



MADURAI KAMARAJ UNIVERSITY
(University with Potential for Excellence)
DISTANCE EDUCATION



M.A.,
Second Year

Paper - VIII

POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

Recognised by D.E.C.
www.mkudde.org

R 277



MADURAI KAMARAJ UNIVERSITY
(University with Potential for Excellence)
DISTANCE EDUCATION



M.A. Political Science

SECOND YEAR
Paper - VIII

POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

Recognised by D.E.C.

www.mkudde.org

S 277

II. M.A., POLITICAL SCIENCE (NON-SEMESTER)

POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

Dear Student,

You are just and year away from getting your M.A., degree in Political Science. You should be confident, after undergoing the course for one year, that it is not ever difficult after all. It all depends on how you study throughout the academic year.

This paper, Political Ideologies, is an interesting one. As you have already studied Western Political Thought, the background for this paper has been set up. The world today is torn between different political ideologies. It is but proper that we know something of each one of them. Of course some of the 'isms; included in the syllabus are not longer having many followers. But they have had their own roles to play in the field of politics. Besides this lesson is prepared based on SIM Pattern and consists of 10 Units. If you take pains to practice answering the questions at the end of each lesson it will be useful for you when you take the examination, With best wishes.

DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Paper – VIII

SYLLABUS

POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

- Unit- 1 - Introduction – Liberalism**
- Unit – 2 - Democracy**
- Unit – 3 - Socialism**
- Unit – 4 - Democratic Socialism**
- Unit-5 - Fabian Socialism Guild Socialism**
- Unit -6 - Syndicalism**
- Unit – 7 - Leninism**
- Unit – 8 - Stalinism**
- Unit- 9 - Revisionism – Pluralism**
- Unit-10 - Fascism and Nazism**

SELECT REFERENCES

- 1. Sir E. Barker, Principles of Social and Political Theory, Calcutta, Oxford University Press, 1976.**
- 2. N.P. Barry, Introduction to Modern Political theory, London, Macmillan, 1955.**
- 3. A. Brecht, Political theory: The foundations of Twentieth Century Political Thought, Bombay, The Times of India Press, 1965.**
- 4. R. Dahl, Modern Political Analysis, Englewood cliffs NJ, Prentice Hall, 1963.**
- 5. D. Easton, The Political system: An inquiry into the State of Political Science, New York, Wiley, 1953**
- 6. D. Easton, A systems Analysis of Political Life, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice Hall, 1965.**
- 7. D. Held, Political theory Today, Cambridge, - Press, 1991**
- 8. H.J. Laski, A Grammer of Politics, London, Allen and Unwin, 1948**
- 9. C.B. Macpherson, Democratic Theory: Essays in Retrieval, Oxford, The Clarendon Pres, 1977**
- 10. S. Ramaswamy, Political Theory : Ides and Concepts, Dellhi, Macmillan, 2002**
- 11. S.P. Varma, Modern Political Theory, New Delhi, Vikas, 1983.**

SCHEME OF LESSONS

Unit - 1	-	Introduction – Liberalism
Unit – 2	-	Democracy
Unit – 3	-	Socialism
Unit – 4	-	Democratic Socialism
Unit - 5	-	Fabian Socialism Guild Socialism
Unit -6	-	Syndicalism
Unit – 7	-	Leninism
Unit – 8	-	Stalinism
Unit - 9	-	Revisionism – Pluralism
Unit - 10	-	Fascism and Nazism

UNIT – 1

LIBERALISM

INTRODUCTION

Man is the centre of the universe. The modern world's emphasis is more on secular matters than on religion. People are giving importance to life on this earth and their capacity for enjoying it. This new age started with Renaissance. With the transformation from the medieval to the modern period, old loyalties and traditional institutions have been abandoned. New institutions are not however, accepted easily. For men are basically conservative.

The new discoveries in science and technology played an important role in man's conception of himself as master. When man discovered the laws of nature, his belief in reason grew to a great extent. His emphasis shifted from what is beyond to what is here, importance being given to the good life in this world. Soon the good life came to be identified with the materially abundant life. This led to ideological struggles between men to decide their share under conditions of scarcity. The bone of contention was private property in the means of production.

One of the great developments of the modern period is the emergence of nation state. After the Reformation, the power of papacy was substantially weakened. But tradition required that authority should have religious sanction. The king was considered a ruler by the grace of God. It was only when the dynastic state was replaced by the national state that religious sanction disappeared. The modern state is a secular institution.

OBJECTIVES

By studying this unit, the students will

- a) Understand the meaning and importance of political ideology.
- b) Study the meaning of Liberalism
- c) Learn, Laski's views on liberty.
- d) Analyze the elements of Liberalism
- e) know history and liberalism in the 19th century

UNIT STRUCTURE:

The age of Reason

Max mark definition of ideology

Meaning of Liberalism

Relationship between liberty and equality

Laski views on Liberty

The elements of Liberalism

History of Liberalism

Liberalism in the 19th Century.

Obliteration of Liberalism by totalitarianism

Summary

Key words

Check your progress question

Books for further reading

Questions and exercise

1.1. THE AGE OF REASON:

The Age of Reason did not lead to any psychological analysis of various issues. It was much later that man was confronted by the awareness of his emotions and impulses. What determined the goals of man-reason or emotions? For David Hume, reason is effective only in determining means; goals are established by human passions. Reason is to be the slave of the passions. There is number of views regarding the goals in life. While Kant holds that the fulfillment of one's duty as a rational being is the goal, Jeremy Bentham says that it is happiness. Political thinkers from the later part of the nineteenth century onwards have turned away from the psychology of utilitarianism and have started to look at man on a deeper psychological level. After the subconscious and the irrational were discovered, a number of new themes about human behaviour were developed. They include the importance of emotion-based myths, the need for leaders, the significance of motives and the fact that man's mastery over .. not lead to beneficial applications.

During the middle Ages, society was regarded as organic and hierarchical. The individual's importance lay in the group into which he was born. The Renaissance too did not help in the emancipation of all men. The

expansion of individual freedom applied only to the upper classes. The masses remained in their traditional state of dependence and were not given any importance within society. It was the rise of the middle classes that led to the drawn of democracy. But democracy was also highly restrictive in the beginning. In Britain, for example, at the beginning of the twentieth century, the electorate represented only 30 percent of the voting age population. Universal adult franchise was introduced on in 1928. The main argument against the inclusion of all the people in a democracy was that only those who had a stake in the state should be given the right to participate in the election, and property should determine the qualification.

Democracy of the western world did not put an end to the economic disparities among people. It was supposed to operate only in the political sphere. The division between political and economic spheres ended only in this century. The modern democratic state accepts the responsibility for the economic welfare of its people. The meaning of democracy is not the same in all countries. All of them accept that the interest of the many should be given more importance than those of the few. When society became secularized and democratized, social philosophy entered the arena of social struggle out of which ideology was born.

1.1.1. MAX MARK DEFINES IDEOLOGY:

Max Mark defines ideology as “any organized set of ideas about the good life and the institutional framework for their realization”

He also refers to it as “emotionally charged beliefs about the substance of the good life, the most desirable orbit of human fellowship, the ideal form of social organization, or the conditions for the legitimacy of government-or all of these together”.

There are two elements in every ideology. The first is a particular value, and the second ascertains that social reality calls for the implementation of only that value. For example, the ideology of nationalism maintains all those who have a common language and culture to have their own political home, independent of foreign domination; only that can lead to the happiness and development of the individual.

Any attack upon an ideology must concentrate on its interpretation of social and psychological reality. However, objective proof of something is very difficult to-day because of the complex and contradictory elements of reality. Arguments about ideology are themselves ideological, though they appear to be scientific. Although ideologies rise in response to particular situations and needs, we cannot say that a situation and an ideology are always connected. A particular situation may allow different ideologies. However, a situation sets definite limits on the relevance of an ideology.

The age of ideology began with the French Revolution and has reached its climax in these days. That ours is an age of revolution is reflected by the role of ideology to day. This revolution transcends national boundaries, questions the traditional organization of societies and has set different interpretation of the good life against each other. In the international sphere there is worldwide competition for supporters in terms of different ideologies.

1.1.2. MEANING

Liberty is the basic element in the principles of liberalism. Harold J. Laski defines liberty as, “the absence of restraint upon the existence of those social conditions which, in modern civilization, are the necessary guarantees of individual happiness”. The absence of restraint implies power to expand, the choice by the individual of his own way of life without imposed prohibitions from without. Liberalism does not agree with Rousseau’s claim that men can be forced to be free. Nor can they find liberty in obedience to the law, as Hegel insisted. Men are free only when the rules under which they live leave them without a sense of frustration.

Check your progress questions

1. Write you Max Marle definition ideology
2. What you Meant liberalism
3. Explain the relationship between liberty and equality

Laski’s definition also implies the view that if some people in a state possess unlimited political power, those living in that state can never be free. As a pluralist, he argues that those who posses absolute power are always tempted to impose their views upon others and they assume that the good of the community depends upon their continuance in power. Liberty demands a limitation of political authority. This limitation can be attained when the holders of power are made accountable to the people.

Massimo Salvadori says that liberty is operative in the measure in which individuals make their own decisions and can act on the basis of these decisions. Liberty lies not in national independence, class emancipation, free enterprise, justice, equality, truth, belief or disbelief in God but in choice. This choice can be made use of for good or bad purposes. It has made for progress in terms of greater knowledge, better standards of living, higher levels of maturity and more efficient societies. Thus liberty and progress are inseparable.

Absence of restraint does not mean the absence of rules and regulations. They are necessary to balance the various interests and desires of the people. These limitations upon freedom are essential for the happiness of man. Economic security is not liberty, though it is a condition without which liberty is never effective. It is agreed that property alone does not make a man free. At the same time we realize that without economic security, liberty is not worth having.

The threats to freedom are found when there is special privilege for a section of the society, or when the majority acts in a tyrannical manner. For uncontrolled power is always the natural enemy of freedom. Those who possess such power are able to tilt the balance of social action in their own favour. The early history of liberty was conceived as protection against the tyranny of the political rulers. Their power was limited either by the recognition of special immunities or by the creation of constitutional guarantees. When special privileges of a few are abolished, there would be equality of all.

1.1.3. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

Liberty and equality are not to be treated as the same thing. But they are complementary. In the absence of certain equalities, freedom cannot be realized. Aristotle realized long ago that the craving for equality is one of the major of their freedom. For equality attempts to give each similar chances to utilize his powers. It insists that there is no difference inherent in nature between the claims of men to happiness.

Equality and freedom are closely connected because equality means the organization of opportunities, which does not destroy one's personality to the private benefit of others. Everyone is given his chance to use his freedom to experiment with his powers. He may not attain his goal but he has the consolation that society has not weighted the scale against him. We can explain the concept of equality by an illustration. In the matter of given education, all children must be treated equally. That is, no child is to be denied the type of education that another child might receive. But in the selection of men for appointment in government officers, one might be preferred to another on the basis of ability or training; one cannot claim equality there.

Another argument against individual liberty is that it fails to take note of the rights of the society, which are necessarily superior to those of the individuals. Any organization is more than the units of which it is composed. It has its own needs and purpose. The liberty of each member must be subordinated to the liberty of the society. We enjoy our freedom only because the State enforces our rights as obligations upon others.

Liberty is to be realized by the co-ordination of competing interests. That is, one must give way to others by accepting restraints upon one's rights. This surrender is not made for the sake of the society regarded as something other than its members, but for the sake of people whose totality constitutes the collective society. It is based on this argument that the idealist theory states that individual freedom means obedience to the law of the society. When a man theory states to realize himself, he is seeking to be one with the order of which he is a part. He is not independent of that order, but one with it and of it. As the order realizes itself, the individual is also realized. The idealists argue, therefore, that true liberty consists not in the absence of restraint, but in the subordination to a system of rational purposes which receive their highest expression in the activities of the state. Association with the activities of the state may then be regarded as the highest freedom a citizen can think of.

The idealist school has urged that compulsory obedience to a code is the very essence of freedom. Liberty is not a mere negative concept like the

absence of restraint. It is a positive self-determination of the will which seeks the fulfillment of rational purpose behind the diversified interests in each. As Rousseau holds, the real will is the highest part of men. This will is the same in each member of the society. This is a common will which finds highest embodiment in the state. Thus, the state becomes the highest part of men. If people were to will for their permanent good, their aim should be one with the object of the state. This is Hegelian idealism.

1.1.4. LASKI VIEWS ON LIBERTY

Laski urges that a true theory of liberty should be built upon a denial of each of the assumptions of idealism. The true self of one is not a selected system of rational purposes identical with those sought by every member of society. It is all that a man is and what he does. It is the total impression of his various acts, good and bad. All of them go to the formation of his view of the universe. They are his expression of his striving to fulfill his personality. Each one must give way only in terms of his own judgment and not of one made for him by some other will. Only then will he remain a purposive human being serving himself as an end.

Further, this real will cannot be assumed to be identical in every member of society. The inescapable fact in politics is the final variety of human wills. There is no continuum which makes all of them one. Several persons may desire common objects, but each will is a different will. There is no single or common will in society. Each man desires good as he sees it. He remains himself even while joining with others to attain some common object of desire. Political theory must start with the assumption of the isolation of individual personality.

Generally people conclude that without democracy there cannot be liberty. Democracy involves a frame of government in which people are given the chance of making their government. The laws of that government should be binding equally upon all. A citizen excluded from franchise is not free. For those who wield power will not regard his will as entitled to consideration in the making of policy. The government should be made periodically

accountable to the people. Only then will it be eager to satisfy the wants of the voters.

There are certain rules in the organization of a state, which are fundamental to freedom. Laski gives importance to two of those rules. 1) No citizen is secure in liberty unless certain rights are guaranteed to him by the government. 2) The judiciary should be separated from the executive in order to secure the maintenance of those rights. Those who are in power always try to enlarge the boundaries of their authority. It is essential to resist such encroachments for the preservation of freedom.

1.2. ELEMENTS OF THE LIBERALISM

We have discussed the meaning of liberalism and its relationship with equality. For a better understanding of its meaning, we shall now deal with the elements of the liberalism. L.T.Hobhouse lists them as follows:

- 1) Civil liberty
- 2) Fiscal liberty
- 3) Personal liberty'
- 4) Social liberty
- 5) Economic liberty
- 6) Domestic liberty
- 7) Local, Racial, and National liberty
- 8) International liberty and
- 9) Political liberty and Popular Sovereignty

CIVIL LIBERTY:

The foremost liberty to be secured is the right to be dealt with in accordance with law. It is the first point of attack against arbitrary government. Every man should be given legal rights against another. In some cases, though people are allowed rights of person and property against one another, they have no such rights against the government. Several European governments had also been absolute at various times and in various directions. These governments had resorted to arbitrary arrests, detention and punishment, although regular courts of law were there. The English parliament reached against arbitrary government in the seventeenth century by its petition

of Rights and Habeas Corpus Act. This first step in liberty was a demand for law. Locke sums up the controversy thus: "Freedom of men under government is to have a standing rule to live by, common to every one of that society and made by the legislative power erected in it"

For securing freedom for all, there must be restraints upon all. The first condition of free government is Government not by the arbitrary determination of the ruler, but by fixed rules of law, to which the ruler himself is subject. There can be no contradiction between law and liberty. On the contrary, law is essential liberty. Of course, law means restriction upon the individual. But it also restrains others from doing with him as they want. It frees man from the fear of arbitrary aggression or coercion. This is how liberty is guaranteed to an entire community.

when we assume that rule of law guarantees liberty, we take law to be impartial. If there are different laws for the government and its citizens, for the nobility and the commons, the laws do not guarantee liberty at all. Liberty here implies equality. Hence liberalism demands impartial application of law, independence of judiciary to secure equality between government and the governed, simple procedure and accessibility of courts, abolition of privileges of class and the abolition of the power of money.

FISCAL LIBERTY:

This is more widely felt in everyday life. The revolution in England had its roots in arbitrary taxation by the Stuarts. Similar methods of George III led to American War of Independence. The immediate cause of the French Revolution was the refusal of the nobles and the clergy to bear their share of the financial burden. Fiscal liberty raises more searching questions than juristic liberty. It is not enough that taxes should be more searching questions than juristic liberty. It is not enough that taxes should be fixed by law applying universally and impartially. The Executive, which deals with taxation more than the legislature, must be restrained by a more direct and constant supervision. It means responsible government. The cry "No taxation without representation" denotes the demand for fiscal liberty, which involves political liberty as well.

PERSONAL LIBERTY:

It is very difficult to define personal liberty, but it is the subject of fierce conflict of passion and deep feelings of man. The basis for personal liberty is liberty of thought. With it goes freedom of speech, writing and discussion. It is not easy to draw the limits of liberty. But liberty can never be absolute. For example the modern state, while granting freedom of religion, would not tolerate a form of religious worship which should include human sacrifice, That is, liberty should not be in conflict with order.

Religious liberty includes freedom of thought and expression, and the right to worship in any form which does not cause injury to others or involves a breach of public order. This limitation implies a certain decency and restraint in speech which avoids insult to the feelings of others. Religious liberty is something more than toleration. It implies full equality of opportunities in office, education, etc. for the various religious groups.

SOCIAL LIBERTY:

The hierarchic organization of society has always led to restraints on the individual, and reservation of certain offices, certain forms of education, etc, to people of a certain rank or class. The more extreme form of differences is to be found in a caste system, whose restrictions are religious, legal or social. In Europe, some occupations had been the monopoly of a few corporations. Appointments to public offices and ecclesiastical patronage were reserved for the upper classes. Under these circumstances, the struggle for liberty was also a struggle for equality. Equality of opportunities was demanded. The Liberals' support for a national system of free education came on these lines. Even while insisting on the rights of the individual, the social value of the corporations like the trade union cannot be ignored. Hence the liberal principle that membership of a corporation should not be on the basis of any hereditary qualification and there should be no artificial difficulty of entry into a corporation.

Liberalism is also opposed to discrimination on the basis of sex. In occupations where women are considered unfit, there should be a test of

fitness which will exclude them. So apart from pleading for the equality of women, liberalism also demands equal opportunities for the talented.

ECONOMIC LIBERTY:

In the early part of the modern period trade and industry were subjected to a lot of restrictive laws. The tariff was an obstruction to free enterprise and a source of inequality among the traders. The liberal movement attacked both obstruction and inequality. The regulations unsuited for the time were gradually abolished during the industrial revolution. It then appeared as though people were pleading for unrestricted industrial enterprise. But there began a new process of regulation. During the time of industrial revolution, the workers were subjected to such hardships that the factories had to be regulated by a series of laws.

The liberals were in a dilemma. Being supporters of freedom of contract and personal responsibility, they had to agree that an adult individual possessed the right of concluding an agreement according to his own interests and the right and the duty of determining the lines of his life for himself. If he chose the work in a factory, it was his own free will. Hence the liberals doubted the wisdom of regulating industry by law. None the less, as time passed on, the liberals came to accept and advocate the extension of public control in the industrial sphere of collective responsibility in educating and feeding the children, providing the industrial laborers with accommodation, the care of the sick and aged, and the provision of the means of regular employment. We must note that the function of liberalism is not so much to maintain a general right of free association as to define the right to the maximum enjoyment of real liberty and equality.

DOMESTIC LIBERTY:

The most universal and vital association within the state is the community of the family. Authoritarianism in a state was also reflected in the family, in which the husband dominated the person and property of wife and children. Hobhouse notes that the movement of liberation consists in the following: 1) in rendering the wife a fully responsible individual, capable of holding property, suing and being sued against, conducting her own business, and

enjoying full protection against her husband; 2) in establishing the marriage legally personal on a contractual basis, and leaving the sacramental aspect of marriage to the regulation of the professed by the man and the woman; 3) in securing the physical, mental, and moral care of the children, partly by imposing definite responsibilities on the parents, partly by preparing a public system of education and of hygiene.

Of these, the first two movements are typical cases of the interdependence of liberty and equality. The third is regarded more as a socialistic measure than as a liberal tendency. The state control of education has given rise to some searching question of principle. The state here seems to override the functions of the parents. All the same, the child has the right to protection against parental neglect, and to equality of opportunity which he may claim as a future citizen. Hence also liberty involves control and restraint.

LOCAL, RACIAL AND NATIONAL LIBERTY:

Nation is the largest social unit. History is full of examples of national struggle against alien rule. The liberation movements in Europe against Napoleon, in South Africa and Zimbabwe, and the national movements in Ireland and in India present the problem of liberty. The general tendency of liberalism is to favour autonomy. But there are problems of subdivision and the complexity of different groups.

INTERNATIONAL LIBERTY:

Liberals uphold the importance of non-interference in international affairs. They oppose the use of force, the basis of all tyranny. Aggression against a country may result in national subjection. The use of force becomes meaningless to the extent the world is free.

POLITICAL LIBERTY AND POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY

To secure and maintain the different types of liberty, the executive and legislature should be made responsible to the people as a whole. Thus the general theory of liberty and the doctrine of universal suffrage and popular sovereignty are interrelated. The people as a whole might be careless of their rights and incapable of managing them. It is possible, from the point of view

of general liberty and social progress, that a limited franchise might give better result than universal adult franchise.

