SFIO), under the leadership of Jean Jaures and after him, Leon Blum, followed the views of Marxists, but later they remained as reformist party in practice. In 1877, in the United States, the Socialist Labour Party was established, but later it was divided in 1890. Some of the moderate faction of the party joined with Eugene V. Debs to start the Socialist Party of America. In fact the influence of the party slowly decreased and socialism never became the major political power in USA, and communism which attained major place later it collapsed in USA and Canada as well.

There was some differentiation amongst the socialists and the communists who became more prominent during and after the World War I, during the First World War I in 1914, the socialist leaders of Europe supported their own governments but

Russian leader Lenin does not favour the and opposed it. Whereas, Lenin, criticised the war as conflict of imperialists and requested the workers in the entire world to make this as situation for the revolution of socialism. In this war, socialist parties of France and Germany braced the state wartime military and economic planning, in spite of their ideological promises to internationalism and solidarity, this ideological conflict resulted in the fall of Second International. The works of Lenin have been published in 63 countries in 125 languages, according to UNESCO, statistics the works of Lenin head the list of translated literature in the world. Marxism-Leninism great energy has now to be approved by the ideological difficulties also. A leading American expert, William Douglas, said that, even if all the books on Marxism-Leninism were burned,, the views in them will exists on and the people will continue to perform accordingly with those teachings. Most of the anti-communists who differ with Leninism are now forced to accept the significance of Lenin for understanding the position in the world today. They stated that the traditions and ideals of Lenin have won the minds of millions in the world. It was also observed that the, all ideologies of our period touch the influence of Marxism-Leninism as it followed the scientific socialism which talks about the human beings unstoppable development.

After the October revolution, socialist ideas improved in two important ways, firstly, the scientific, Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism was expanded, completed and improved on the grounds of the practice first in Soviet Union and later in other countries, and it was primarily based on the battle of working class. Secondly, the 'conceptions of the socialism', which replicating the outlooks and opinions of the peasantry, the appealing bourgeoisie, in the middle and other non-proletarian social divisions established as socialism comprised wider and more varied units of the population.

#### **14.6 Rise of Soviet Union:**

The Russian revolution in 1917, had brought the division amongst the communists and the social democrats, the communist parties form Europe and Soviet Union sacked more moderate socialist parties and broke of the contacts. In Soviet Union Soviet Communist party wanted to build socialism and for first time socialism was seen as the vision of the futuristic tomorrow of the society. Lenin nationalized all the

production except agriculture and he executed government by council of workers in lieu of democracy. During this time he blocked and executed any of his rivals and also executed the entire family members of Czar. In the process Soviet Union established a bureaucratic and authoritarian model of social improvement, declining the democratic and socialist views of Alexander Kerensky's revolution in February in 1917. After the death of Lenin Stalin assumed power and he preferred 'socialism in one country' strategy, in distinction to Leon Trotsky's call for permanent revolution. Both Lenin and Stalin understood the fragility of the Soviet experiment and did not want to jeopardize the USSR. Stalin was ready to make many conciliations with west and Hitler. The Suppression of opposition by Stalin was very methodical and genocide and viciousness were everyday throughout his 30 years in power.

#### **14.7 Years of Cold War:**

After the World War II, in the Western Europe, socialism was in rise because of the poverty in those areas, even, the governments of conservative parties where they were in power, were enforced to follow a number of social welfare reforms and to be the welfare state in their countries. The socialist parties mainly followed the USA led cold war strategies and they were against the policies of USSR, this comprised Marshall Plan and North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The scholars from Frankfurt School, such as, Hannah Arendt, criticised Soviet Union as the 'totalitarian'. Socialism steadily progressed and it even influenced the third world countries, which did not have democratic leadership in several post-colonial states. Chinese revolution was started in 1949, and communist rule was in the entire China's mainland, and the nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America who adopted the socialist economic programmes regular basis and in number of occasion they nationalized industries owned by the foreigners.

In Britain, in 1945 elections the British labour party won the elections it was the first clear cut electoral mandate for socialist programme in a country like Britain. This new government was not like communist or Marxist; most of its leaders were from the London School of Economics, which had been spreading Fabian method to socialism for more than a generation. After the world War, the Labour government which was led by Clement Attlee, acknowledged that with the post war problems

contained by British particularly with economic and social problems, unlimited capitalism was to deliver equity and social justice to its citizens. His government suggested to remove private ownership particularly in those areas where economy was very critical for the wellbeing of the people such as, public utilities, transportation, Bank of England industries like iron and steel. Attlee also paid the care to social welfare, through legislation, pensions, unemployment insurance, health care etc. all the actions of the labour government convinced the people that it was in solving the demands for social and economic justice. But in the later election of 1950, this party was reduced. The Socialist Democratic Party was in power for long time in Sweden, Germany etc.

In the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the socialism in the western countries arrived into a novel era, of uncertainty and crisis. The development of burgeoning bureaucratic state which began to face the economic problem and Leonid Brezhnev could not control it properly and during this time, monetarists and neoliberals criticised the social welfare system as weakness to economic growth. By the establishment of Ronald Reagan as the President of USA, and 'supply side economics' along with Margaret Thatcher of Britain Prime Minister, put more pressure on the countries of west so that they can become more competent ones. By the help of democratic economic development which occurred in 1980s and 1990s, all the western countries and international organizations disallowed the socialist democratic methods of Keynesian economics in support of neoliberal strategy.