From the elements of liberalism we have discussed, we can note that it is coextensive with life. It is concerned with the individual, the family and the state. It covers industry, law, religion, and ethics, Hobhouse sums up that 'liberalism is an all penetrating element of the life structure of the modern world'. Its work is not complete; yet, it is in progress thought the world. another feature is that in most of the cases, the movement for liberty is also the movement for equality. For the principle of liberty and equality are habitually associated with each other.

1.2.1. HISTORY OF LIBERALISM:

The English revolutionaries of 1688 were motivated by the principles, values, and goals which would, in the 19th century, become the core of the liberal philosophy and inspire the programme of political liberalism. This is indicated by the Bill of Rights of 1689 and the subsequent constitutional developments. Similarly the French Revolutionaries of 1789 and the members of the National Assembly of France (1789-1791) were also motivated by the liberal principles.

The dominant group among the members of the National Assembly was inspired by the example of Great Britain. They wanted the liberties to be clearly formulated and institutionalized through a written constitution. The National Assembly approved the Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1789, and two years the constitution was adopted. The Declaration has ever since been a basic charter for European liberals and liberal democrats. Some of the leading clauses of the Declaration are:

Article I – Men are born and remain free and equal in rights. Civil distinctions, therefore, can be found only on public utility.

Article II – The end of every political association is the conservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, security, and resistance to oppression.

Article III – The nation is essentially the source of all sovereignty....

Article IV - Liberty consists in the power to do anything that does not injure others. The exercise of the natural rights of every man has no other limits than those which are necessary to secure to other members of society the free exercise of the same rights. These limits can only be determined by law.

Article VI – The law is the expression of the general will. All citizens have a right to take part personally or by their representatives, in its formation.

The French constitution of 1791 embodied the principles of national sovereignty, of government by discussion in an assembly of freely elected representatives of the citizens, of separation of powers between the legislature, executive and judiciary, etc, which formed the programme of European liberalism in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The liberalization of institutions in the U.K. after 1830 was largely the work of liberals. The limited governments of France and the establishment of the Third Republic in 1870 were all the result of liberal initiative. Liberals played an important role in several revolutions in Europe between 1820 and 1876. During the first quarter of the present century liberal governments had existed in the U.K., France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Hungary, Greece etc. Several European thinkers, from the seventeenth century to the twentieth, have shared the convictions essential to liberalism. They include Locke, Kant, Bentham, J.S. Mill and Keynes.

1.2.2. LIBERALISM IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY:

With the defeat of Napoleon Bonaparte, Europe entered into an era of limited constitutionalism. Several countries including France, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Norway, and Poland began to have constitutional forms of government. In 1815 Great Britain was the most free European nation. From then on, the liberals were largely responsible for expanding their principles in all European nations. They were helped by nationalists, democrats, anti-clericals and some groups of socialists.

In some European countries, the liberals fought for their aims through legal battles; in most cases, they achieved their goal by revolutions. In Britain changes in the constitution were through a series of reforms, In Switzerland and the Netherlands (1848), Denmark (1849), Sweden (1864) and Norway (1905) new constitutions were adopted. Though many liberal revolutions failed, some of them were successful and had lasting effect. The advance of liberalism in some major countries was made possible by their defeats in wars. Austria – Hungary lost the wars in 1859 and 1866, France in 1870-71, and Russia in 1853-1856 and 1904-1905. These defects led to the weakening of despotism in those countries.

By the beginning of the last quarter of the nineteenth century Parliaments had been established almost everywhere in Europe. With the turn of the present century, parliamentarianism has succeeded in several countries. It was only in Germany and Austria – Hungary that parliaments were in a subordinate position.

The liberals from the time of the French Revolution, were upholding the right of nations to independence and thereby found support from patriots and nationalists. In countries like Great Britain they appealed to Nonconformists by advocating separation of church and state. In Catholic countries they supported the Protestants and in Ireland, the Catholics. The liberals at times received the support of many businessman because they upheld private ownership of property and free enterprise. When championing the cause of social legislation they had the support of large sections of industrial labour. Liberal's alliance with these groups was temporary and linked and temporary and linked to specific issues. The essence of political liberation remained self government and its accompaniments.

Most of the liberals of the early nineteenth century, however, were not democrats. They felt that the ancient and medieval republics were nothing but mob rule and uncontrolled emotionalism, which ended in dictatorship. They held that self government was possible only if suffrage and election to office were limited to responsible citizens. The main criteria for responsibility were ownership of property and literacy. The liberals assumed that the expansion of

the economy and the diffusion of education would lead to democracy. Meanwhile, they preferred the rule of democratically organized open oligarchy of educated rich people over the poor and the illiterate.

During the nineteenth century, most European liberals were enthusiastic supporters of capitalism. Though the economy expanded rapidly under capitalism, industry replacing agriculture as the main source of wealth, there was also accumulation of problems like depressions, unemployment, etc. The free economy led to greater problems. Capitalism was differentiated from other economic systems, not by the size of the problem but by the awareness of men, as the result of freedom of expression.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the liberals were divided as moderates and radicals. The moderates continued to support laissez-faire as the only remedy for economic ills: In practice however, laissez-faire strengthened economic privileges, and had an illiberal effect on society. Most radicals believed that private ownership of property was a major guarantee of the individual's liberty. However they also favoured governmental action to limit the instability of a system which caused unbearable insecurity for millions of people; to achieve balance between economic forces; to diminish tensions between the rich and the poor, management and labour, agricultural and industrial interests, private right and public service; and to lessen rivalries between nations. Capitalism was a bigger factor than democracy in causing the moderate liberals to merge with conservatives, and the radicals with democratic socialists.

1.2.3.OBLITERATION OF LIBERALISM BY TOTALITARIANISM:

Liberals had not trusted democracy and socialism. But both became the bulwark of liberal ideas and institutions except for the economic ones. The liberals had not expected nationalism to become a powerful enemy, but from the end of the nineteenth century, Europeans motivated by nationalistic passion attacked parliamentarianism as the source of the state's weakness, rejected liberal principles and values as destroying between individuals and

Check your progress questions

4. Analysis Laski views on Liberty

5. Explain the elements of liberalism.

between nations. In the form of Fascism and Nazism, nationalism had obliterated liberal institutions in several European nations.

The liberal institutions of Russia, Italy, Germany, and France collapsed in the twentieth century mostly because of lack of sufficient support from the citizens. A regime founded and liberty cannot function effectively and survive crises unless the citizens prefer liberty to authoritarianism, whatever the defects and errors of the former.

The rule totalitarian nationalism in Europe came to an end after World war II. Continental nations previously ruled by fascists and Nazis were reorganized on the basis of free institutions founded on universal suffrage. Though the policies or dominant political parties vary, the political structure was that of liberal democratic states. This was not due to the strength of liberal parties. It was primarily the result of acceptance of basic liberal principles by the major political forces.

The electoral weakening of liberal parties is generally interpreted as the fading of European liberalism. In the democratic countries of Europe, the parties are smaller, but the principles and institutions of liberalism are more widely diffused than they had been earlier when liberal parties were very strong. Liberalism had contributed to the emancipation of minds and consciences from dogmas and superstitions, and of individual and collective behaviour from conventional taboos. The new ideas and movements on the European scene are evidence of the emancipating effect of free institutions.

1.3. SUMMARY

This unit dealt with the meaning and the importance of political ideology. Moreover it provides details to study meaning of liberalism, Laski views on study liberty. Also you are able to know history of Liberalism. This unit also dealt with Liberalism in the 19th century in details.

1.4. KEY WORDS

Reformation	-	Change for the better.
Emancipation	-	Act of freeing
Ideology	-	Science of ideas, theories

Complementary	-	Completing
Herarchi	-	an order of priests

1.5.ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS QUESTIONS

For question No.1	-	Reference Section No. 1.1.1
For question No.2	-	Reference Section No. 1.1.2
For question No.3	-	Reference Section No. 1.1.3
For question No.4	-	Reference Section No. 1.1.4
For question No.5	-	Reference Section No. 1.2

1.6. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READINGS

1. Mark, Max; Modern Ideology (St. James press London)
2. Arblaster, The rise and Decline of Western liberalism, Oxford, Black well. 1984.
3. Coker, Recent Political Thought (A.C.C. or World Press)

1.7.QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

1. Define Liberalism, what according to L.T. Hobhouse, are its elements?
2. Trace the history of Liberalism during 19th Century.

UNIT – 2

DEMOCRACY

INTRODUCTION

Democracy has been defined variously by different people. There is no single definition which is agreed upon by all the thinkers. Moreover some definitions of democracy are so vague as to be useless and others so specific as to be obviously inadequate. The literal meaning of the term is government by the people. But this definition is not satisfactory, for no political system at any time has ever given to all the people, the right of choosing their own government. There have always been laid some conditions for the enjoyment of political rights. Sometimes the restrictions are logical; for example, the insane are defined the right to vote on the ground that they are incapable of taking responsible decisions. But many restrictions have been based on prejudices which, according to the prevailing political climate of the time, were taken for granted as self-evident truths. For example, till almost the end of the nineteenth century, it was taken for granted everywhere that women ought not to enjoy the same political rights as men. Britain, the United States of America and Switzerland have long been generally recognized as democracies. But women were granted voting rights in Britain only in 1918 and in Switzerland only in 1973. In the United States black citizens were not given full recognition in practice; the women have still to fight for their rights.

OBJECTIVES:

By Studying this unit, the students will

- a) Know the meaning of Democracy
- b) Under stand Democracy as a system of Government
- c) Learn Democracy as a way of life.
- d) Analyse representative form of democracy
- e) Categorise the kinds of democracy

UNIT STURCTURE

Meaning of Democracy

Democracy as a system of Government

Democracy as a way of life

Representative Democracy – Development

The limitation of Representative Government

Kinds of democracy – Political Democracy

Economic Democracy

Social Democracy

Democracy as a middle class political theory

Psychological basis of Democracy

Pragmatism in democratic precepts

Pluralistic Vs Elitists

Summary

Keywords

Answer for Check your progress questions

Books for further reading

Questions and Exercises

2.1. MEANING OF DEMOCRACY

Why is it difficult to define democracy? One of the reasons is that political systems are always in a state of evolution. Ideas that are inconceivable in the political climate of one era become generally accepted in another. In every period there will be a number of attitudes that are accepted without question as part of the nature of things. The right to vote, for example, has been given at the age of 21, and now it is given at the age of 18 in several countries. The question of governmental intervention in the lives of individuals has also changed and is ever changing. In the last century, democracy was viewed mainly in terms of equality of political and legal rights, the right to vote, expression of differing political opinion, right of elected representatives to control the activities of the government. Today the stress is upon the need of the state to guarantee to every one certain economic and social rights, by eliminating educational and social inequalities.

As ideas change the content of the word 'democracy' changes in the minds of people, ; In the nineteenth century, though parliamentary government had by then long been generally accepted in Great Britain, not all its supporters believed that it ought to be democratic. Today democracy is accepted by all the countries, which pay lip service to it. According to a UNESCO report in 1949. "Probably for the first time in history democracy is classed as the proper ideal description of all political and social organizations advocated by influential proponents". As a result of this change of attitude, the term is now used to describe so many different forms of government that there are risks of its becoming ambiguous and meaningless.

The term 'democracy' is today used to cover a wide range of political systems, old and new, experienced and inexperienced. It serves more to justify some and decry others than to explain how systems work. The newly emerged Afro-Asian states as also the Communist states call themselves democratic. In many of the Afro-Asian countries, democratic constitutions have been overthrown by military or authoritarian rule. The communists describe their systems as social or people's democracies and the systems they dislike as 'bourgeois' democracies. Each system claims itself to be truly democratic.

2.1.1. DEMOCRACY AS A SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT

Though there are divergent views of the meaning of democracy, for Dorothy Pickles, it is a system of government that fulfils two essential requirements. These requirements are:

1. It must be able to elicit as accurately as possible the opinion of as many people as possible on who shall be their representatives and on how the country ought to be governed.
2. It must provide ways of ensuring that those chosen by the public in fact do what the electorate wants them to do, or that they can be replaced even between elections.

The first requirement means as a minimum, universal suffrage, political parties and the organization of free and fair elections, The second requirement entails methods of supervising the working of governments and

keeping them in constant contact with public opinion. The essence of democracy is thus an effective dialogue between government and governed. Dictators like Hitler can obtain power either by manipulating public opinion in their favour or by ignoring or suppressing its free expression.

Modern democracies have evolved a number of complex institutions because the states have come to play more important roles in national life. Upto the middle of nineteenth century, the citizen's interest were tied with those of local or professional community in which he lived, together with the employer and the family. During the second half of the last century and in the present century however, the responsibility of the state for vast economic and social services has been steadily growing. Hence a number of national and local organizations have sprung up to supervise the working of governmental agencies. Although these organizations can help to maintain contacts and to make governments responsive to public opinion on specific issues, it has become difficult to ascertain the real public opinion on complex and technical matters.

The behaviourist political scientists regard traditional democratic theories of consent and participation as unrealistic and out of date. On the basis of observation and measurement of people's behaviour, they conclude that a majority of the public prefers passive acquiescence to active consent and refuses to accept the responsibilities of participation. Participation by the people ranges from active support to political parties to passive acquiescence, in the form of a vote for somebody.

J.S.Mill, in his Representative Government wrote that "the only government which can fully satisfy all the exigencies of the social state is one in which the whole people participate, that any participation, even in the smallest public functions, is useful;.... And that nothing less can be ultimately desirable than the admission of all has a share in the sovereign power of the state". But the behaviourists quote statistics to show that less than one-third of the electorate is really interested in politics and that few can give clear explanations of why they vote as they do. Studies of voting behaviour show that the classical assumptions about the need for citizen – participation are

Check your progress questions

1. Explain the meaning democracy
2. Democracy as a system of government discuss

either inadequate or idealistic. One of the behaviourists, Robert Dahl writes “If one regards political equality in the making of decisions as a kind of limit to be achieved, then it is axiomatic that this limit could only be arrived at with the complete participation of every adult citizen. Nevertheless, what we call democracy... does seem to operate with a relatively low level of citizen participation. Hence it is inaccurate to say that one of the necessary conditions for democracy is extensive citizen participation.

As per Rober Dahl’s view, the fact that most people are politically apathetic does not necessarily invalidate the claim of states to be democracies. We must note that Mill and other supporters of the traditional approach never said that extensive citizen participation was likely to be obtained, they only held that it would be desirable. The traditionalists hold that wherever people are able and willing to participate in the process of government, they must be allowed to do so. If several people refrain from participation, we can only say that the existing democracies are far from ideal. Mill’s contention has never been on of the conditions for democracy; it may be one of the conditions for good democracy.

2.1.2. DEMOCRACY AS A WAY OF LIFE

There are two main approachea to democracy, the philosophical or moral approach, and the institutional approach. The philosophical approach sees democracy primarily in terms of ends. The institutional approach, however, is concerned with the actual political institutions, the means. Many modern citizens who are not actively interested in the political processes prefer the moral approach. They view democracy not as a programme, but as a way of life.

Both approaches are necessary for the survival of democracy and for its progressive nature. If the institutional approach is considered in isolation, it becomes utopian because it is not possible to discover how far principles and ideas are realistic until attempts are made actually to put them into practice. The philosophical approach is useful because it stimulates men’s imagination, makes them self-critical and enables them to think in fresh light unhampered by the prejudices and habits of their own environment. But this utility has

certain limits. The human imagination is limited by history and tradition, and by the climate philosopher, who is out of the line with his contemporaries is liable to be dismissed as an impractical dreamer, not to be taken seriously.

It is by chance that a particular audience receives well some new ideas. The modification of opinion by the new ideas depends largely on the machinery that exists or is devised. Therefore, democracy cannot be defined wholly in terms of ideals and goals.

Another disadvantage of the moral approach is that such definitions are more vague and subjective than definitions in terms of institutions. According to 'A Dictionary of the Social Sciences', democracy is defined as 'a way of life in a society in which each individual is believed to be entitled to an equality of concern as regards the chance of participating freely in the values of that society'. Democracy is described, by some, as a society with 'liberty and justice for all'. Now, how are these definitions going to be put into action? Measures intended to produce equality merely impose uniformity, which is the negation of liberty. How much liberty can be permitted to individuals of groups without creating the danger of the liberties being used to deprive other individuals and groups of their liberties? Thus general definitions of this type tend to encourage cynicism unless it is possible to show what the words mean in terms of institutions.

One advantage of looking at democracy in terms of institutions, at the same time keeping their essential purposes in mind, is that it can help us to avoid some common misunderstandings about it. One of the misunderstandings is that democracy is a synonym for majority rule. It is a fact that democratic systems have to rely on universal suffrage and majority rule when no general agreement or compromise is possible between differing conceptions of how society ought to be organized. But it is also true that majority rule can be effective only with the tacit or explicit consent of the minority rule can be effective only with the tacit or explicit consent of the minority. Where the minority is suppressed, there can be no stable government. As soon as the opposition becomes powerful enough, it will overthrow the government, as had happened in a number of African states. If

the opposition is not powerful enough, it will go underground. This will lead to the threat of disturbance, and even of anarchy or civil war. The state will then be tempted to resort to repressive measures. Even though it may have majority rule, unless both minority and majority parties are allowed to put their views freely to the electorate, an election cannot be regarded as a reliable test of opinion.

There is also an argument that states which have obtained independence recently cannot afford the luxury of opposition parties. These states are inexperienced and they do not have the political, economic or administrative resources to cope with the practical and urgent problems that they have to face. This argument amounts to mean that the conditions for effective democratic government are not present. these condition include organized parties, pressure groups, a free press, an uncorrupt civil service, independent courts of law and so on. All this requires long experience, as well as a high level of educational and social development.

In his 'The Real world of Democracy', C.B.Macpherson says that democracy can be defined in a broad or a narrow sense. In the broad sense, it is not a definition at all, but an acceptance of the face value of the assumption of communist and one party states that they are entitled to call themselves democracies. Macpherson defends the communist working class rule as democratic because it would comprise the great majority of the population and because its purpose would be the humanization of the whole people. The one-party rule common in African states could be defended as democratic because 'there is in these countries a general will, which can express itself through, and probably only through, a single party'. But democracy is concerned with both means and ends, and majority rule is only of the means. One of the means is that there must be a genuine dialogue between different shades of opinion. Especially, the dialogue should be between supporters and opponents of the system.

Most of the government believe that they are acting in the general interest. Their intention may be true. But if they are impatient with the opposition, they cannot succeed in carrying out their programme. Every

democratic government should respect the free expression of minority interest. Hence, the claims of one party states to be democratic are to be rejected.

2.1.3. REPRESENTATIVE DEMOCRACY DEVELOPMENT:

The first known example of democracy was that of Greece. The Greek experiment in democracy was much simpler in form than the modern, complex form of democracy. It was Athens, among the many Greek city states, that could boast of being the pioneer in democratic system in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The system prevailing then was direct democracy, wherein all the citizens participated with equal rights. No political office was based on grounds of wealth, status, or property. But the Greek system cannot be followed in the modern world. The modern principle of democracy is that of representative government. This principle has developed very gradually.

In medieval Europe, there was the divine right theory according to which the monarch was accountable only to God. There were, however, conflicts between the kings and the church. In England the divine right theory was successfully challenged in the second half of the seventeenth century. It was then claimed that kings and their governments represented the people only in terms agreed to by the people themselves. The kings had consulted influential citizens such as landowners, peers and spokesmen for trading corporations as far back as the thirteenth century. Those representatives spoke, not for their local people and their individual interests but for collective interests, either local or professional. Their aim was to limit the exercise of royal power. They had no intention of putting forward anything like a national policy.

By the end of the seventeenth century, the authority of the English Parliament was already binding upon the monarch in a number of fields. In France the early representative body, the States General had never become the recognized spokesman for the nation as a whole, and so absolute monarchy was persisting there till most of the eighteenth century, while England was developing a system of representative parliamentary government. Upto the nineteenth century, only very few people could participate in the elections to British Parliaments. The democratization of the parliamentary system came

only slowly. Ideas of equality and accountability had been held by political thinkers from the seventeenth century onwards, but they were a small minority. It has also claimed that men had the right to be represented as individuals rather than as corporations and vested interests. Both these movements were shortlived.

Many political thinkers of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw the place of the individual in the state within the frame work of social contract theories. Supporters of the theories freely interpreted the hypothetical contract to suit themselves and invoked it to justify both subservience to rules and rebellion against them. There was no adequate political machinery to safeguard the rights and obligations of citizens. Had there been one, locke's contract theory could have led England along the road to responsible representative government. People and their leaders believed that only certain classes ought to have the right to express their views directly. In the eighteenth century, Edmund Burke estimated that there were only 4,00,000 people in England, who could be given this right. These people were 'of adult age, not declining in life, of tolerable leisure for such discussions, and of some information, more or less, and who are above menial dependence (or what virtually is such)'.

The American War of Independence and the French Revolution were the decisive events which heralded the change of views from those of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries to those of modern representative government. The written constitutions provided for a system of government based on the acknowledged principle of popular sovereignty. The declaration of Independence in the U.S.A. and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen upheld the equality of men and sovereignty of the people. But the United States as well as France and Great Britain had still a long way to go before they could justifiably claim that their representative democracies gave full expression to the principles of individual equality. In Britain full universal suffrage was attained in 1929 only, when women were granted voting rights on the same terms as men. In France, acceptance of the theory of popular sovereignty practice. A distinction was made between active and passive citizens were not given the right to vote, but had rights to life,

liberty and property. Even active citizens had to choose their representatives only indirectly. The Third Republic gave voting rights to all men. Franchise was extended to women only in 1945. In the United States the evolution of representative government was more repaid in some states than in others. According to the 1789 Constitution, originally it was left to the states to determine qualifications for voting. Voting rights were extended to the Black Americans only in 1870 by the Fifteenth Amendment to the constitution. It was not until 1919 that the Nineteenth Amendment compelled states to introduce votes for women on the same terms as men.

2.1.4. THE LIMITATIONS OF REPRESENTATIVES GOVERNMENT:

The representative system of any country hopes, desires and dislikes, as well as habits of thought and action that result from its history. There are circumstances in which the hopes cannot be achieved at all. For example, if a country is deeply divided and these divisions are reflected in its representative system also, the system may help to perpetuate them and prevent the possibility of any coherent government. Even in countries which have had state representative and democratic government, it is not easy for a representative system to fulfill with equal success the two functions of representation to reflect opinion and to provide a government. Successful democracies like Britain and the United States have ensured stable majority government at the cost of accuracy of representation.

If party divisions are based on deep constitutional issues, or on political, moral or religious principles, the necessary compromise may not be attainable. If many such parties are opposed to each other as well as to the representative system itself might be blamed, although the basic cause of the failure was political division rather than the inadequacies of the party system. Criticism of representative systems have been expressed by political reformers throughout history. Rousseau even argued against the validity of the whole principle of representation, on the ground that men are unique and cannot be represented. Real democratic government would be possible, according to him, only if each citizen were to participate in major political decisions, with

community interest in mind. He concluded that this could not be conceived in the world as he knew it.

James Madison, one of the founding fathers of the U.S. Constitution, while sharing Rousseau's view that pure democracy could not exist in the modern world, was not pessimistic regarding representative government, as Rousseau was. Madison considered it as the only means of providing democratic government in modern conditions and as a means of overcoming one of the chief obstacles to democratic government, namely 'faction' or the essential selfishness of sectional interests.

John Stuart Mill, who also believed in representative government, considered as its main weakness grant of political power to the ignorant. He feared that democratization of society might be incompatible with individual distinction. In order to avoid such a situation, he suggested at least a literary test for voters. Every voter should be able to read, write and perform the common operations of arithmetic.

The concern of modern critics of representative democracy, however lies in the possibilities of improving the techniques of consultation, in the hope of finding ways of recording opinions accurately without giving a chance to governmental instability. For with the increasing pace of decolonization in the twentieth century, universal suffrage has been brought to a large number of new states, in which most of the people are illiterate. The growth of party organization and the modern mass media have provided new techniques of persuasion and pressure, which can reach almost all sections of the public in one form or another.

Political stability of the modern world is not linked with representative or parliamentary system. Where the representative institutions help is in strengthening the existing trends. The electoral and party systems, as part of a settled way of life, help to increase stability by removing sources of discord from the political stage. In both Great Britain and the United States, government and opposition are equally convinced of the benefits of a two-party system. This has helped to maintain the system and to encourage the political attitudes necessary for an efficient functioning of the system. These

attitudes include the readiness to compromise, the desire not to embitter inter-party strife more than necessary, the refusal to abuse constitutional and procedural rules of the game, etc. If these attitudes were to change under the stress of circumstances, the party system cannot save a country from the danger of political instability. Whatever may be the strength and weakness of parties and electoral systems, no democratic system has to far found a satisfactory substitute for them.

2.2. KINDS OF DEMOCRACY

Political Democracy:

Political democracy aims at the just and rational organization of authority in human society. For most of the 19th century, democracy in Great Britain and the United States continued to be regarded predominantly in political and legal terms. Political democracy then consisted of a gradual extension of the franchise and of a system of justice making possible the kind of rule of law defined by Dicey. The idea and desirability of universal suffrage and the inclusion of economic or social egalitarianism gave birth to the notion of liberal democracy. The evils and hardships of industrial development, urban living, poverty and disease paved the way for intervention by government in many social and economic fields. The content of the notion of liberal democracy began to change rapidly. Side by side the notion of political equality the idea of economic equality was suggested and is being pursued with great vigour. It is, therefore, necessary to make a clear distinction between theories claiming that democracy is incomplete or inefficient without an economic and social as well as a political and legal content and those who consider the attainment of complete economic equality as one of the objectives of democracy. The liberal democrats advocate the principle of private enterprise with a minimum of government interference for the sake of abolishing socio-economic evils. The democratic socialists on the other hand advocate the collective ownership or control of the most important means of production, distribution and exchange. The pragmatic content of political democracy control either in order to protect individuals and sections of society from the greater evils of unfettered private enterprise or merely in the interests or greater efficiency. The liberal democrats emphasise individual freedom and demand that the state shall not lose sight of this in the search for social justice.

On the other hand, socialists emphasise social interests and demand that these shall take precedence where social and private need are in conflict. In the British tradition there is considerable scope for approachment between liberal and socialist policies. In the United States neither Socialism nor communism has ever attracted much support. The three unique characteristics of the American democratic tradition – consciousness of a revolutionary heritage, the federal diffusion of authority, a stable constitution as the symbol of American unity indicate that American liberal democracy – has meant not only political stability and economic opportunity but also an absence of ideological controversy. In France the transition from absolute monarchy to a regime intended to be built on the principles of liberty, equality and fraternity was sudden and violent. The reaction against revolutionary excesses led to almost a century of constitutional experiments. During the long period of alternating authoritarian regimes and brief democratic or socialist revolutions, a revolutionary tradition has been built up. The Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen contains the principles of revolutionary democracy. ‘Resistance to oppression as a natural and imprescriptible right’ was worked into the Jacobin Constitution of 1793 in such terms as ‘when the government violates the rights of the people, insurrection is the most sacred right and the most indispensable duty’. This tradition is also a cause for the emergence of constitution after constitution. The revolutionary tradition has also been responsible for a much greater emphasis in French democracy on the principle of equality.

2.2.1. ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY:

We must remember that the term ‘democracy’ ought not to be used as a moral yard stick since it is not synonymous with the good society. In the words of E. P. Thurnwald “if some people choose to mean by democracy what other people mean by Utopia there is nothing to stop them doing so”. The term ‘economic democracy’ in particular can have a wide range of differing and often vague interpretations. In the communist dominated systems it implies state control of economy. In capitalist countries it means no more than an intelligent system of labour relations in the interests either of efficiency or of the workers or both. Economic democracy has also been interpreted to mean a system in which the economy is entirely run by the workers

themselves with the intention of creating a complete reorganization of society, involving the elimination of the State and of the capitalist wage system. These anarcho-syndicalist theories have directly influenced modern opponents of democratic methods, yet they describe their methods such as trade unionism as more democratic. Among ideas derived from theories of economic democracy but capable of practical application within the general frame work of democratic systems, what is called industrial democracy has played a significant part. Influenced by theories of Ruskin, William Morris and G.D.H. Cole, its basic principle of workers' participation has attracted wide support. The unrelenting search for equality can turn into a search for the kind of uniformity that results merely in equality in unfreedom. This is the danger of putting too much emphasis on the 'economic' part of democracy.

2.2.2. SOCIAL DEMOCRACY:

The emphasis of contemporary democratic thought is now becoming predominantly social. The increasing focus of political parties on social welfare and the concern of sociologist with the analysis of class structures have combined to make what is called social democracy i.e., the desire for an equal and classless society, the most distinctive political objective of recent years. The idea of social democracy is pre occupied with 'participation', social equality and with ways of attaining it through the leveling influences of social services, and above all, through a unified and increasingly uniform national educational system. It is doubtful whether social equality can possibly be achieved by political means, and also whether the majority of citizens in any country really share the enthusiasm of sociologist and educational reformers for the idea of equality. For in the name of equality liberty must not be curtailed. The advocates of social democracy have not succeeded in explaining how they are to recognize the precise point at which all unnatural equalities such as wealth, status, educational and social opportunity, would have been eliminated. The more inequalities they remove, the more potential inequalities they will discover.

In conclusion, the problem of how to reconcile liberty and equality is a very old one, and is probably insoluble. This reconciliation cannot be done by establishing theoretical priorities. Experience of the past suggests that the

practice of governments has been mainly pragmatic seeking to remedy recognized grievances on to eliminate as far as possible clearly perceptible inequalities. The reduction of differences between classes has followed as by product, and will probably continue to do so.

2.2.3. DEMOCRACY AS A MIDDLE CLASS POLITICAL THEORY:

Prof. D.A.Zoll regards democracy as a middle class political philosophy: it is the political theory of the bourgeoisie. The basis of democracy is appetition. Likewise the internal orientations and values of the middle classes are fundamentally acquisitive, materially and psychologically. The political power of the middle classes has grown out of the individualist assumptions from the time of Hobbes and Locke. C.B.Macpherson has termed the assumption as 'possessive individualism'. These assumptions are explained by Macpherson as follows: 1) The individual is the absolute natural proprietor of his won capacities; he owes nothing to society for them. Man's essence is freedom to use his capacities in search of satisfactions. This freedom is limited properly only by some principle of utility or natural law which forbids harming others. Everyone is free. For everyone possesses at least his own capacities. 2) Society is seen not as a system of relations of domination and subordination between men and classes held together by reciprocal rights and duties, but as a lot of free equal individuals related to each other through their possessions. The relation of exchange (the market relation) is seen as the fundamental relation of society. 3) Political society is seen as a relational device for the protection of property. Even life and liberty are considered as possessions rather than as social rights with correlative duties.

The main difference between the democracy of the nineteenth century and that of the present century is to be found in the expansion of those political principles operationally useful to the middle classes to a fuller range of the society. Uniformity, which is ultimately an important characteristic of popular democracy, consisted of the spread of middle class principles to other classes. The character of political, ethical, and artistic culture is decisively shaped in this manner.

All normative definitions in the twentieth century are based on appetitive assumptions. The key concept is appetite or the satisfaction of subjectively felt needs and desires. From the nineteenth century onwards, this appetite concerned material or political possessions. Thus capitalism was the appropriate economic expression of the ideology. But recently the emphasis has shifted to psychological appetite, which is close to the problem of social as against legal or political equality.

We have seen (in the last lesson) that democracy is defined differently as a body of principles or as the establishment of some institutions. Whatever may be the definition, the most fundamental consideration remains the nature of human equality. It is very significant in contemporary democratic thought. The concept of human equality is fully explored by Hobbes. Although there are difference among men, they are inconsequential because men equally seek survival, sustenance, and gratification. Popular democracy begins with the proposition of equality of desires which was first fully propounded by Jeremy Bentham.

Bentham's utilitarianism was immensely influential in social theory. It formed the base for the ethics of American pragmatism, which in turn, had an impact on the transformation of nineteenth century democratic theory into the more popular manifestations of the twentieth century. The concept that desires are qualitatively equal and self-justifying is the core of twentieth century democracy's view of equality. Other conventional democratic axioms like equality, consent and majoritarianism cannot be sustained. Some Christian thinkers have argued that democratic theory is directly derived from Judeo-Christian ethics. But this view cannot be accepted because it has serious draw-backs; one of which its failure to reconcile religious teachings with the appetitive foundations of popular democratic thought.

2.2.4. PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS OF DEMOCRACY:

Contemporary democratic theory defends human equality from a psychological point of view. Its main claim is that there are no significant qualitative differences between men based upon a psychological study of

them. Democrats differ, not on arguments regarding intrinsic notions of equality, but on forms of procedural equality, that is, how people are to be treated from an egalitarianist stand point. The nineteenth century view was that while no impediments to opportunities should exist, individuals ought to be generally entitled to the rewards of their industry, talent, or foresight.

The nineteenth century view point is challenged by a twentieth century argument which emphasizes an enforced equality in the distribution of social advantages and prerogatives. This argument underlies the concept of "participatory democracy", a phrase of the post-world war II times. Equality in political economic or social participation is something quite distinct from a more rudimentary equality that is defined as an equal chance at social and economic mobility, granting that there is equality of the law and opportunity to participate in the formation of governments.

The idea of distributive equality has developed in three major stages. The first stage eliminated innate or formal disabilities such as race or religion, that would prevent equal access to the competition for the social rewards. The second stage is identified with the welfare state. It sought to limit the competition, not by an imposed over-all distributive equality, but by limiting the spectrum of social benefits. This limitation is done by subsidizing at the one end of the spectrum and by limiting the benefits at the other end. The subsidies include guaranteed annual wage, subsidized housing, medical services and welfare benefits. The limitation of benefits includes high graduated income taxes, taking over of inherited wealth, and restriction on forms of social exclusion. The third stage involves a comprehensive leveling of social rewards, so as to make operative a general uniformity by the virtual elimination of social and economic competition. The western democracies have accepted the rationale of the second stage but they dispute the desirabilities of the third stage.

The democratic thought of the nineteenth century was based upon individualism while that of the twentieth century upon collectivism. This transition involves differing ideas regarding the desirability of pluralism, the concept that the best society is characterized by tolerance of variety, and a

high level of respect for individual differences and preferences. The democracy of the nineteenth century was vigorously pluralistic and represents the first stage of distributive equality. The democracy of the twentieth century, which manifests a mixed mind on the subject is the second stage.

2.3. PRAGMATISM IN DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT:

The changing attitude toward pluralism is related to the emergence of pragmatism in the twentieth century. Although pragmatic movement originated in the nineteenth century, it became prominent only after World War I. John Dewey has called it instrumentalism. To begin with, pragmatism was concerned with, clarification by use of scientific and experimental techniques. Its main argument, however, was based on a concept of truth in which utility, subjectivism, nominalism, and relativism were main elements. The truth of judgements and beliefs were thought to rest on their political consequences, defined in terms of workability, individual satisfaction and desirable social attitudes. This definition of truth implied a rejection of intellectualism in favour of an exclusive attention to a variety of empirical relationships. It emphasized on solving problems, conceived in terms of immediate, self-identified human concerns.

2.3.1. D.A.ZOLL'S DEMOCRATIC PRECEPTS:

In his twentieth century political philosophy observes that the hand of pragmatism can be seen in the basic trends of twentieth century democratic thought. He lists the general democratic precept of the pre-World War II period and shows their connections with pragmatism as follows:

1. **Majoritarianism:** Pragmatic concepts extended this principle to a wide range of human groups.
2. **Popular sovereignty:** Pragmatic influences stressed government as essentially responsive to human problems and needs.
3. **Popular representation:** Pragmatism endorsed an equilibriumist view of the tension between interests.
4. **Human equality:** Pragmatism reinforced a psychologistic view.
5. **Legalism:** Pragmatism encouraged judicial positivism.
6. **Individual liberty:** Pragmatic definitions were subjectivistic, but sought to reconcile social utility with individual prerogative.

Check your progress questions

3. Explain the limitation of Representative democracy

4. What are the different kinds of democracy

7. **Value relativism:** The pragmatic impact was to press relativism to more radical formulations.
8. Human nature was seen as fundamentally good and improvable.
9. **Altruism:** In part, defended by pragmatic psychology.
10. **Freedom:** Defined by pragmatism in terms of the positive desirability of unrestricted individual and social experimentalism as necessary to social well being; provided no authoritarian consequences.
11. **First truth:** Since truth, as defined by pragmatism, rests upon “facts” rather than “ideas”, it will prevail without authoritative intervention or protection.
12. **Second truth:** On the basis of the same definition, truth is that which solves problems.

The close connection between pragmatism and democratic theory is reflected in two curious aspects. They are: 1) Though pragmatism is subjected to devastating analytical criticism, its influence on democratic theory is not impaired. 2) As a movement, pragmatism was remarkably short-lived yet its impact on democracy was for long lasting.

2.3.2. PLURALISTS VS ELITISTS:

The defence of pluralism by pragmatism came under heavy attack after World War II, by anti-democrats as well as by rival democratic theorists. The critics of pluralism are labeled as revisionists or elitists by Zoll.

The rise of revisionism in democratic theory is due to the pessimism regarding the ability of defending democracy in conventional terms. The democratic theory has been attacked by conservative critics and doctrinaire radicals. Democracy did not seem to work along its conventional definitions. Therefore, the elitists adopted a different conception, borrowing heavily from the elitist European sociologists.

The essence of the new democratic defence by the elitists was that the values of democracy were sound enough, but realistically, democracies operate on the basis of elites. This is in contrast to the notion that

democracy's nature requires the acceptance of the concept of popular or mass initiative and control. Thus the two main propositions of the elitists are: 1) All political societies operate on the basis of elite control and respond to elite competition, and 2) This competition is between democratic elites in a democracy who recognize the values of democracy.

The elitists argue that their concept is advantageous because it is more realistic, as it takes into account what takes place in the social and political fields and the important contribution to be made to the maintenance of democracy by competent elites.

The main difficulty in defining contemporary democratic theory is the lack of viable philosophical base. The individualistic democratic theory of the nineteenth century had such a base; so also the pragmatic popular democracy of the first half of the 20th century. But presently both elitism and pluralism suffer from some philosophical uncertainties. The primary problem of elitism grows out of its conception that elite competition can take place entirely under the protocols of democratic procedure. Elitism then involves a mood of dogmatism. The pluralists face the dilemma of attempting to shift their argument from an endorsement of equality of opportunity to a defence of an equality of opportunity to a defence of an equality of condition without affecting pluralism altogether. Pluralism has lost its defence because it is now thought to be a "means" rather than an 'end'.

The main concern of democracy, irrespective of its several dilemmas is how to preserve and enhance an ancient regard for the importance and dignity of the individual in the face of pressures, changes and dehumanizing temptations.

2.4. SUMMARY

This Unit has given clear meaning of democracy and it explains democracy as a way of life and system of government. In addition, this unit also provides details to study the different forms of democracy and the limitation of representation government.

2.5. KEYWORDS

Democracy	-	Demo-People –Cracy-Rule
Synonym	-	having the same meaning
Political Stability	-	Steady State of being
Egalitarianism	-	One who asserts the equality of all men.

2.6. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS QUESTIONS:

For question No. 1.	-	Reference Section No.2.1.
For question No. 2.	-	Reference Section No.2.1.1
For question No. 3.	-	Reference Section No.2.1.4
For question No. 4.	-	Reference Section No.2.2.

2.7. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:

1. E. Durbin, The Politics of Democratic Socialism, London, Rout ledge, 1940.
2. Coker, Recent Political Thought (A.C.C.or world Press)
3. R.N. Bernstein, Evolutionary Socialism, New York, Schoken, 1961.
4. R.N. Berki, Socialism, London, John Dent and sons - 1978.

2.8. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES:

1. Describe the difficulties in defining democracy
2. Estimate democracy as a middle class political theory
3. Bring out the pragmatic aspects of twentieth century democracy thought.

UNIT – 3

SOCIALISM

INTRODUCTION:

Socialism is perhaps the single most important ideology of our time. It has been a major influence on modern political consciousness and has deeply penetrated other beliefs throughout the world. Like other ideologies, socialism has a double reference. First, it refers to ideals and values of socialist vision. Secondly, It refers to empirical features of social and political institutions which are supposed to embody the vision. The socialist list the most important values of socialism as freedom, equality, community, brotherhood, social justice, the classless society, co-operation, progress, peace, prosperity, abundance and happiness. Sometimes the value component is stated negatively as follows: socialists are opposed to oppression, exploitation, inequality, strife, war, injustice, poverty, misery and de-humanization. Institutionally, socialism is opposed to the capitalist private enterprise system, which is ought to be replaced by a system of control over wealth and property and the social supervision of economic activity. This is summarized as ‘public ownership of the means of production’.

OBJECTIVES:

By studying this unit, the students will.

- a) Analyse the concept of socialism in detail
- b) Understand the basic tendencies of socialism
- c) Know the emergence of socialism

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Meaning of socialism

Approaches

Controversy in the approach

Basic Tendencies of socialism

The First tendency of socialism egalitarianism

The second tendency of Moralism

Rationalism is the third basic tendency of socialism

The fourth basic tendency of socialism –romantic principle

The emergence of socialism

The French Revolutionaries

The Behaviourists

Legendary founding father socialism

Socialism emerging in French, England

The Industrial Revolution

Fourier's Socialism

Summary

Keywords

Answer for Check your progress questions

Books for further reading

Questions and Exercises.