#### **14.8 Top Ten Socialist Thinkers:**

1. Eduard Bernstein (1850-1932) was the theoretician behind Marxist revisionism, which purports that it is possible to use reform to create a socialist society.
2. William Beveridge (1879-1963), known as "The People's William," wrote the blueprint for the modern British welfare state.
3. Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937) created the concept of Cultural hegemony, which says that a successful revolution must change a society's dominant ideas as well as its political structure.

4. Michael Harrington (1928-1989) was sometimes called “the man who discovered poverty.” His book *The Other America*, was a major influence on Lyndon Johnson's “Great Society” and the New Left of the 1960s.
5. Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924) transformed Marxist ideology to reflect Russian political realities. His recognition that peasants were as oppressed as any urban proletariat and represented a potential revolutionary force was the basis for later revolutions in relatively unindustrialized countries.
6. Karl Marx (1818-1883) and Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) were the Tweedledum and Tweedledee of socialism-you don't find one without the other. Together they developed the socialist theories on which Marxism is based.
7. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon (1809-1865) was the first person to call himself an anarchist. He developed the theoretical foundation for anarchism and syndicalism.
8. David Ricardo (1772-1823) was not a socialist himself. His economic theories of rent, the labor theory of value, and the iron law of wages laid the foundation for Karl Marx's analysis of capitalism.
9. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) distinguished between natural and social inequality.
10. Sidney and Beatrice Webb (1859-1947 and 1858-1943), founders of the English Fabian Society, developed the idea of gradualism: the transformation of society from capitalism to socialism through gradual reforms.

#### **14.9 Social Democracy redefined by Tony Blaire:**

During the election in 1983, Blaire was elected as representative and he was the youngest labour MP. Again in 1987, election Conservatives smacked the Labour party, party was divided between the ‘traditionalist’, who had old fashioned ideas and new outlook ‘modernizers’, who desired to transfer party towards the political centre and Tony Blaire was one of the utmost outspoken of the modernizers. In the 1992, Conservatives were very weak and country was in the recession for 18 months and unemployment stayed close to 10% and at this time Margaret Thatcher was sent out of the office by her own party members and replaced her with John Major.



New Labour: Blair thought that the Labour party's defeat was due to the fact and he understood that, society was changed and we did not change accordingly with it, he was elected as the party leader in 1994, and he started to reorganise the labour party. Under him the party it took a strange step that it distanced from the trade unions and changed its strategies on very important issues. After winning the leadership he suggested change the clause of IV of the party's constitution, which had been written in 1918 by the Fabian Society theorist Sidney Webb. During the 1997, elections Blair stated himself as the champion of entrepreneurs, within the party critics protested to method of new labour, Blair thought, "that socialism if it still means anything at all, was a set of values that should guide public policy under capitalism, nothing more". In those elections Blair led the labour party to a resounding victory and he served as the Prime Minister for three terms.

#### **14.9.1 Experiment of Mitterrand:**

When the British Labour Party was defeated by the Margaret Thatcher, in France Mitterrand wants to be on the rise, he defeated conservative party in an election for the French Presidency. After his victory he called for general election and Socialist Party of France won about 70% of the seats and Mitterrand named militant socialist Pierre Mauray as the Prime Minister and the cabinet was of socialists and four communists. Mitterrand was very efficient in pushing through the socialist reforms and completed them in less than one year. The exports of French were reduced the value of Frank fell and inflation raised and at the same time investors took their capital out of the country. Mitterrand stopped his efforts to create socialist France and instituted austerity measures to 'bring about a real reconciliation between the left and the economy'. In 1988, elections socialist party loss its control in National Assembly, with two years left on his term he joined socialist scramble towards political centre.

#### **14.10 Conclusion:**

From the starting of the 1980s the socialist countries had shown much varied that socialism would mean the entire mixing of views of socialism into the society of democracy or reasoning for the domination of political power in a highly colossal and

frequently by the representative regime. In the Western part of the world particularly in West Europe, the movements of the democratic-socialist, had given a new look and attained not only the political actions of the country but it had shown domination over the politics. Socialism talks about the broad display of political movements that predict a socio-economic system in which the state or by the representatives of the state will determine the ownership of the industry and the disbursement of wealth to the people.

The aspects of socialism has been observed since the early times of Plato and Aristotle and Thomas More, one can see that socialism was dealt in Plato's Republic, Aristotle's Politics and Thomas More's, Utopia. It was observed that in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the aspect of socialism was converted into a political idea and it was mainly established by the Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, they were encouraged by their disagreement by using a materialist interpretation of the dialectic philosophy of Hegel, which was one of the primary rationale for revolutionary activities against governments, which were sacrosanct.

In the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, in the Western European intelligentsia, the social democracy became very powerful and in 1884, in British middle class intellectuals established the Fabian Society and they helped in making the ground for the political organisation known as the Labour Party which came into existence in 1906. After the World War II, in the Western Europe, socialism was in rise because of the poverty in those areas, even, the governments of conservative parties where they were in power, were enforced to follow a number of social welfare reforms and to be the welfare state in their countries.

#### **14.11 Questions:**

1. What is socialism and the early socialism and beginning of socialism?
2. Describe about social democracy Vs Socialism?
3. Rise of Soviet Union and years of cold war?

**14.12 References:**

1. Prabhat Patnaik, Re-Envisioning Socialism, Tulika Books, New Delhi, 2011.
2. Prabhat Patnaik, RE-Envisioning, Tulika Books, New Delhi, 2011.
3. Warren Lerner, A History of Socialism and Communism in Modern Times, Prentice-Hall, Englewood, 1982.
4. P.N Fedoseyev & Co, The Marxist-Leninist Teaching of Socialism and the World Today, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978.