3.1. MEANING:

The above – mentioned explanations of socialism are inadequate because they are abstract. The values, for example, have several conflicting definitions. They are not different from the claims of other ideologies. For everyone of them progresses to believe in freedom, justice and prosperity, and is against oppression, misery and war. If these values are to be defined, the numerous divisions among socialist will be highlighted. For example, 'equality', is defined by some socialists as 'equality of opportunity' while others define it as 'equality of remuneration'. Similarly, 'public ownership' may mean central planning with complete state ownership of resources, of the nationalization of large industries, or state shareholding in private sector, or producers' co-operatives. All these have been advocated under the name of 'socialism'. The identity of socialism, therefore, is elusive. In his Dictionary of Socialism, Dr. Angelo Rappoport lists thirty-nine definitions of socialism.

3.1.1. APPROACHES:

Socialism is described variously according to the angle of approach. Each approach emphasizes different aspects of socialism. More than any other ideology, socialism proves to be a different creed in the hands of each of its exponents, varying with the temperaments of its advocates and the nature of the abuses which have prompted their advocacy. This has made C.E.M. Joad observe in his Modern Political Theory that "Socialism is like a hat that has lost its shape because everybody wears it".

Let us now discuss a few of the approaches to the problem. Many of them attempt to impose unity on socialism by drawing hard and fast lines of distinction around it and thereby reducing its content. This reduction is divided into two kinds by R.N. Berki political and academic.

The political approach is emotionally involved with socialism. There is at first the essentialist approach according to which socialism is linked to only one socialist ideal, declaring it alone to be the essence of socialism. Thus it has been asserted that the essence of socialism is equality, freedom, social justice, etc. This approach deliberately ignores the variety of socialist literature and inflates the definition of its essential value.

The second political approach is the transcendentalist approach. This recognizes socialist values only and condemns all the other institutions as a distortion of the socialist vision. But here intelligibility is gained only at the cost of irrelevance, purity of concept at the price of practical innocence.

The most important kind of political reductionism is the approach from concrete commitment. Here the double reference of socialism is duly kept in mind; but the problem of complexity is solved simply by denying the legitimacy of the 'socialist' label to other definitions of socialism. The major controversy is between the Marxists and the social democrats. The former have accused the latter of being opportunists and traitors to socialism. The latter have reported by arguing that Marxists negate socialism by the manner of their political methods. The social democrats have been branded as liberals in disguise, and the Marxists as totalitarians.

The substantive differences between the views of social democrats and Marxists occur within socialism rather than between socialism and some other ideology. In contemporary, political terms a distinction is often made between communists and socialists with regard to the methods used by each of them. Communists are held to be more extreme and more militant than socialists. But this distinction cannot be maintained now because some of the socialists

groups in Western Europe profess to be more militant and revolutionary than their respective communist parties.

In ideological terms, a distinction is usually drawn between these 'isms', in that communism is thought to imply a more radical reorganization of social (especially labour and property) relationships than socialism. But this distinction is blurred as long as both socialists and communists emphasize the idea of 'common ownership'.

3.1.2. CONTROVERSY IN THE APPROACH:

The Controversy in the approach from the angle of commitment centres as follows:

- 1) No agreement can be reached on nomenclature;
- 2) All diverse groups lay claim to the same name; and
- 3) There is acute rivalry for the proprietorship of socialism.

The hostile approach to socialism is yet another political approach. This also involves reductionism because hostile writers often tend to dismiss socialist ideals, taking into account only the empirical achievements and political activities of socialists. Here the institutional aspect is discriminately inflated, when socialism is made responsible for all crimes and blunders.

The academic reductionism is characterized by the absence of deep emotional involvement with socialism and the desire to be fair and objective in one's dealing with the subject. Here are two important approaches. The first one is legalist approach. Legalism can be usually recognized by formulae use in individual works on socialism. The writers attribute some meaning or other for the term 'socialism' in connection with their particular writings. This approach implies scholarship and genuine concern with the complexity of the subject matter. Nevertheless the definitions involve reductionism and are prone to complexity and obscurity instead of the desired clarity.

The second academic approach is in essentialism, which tries to solve the problem of unity and diversity by simply disposing of it unceremoniously. The equation of defining socialism is difficult because, in the first place, it has been posed wrongly, assuming that there is an essence of socialism. But this

approach argues that words do not indicate things; they have only their use, which varies with the context. Socialism thus might mean a variety of things to different people at different times, and therefore, it is useless to look for a unitary meaning. One must rather try to define and study something more tangible like the contribution of individual thinkers.

In essentialism is criticized on two counts. Firstly it appears to be based on a fallacy which consists in believing that contexts are limited and isolated from one another. Though one may be familiar with the meaning of the term used by a thinker, yet there ought to be a general meaning for the word. Thus a particular explanation could not exist and be made intelligible without the general meaning. Secondly, as there is no consistency even within the writings of single authors it is impossible to bring out the meaning of socialism. Instead of finding out a unitary meaning, one is led to deny the objective existence of essential characteristics. Thus in essentialism also leads to unintelligibility just as the approach from commitment does.

The various approaches discussed above have not succeeded in reducing socialism to one single 'true' body of doctrines or values. At the same time, it is erroneous to dismiss the identity of socialism on account of the diverse and conflicting views for which the name is used as verbal cover. All usages are valid and all those who call themselves socialists are participating in the same discussion. Hence R.N. Berki advances the thesis that the identity of socialism lies in the irreducible plurality of values and institutions which constitute its area of reference, and in the very problematic character of any attempt to reconcile these into an harmonious totality. We must seek to grasp socialism as a bundle of complex problems, paradoxes, intellectual manifestoes, nor in secret pamphlets. As Berki puts it, "Socialism is not a single thing, but a range, an area an open texture, a self-contraction". For socialism as a movement and as a system of ideas expresses an inherently ambivalent attitude to the spirit of the modern age. It is both a child of the modern age, and the emotional, intellectual, and political embodiment of the most resolute denial that the spirit of this age has received. Its eyes are set firmly on the future, yet its strength and appeal are drawn from the past.

Check your progress
questions

1. Explain the term 'Socialism'.
2. What are the different approaches to study socialism

Socialism derives its values from the humanism and classical liberalism of the Renaissance and Enlightenment. These values reflect the spirit of the age, by asserting man's independence from any supernatural being and his being rooted in the material world where he has to find his own salvation. Socialism is the most articulate expression of the cultural complex. The main ingredients of the complex are self-assertion (individualism), self-sufficiency of human reason and a human society (secularism), and sense of seeking happiness in the possession and enjoyment of objects found in nature or extracted by human labour. The spirit of the age leads towards greater and greater materialism and the pursuit of individual happiness and towards more explicit secularism.

The socialists criticize the modern trends on two grounds. Firstly, they highlight the inadequacy of the material and institutional provisions made by liberal-capitalist society for all its members in terms of its own professed contemporary values. Though the liberal institutions and the economic and political revolutions of the eighteenth century have promised happiness and material progress for all men, socialists point out that the result was something different. The curbing of royal power and of aristocracies, and improvement in modes of production had only resulted in a new kind of poverty and misery for the masses. One type of oppression was replaced by another. A few rich people possessed power and concerned off the benefits of changes while the great majority were still excluded from its enjoyment. When liberalism failed to extend the advances for the benefit of all persons, socialism had to come in.

The second aspect is the qualitative critique of modern society and its spirit, which is closely connected with the quantitative aspect of socialism. The socialists have not only wanted more of existing goods and their more equitable distribution, but have also demanded a fundamental reorientation of value. They talked about the importance of society as something more than its components, the individuals along with individual happiness. They wanted to establish a society opposed to the capitalist society and hoped for a future where men would live simply, turning away from the pursuit of material wealth. They presented the ideals of selflessness, brotherliness, sacrifice and

the voluntary acceptance of hardship in the community. Their values owe their origin, only in part, to the enlightenment.

Socialism is the leading ideology of our age because it has a more balanced mixture of the whole heritage of the past than any other concept. It is a blend of the most important cultural, political, intellectual, and ideological trends. It represents an aspiration to a future, upheld by thinkers of all creeds, and believed by masses of ordinary people in all countries. Socialism has become an integral part in our social and political institutions. It sets the style for present day politics. Conservatism, liberalism, nationalism, fascism, etc. are, to a considerable extent, the partial adaptations of socialism. Fascism is a distortion of socialism. Nationalism can be a bitter enemy or partner of socialism. Both conservatives and liberals show in their theoretical assumptions and in practical policies, the influence of socialist thought such as the acceptance of social responsibility for general welfare and the eradication of poverty, and the political management of economics.

3.1.3. BASIC TENDENCIES OF SOCIALISM:

Socialism has gradually emerged in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as a series of responses to a rapidly changing world. The great political movements and revolutions of the age, from the civil war in England to the mid-nineteenth century upheavals, brought hopes of freedom, justice and prosperity. The popular causes were the fight for constitutionalism and against the arbitrary power of kings. But the people were soon disappointed when liberalism collapsed into the world of the bourgeoisie. It was then that socialism came to the fore. Socialism consists of several principles, types, traditions or tendencies. Each tendency contains ideas which are usually associated with socialism. There are four basic tendencies of socialism according to R.N. Berki. They are mutually supporting and reinforcing and are connected logically and historically.

3.2. THE FIRST TENDENCY OF SOCIALISM IS EGALITARIANISM:

It is the classical principle of socialism. In its purest sense, equality culminates in a conception of community. Equality must lead logically to

community. To be truly with others in the community, one must in the last resort stop being self-regarding. Egalitarianism thus means the aspiration for a return to communal way of life. Its earliest example is the Greek city-state of Sparta. In an egalitarian society, the common ownership of goods becomes an end itself. That is, nothing should be allowed to stand between the single individual and his community. The egalitarian critique of capitalism concentrates on the division of the community into rich and poor. Egalitarianism is militant; it demands revolution leading to the final victory which is the complete eradication of these divisions and the unification of mankind to into one community. Politically egalitarianisms stands for complete democracy. Yet it is also compatible with and sometimes leads to the demand for, transitory, educational dictatorship in the period preceding the development of full communal consciousness. Egalitarianism values the qualities of courage, devotion, fellow-feeling, single mindedness and the voluntary acceptance of the need for self-sacrifice. It is definitely the most unpalatable tendency in socialism; at the same time, it is also the most dynamic and noblest all socialist principles.

3.2.1. THE SECOND TENDENCY IS MORALISM:

It constitutes the religious principles of socialism. The chief values for moralism are social justice, peace, co-operation and brotherhood. It is opposed to the inhumanity of capitalism and its exploitation of the people, especially of the poor. Capitalism is unjust because it inflicts misery and suffering on the very people who produce wealth. It is cruel and inhuman because it sets man, against man extolling selfishness and mutual enmity in the name of 'free competition'. The moralist ideal seeks to bring about justice by replacing enmity with mutual help, and promoting feelings of love and understanding among men. Concern for the welfare of others in society should guide our actions. Further we should find positive satisfaction in work. The moralist values also opt for democracy, coupled with a sense of moderation and responsibility on the part of individual citizens. Moralism is opposed to war and is uneasy about revolution and violence. It prefers to bring about changes by means of persuasion. Though it recognizes the sacredness of life, it also holds human nature as being imperfect and in need of constant care and attention

3.2.2. RATIONALISM IS THE THIRD BASIC TENDENCY OF SOCIALISM:

It represents the principle of the enlightenment. Its chief values are individual happiness, reason, knowledge, efficiency in production, and the rational and purposeful organization of society in the interest of progress. The rationalists view that the human race has now grown up and at last freed itself from the age-old bonds of ignorance and superstition. With the use of science, nature can be moulded to serve our own ends. As material wealth is primarily responsible for our happiness, we should organize ourselves so as to secure the maximum technical, economic and administrative efficiency in all our social activities. The rationalist criticizes, capitalism on the wastage and chaos involved in its methods of production, and the continuance of ignorance and superstition. Rationalism also leads to democracy as the political form. For this tendency too acknowledges the fundamental equality of men and believes in the self-sufficiency of individual human reason. It believes, however, that democracy should be tempered with meritocracy. That is experts like scientists, technicians, and the intellectuals should guide democracy towards the promotion of general happiness. This tendency also condemns violent revolution as an irrational, wasteful, dangerous method of change. It gives preference to rational persuasion, appealing not to man's fellow-feeling, but to his self-interest. It holds socialism as the crowning of the values and aspirations of the enlightenment; it needs only common sense and the right kind of education to make people accept it and work towards its realization.

3.2.3. THE FOURTH BASIC TENDENCY OF SOCIALISM IS ITS ROMANTIC PRINCIPLE, NAMELY LIBERTARIANISM:

It is the most extreme and radical among socialist principles. Libertarianism centers on the ideal of freedom, in the sense of the total absence of restraints, both external and internal. Its main values are nature, sincerity, diversity and happiness. It seeks to liberate man from rationality as well as convention. It sees human beings as primarily passionate and emotional creatures. In the words of R.N. Berki 'It is, for that matter, no more

unkind to say of libertarianism that it wants us to become animals than to say of egalitarianism that it considers us to be potential angels while rationalism sees us as machines and moralism sees us as children". The libertarian criticizes capitalism on its oppressive character and its falsification of human desires. It is very difficult to identify the system of government favoured by libertarianism, for it repudiates politics in toto. But it should not be equated with anarchy either. Though it accepts equality in its fundamental sense, in the last resort, it finds the ideal of equality irrelevant and meaningless. For equality leads to the ideal of community, whereas libertarianism is solely individual. Inner conversion and persuasion by means of example are the methods preferred by libertarianism. To sum up as Berki states, 'Libertarianism is the gentlest, kindest, most tolerant of socialist tendencies; it is also the most unstable and unproductive". All these four basic tendencies express different socialist attitudes to the modern world. Socialism is opposed to capitalism; but the degree and kind of opposition vary with each of the tendencies. The degree of opposition is distinguished between belief in revolution and evolution. Of the four tendencies, egalitarianism and libertarianism are committed to revolution. They are extreme tendencies, standing for total opposition to capitalist society and for radical changes in human consciousness and social relationships. Moralism and rationalism, on the other hand, are moderate, mixed, impure and soft tendencies. They are opposed to modern capitalism only in part, and their respective stands involve the desire to reach accommodations, compromises and slow processes of change.

3.3. THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIALISM:

The origin of socialism as an ideology cannot be determined with any certainty. We can only know about the period during which socialism entered the field of ideology. This period lasted from the mid-eighteenth century to the first quarter of the nineteenth century. It is at this time that distinct logical modes of egalitarianism, rationalism and moralism also crystallized. The enlightenment was not a united movement. It was split into two divergent attitudes and interpretations of the interests of humanity. This split is reflected in the tension and inner conflicts of socialism. In the eighteenth century there was bitter enmity between philosophers like Voltaire, Diderot and Helvetius

on the one hand, and Rousseau on the other. The philosophers were generally teaching the value of knowledge and learning as against superstition. They were for progress and refinement as against stagnation and primitiveness. But in social terms their views were moderate, liberal and individualistic. They did not think too much of the common people and were suspicious of equality as a social ideal. Voltaire wrote in his *Philosophical Dictionary*: 'It is impossible in our wretched globe for men living in society not to be divided into two classes'. Rousseau, on the other hand, took a bold new stand demanding equality and popular sovereignty. Rousseau held that human beings, corrupted by modern civilization, could resurrect and enhance these qualities, thereby gaining freedom and fulfillment, if they founded their communities on right lines. The general will then ensures and guarantees the freedom of its members, and keeps them in a wholesome state of equality. According to common under the supreme direction of the general will, and , in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole". The general will is our own personal will pertaining to our higher, social consciousness. Rousseau's doctrine is harsh and ambiguous. It would be absurd to ask whether or not he was a socialist in any arbitrary sense. He did not demand the public ownership of anything. Yet he is regarded as one of the chief modern transmitters of the egalitarian tendency in socialism.

3.3.1. THE FRENCH REVOLUTIONARIES:

The French Revolutionaries were imbued with the ideas of equality and popular sovereignty. As the revolution gained momentum, liberal ideas and their followers were pushed aside by more militant groups. The Jacobins, under Robespierre and Saint just were themselves being pushed into greater and greater militancy. They were not socialists. In the words of J.L. Talmon, the Jacobins were most reluctant to yield to the view that there was an inconsistency between a rational political-ethical system and free economics. The Revolution forced upon them lessons against their own grain. There was a definite social dynamism in the idea of unlimited popular sovereignty. The poor were the vast majority of the nation, and thus entitled to dictate conditions to the small minority of the rich. There were levies, price control and clampdown on speculation. Robespierre is not counted among the fathers of socialism; yet his position is absolutely central in the egalitarian tradition.

After the rule of Jacobins, the Courgeois character of the revolution came to be consolidated. It was then that Jacobinism fully emerged in an easily identifiable socialistic shape. Babeuf was the leader of its extreme left wing. The same logic which led from Rousseau's understanding of freedom as pertaining to members of the community, to Jacobin militancy, austerity, and attempts violently to end the conflict between the rich and the poor, also led to Babouvism.

3.3.2. THE BABOUVISTS:

The Babouvists were also struggling against the spirit of the age. Babeuf himself wrote that, 'society must be made to operate in such a way that it eradicated once and for all the desire of man to become richer, or wiser or more powerful than others'. He also held that 'Nature has placed everyone under an obligation to work. None may exempt himself from work without committing an antisocial action'. The egalitarianism of Babeuf is the simplest and most consistent of the socialist arguments. From the demand for absolute equality as members of the community, it led to the elimination of the opposition between rich and poor and to the community of property. Babouism stood for common possession of land and industry. Its educational policies were austere, aiming to guard the youth of France from the corruption of 'effeminacy and love of an uncorrupted, revolutionary elite is usually held most important in the Babouvist dictatorship by a revolutionary elite is usually held most important in the Babouvist legacy. But the roots of this argument go back to classicism, to the yearning after the lost community. Babeuf was executed at the age of 37. Anyhow, Jacobinism and Babouvism have greatly influenced insurrectionists and socialists of later days.

3.3.3. ANOTHER FOUNDING FATHER OF SOCIALISM:

Another legendary founding father of socialism was Henri de Saint-Simon, who also took part in revolutionary events. He was engaged in land and building speculation at the time of the austere reign of Robespierre. His rationalism was of constructive type, as he wished to continue the critical work of the eighteenth century with a more constructive nineteenth. He wanted the restoration of order prevailing in the medieval period, on the basis

of enlightened principles. He was against classical equality. He once wrote “Remember that the property owners, though inferior in numbers, are more enlightened than yourselves and that in general interest, domination should be proportionate to enlightenment”. He also argued that the government should co opt and endow with property those who are without property but distinguished by outstanding merit, in order that talent and property should not be divided. Merit can be measured by one’s usefulness to the community. Contrary to the values preached by Rousseau and adapted by the Jacobins and Babouvists, Saint-Simon accepted modern civilization and its premises, based on the quest for individual happiness through the production and enjoyment of useful articles. Saint-Simon’s watchwords were ‘industry’ and ‘organization’. He believed that instead of equality, a destructive principle, the idea of ‘industry’ should be taken up in order to achieve social cohesion in the post revolutionary age. Industry here includes every kind of useful activity, theoretical as well as practical, intellectual as well as manual.

The basic distinction, according to Saint-Simon, is between industrial forces, and idlers, parasites who did not contribute to the well being of society. In a very famous passage, he contrasts the dangers to France which would accrue to her if she were to lose either her scientists, bankers, financiers, and skilled artisans, or her princes, rulers, politicians, and clergy. In the last years of his life, Saint-Simon, consciously moved away from the relics of individualist premises in his thought, and came to condemn selfishness in no uncertain terms. To fight the selfishness of that age, he sought to found a new kind of religious consciousness, which he called the ‘New Christianity’. The aim of this religion was to achieve the victory of the principles of universal morality in the struggle between the forces aiming that individual and public interests. It was called upon to link together the scientists, artists, and industrialists, and to make them the managing directors of the human race. This new religion was also designed to serve the worldly, immediate, material interests of people. Thus while saint-Simon believed in meritocracy and leadership, he was also adamant that the leaders should govern in the interests of the poorest and most numerous class. This is the only thread which links Saint –Simon to the later development in socialism.

Emile Durkeism, in his socialism and Saint –Simon, argues that in spite of surface appearances, socialism is already contained in Saint-Simon’s own doctrines. The liberal thinkers have not integrated society along the lines suggested by the nature of economic activity itself, although they elevated economic activity above everything else. Production was still left arbitrary and unorganized on the level of the whole community. But if the fruits of economic activity are to be given the highest importance, political concerns should be wholly subordinated to economic interests. Durkheim notes; ‘If economic interests do have the supremacy attributed to them, if, as a result, it is to these interests that human ends are reduced, the only good society can set itself is to organize industry in such a way as to secure the maximum production possible..’. he also says: ‘Society cannot become industrial unless industry is socialized. This is how industrialism logically ends in socialism’. Saint-Simon’s ideas are then the direct link between socialism and the mainstream of the enlightenment.

3.3.4. SOCIALISM EMERGING IN FRANCE, ENGLAND:

When socialism was emerging in France, England did not lag behind. The English socialism had close ties with liberalism. This radical ideology, representing the interests of a strong and ever growing middle class, was steeped in the secularist, individualist, materialist values, of the eighteenth century. Liberalism itself had been the offspring of previous doctrinal foundations. The individualist-liberal tradition had the most fertile soil in England. The tradition of socialism as followed by Rousseau, the Jacobins, and the Babouvist could never become predominant in England. On the other hand Jeremy Bentham and James Mill put forth the idea of philosophical radicalism or utilitarianism, which became the centre of English thought. English socialism had to develop from this background. Robert Owen (1771 – 1858), generally regarded as the father of English socialism was a successful entrepreneur and a capitalist employer once allied with Jeremy Bentham. He was a man of sound, practical judgement and with lot of experience in industry. Far from looking upon capitalist England as a dungeon of inhumanity, he described the English constitution as being among the best devised and most enlightened that have hitherto been established”. He did not believe that evil can be suddenly transformed into good. Hence he advocated

'progressive repeal and modification' of unjust laws and conditions, rejecting revolutionary change. He felt that "the British constitution, in its present outline, is admirably adapted to effect these changes". Owen appealed to 'every rational man, every true friend of humanity' for co-operation and unity of action between the government, Parliament, the Church, and the people. His book, *New View of Society* discusses education more than any other one.

In the true liberal capitalist tradition, Owen looked to society rather than to the state for important change. He stressed the importance of full employment for the maintenance of a civilized society. Yet he did not want the state to dispense employment, but to provide an educational system which would equip every person with the skills with which he could find employment. Owen believed in the policy of self-help. Hence he started the co-operative movement and supported the incipient trade union organizations springing up throughout England. He believed that a new social order could be established by producer's co-operatives rather than consumers' co-operatives. Thus he spoke of the new spirit of community replacing the selfish individualism dominating English society.

The early successes of the English middle class made it necessary for English socialism to develop in a less rationalistic direction than the Saint-Simonies. The English socialism came to be mainly dominated by conservative-moralistic tendencies. There was strong influence from non-conformism and liberalism. Another important phenomenon which influenced the transformation of English society was the Industrial Revolution, which led to the virtual disappearance of the English peasantry, the growth of towns, the new forms of economic organization, the increasing emphasis on foreign trade, to find resources and markets, and the political pressure exerted by the radical philosophers. The French Revolution and Napoleonic wars also had their repercussions in England, where there was retardation of economic and social progress, and intensified conflict among the various groups. There was also the rise of a group, new in history, namely the urban industrial working class. This class suffered most from economic disorder and political repression.

Under these circumstances, individual happiness remained as the main aim and economic activity was regarded as basic. It was left to the socialists to bring about creation of wealth as a distant goal. The early English socialists like Owen took the achievements of the Industrial Revolution for granted and were chiefly concerned with the discrepancy between the immediate reality of wealth creation and socially disruptive form of wealth-distribution. As John Stuart Mill observed later, the lack of success the Saint-Simonians had in England was due to the lack of success the Saint-Simonians had in state where socialists had to concentrate on the rationalization of production. That is, the predominant tendency of English socialism could afford to become relatively mellow, humane and moralistic in its preoccupations.

The Industrial Revolution and its offshoot, the poverty-stricken working class meant that socialism in England must become realistic, paying attention to the real problems instead of indulging in well meant and noble but abstract fancies like the achievement of true equality. English socialism, however, did not originate with the working class. As a matter of fact, socialism movement never had a purely working class origin, though it is true that this class became the chief constituent and propagator of socialist ideas. In the early days, the poor, hungry ill-clad workers in England did not take much notice of socialism. But the socialists were compelled to take note of, and to incorporate in their theories the plight of the working class.

In England the socialists critique of modern society as well as socialist vision of the future grew out of the long three cornered struggle between the landed aristocracy, the rising middle class, and the poor. This gave a peculiar character to the ideology of English socialism emerged as an amalgam of two opposed lines of ideological attack-the middle class attack against bourgeois industrialism and commercialism. The early English socialism attacked the bourgeoisie and the landlord together. As an adherent to the Owenite co-operativism, William Thompson wrote. "The feudal aristocracy and the aristocracy of wealth have coalesced; and those admitted into the unholy coalition against the happiness of the great majority of their fellow creatures are frequently the most bitter enemies.....of the industrial classes".

The immediate reality of wealth-creation and the presence of an industrial working class in England gave an economic orientation in socialist thought. The ‘labour theory of value’ has come from liberal sources and it has a history from John Locke through Adam Smith to David Ricardo. Marx used the theory in a hard rationalist, scientific theory culminating in this predication of the inevitable demise of capitalism. But in the pre-Marxian era, ‘labour’ in socialism had heavy moralistic overtones. This signifies another kind of logical base to socialism. The labourers created wealth; but they did not get their fair reward, they were being cheated, injustice was done to them. The notions of fairness and reward clash with William Thompson, who in this respect represented the feelings of the majority of English socialists. Thompson feels that the fact that wealth is produced by labour introduces a limitation to equality. He puts the point clearly, ‘Non-production is a greater evil than inequality distribution. Hence the necessity at all hazards, and by ‘whatever miserable expedients, of upholding what was security’

From the discussions above, we find the earliest appearance in modern socialism of three underlying socialist tendencies; egalitarianism developing from classical ideals through the logic of progress and wealth-creation and moralism through the logic of the fair distribution of wealth. The fourth major tendency, libertarianism, was held less important than the immediate economic and political demands. Glimpses into libertarianism could be gained by a study of some relevant ideas of Charles Fourier, who is considered another founding father of socialism. His main contributions to socialist doctrine were his attack on commerce and his strong advocacy of agricultural communities where labour would be made attractive, a source of constant joy, instead of the toil and sweat which it represents in civilization. His original and enduring contribution to radical thought was made as critic of bourgeois society rather than capitalist economics. As a critic, Fourier attacked bourgeois morality and the family system, And as a visionary he argued in favour of complete sexual liberation.

Check your progress questions

3. Analysis the basis tendencies of Socialism.

4. Give a note on French Revolutionaries.

3.4.1. FOURIERIST SOCIALISM:

The impact made by Fourierist socialism was the direct opposite to the Jacobin and allied varieties. The Fourierist school became, as George Lichtheim puts it 'the synthesis of socialism and Romanticism". It meant the adoption of highly unorthodox attitudes to burning social and economic questions. Romanticism, the artistic and literary movement, which had Rousseau as one of its imputed founders, found its true home in Germany. It is not usually associated with origins of German socialism. But the romantic spirit, stressing nature, feeling, and the need for authenticity, did make an impact on radical thought there influencing, for example, the ideas of the famous philosopher, Ludwig Feuerbach. For Feuerbach, it was love which was most important in human nature, and in the service of which Feuerbach embarked on his crusade to destroy the bases of 'alienation'. He found these bases in transcendental religion. This point was sharply contested by Karl Marx.

3.5. SUMMARY

This unit provides details to study the concept of socialism in details. It also explains the basic tendencies of socialism. This unit describes emergence of socialism in France and England during industrial revolution.

3.6. KEYWORDS

Abundance	-	Plenty
Transcendentalist	-	going beyond
Reductionism	-	diminishing principle
Embodiment	-	Give a shape
Tendency	-	an inclination

3.7. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS QUESTIONS:

For question No.1	-	Reference section 3.1.
For question No.2	-	Reference section 3.1.1
For question No.3	-	Reference section 3.1.3
For question No.4	-	Reference section 3.3.1

3.8. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

1. R.N. Bornstein, Evolutionary socialism NewYork, schoken, 1961
2. L. Derfler, socialism since Marx; A Century of the European left, London, Maccmillan, 1973.

3.9. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES.

1. Define socialism, what are the various approaches to this problem?
2. Trace the history of socialism

UNIT – 4

DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM

INTRODUCTION:

Democratic Socialism is the term generally used to describe the principles, policies and institutions characteristic of European parliamentary socialism. Giles Radice, in his book 'Democratic Socialism' defines a democratic socialist as 'a person who believes in equality and freedom, and in the conscious, directed organization of political, economic and social machinery to change society in accordance with these ideals'.

Democratic Socialism arose as a protest against the injustices created by the industrial revolution, which began in Britain at the end of the eighteenth century. Industrial revolution brought a total change both in man's way of life and in his expectations. In an industrial society however, man has come to possess the machines, tools, and organization which, if used diligently, would make him its master. He could, at last, free himself from property and build up a society wherein he could develop his talents.

The British industrial revolution was the result of several factors operating together. The most important were the technological inventions that enabled the whole process of industrial revolution to be immensely speeded up. Many of these inventions were simple, or involved the combination of two existing processes. Yet their effect was revolutionary.

The capital needed to finance the production of these technological discoveries was obtained through steady improvements in agriculture and above all expansion in overseas trade. Men wanted to invest their money in new industries rather than spend it. This attitude was the result of new ideas about consumption which had been developed a century ago.

The increase in population was another important factor. A better environment and improved agricultural techniques resulted in the growth of population in Britain which provided the man power to run the new factories

and also the customers to buy consumer goods, mostly cotton garments to begin with, that were characteristic of the British industrial revolution.

The architects of industrial revolution in Europe were dynamic, ruthless men who believed in the currently fashionable economic theory of laissez-faire. They were against government intervention in the economy. Most governments accepted this philosophy, especially in its application to industrial conditions and employment. As a result, when agricultural labourers flocked to the towns created by the new industrial concentrations to escape poverty and unemployment, their new living conditions were no better.

Employers had almost absolute power over their workers. Men, women and even small children were made to work long hours for low pay in insanitary and often dangerous conditions. Even a small child of seven years had to work sixteen hours a day. Further, when the equilibrium of the new economic system was interrupted at regular intervals by economic crises and depressions, a greater number of people were thrown out of their jobs, while wages of those employed fell to below subsistence level.

The conditions prevailing then are summed up by Giles Radice as follows: 'The result of early industrialization, despite a slightly rising standard of living compared with pre-industrial times, was often ill-health, early death, maiming and stunting of children, the break-up of the family, prostitution, drunkenness and crime'. But, without political rights, the workers had no way of changing their lot. These conditions were criticized by radicals, enlightened businessmen, philanthropists and even conservative politicians.

OBJECTIVES:

By Studying this unit the students will

- a – Study the origin of democratic Socialism
- b – Know the principles of Democratic socialism
- c – Analyse democratic socialism and democracy

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Early Socialists

Democracy and the Rise Socialist parties

The great Depression and the Emergence of a viable democratic socialism.

Principles of democratic socialism Equality

Freedom

Democratic Socialism and democracy

Summary

Keywords

Check your progress Questions and Answer

Books for further reading

Questions and Exercises.

4.1. EARLY SOCIALISTS:

It was the socialists who made the most rigorous criticism of the new industrial society and were concerned to change it. The word 'Socialist' was first used in 1827 by disciples of Robert Owen in the Co-operative Magazine to denote a person who rejected the laissez-faire theory propagated by the new entrepreneur class in favour of co-operation. The socialists argued that the profit motive, left undisturbed by government action, did not and could not produce universal happiness, as the capitalists claimed. It was better to have a society based on co-operation, which would ensure fair shares for all. The apostle of co-operation, Robert Owen, was a member of the new entrepreneur class. But he was a capitalist with a difference. He was a model employer who paid his employees regular wages when production was affected by the shortage of materials during the American war. He advocated a new system of co-operative enterprises in which the new wealth created by the industrial revolution might be shared by all. In France, utopian thinkers like Saint-Simon and Charles Fourier rejected the laissez-faire system and advocated societies based on co-operation and planning. While Saint-Simon stood for state control and central planning, Fourier preferred small self-sufficient communities. The most systematic thinker of the nineteenth century was Karl Marx.

4.1.1. DEMOCRACY AND THE RISE OF SOCIALIST PARTIES:

Marx's theory ignored the rise of democracy in Western Europe because it did not fit in with his theories. The main reason for the rise of democracy was the growth of industrialism. It was not then possible to prevent the educated workers from forming their own associations and political parties. Contrary to Marx's predictions, the ruling classes, the aristocracy and the new business class realized that the only way in which they could retain any political power was by bringing the working classes into the political system. Although the 1848 revolutions in many European countries failed, it left behind them constitutions which enabled radicals and liberals to exert some influence.

During the first half of the nineteenth century, there arose another interesting phenomena, namely the British Chartist Movement. Most of its participants were workers, motivated by economic grievances. But their immediate objectives were political. They called for nothing less than democracy. The charter included demands for universal manhood suffrage, secret ballot, and payment of members. The significant point here is that the chartists saw control of parliament as a pre-requisite of social reform. These ideas survived the collapse of Chartism. After 1848 the working class organizations were revived, especially the co-operatives and trade unions. The co-operative societies brought decent consumer standards to the worker. The trade unions gave him increased industrial and political bargaining power.

With the rise of democracy, the workers were able to form their own political parties to protect their own interests. By the close of the nineteenth century, socialism became the created of mass parties. The international was the first practical expression of the internationalism of socialists. It was an association of the socialists throughout the world. The first international was an assembly of learned theoreticians and professors. Founded in 1864, it broke up in sterile squabbling between Marxists and Anarchists. The second international, set up in 1889, was a gathering of the world's first mass political parties. It provide a forum at which all the national socialist parties could thrash out the great problems of the day; whether a socialist party should aim

at revolution or at reform by parliamentary means; how socialists could prevent wars. By 1900 there was an independent working class party in almost all the West European countries. Many of these parties were Marxists. In 1891 the German socialist party (SPD) adopted a mainly Marxist programme. From the 9 percent of the total votes it obtained in 1877, it grew to get 24 per cent of the total votes in 1903. The Austrian Social Democrat Party (SPO) maintained close links with the SPD. Its ideology was also Marxist, but because of differences among its leaders, there grew up a body of political ideas known as 'Austro-Marxism'. The French working class movement was weaker in organization than the German and the Austrian parties.

In Britain, however, there developed a party which was not Marxist. The Labour Representation Committee, founded in 1900 there, took the name 'British Labour Party' in 1906. To begin with, it was mainly a trade union party pledged to safeguard trade union interests in the House of Commons. It became socialist only in 1918. Marx had very little influence on the British Labour Party. The socialists owed far more to Christian ethical principles and to the gradualist philosophy of the Fabian Society than to the teachings of Marx. Up to 1914 the Labour Party was forced to work with the Liberal Government in Parliament because the former was small. Yet labour's support increased rapidly in the industrial areas, when four million workers were members of the Trade Union Congress. There was a good chance, therefore, that they would come to power by constitutional means.

There were other socialist parties also which had abandoned Marxism in practice. This group included the Scandinavian and Belgian parties. The most important in this group was the Social Democratic Labour Party of Sweden, which was founded in 1889 by the trade unions. Establishment of a classless society, through the socialization of the means of production, was its goal. But the party was against a violent upheaval. By 1914 the Swedish industrial revolution was the strength of the working class movement. The social democrats also had a decisive effect in widening the franchise. In 1902 they called a political strike which forced the Swedish parliament to recognize the principle of universal manhood suffrage. By 1915 the Social Democrats had become the largest party in the Second House.

The new opportunities created by the rise of democracy influenced even the most orthodox of the Marxist Socialist parties, the German Social Democrats. There were discussions held within the party about the relevance of Marxist doctrine to conditions in Germany. Socialists like Eduard Bernstein demanded that Marxist theory should be brought up to date in the light of new conditions. Bernstein pointed out that the position of the workers was improving rather than deteriorating. The increased power of the working-classes, through their representatives in parliament and trade unions, made it a probability that the workers could bring about the classless society in a gradualist and constitutional manner. There was a compromise among the Social Democrats. While accepting parliamentary democracy and evolutionary methods in practice, they remained committed to Marxist theory of revolution. The German Social Democrats forced these views on the Second International, at a time when there were opportunities in countries like France for the emergence of Democratic Socialism.

On the eve of First World War, the socialist parties and their trade union allies had become powerful in Europe. The German Social Democrats were the largest party in the Reichstag while the Swedish Social Democrats were the largest party in the Second House of Parliament. Although socialists had not formed their own governments, they could pressurize non-socialist politicians into making social reforms. In Britain, the liberal government had introduced a series of reforms, including health and unemployment insurance scheme, the national network of labour exchanges, and a law protecting the trade unions. Outside Europe, the Australian Labour party formed a minority government in 1904 which has the distinction of being the first labour or socialist government in the world. A majority labour government there (1910-1913) brought in pensions for invalids and maternity allowances. But in spite of their achievements, the world Socialist leaders were confused in their thinking. Their devotion to Marxist theories was becoming a substitute for independent analysis or action. The German Social Democrats, for example, who were the most powerful socialist party in the world gave little thought as to how they could make the Reichstag more powerful or what they should do if they actually came to power.

4.1.2. THE FIRST WORLD WAR AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION:

The socialists could not prevent the war, and they had no power to do so. Successive meetings of the International passed unanimous resolutions condemning war as a form of capitalist aggression. But those resolutions were not worth much in the absence of power over the military machines. But soon the socialist parties began to have concern over national defence. In the heat of the war, nationality triumphed over working class solidarity.

The First World War actually strengthened the position of the working class. In order to win the war, the ruling class had to pay attention to the welfare of the people and more of their soldiers and citizens. Every able bodied man had to fight; food was shared fairly among citizens. In most of the countries the political leaders took socialists into their confidence to ensure that the factories worked smoothly. The experience of office and responsibility gained during the war by socialist leaders immensely strengthened the socialist influence over the people. After the war, the European people began to look to the socialists as the natural alternatives. In the words of Giles Radice, "The rash of socialist government that appeared after the war all over Europe in Sweden the first socialist Prime Minister, in Austria a Socialist Chancellor, in Weimar Germany, primarily the creation of the Social Democrats, a Social Democrat president as chancellor and subsequent SPD participation in later coalitions, and in Britain the two minority labour governments of 1923-1924 and 1929-1931 owed much to the 1914-1918 war".

Another decisive change brought about by the war was the Russian Revolution. The socialists were at first very enthusiastic in their reaction to the Russian Revolution. But soon they objected to the harsh methods used by the Communists. The Berne International Conference of Socialists of 1919 condemned Bolshevism as a model for socialist parties. A reorganized society more and more permeated with Socialism cannot be 'realized, much less permanently established, unless it rests upon the triumphs of Democracy and is rooted in the principles of liberty'.

The Split on principles between socialists and communists was reflected in a similar split in organization. The Communists sought to establish a communist International in the place of the old International which had collapsed in 1914. The European socialist parties formed a Labour and Socialist International in 1923. Thus the breach between those who believed that socialism could be established by democratic means and those who believed only in revolutionary socialism was complete. Democratic Socialism emerged for the first time, in 1923, as separate and independent political philosophy, though not yet as a viable one.

4.1.3. THE GREAT DEPRESSION AND THE EMERGENCE OF A VIABLE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM:

The economic crisis that caused mass unemployment in the 1930's was called the Great Depression. It finally put an end to the myth of capitalism. In the previous decade right-wing politicians had argued that the capitalist system would ensure a fair deal for all people. They dismissed unemployment as a natural phenomenon. But the Great Depression disproved the idea that the unregulated capitalist system was efficient. By 1933, 30 percent of the German and American labour and 22 per cent of the British workers were unemployed.

The Communists, however, were hoping that the Great Depression would bring about a great proletarian revolution. They pointed out the differences between the mass unemployment of the Western democracies and the purposive planning begun in Soviet Russia.

The Depression brought down a number of socialist government in Europe. The German Socialists had no practical answer to the problem of unemployment. Therefore they resigned from the coalition government which proved to be last parliamentary government of the Weimar Republic. The failure of the Social Democrats made Hitler's path to power easier. In Britain the minority Labour government, led by Ramsay MacDonald was destroyed by the economic crisis.

The hopes of Democratic Socialism, however, were kept alive by the success of socialist government in Sweden and New Zealand. The Swedish Democrats introduced a nation-wide system of public works financed by loan to provide work and to stimulate general economic recovery. Aids were given in order to restore agricultural purchasing power. A system of social services was introduced for providing the people with social security. All these efforts were successful, and the Swedish social Democrats were able to bring about a steep fall in the rate of unemployment.

In New Zealand, the labour government came to power in 1935. It took immediate steps to bring about economic recovery. These included an expanded public works programmes including roads, hydroelectric enterprises and public buildings, promotion of secondary industries, and a system of guaranteed prices for dairy produce. Employment was promoted. Control of credit was ensured by the nationalization of Reserve Bank. As a result of these policies, there was a remarkable expansion of employment. In 1938, the government also passed the Social Security Act, which provided for health service, family allowances, unemployment and sickness benefits and old age pension. It also introduced rent control and embarked on a vigorous housing programme.

The success of the labour government in New Zealand and of the Social Democrats in Sweden proved conclusively that Democratic Socialism was a practical proposition. They showed that a determined democratic government could solve the unemployment problem, and that it was possible to create a more egalitarian society through a comprehensive system of social security. The post-war Socialists and left-wing reforms which greatly changed the lives of most. West Europeans owed most to the pioneering work of these two successful socialist administration.

The depression years taught another important lesson. That is, mere mastery of Marxist doctrine could not help Democratic Socialists in power. This was proved by the failure of Social Democrats in Germany and Austria. That orthodox conservative thinking was equally irrelevant was proved by the failure of Mac Donald's Labour government in England. The only socialist

governments which were successful were those which refrained themselves from being doctrinaire. If a Socialist is to be successful, above all other-democratic governments, it needs to be receptive to new ideas and courageous enough to act on them.

4.1.4. PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM:

Democratic Socialists have always believed that political action must be based on carefully defined principles. For man's behavior, both in politics and in everyday life, is governed by his assumptions and beliefs. The leaders of the movement formulated their policies in order to put right the injustices that had horrified Marx and Owen. Because they believed in individual equality and freedom, they opposed the exploitation of one man by another. Thus the basis of Democratic Socialism is its insistence on the importance of the individual and the recognition that his rights and opportunities can mostly be protected and enhanced only by collective decisions. The Oslo Declaration of the Socialist International, in 1962, says, "We, the Democratic Socialists proclaim our conviction that the ultimate aim of political activity is the fullest development of every human personality".

For the Democratic Socialist both freedom and equality are precious and essential to human happiness. They are the two pillars upon which the ideal of human brotherhood rests. These principles have been in existence from the time of ancient Greece. The principles of the French Revolution were 'liberty, equality and fraternity'. But the gap between theory and percent of the people including women and slaves, had no rights at all. The French Revolution ended in bloodshed and military reaction. Till nineteenth century, the concepts of equality and freedom remained abstract. They became practical political objects only when the socialists of the nineteenth century devised political, economic and social machinery to put these principles into effect.

Any ideology is judged by the validity of its principles and by the effectiveness of their practical application. The twin principles of individual equality and freedom, professed by the democratic Socialists, depend more on their logical validity than on their practical application. The empirical

evidence, however, should not be underestimated. The basic objection to oppression and inequality is that every man and woman is entitled to enjoy freedom and equality as of right.

Freedom and equality are interdependent. There cannot be freedom for all unless everybody enjoys it equally. Freedom should not be a privilege of the few. For, in the words of the British Socialist Philosopher R.H. Toynbee, "Freedom for the strong is oppression for weak. Let us now examine what Democratic Socialists mean by the words 'equality and freedom' "

4.2. EQUALITY

The socialists believe that every human being is worthy of equal consideration. Every one should be given an equal opportunity throughout life to develop one's life in the manner one thinks best. Equal opportunity does not mean literally identical material circumstances, but that difference within narrow limits should be no greater than are strictly necessary to call forth those special efforts, talents, sacrifices and resources without which a community cannot progress at its maximum capacity to the general benefit of all. It is neither fair nor practical for every man to have a precisely equal income. Different people have different needs and desires. It would be unfair if people with special gifts, abilities and qualification are not rewarded appropriately. But any difference should not be larger than is socially justified. Vast differences in possession of wealth are indefensible because they are unjust as well as causing class divisions and hatred. This is applicable not only within a country but also between nations. The growing difference of wealth between the western or developed nations and the Afro-Asian or developing nations is moral indefensible as well as dangerous for the peace and prosperity of the world. In its Oslo Declaration of 1962, therefore, the Socialist International Committed all socialist parties to do their best to end these inequalities of wealth between nations.

The Democratic Socialists emphasize not only material equality, but also equality of status. This does not just mean equality of opportunity. For equality of opportunity may mean an equal opportunity to be unequal in the economic and social spheres. Though 'equality of opportunity' is certainly one

of the prerequisites of social equality, it can lead to a society where the benefits go to the strong, and the weak are left to look after themselves. Thus 'equality of opportunity' can be used to justify society in which very great inequalities exist. Let us take the example of U.S.A. The American Declaration of Independence of 1776 says, 'These truths we hold to be self-evident : that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness', Theoretically, the American society offers equal facilities for education for all people. But in fact, the blacks as well as poor whites do not get the same educational opportunities as other sections of the community. There is also extreme economic and social inequality. In 1955, the lowest income group numbered about 10 percent of the population; but they received about only 1 percent the total money income of the country. The highest income group, consisting of about 10 per cent of the population, however, received 27 percent of the total income.

Democratic socialists reject this type of equality of opportunity. They assert that unless all children really share the same educational opportunities, equality of opportunity is merely an empty phrase. But equal educational opportunities do not just mean having an equal chance to go to the best schools. It also means that a child should be provided with an environment that is suitable for its studies. It should not be handicapped by having to live in conditions of poverty. Therefore, 'equality of opportunity' has meaning only in a society which already has a high degree of equality in income distribution, in social security and health services, and in housing. Intelligence is not solely a question of heredity; it is also shaped by environment. Therefore, any elite theory of education with benefits for the few will not only be morally wrong but also wasteful and frustrating in practice.

Equality of opportunity alone is not enough. A society based solely on rewards for the stronger members of community would be the negation of equality. The sick, the aged, the unemployed, the weak, the poor, the exploited and the unlucky deserve special treatment. Any doctrine of equality which excludes any section of society is partial and unfair.

Social equality does not mean uniformity. What socialist concept of equality means, is to give every man and woman the opportunity to make his or her life interesting in the way he or she thinks best. In the words of the 1951 Frankfurt Declaration of the Socialist International, "Socialism means far more than a new economic and social system. Economic and Social progress have moral value to the extent that they serve to liberate and develop the human personality".

4.2.1. FREEDOM

The second important principle of Democratic Socialism is freedom of the individual. Clement Attlee, the former British Labour Prime Minister wrote, "The aim of Socialism is to give greater freedom to the individual". Without freedom, there can be no equality. The purpose of equality is to ensure that everybody gets his share of freedom. Freedom means the opportunity to exercise individual choice and responsibility: to love one's own way to the limit which equal respect for other people's freedom permits.

Governments should protect the individual freedom. It is not left to politicians to decide how individual freedom can be enjoyed, so long as it is not at the expenses of others. The difference of views between Socialists and communists is clearly visible at this point. Communists countries, the communist party's decision is final. The party claims to be the sole interpreter of the wishes of the masses. Thus only the Community party can enjoy freedom.

When the government is expected to protect individual freedom, it must necessarily protect political freedom. Political freedom includes certain rights such as free choice of government, freedom of speech, freedom to criticize the government and to organize opposition to it. For Democratic Socialists all these political rights are essential to freedom. That is why they condemned Stalin's Russia, Hitler's Germany and Salazar's Portugal".

Although other democratic parties also share the Democratic Socialist belief in safeguarding the basic political freedom, the special contribution of Socialists to concept of freedom lies in their conviction that the government

should widen the frontiers of freedom as a whole, apart from preserving political freedom. Government should ensure that every member of the community is prosperous. When a man is poor and hungry, he concentrates on survival. When he is more prosperous, money and increased leisure give him opportunities to develop his personality in his own way radices rightly says, "Poverty limits choice, prosperity extends it".

Democratic Socialism is more than a belief in individual equality and freedom. Its adherents want direct control of the social, political and economic machinery of a nation. They have always argued that the unchecked workings of the forces of the market produce inequality and exploitation. Vigorous government intervention in the form of control of the economy, public ownership of the basic industries, redistribution of wealth through taxation and social services, and egalitarian education is necessary if society is to be changed in the direction of greater equality and freedom.

Democratic Socialists are realists. They are aware that they cannot carry out the whole programme over-night. Hence they have the difficult job of fixing up priorities and the pains of rejecting what is not practicable or less desirable. At the same time a socialist government has also to ensure that it retains the support of the people. Democratic Socialists seldom allow means to become divorced from ends. Their ideals give meaning to the work of socialist governments. They are ready to modify traditional policies if they no longer help to achieve their ends. Even if they are defeated in elections, they accept the verdict because the right of free choice of government is part of the freedom for which they are fighting.

4.2.2. DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM AND DEMOCRATIC:

The democratic socialist principles are politically expressed in democratic institutions. According to Edward Bernstein, Democratic is at the same time both the means and the end. It is the means of the struggle for Socialism and it is the form Socialism will take once it has been realised'. The basic political freedom can be preserved only through democratic institutions:

The Western Democratic Socialists argue that violent revolution is both unnecessary and a debasement of fundamental human rights. Sometimes

Check your
progress questions

1. Discuss the
origin of early
socialists?

2. Give a brief
account about rise
of socialist parties

3. What are the
principles of
Democratic
socialism?

revolution may be the only course open to an oppressed people. But when there are possibilities of redressing wrongs democratically, revolution is unnecessary. In his address to Yugoslav Communist leaders, Stalin said in 1945, 'Today Socialism is possible even under the English monarchy. Revolution is no longer necessary everywhere'. Where a democratically elected government is overthrown, it amounts to deliberately floating the wishes of the majority of the people and thereby diminishing political freedom.

Democracy has clear advantage over other forms of government. First, democratic government has the advantage of securing the possibility of regular change of political power without bloodshed. Secondly, it avoids the tragic blunders of the type committed in totalitarian regimes, because it is responsible to public opinion. As there is no real provision for criticism and for the expression of public opinion in non-democratic government, their leaders are liable to commit colossal excesses and mistakes. Thirdly, democratic government, as the representative of people, can provide strong leadership backed by national unity of a kind that totalitarian leaders can never hope to emulate.

Socialists have been among the staunch defenders of democracy. It is true that the first democratic institutions in Britain, France and Germany were created by liberals and enlightened conservatives. But they were always under pressure from the emerging labour movements. It was the Socialists who brought responsible democratic government to Germany and Austria respectively. ; In Sweden, universal suffrage was first introduced by the liberal social Democrat coalition. IN 1898 the French Socialists played a prominent role in defending their country's Parliamentary institutions against the pretensions of the army. The German and Austrian Socialists were Hitler's main opponents and among his chief victims. In 1940 the Labour Party joined Churchill's coalition in order to defend democracy against the two dictators, Hitler and Mussolini.

Between the two world wars, democracy was characterized by its instability. In 1922 Mussolini overthrew the democratic Italian government and ruled Italy as a dictator for twenty one years. In 1933 Hitler seized power

and held it until his defeat in 1945. Democracy in Austria led to virtual Civil War, a period of dictatorship, and the occupation by Hitler. In France and Britain, there were extremist movements and deep unrest. The main reason for this instability was the existence of mass unemployment and unfair division of wealth between different sections of the society. The democratic institutions were at last given a new stability by the socialist reforms of the 1940s, which have now been accepted by nearly all democratic governments. These reforms include full employment, system of social services and a fair distribution of wealth.

Socialist parties have held power under different systems of democratic government. But they are not dogmatic about any one of the forms. They, however, believe that there must be some form of effective popular representation, the possibility of constitutional and peaceful changes of power, and limitations on the power of the government. Democratic Socialists consider the multi-party system as the best way to ensure the possibility of a regular and peaceful change of power and to preserve the basic civil liberties.

4.3. SUMMARY

This unit dealt with the origin of democratic socialism and provides details to the study rise of socialist party. This Unit also describes the principles of democratic socialism and the relationship between democratic socialism and democracy.

4.4. KEYWORDS

Democratic socialism	-	Socialism means of democracy
Depression	-	Lowering of pressure.
Prominent	-	Distinguished

4.5. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

QUESTIONS

For question No.1	-	Reference Section No.	4.1.
For question No.2	-	Reference Section No.	4.1.1
For question No.3	-	Reference Section No.	4.1.4

4.6. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

R.N. Bernstein, *Evolutionary socialism*, New York, Schocken 1961.

L.Derfler, *Socialism since, Marx. A century of the European left*, London, Macmillan, 1973.

E.Durbin, *The Politics of Democratic socialism*,

A.J. Groth, *Major ideologies: An interpretative survey of Democracy, Socialism and Nationalism* (John Willy).

4.7. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES.

1. Describe the growth of Democratic Socialism from the 19th century.
2. Examine the relationship between Democratic Socialism and Democracy.

Unit 5

FABIAN SOCIALISM – GUILD SOCIALISM

INTRIDUCTION

The 1880's saw the rise of several rival socialist groups in England. 'They were the Social Democratic Federation, the Fabian Society and the Socialist League. Barring the Fabian Society, the other two were nominally Marxist. The Social Democratic Federation of Hyndman preached socialism, concentrating on practical problems such as housing and the eight-hour day and earned some support of working class. The movement continued to grow despite internal dissensions, A few years later, a revival of militant unionism gave all the socialist rival groups the popular platform they had been looking for, but the Marxists were more effective than the Fabians in influencing the working class. In 1893 the Independent Labour Party was organized with a quasi socialist platform. Scotland and Wales drifted slowly away from liberalism to labourism by way of the Independent Labour party. The liberal party had by then begun working –class leaders received their political training in and through the Social Democratic Federation. This was the background in which two principal British school of socialist thought, namel Marxism and Fabianism Contributed to the growth of socialism. We shall here discuss the part played by the Fabians.

OBJECTIVES:

By Studying this unit the student will

- a – Analyses the concept of Fabian Socialism
- b – Understand Sidney webb's views about fabianism
- c – Learn the concept of Guild Socialism

UNIT STRUCTURE:

The Fabian Society

Davidson's views about Socialism

Purpose of Fabianism

Sidney Webb on Fabianism

Guild Socialism

Hobson views on State

G.D.H. Cole's views on Guild Socialism

Cole's Five types of powers to the Commune

Summary

Keywords

Check your Progress question and answer

Books for further reading

Questions and Exercises.

5.1. THE FABIAN SOCIETY:

The Fabian Society was founded in London in 1863 by a group of London-based intellectuals, descending from the positivist trading of August, Comte, Unlike their predecessors, they were socialists. Though influenced by both Comte and Marx, they believed themselves to be in a peculiarly English tradition. Most of them were intellectual heirs of Bentham and Mill. The Fabian Society was clearly not committed to either Marxism or anarchism. It had come together at a time when socialism was only just beginning to revive in Britain, while it already had a following in France, Germany and elsewhere on the continent. Its founder was Thomas Davidson, a Scottish schoolmaster by origin. He was a classical scholar, philosopher and linguist who wanted to undertake the reformation of making along the lines of religious ideals. His appearance in London in 1883 acted as a catalyst in the formation of a group whose members had already broken with revealed faith under the influence of Darwin, Mill, George Eliot and Comte. The early Fabians were not very familiar with Karl Marx, One of the difficulties which all socialists in England then had was that people tended to associate the term 'socialism' with memories of the French Revolution and everything that had flowed from it, down to the great disaster of the Paris commune. The First International had left few; German Social Democracy was not yet a powerful movement; and to British intellectuals it appeared that Henry George, whose visit to England from the U.S.A. in 1881 -1882 stirred up interest in social reform, was more relevant than Marx. In any event it was Henry George and Thomas Davidson, both visitors from the U.S., who set this particular group of people in London thinking about the reformation of

society. Thus the society originated in a quasi-religious enterprise not untypical of the period.

5.1.1. DAVIDSON'S VIEW ABOUT SOCIALISM:

Davidson himself did not approve of socialism. As a result, on January 4, there was a split in the Fabian Society. Some of the original members formed the Fabian society while the others continued under Davidson in 1883. The most important Fabian secessionists were Edward R. Pease, Frank podomore and Hubert Bland. The term 'Fabian Society' appears to have been suggested by Podomore, an Oxford graduate and a clerk in post office who believed in ghosts. It was a reference to the elderly Roman commander Fabius Cunctator, famous for his extreme caution in conducting military operations, especially against Hannibal. Some of the earliest tracts of the society bore a motto (composed by podomore), which stated, 'For right moment your must wait, as Fabius did most patiently when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain, and fruitless. Critics of Fabianism point out that Fabius never struck hard and therefore, none can expect Fabians to stike hard for socialism.

Those who joined the Fabian Society between 1884 and 1886 included Sidney webb, Sydney Olivier, Bernard Shaw, Graham Wallas and Annie Besant. They disapproved both Anarchism and Marxism. They disapproved both Anarchism and Marxism. They adhered to democratic procedures and orderly methods but had no objection to a certain degree of enlightened authoritarianism. Their fundamental assumption was that socialism would be introduced not through class conflict, but by way of democratic welfare legislation administered by the civil service, of which some of them were members of the Fabian Society. In holding this view, the Fabian Society was undoubtedly aided by its composition and by the practice of admitting new members through Co-option. The group was, from the beginning, almost exclusively composed of professional men and women. There was only one working man among the founding members, called W.L. Phillips, a retired house-painter. The others were teachers, journalists, civil servants, bank clerks or people with independent incomes. In the 1890's a few union leaders joined,

but there was never any question of enrolling numbers members. The Society was elitist. In 1892, Beatrice Potter (Mrs. Sidney Webb) became a member. As she hailed from the class of industrial entrepreneurs, she brought many of the virtues of that stratum into the organization.

5.1.2. THE MAIN PURPOSE OF FABIANISM:

The main purpose of Fabianism was to win the educated professional middle class over to socialism. Most of the members were not fit for popular agitation. Though they welcomed the formation of working class socialist societies, they later did not welcome the Fabians. The Fabian Society had, as its members, people with different shades of opinion. The first executive committee of the Society, elected at the end of 1884 had an anarchist, a Social Democrat, a gradualist, a Tory and an elitist. The members believed in different ideals. In the setup, it was difficult to make out anything specific. Nonetheless there was a distinctly Fabian theory of Socialism and, in particular, an economic doctrine whose core was a theory of exploitation. Philip Wicksteed persuaded Webb and Shaw that the labour theory of value was untenable. Wicksteed raised the question whether the theory of surplus value was necessarily depend upon the labour theory of value. Marx tried to prove, by means of the theory of surplus value, that even in the capitalist economist's state of perfect competition, the workers would be cheated of the full fruits of their labour. He used the labour theory of value and the theory of surplus value as a key in his analysis of the 'laws of motion' of capitalist society, Wicksteed claimed that he had stuck away the foundation of Marx's arguments by bringing forward an entirely different theory of the determination of value.

The early Fabians were bound to surrender the labour theory of value if they could not accept its classical Ricardian formulation. However, they had to hold on to some doctrine of 'surplus value' if they were to show that capitalism was a system of exploitation. Hence they could not accept the Marginal Utility doctrine of Stanley Jevons. For marginal utility implied that under certain assumed conditions, 'capital' and labour were being remunerated in proportion to their respective contributions to the production of wealth. Instead, the Fabians fell back upon a 'theory of rent', which was independent

of any kind of value theory. This theory was accepted as the center piece of Fabianism, and the foundation of their critique of capitalism and liberalism. The theory was worked out in the meetings of the Hampstead Historic club, whose important members were Webb, Shaw, Olivier, and Wallas. It was put forward by Sidney Webb in the Quarterly Journal of Economic for January, 1888, and was given its popular form by Shaw in his contribution to the 1889 Fabian Essays.

Shaw quotes Mill's statement that 'the rent of land consists of the excess of its return above the return to the worst land in cultivations'. He first introduces the first disinherited son of Adam, the first proletarian, one in whose seed all the generations of the earth shall yet be blest, but who is himself for the present foodless, homeless, shiftless, superfluous, and everything that turns a man into a tramp or a thrall' Shaw the discusses landlord-tenant relationship, differential rent, the tenant-cultivator's need to sell his labour so as to feed his family, the principle of exchange value, etc., He finally discusses the question of wages in industry and concludes that shareholder and landlord live alike on the produce extracted from their property by the labour of the proletariat'.

5.1.3. SIDNEY WEBB PRESENTS FABIANISM AS FOLLOWS:

1. The wages paid to the unskilled labourers employed on the worst soil, with the minimum of capital, and in the worst circumstances, will be the natural measure of the wages paid to all unskilled workers.
2. Assuming an unregulated growth in population, the minimum wages will equal the subsistence wage necessary to keep the unskilled worker and his family alive long enough to rear a new generation of unskilled labourers.
3. Higher productivity resulting from the application of Capital and skilled labour, or from better soil, will yield a surplus which will in turn be divided between various type of 'rent'. Such 'rents' will arise in many circumstances where labour, land, ability, and capital vary in quantity and quality. In a capitalist society the bulk of 'rent' is appropriated by the owners of the means of production. Skilled and organized workers may get a portion

Check your progress questions

1. Give a brief note on Fabian society

2. What are the different purpose if Fabianism.

of the 'rent of ability' but never the whole of it. Moreover, skill is related to education, which in turn is unequally possessed, children from wealthy families getting more of it. Thus the return to the different factors of productions such as land, labour, capital, operative skill is the liberal economists that the various factory are remunerated in proportion to the contribution they make to the creation of wealth is wrong. There is an 'unearned increment' that goes to the owners of capital.

Fabian economics was the application to capitalist industry of the Ricardian theory of rent. The landlord and the capitalist were treated alike. For those who argued that the capitalist, unlike the landowner, was an active agent of industrial production and moreover created capital by saving, the Fabians replied that although the accumulation of capital was necessary, this did not justify the existence of a capitalist class, for saving could be done collectively by the community, instead of being left to private individuals. Further the rich did not undergo a great hardship by saving some of their capital. As for the managerial function, it could and should be separated from that of the pure capitalist. This is no novel as it had earlier been suggested by Marx in Capital. The novelty lay in a concept of 'surplus' that did not depend on the labour theory of value.

The notion of rent is today thought of as either politically neutral or relevant to liberal radicalism rather than to socialism. It did not clearly bring out the characteristics of Fabianism, although its authors regarded it as superior to Marx's version. The Fabians did not develop any theory of economic growth and consequently they suffered a political catastrophe in 1931.

Most of the early members of the Fabian Society were previously adherents of the left wing of the liberal party, which stood for Universal Suffrage, land reform, freedom for Ireland, anti-imperialism and other democratic causes. They believed, as a political strategy, in permeation' chiefly of the liberals. As a result they virtually ignored the growth of labour movement, snubbed the most important union leaders, and made a far less contribution to the eventual formation of the labour party than the Social

Democratic Federation. The Fabians claimed to have broken the spell of Marxism in Britain. But Hosbawn and Mc.Briar, writing from different angles, point out that there was no such spell and consequently no chance of breaking it.

The Fabians were unable to make contact their natural allies, the left-wing liberals. Their attitude during the Boer War (1899-1902) was anti-democratic. Bernard Shaw's defence of British policy in South Africa smacked of imperialism. He attacked 'Gladstonian liberalism' and claimed that a Fabian must necessarily be an imperialist. The Society had by then been abandoned by anti-imperialists like the former liberals and Marxists. The Fabians argued that because imperialism was a reality, all that Socialists could do was to try to administer the system with maximum efficiency. This argument betrayed the liberal-imperialistic tendencies of the Fabians.

The leaders of the Society believed themselves to be advancing the Socialist cause when they were being most anti-liberal. In his *Fabian Socialism and English politics*. A.M. McBriar says, 'The Fabians stood at the parting of the ways, at the point where the modern attitude to the state diverged from the liberal-Radical attitude of the nineteenth century rejection of liberalism and they were authoritarians. They wanted the forcible reorganization of society by the state. The Webb's uncritical enthusiasm for Stalinism and Shaw's brief flirtation with Italian Fascism were rooted in the same. Their version of socialism was both non-liberal and non-Marxian. That is why it appealed to the administrators, technicians and industrial managers who were beginning to doubt *laissez-faire*.

5.2. GUILD SOCIALISM

Guild socialism is English in origin. It first came to the fore with the publication in 1906 *The Restoration of the Guild System* by A.J. Penton. He advocated a return to the medieval principle of self Government in industry. According to that principle, the craftsman who was a member of an autonomous Guild, owned the instruments with which he worked, and determined the nature and extent of his production. This approach is hostile to modern methods of production and trading on a large scale. But the solution offered by Penton represents the utopian phase of Guild Socialism.

The theory attained a more practical form in 1909. During the period from 1909 to 1912, there was great labour unrest, in which the Trade Unions played an increasingly important part. Writers like S.G. Hobson and A.R. Orage proposed that the Guild idea should be adapted to modern conditions on the basis of the existing Trade Union organization. They pleaded for self government in industry by the workers employed in the industry, grouped together in a system of industrial Guilds, for which the existing Trade Unions would form the nucleus. The Guild idea became a definite force in the British labour movement. The National Guilds League was founded in 1915.

Guild Socialism stands between syndicalism and collectivism. It seeks to reconcile the doctrine of producers' control with the rights and functions of the consumer. G.D.H. Cole explains the general philosophy of guild socialism when he says, "The state should own the means of production, the guild should control the work of production".

The Guildsmen started from the assumption that the main evil in society is the complete ordering of the working life of man by the owners of capital. This slavery or 'wagery' is far worse than poverty, for, as Cole points out "poverty is the symptom, slavery is the disease. The many are not enslaved because they are poor, they are poor because they are enslaved. Hence collectivism is only a little worse than capitalism since it merely consists in replacing the capitalist bureaucrat by the state bureaucrat. The essential thing is the taking over of the management of the industry by the workers, both manual and intellectual. They must also take over the joint control of their working lives. For this purpose the guildsmen advocated that each industry should organize itself into a guild. These guilds are, however to be only the spiritual prototypes of the medieval guild. The guildsmen were for substituting machinery with handicraft and for the return of society to small self-sufficing units. In short, the demand was for the formation of national guilds, which would take over the present industrial system. Though the number of these guilds might vary, the preference was for a small number of large guilds rather than a large number of small guilds. The general consensus was that fifteen to twenty industrial guilds would be sufficient.

Within each national guild, there would be local autonomy. Most of the national guilds would confine their efforts to the purchase and distribution of raw materials, the sale of the finished products, and the procuring of capital. The methods of production would be left to each separate factory. These factories will be federated into district guilds and these in turn into the national guild. The governing committees of the factory are to be elected by the workers on a craft basis. The district committees of the be organized on a double basis, form the factories as a whole and from the separate craft in the district. The national executive committee will be composed of representatives of the districts as such and of the individual national craft bodies.

All supervisory officials are to be chosen by the workmen themselves. However, coordinating officials like general managers and staff officers are to be chosen by the various committees. For, the committees would be better judges of technical skill than the rank and file of the members.

All these ideas are not very different from those for syndicalism. The fresh contributions to political theory by guild socialism are along the lines of the problems of the possible exploitation of the consumer by the producer, and of the direction of the functions like education protection, justice and health, which are, plainly communal. Views on these subjects divide guildsmen into two distinct schools of thought. The first is represented by S.C.Hobson and it asserts the ultimate sovereignty of the state over the guilds.

5.2.1. HOBSON VIEWS ON STATE

Hobson says that the state as representing the community at large must be the final arbiter. The industrial guilds would take over all the economic functions, leaving the conduct of civic affairs to the state. Although the state is theoretically sovereign, it should keep free from any clash with the guilds except on matters of public policy. When the state does interfere, it should be in its capacity as representative of men as citizens and not of men as consumers. The consumers of commodities do not need protection from the producer, who must foresee the requirements and desires of the consumer and produce to meet them if he is to be successful. At the most, a distributive guild, consisting of the employees in retails trade would be sufficient to

protect the consumer. The guilds will be free to fix their own credit. This is subject to appeal to the Guild Congress and to the state, if public policy is involved. The state would tax the guilds for the support of civic amenities provided by it. The actual direction of civic amenities like education, health and protection would largely be in the hands of the guilds in these lines. As Hobson says of education, ‘our modest purpose is to throw upon the state the duty of a minimum civic education only. This minimum might best be assured by the state charging the National Union of Teachers with the powers necessary and the consequent to society for carrying it out’.

In this way, guild socialism asserts the ultimate sovereignty of the state, but debars it from participating in economic matters except as a last resort. The theory gives almost complete powers to the guilds, either individually or collectively in the guild congress.

5.2.2. G.D.H. COLE VIEWS ON GUILD SOCIALISM

This theory is opposed by another school of guild socialism led by G.D.H. Cole who has consistently attacked the ultimate sovereignty of the state. While maintaining the need of protecting the consumer, the form this protection and the agencies through which this protection should be exercised, however, have undergone changes in Cole’s thought. In his self Government and Industry, Cole regarded the state as an association of dwellers in’ a common neighbourhood and hence of consumers. Such an association should be only one of many and ought not to be dominant over other associations which represent men in their capacity as producers, fellow-worshippers, etc. The state, however, should be preserved as the representative of the Consumers and should stand opposite the guilds. At the top would be parliament, representing the consumers, and the Central Guilds Congress, representing the National Guilds. In the words of G.D.H. Cole, “Neither Parliament nor the Guild Congress can claim to be ultimately sovereign the one is the supreme territorial association, the other, the supreme professional association’. If a dispute were to arise between the two matters like price and quality, “the final decision of such a quarrel ought to rest with a body representative of all the organized consumers and all the organized producers”. The ultimate sovereignty in matters industrial would seem

property to being to some joint body, representative equally of parliament and of the Guild Congress. Otherwise, the scales must be weighted unfairly in favour to either consumer or producers.

Cole later changed his position in two respects because of Hobson's attack upon the idea that the state represented the consumer. First, Cole advocated the formation of other associations than the state to serve as the representatives of the consumer, and secondly he shifted his emphasis from a national to a local coordination of production and consumption. He came to believe that the state represented the complex of the separate interests within the territorial unit, and not the consumer interest exclusively. But no group can represent all the interests of men. Each interest or 'function' must have separate representation. The 'all powerful' state must therefore give place to the federation of functional groups. Thus the units of the industrial guilds would federate locally and regionally. The consumers would be organized in two main associations, namely those who consume articles, like tobacco, the form of which varied according to the tastes of the consumer, and those who consume undifferentiated products, like water, electricity and gas, the form of which does not vary from one consumer to another. The first was called the co-operative council and the second, the collective utilities council. Communal services were to be reorganized in civic guilds, and their consumers were to organize in councils such as the Cultural Council, the Health Council, etc., Each of these groups would send representatives to the local communes. The industrial guild and the corresponding consumers Councils should be represented equally. Above the local commune, there was to be the regional commune. At the top, a national commune was to be organized on the basis of functional and regional representation.

Check your progress questions

3. Discuss Sidney Webb's views on Fabianism

4. Explain G.D.H. Cole's views on Guild Socialism.

5.2.3. COLE GIVES FIVE TYPES OF POWERS TO THE COMMUNE:

Cole gives five types of powers to the commune. They are as follows:

- 1) Financial problems, especially the allocation of national resources, provision of capital and to a certain extent, regulation of incomes and prices.
- 2) Differences arising between functional bodies on questions of policy.
- 3) Constitutional questions of demarcation between functional bodies.

- 4) Questions not failing within the sphere of any functional authority including general questions of external relations, and
- 5) Coercive functions.

Thus it is apparent that while Cole denies the sovereignty of the state, in practice, he provides for much greater control of and interference with the guilds by outside bodies for much than does Hobson.

The guild socialists have not paid much attention to the basis of wage payment, although nearly all of them express a wish that ultimately and equality may be established. Hobson suggests that an equal amount per capita might be allocated to the various guilds for salaries. Each of the guilds might pursue its own method of division among its members. Guildsmen denounce the payment of interest and would desire to abolish it.

In order to fulfill their aims, the guild socialists relied upon developing the future guilds out of the trade unions must undergo a change. Craft unionism, or organization according to similar work, must give place to industrial unionism, or organization on the basis of the turning out of a common product. This is necessary for the creation of a more effective fighting machine and because the industrial unit will alone be competent to manage production. Unionism must reach the unorganized manual workers too. Brain as well as hand workers should be included in the new organization.

These union must seek to wrest the direction of industry from the capitalist by encroaching control. They should use their economic power to secure the election of foremen, the enforcement of shop discipline etc. They should continually seek to wrest the direction of industry from the capitalist by encroaching control. By means of the 'collective contract', they could guarantee to produce a given quality for a stated price and thus take over all questions of management even while still operating within the capitalistic system. Finally by means of independent guilds, they could enter into active competition with capitalism. But the workers must be careful about delusive offers of sharing control with capital and of plans for joint management, for these are likely to destroy the ultimate demands of the worker.

It is thus, by industrial and not by political action that guildsmen plan to build up the society. They will not assist in nationalizing industry although they agree that it may be easier to introduce producers' control in state – owned industries than in private industries. Ultimately, G.D.H. Cole believes that, “apart from capitalistic blunders a catastrophe will be necessary to end the wage –system”.

5.3. SUMMARY

This units attempts to study the concept of Fabian socialism and its purpose. It also gives details to study Sidney Webb on Fabianism. It describes the concept of Guild Socialism and G.D.H. Cole's views on guild socialism in details.

5.4. KEYWORDS

Fabianism	-	purposely delaying
Guild socialism	-	Association of persons for mutual aid
Imperialism	-	Policy of domination over weak
Permeation	-	Pass through

5.5. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

QUESTIONS

For questions No.1	Reference section No.5.1.
For questions No.2	Reference section No.5.1.2
For questions No.3	Reference section No.5.1.3
For questions No.4	Reference section No.5.2.2

5.6. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

1. Coker, Recent, Political Thought (Accurword Press)
2. Mark, Max, Modern ideologies. (St. James Press London)
3. R.N Bernstein, Evolutionary socialism New York, Schoken 1961.

5.7. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

1. Assess the Fabian contribution to socialist ideology
2. Bring out the tenets of guild socialism.

UNIT – 6

SYNDICALISM

INTRODUCTION

In the early years of the twentieth century, there was a growing dissatisfaction with the state. People were disillusioned with the idealist theory of Hegel, according to which the state was regarded as an indispensable entity with mystical attributes. New theories arose against this view. The state came to be regarded as an association of consumers, one among several such associations to which the individual may belong. The state was sought to be replaced by a different machinery of government if the former did not serve well the needs of the community.

The experience of state control during the war has reinforced rather than removed the dissatisfaction with the state. Even collectivist socialism had to be modified to a considerable extent because of the prevalent hostility to centralized government. The attack upon the collectivist state was led by two schools of socialists, the Syndicalists and the Guild socialists.

Syndicalism refers to both a theory of social organization and a plan of action. The plan of action is similar to the phase of what Marx called the class war, and its aim is to bring about a Syndicalist organization of society. The Syndicalist plan of action is direct and well-defined. But the type of state it wants to build up is not clearly defined the general outlines alone are indicated.

The term 'Syndicalism' is derived from the French word Syndicat, which means group for the defence of common interests, and another French, Syndicalisme, which indicates trade unionism, Syndicalism took its shape in the French trade unions of the last decade of the 19th Century.

OBJECTIVES:

By studying this unit the students will

- a – Understand the theory of syndicalism
- b – Analyse the theory of scientific socialism
- c – Study the contribution of Karl Marx and Engels to Marxism.

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Syndicalist theory of society

Methods of syndicalism

Evaluation

Marxism

Scientific socialism

The age of Karl Marx

Marx and Engels

Dialectical Materialism

Materialistic Interpretation of History

Capitalist order

Theory of surplus Value

Theory of class struggle

Dictatorship of the proletariat

Views on religion

Theory of alienation

Theory of State

Merits of Marxism

Demerits of Marxism

Summary

Keywords

Check your progress question and Answer

Questions and Exercises

6.1. SYNDICALIST THEORY OF SOCIETY:

Syndicalism may be defined as a theory which regards the Trade Union organizations as at once the foundation of the new society and the instrument by which it is to be brought into being. It is socialistic, for it adopts the general socialist view that capital is theft; endorses the notion of class war as fundamental in capitalist society; and proposes to abolish the private ownership of the means of production and to substitute ownership by the community.

Syndicalism differs from both collective Socialism and Communism in that it draws its inspiration from the work of Proudhon rather than from that

of Marx Proudhon's theory of Associate Communism envisaged society which is in several respects similar to the free organization of voluntary associations advocated by the Anarchists. French Trade Unionism was strongly influenced by the teaching of Proudhon: consequently, its developed anti-authoritarian tendency was reflected in the disposition to regard the Trade Union as the voluntary association which was to succeed the capitalist state. Syndicalism, which has emanated from French Trade Unionism, never lost the Anarchist sympathies it has derived from its origin.

Syndicalism's main difference with collectivist socialism lies in its insistence on the importance of producers' control. The workers who create value should, in the Syndicalist view, be the controllers of society. That is the workers as producers should exercise control not only in the economic or industrial sphere, but also in the political sphere. The state should cease to exist as a political organ and its functions should be taken over by bodies of producers organized on a vocational basis. In this syndicalism differs from Guild Socialism, since the latter, while objecting to the state interference in the industrial sphere recognizes a need for further representation of the common Will in the political sphere. It is in this respect that "Guild Socialism occupies a middle position between Collectivism on the one hand and Syndicalism on the other".(C.E.M JOAD).

Thus we find that Syndicalism, in reaction from the state socialism which tends to regard society as an organization of consumers only, goes to the other extreme in its insistence on the importance of producer. One of the Syndicalist leaders, Pelloutier affirms that the task of the revolution is to free mankind not only from all authority but also from every institution which has not for its essential purpose the development of production'.

The Syndicalists are opposed to the State and any form of state organization of society for the following reasons. Firstly they are hostile to the state as a bourgeois and middle-class institution. The State is, by its very nature, an instrument of capitalist exploitation in society. The service of the state makes men bureaucratic and unsympathetic to the needs and aspirations of those who are actually engaged in production. A central organization tends

to uniformity, to routine, to lack of imagination and initiative, and to distrust of local development and enterprise. It is not the middle class civil servant, but the manual worker who knows what he himself wants. Therefore, the prescription of industrial organization should be left for the manual worker to decide.

The second reason for Syndicalist opposition to the middle class state is a distrust of middle-class Socialism. Syndicalism claims to be the only school of socialism which is the product of the workers themselves, all other forms of socialism had their origin in the minds of clever middle-class theorists. They tend to regiment the workers in conformity with some pre-arranged system of society which has seemed good to a few intellectuals. They are, hence, out of touch with the needs of the workers. The workers alone can clearly express their needs. Moreover, the importance of keeping alive an intense class consciousness forbids any rapprochement between the workers and the intellectuals of the middle class.

While favouring a system of producer's control, the syndicalists argue that it will lead to an increase both of freedom for the workers and of efficiency in industry. If the Industry is owned and controlled by the Trade Unions, each worker participating therein has a direct voice in its management. Thus he enjoys the substance of democracy in every act of his working life. Having a personal interest in the conduct of industry, he will take a pride in his work, and the quantity and quality of his labour will both be improved.

The body which popularized syndicalism was the French Confederation Generale du Travail (C.G.T.). It was the national federation of trade unions. French Unionism has taken two forms, after being legalized in 1884. The first were Bouresse du travail each one of them comprising of workmen belonging to different trades, but happened des Bouress du locality. This Federation merged with the C.G.T. in 1992. The C.G.T. itself was first formed in 1895 as the federation of about seven hundred Syndicates. The Syndecates were trade unions of workmen engaged in the same industry.

Check your progress
questions

1. Explain the theory of syndicalism
2. Analyse the theory of Scientific Soccialism
3. Give a note on Dialectical

Both branches of the movement have always aimed at the replacement of capitalism with trade unionism as the directing force of production, distribution and government, but the form in which this control was to be exercised has varied. At the time when the Bourses were predominant, the emphasis was naturally upon local units. The local unions were to be directed by the Bourse. The Bourses would investigate the number of unemployed and the causes of unemployment, the cost of living for each person and the difference between this and the amount of wages received, together with the number of workmen employed in the various trades and the consumptive needs and productive possibilities of the region. With this experience and information, the Bourses in the new society would fix quotas for each local trade to produce.

With the development of national unions, they came to acquire increased emphasis, Pataud and Pouget assign the management of the postal, telegraph and telephone services and the railroads to the respective national unions. Apparently only the industries which have become nationally integrated are to be managed by the national unions; elsewhere the direction is to be in the hands of the C.G.T. which is to draw up estimates of production and consumption and assign quotas. Thus the movement of French organization from a local to a national trade basis has caused confusion in the minds of syndicalists. The relationship between the national coordinating body and the local Bourses is not mentioned clearly because of the syndicalists' characteristic refusal to sketch their future society.

The principle of producer's control is not confined to manufacturing, mining, and transportation. It is also to be applicable to retail trade, the professions, and education. Consumers' Cooperative societies are to fade away and give place to control by unions of producers. Medicine, chemistry, dentistry, etc., are to become self-governing professional associations. In education, however, Pataud and Pouget inconsistently provide that in the professional schools the instructors should be chosen by the students. Even the sweepers were to control their work. Residential groups within a common locality might be organized to assist in health work, but their services were to be primarily advisory to the Bourse. They would not determine or administer

policies. The army and the conduct of foreign affairs would be in the hands of the C.G.T. and its committees.

6.1.1. METHODS OF SYNDICALISM:

The syndicalists have laid more emphasis upon the methods to be employed than upon the precise nature of the end to be obtained. They are distrustful of political methods as a means of achieving the changes in society which they desire. France has witnessed the loss of revolutionary spirit among the leaders of the working class who had newly been elected to the national Parliament. These leaders gradually came to adopt the bourgeois policy of constitutional mediation. Because of this experience, these syndicalists were convinced that the workers must rely solely upon themselves. Further, an M.P., even if he belongs to the Labour Party, does not represent his Trade Union but his constituents; hence, he cannot devote himself to the worker's cause. The worker must accordingly be prepared to obtain authority in the State not mediately through M.P.s. or delegates, but immediately through the strength of his Union. It is then 'direct action' upon which the syndicalists depend.

Syndicalism starts with the general presumption that economic power is the solution to all problems. Its chief weapon in the economic sphere is the strike. Strikes are encouraged whenever and wherever possible. They are good in themselves and as a means to something beyond themselves. They are good in themselves because, even if they fail, they give the workers a sense of solidarity, a lesson in-self-discipline and a feeling of self-reliance. They are helpful to intensify the class war. The strikes are good as a means because they tend to bring near the day of the general strike.

The general strike is the weapon which will ultimately bring in revolution. It is not necessarily a strike of all workers. It is not to be expected that an adequate number of workers will be motivated by a vigorous class-conscious spirit to strike simply and solely for the purpose of terminating the capitalist system. The syndicalists want a strike on the part of a sufficient proportion of the workers in key industries to secure the paralysis of capitalism. The growing complexity and interdependence of modern industry

will make the general strike easier and more effective, by rendering it possible for a minority of the workers to paralyze the whole of industry. As soon as a class conscious minority of the workers of sufficient numerical strength can be got ready, a general strike will be declared and the instruments of production seized. This will be the end of capitalism.

It may be felt that a general strike will be undemocratic in the sense that it may well be opposed to the wishes of the majority of the workers. But the dogma of majority rules is dismissed as a mere bourgeois superstition. It is argued that, during the transitional stage, it will be necessary for a minority to seize the reins of power and guide the rest of the workers towards their own salvation.

The Syndicalists depart from Marx in this respect. They don't agree with the prophesy of Marx that capitalist society in the process of its evolution would rise and dispose their masters. They hold that Marx was unduly optimistic. The employers will not be so ready to fight for their class as Marx supposed; they will bargain and compromise and obscure in a thousand ways the distinction between workers and masters, until the revolutionary edge is taken off workers spirit. In these circumstances the workers must adopt and carry out by all means a policy perpetual offence. Although the strike is their strongest weapon there are also other forms of sabotage, like doing bad work, breaking a machinery, spoiling work already done, and working strictly according to rule.

6.1.2. EVALUATION:

A number of interesting problems with regard to the aims and methods of syndicalism have been raised. Merriam and Barnes list them in their 'History of Political Theories' as follows. First, were the Syndicates to use their economic Power to increase prices and wages in some key industries like railways, mines, banks, power service and to decrease the working hours?

Pataud and Puget suppose that the syndicalistic state will adopt absolute equality of distribution and therefore, no one industry can profit financially at the expense of another, while all will follow of their own free

will the general rules concerning hours and conditions of work enunciated by the C.G.T. This argument falls into another difficulty. That is, in any society where differences in income were permitted, there would be a temptation for those with the economic power to use it in order to better their condition. Some more tangible means of protection of all producers.

A second danger would be the temptation for some industries to develop monopolistic tendencies. It was partly due to this reason that medieval guilds degenerated from the democracy of their early days to their monopoly ridden state of the later Middle Ages. The unions have race and sex prejudices even today, which prevent all workers from having equality of economic opportunity. Professions like law and medicine have also shown a desire to narrow the entrance to their ranks and thereby secure a higher income for those who are already practicing the profession.

Thirdly, there is a distinct danger that an organization of producers will not introduce improved equipment and methods lest it throws out of work some of its members. Many of the workers would be afraid that such improvements would affect them directly; others would sympathize with them and would wish to protect them. There is also the probable tendency for popularly elected managers to tolerate slovenly work from their 'subordinates' which they not endure, were they not dependent in part upon the suffrage of these very workers for their position.-

Fourthly, there are many services for which producers' control is either impossible or distinctly inferior to control by the territorial state. A state through which the popular will may function and control the producers of commodities and services for the common good is essential. Indeed the position of the Bourses and of C.G.T. in the syndicalist society would be virtually that of the state with representation on an occupational rather than a territorial basis. This society would have much weaker powers than would be needed to bring order and popular welfare out of a society torn by the conflicting interests of occupational groups.

Because of these criticisms, the majority of the C.G.T. have fundamentally altered their programme. In 1919 they adopted a programme calling for the nationalization of the key industries with joint control of each by the producers and consumers.

Apart from the final goal of the syndicalists their methods also have equal defects. Thus the abstention from politics would mean the surrender of the state to the opponents of the proletariat. This would mean that in the event of strikes the power of the state would always be used against labour. Secondly, the syndicalists underestimate the strength of capitalism in their belief that they can wear out the owners in the war of attrition. It is true that in recent times, the general strike has shown itself not to be merely a myth, but it is also true that the general strike does not by any means introduce the social revolution, which the syndicalists proclaimed as its inevitable consequence.

Finally, even if the workers succeed in vanquishing capitalism and in taking over industry, they would feel that they had destroyed the substance for which they had been fighting. The victory would turn out to be an illusion because the industry would be in ruins. To sum up, in the words of Merriam and Barnes, "The syndicalists have in reality fundamentally adopted the philosophy of militarism and it is the philosophy of militarism, which, more than capitalism, threatens to ruin the world".

6.1.3. MARXISM

As the curse of exploiting capitalism became a challenge to the very existence of those, who had no capital, new "isms" rose to remedy the evils; one of the 'isms' is communism or revolutionary socialism or scientific socialism. Defining communism is a difficult task, though it is easy to enumerate the basic principles of "communism". Confusion regarding the meaning of the term 'Communism' is increased by the indiscriminate way in which it has been mixed up with terms like 'socialism'. Let us observe at the outset that communism is a form of socialism.

While all communists are socialists, all socialists are no communists. In the 19th century the terms socialism and communism, were more or less

regarded as synonymous; the term communism was not widely used during the period 1848-1918. In Soviet Russia, Lenin's revolutionary followers called themselves communists, and broke away from socialists. Soviet Russia is called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; the term communist has been avoided. It is believed that socialism is a prelude to communism. The ideology of communism favours state ownership of the means of production and equal distribution of wealth. The term Communism has often been used as identical with socialism as was done by Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels in the 'Communist Manifesto'.

Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels gave a new turn to the socialist movement. Their philosophy made socialism an exceptionally strong current of thought, and a terrific movement, which rocked the world of capitalism. Unlike the thought of the British and French socialists their principles gave rise to much violence and bloodshed. It is necessary to make a clear difference between socialism as preached by Robert Owen and socialism as advocated by Marx and Engels. The concept evolved by the former can be called Democratic Socialism and that of the latter, communism.

Democratic socialists do not have any high priest to whose name reference can be made. William Ebenstein points out, "Socialist literature in England has no Marx or Lenin who lays down the law for all time. The most influential socialist thinkers in England have frequently been without any official position of party or government, and their impact has been due primarily to their moral authority and felicitous literary style". On the other hand communists in Russia and China always refer to their high priests; he may be Marx, Engels, Lenin or Mao Tse-tung. Democratic Socialists do not refer to such authorities or develop the cult of the individual. Similarly one does not find in the rank of democratic socialists, the type of fanaticism so common among the communists. Democratic socialism tolerates or even respects the opinion of others, but totalitarian Communism seeks to wipe out any opposition in a violent manner. Democratic Socialism is mild and evolutionary, whereas scientific socialism or communism is violent and revolutionary.

In the words of F.W.Coker, "Though socialism has its definite origin principally in the works of Karl Marx, many of the basic economic doctrine of Marxian Socialism, however are to be found in the writing several decades earlier, notably in the works of William Thomson, Thomas Hodgskin, John Gray, John Francis Bray, and other British writers". The teachings of Karl Marx move round a few basic principles. namely, Dialectical materialism, the Materialistic interpretation of History, The theory of Surplus value, Class war, Concentration of Capital, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Withering away of the State and Religion as the opium of the people.

6.1.4. SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM

Science is a systematic study of any branch of knowledge. In positive sciences, the method that is followed is the inductive method. Positive scientists, to begin with, collect data. After collecting data they derive a hypothesis. Finally, an experiment is conducted to test the validity of the hypothesis. If the experiment confirms the hypothesis, it becomes a scientific law. If it does not it continues to be a hypothesis. Indeed, there are other variations of the scientific method, but all of them heavily rely on experiment.

But experiment is not possible in subjects pertaining to social relations. Neither in economics nor in politics can we afford to conduct experiments to prove or disprove a hypothesis. In any social science, therefore what all we can do is to collect data and then infer hypothesis. Then the hypotheses are made use of to understand social problems. It does not mean that the hypothesis of social sciences can be applied everywhere. ; Neither does it mean that the application of the hypothesis can give precise conclusions. What all we can do with the help of hypothesis in social sciences is to analyse a given situation and then know the tendencies of society. These tendencies can never be precisely known.

Marx examines the political, economic and social aspects of life. As the subject matters of his examination are not fit for conducting experiments, whatever Marx has laid down are in the form of hypotheses. The analytical tools laid down by him being hypotheses, they can never give precise conclusions but only trends or tendencies relating to human life.

While examining the appropriateness of the word 'scientific' to the socialism of Marx we have to know in brief his philosophy. The starting point for Marx is the dialectic. According to this term, social change is inevitable and it proceeds by the clash of thesis and anti-thesis. Such a clash can be between ideas, but with Marx the clash is materialistic. By this term Marx means that historical developments of all social institutions are driven by the dialectic of matter. By matter Marx means the economic factor. All ideas and institutions, be they political, religious or social, constitute the super-structure of the sub-structure and are thus, based on the economic factor. In analyzing the sub-structure further, Marx maintains that it is made up of the conflict between the Haves and the Have-nots. This is true of every stage in history. Whoever controls the means of production, the Haves automatically control the super-structure. State, therefore, is only an instrument in the hands of the Haves.

At the time Marx wrote all these things, the means of production were controlled by the capitalists as opposed to the proletariat. Taking the given situation, Marx maintained that the proletariat would take over the means of production just as the Haves took over control for the means of production in the past. Marx concluded from this analysis that those who controlled the means of production set up their own values in art, morals and politics apart from monopolizing the political power. From this, we derive two conclusions. The values or norms of life that govern society at any time serve the interests of the economically predominant class. Secondly, State is a tool in the hands of the economically predominant class.

In order to assess whether Marx is a genuine scientist or not, we have to bear in mind that he has to be assessed as a social scientist. Whoever is assessed for being a social scientist or not should be judged whether he is dogmatic regarding his hypotheses or not.

After examining the enormous data that he had collected Marx arrived at the ideas contained in the above exposition. In collecting data, he was definitely a scientist. The conclusions that he arrived at are to be treated as

hypotheses but not as laws, because Marx himself stated so. In other words, wherever Marx explains any process or law, he always qualifies it. ; When he maintains that society is divided into two classes he clearly states that there cannot be two sharply divided classes at any given time in society and there are enough stragglers who do not belong to either of the camps. If he felt like a positive scientist, he would not have qualified his conclusions in the above manner.

In treating history too, Marx maintains the same spirit. According to him, history was determined by the conflict between two classes, but he did not apply this tool rigidly to the historical data of the past. What all he maintained was that the economic factor was the most important factor in determining history, but not the sole factor. After Marx's death, Engels conceded that Marx and he were partly guilty of over-emphasizing the economic factor. If Marx viewed his historical materialism in a very precise manner, like a positive scientist, he would not have conceded that there was something more than class conflict to the history of mankind.

Marx refuses to portray the nature of the communist society. He does not permit his imagination to draw a picture of the future because he is a scientific scholar not a story-teller. Even on the nature of State, during the transitory period between capitalism and communism, he has nothing to say. If he was carried away by his imagination, he would have definitely discussed at great length the nature of the proletarian dictatorship. The very fact that he does not venture to do so indicates that basically he adopts the scientific attitude towards the examination of the subjects that he undertakes. Finally, while talking of the role of the party, he is not rigid in maintaining that workers alone should constitute the communist party. This point, too, goes to prove that he is not dogmatic but is ever ready to modify his conclusions as there cannot be any positive laws pertaining to human behaviour.

Marx foresees the coming of communism not as a dogmatist but as a scientist. The enormous data which he examined clearly indicated that the future trends would be in favour of communism. More than one hundred States, have kept planning and socialism as the goals. In the rest of the world,

some countries are conceptually Welfare States while the rest have been striving to increase welfare activities without claiming themselves to be Welfare States. This picture of the world today is a homage to what Marx foresaw, particularly as Marx claims that he is no Marxist, we have to admit that what the world presents today is definitely a tribute to foresight of Marx as a social scientist.

Indeed, Marx often uses the word 'law' in analyzing the situation and also in foreseeing the shape of things to come. But the word 'law' should not be treated as the scientific law but as the normative. No normative law is fully accurate but only conveys the probability of a thing. At this stage one might object that Marx does argue in an unscientific manner that the role of philosophies had been only interpretation till his time and in the future it should be capable of changing society. When Marx airs this view he complains against the poverty of philosophers till then. After all, society is not subject to scientific laws at any time. If society is so pliable there is no necessity for philosophers making efforts to change it. Marx definitely does not mean that philosophers alone could change society in the future. What all he maintains is that philosophy should play more of an active role in the changing society, particularly because he was proud of the fact that he had discovered tendencies that shape the course of events in society.

Too often Marx refers to inevitability of changes and mankind reaching a perfect society. Although he backs up these two contentions by his arguments, it is beyond doubt that Marx was influenced by the belief of the age that it was progressing towards perfection. The belief that progress is inevitable is the unscientific assumption in Marx's philosophy.

In the end, it has to be considered that although the approach of Marx is scientific in the sense of a social scientist, he does not give proper placing to the role of science in society. Marx himself does not venture to explain that the development of science could be explained according to dialectical materialism although some attempts were made by Lenin and his followers. Nowadays, science has so enormously grown that it has been tremendously influencing our life. By no stretch of imagination can we call the impact of

science to be purely economic. To say that the economic factor is a determining factor of today would be missing much of the real working of society as it is.

6.2. THE AGE OF KARL MARX

Karl Marx, German philosopher of history and the most important figure in the history of socialist thinking was born on May, 5, 1818. He studied history and philosophy. The fundamental basis of Marxist thought is the Hegelian dialectic. The communist Manifesto, which was published in February, 1848 contains a summary of Marx's whole social philosophy.

To understand the problem of Marx, it is necessary to have an idea of the age in which he lived. The age in which he was writing was one of great physical and technical achievement. It was an age in which religion was no longer exercising its former appeal and the world had grown colder in consequence. It was an age in which the products of technical achievement were very unevenly spread, an age of growing wealth for many and, so it seemed of increasing mystery for more. It was an age in which civilization was not as impressive as technical achievement. Marx said that the bourgeois civilization had snapped all bonds between man and man except naked self-interest and callous cash payment. The widening disparities of wealth only reflected the growing chasm between theory and practice of morals. Deepening class antagonism within each nation and national rivalries had generated ever-increasing tensions.

Marx's task was, therefore, to reveal to the workers their actual place in modern society and the part played in the capitalist system. He also wanted to show the wage earners the necessity of overthrowing the existing economic order. His revolutionary call to the worker was: "The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of the World unite".

6.2.1. MARX AND ENGELS

Marx and Engels were original in the synthesis they formulated, not in its component elements. In the words of Massimo Salvadori, "As in other movements linked to influential thinkers there is a distinction between the

position formulated by the founders and the simpler one of the followers, which became known as Marxism”.

Marxist theory is the doctrine and programme of scientific socialism. It is a political theory because it deals with the class structure of society in which the state is the executive committee of the economically dominant class. It is an economic theory because it is critique of the capitalist mode of production, the exploitation of labour, etc. It is also a revolutionary programme in the sense that it is an analysis of the tactics of class struggle, the emergence of the proletarian dictatorship, etc.

According to Massimo Salvadori, Marxism can be summarized sketchily in a few major propositions:

Only matter is reality, there is neither spirit nor transcendence; ideas and emotions are induced by the economic conditions in which human beings – who are entirely mouldable – live.

Mankind's unit is the economic class, formed by those who share the same relationship with the means of production and exchange; what counts is the group, thus there is no individual autonomy and no individual responsibility.

The dialectical process is the law of the universe; the law is inexorable and men cannot modify it but can accelerate or slow it where it affects them, according to their level of comprehension.

The class struggle is the manifestation of the dialectical process in human affairs, it is the outcome of the forcible appropriation by parasites (warriors, aristocrats, priests, later on capitalists) of the wealth created by toilers, to whom is left what is barely enough for their survival.

The next step in the dialectical process will be the replacement of capitalism first with socialism and then with communism, of private with collective ownership of property, of competition with co-operation, of production for profit with production for service.

The step is inevitable because of the capitalist's concentration of wealth, the toilers (now the proletariat's) increasing poverty and the growing tension between capitalists and toilers which will erupt into violence.

Having seized the state, the proletariat will set up its dictatorship and will use the state for the establishment of collectivism and the realization of socialism.

Once production, rationally conducted, has reached the level enabling all to satisfy their needs (communism) the state will wither away and liberty will be total; the dialectical process having been completed, peace also will be total.

6.2.2. DIALECTICAL MATERIALISM:

The principal element of Marxism is the Dialectical materialism. It is in essence a method of searching for truth in which two persons of contradictory opinion take part. The first makes a statement – the thesis. The second produces objections to the thesis - the antithesis. The two expositors then try to arrive at a position that combines the unassailable truths of both the positions and thus transform them into a new and higher truth – the synthesis. Then the synthesis becomes the thesis for another triadic voyage of discovery.

The dialectical method is a legacy from Socrates and Plato. Hegel took over the concept of dialectics from Plato. Marx adopted the dialectical method of Hegel. But he did not accept the whole of Hegel's philosophy.

In the dialectical materialism of Marx, the vital energy within matter, inevitably drives it towards perfect human society. Marx rejected the old materialism because it was 'mechanical, it was also non-historical and non-dialectical. Further, it merely interpreted the world, whereas Marx wanted to change the world. Therefore, Marx wanted to use the dialectical principle to change the world for the better. According to him the dialectical principle is of universal application in as much as all development is the 'struggle opposites'. The clash of the opposites, thesis and antithesis, would go on and on and this dynamic process will continue by a series of victories of the new over the old,

until, the perfect goal has been achieved. Marx defines dialectics as, “the science of the general laws of motion, both of the external world and of human thought”. On the one hand he believes in historical materialism and on the other hand in dialectical materialism. The two concepts are coupled by Marx by the argument of class struggle that is to say, that there is a sequence in history of successive stages dominated by successive means of production, controlled by successive classes. Thus, the pattern of history is drawn by class struggles. This is the heart of dialectical materialism. In the Communist Manifesto the necessity for the dialectical process is argued. Marx shows that human societies have developed dialectically because of the interactions between the continually changing methods by which men have performed the most essential business of their lives. Dialectics show that no system is permanent and that every historically developed social form is in fluid movement. In short the dialectical principle (thesis, antithesis, synthesis) is applied to social struggle between the bourgeoisie (thesis), the proletariat (antithesis) leading to the classless society (negation of negation – synthesis). The dialectical principle is related to the ultimate breakdown of the capitalist system. All history is a history of class conflict. The struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is relentless and in this struggle, the dialectical principle shows that the bourgeoisie will go asunder and the expropriators shall be expropriated. C.L. Waper remarks, “No stage will end until it has become a better rather than a spur to the forces inherent in any society developed completely before a change takes place and the change itself be sudden as when water turns into steam. In that sudden revolutionary change, the entire structure of society will be eventually transformed, until the new society in its turn is overthrown and remoulded”. It follows that each stage is a step nearer perfection and the major historical transitions are brought about abruptly when forced by changes in modes of production.

To Hegel, dialectics meant something more than compromise, criticism or development by stages. The dialectics may be defined as the theory of the union of the opposites. It means discussion and debate with a view to arrive at the truth. According to Hegel every proposition has a subject and a predicate. But every predicate proves on examination to be incomplete or self-contradictory.

Marx has accepted the laws of dialectics formulated by Hegel. The first is the law of transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa. Marx argues that monopoly capitalism or imperialism has not come into existence by a gradual process out of pro-monopoly capitalism. But it is the last stage beyond which it cannot grow. Having come into existence it takes a dialectical leap and passes into socialism. The second law which Marx accepted is the law of unit of opposites. To explain the evolution of society Marx uses the contradictions that existed in the society. The third law of Hegelian dialectics which Marx accepted is the law of the negation of negation. This law asserts that thesis, antithesis and the synthesis are the stages of development. Marx made use of the Hegelian dialectics. The internal contradictions of feudalism lead to its negation,— capitalism. But the contradictions in capitalism lead to socialism which is the negation of negation.

In his effort to discover the method of changing society Marx found the dialectic method of Hegel as highly suggestive and useful. But he could not take over the Hegelian dialectic in its entirety, Marx says in *Das Capital*. “My own dialectical method is not only fundamentally different from the Hegelian dialectic method, but it is its very opposite. For Hegel, the thought process is the demi-urge of the Real and for him the Real is only the outward manifestation of the idea. In my view, on the other hand, the idea is nothing other than the material when it has been transposed and translated inside the human brain”. The main points of difference between the Hegelian and the Marxian dialectic deserve to be noted. According to Hegel the History of human civilization is, “a succession of national cultures in which each nation brings its particular and timely contribution to the whole human achievement” (Sabine). The historical development takes place under the stress of conflicts between nations, and its moving forces are ideas. According to Marx, on the other hand, the units into which mankind gets divided in the course of historical development are economic classes, and not nations. The thesis, antithesis and synthesis of Marxian dialectic concern economic classes and its moving force is materialism and not ideas. The difference can be traced to the fact that for Hegel, the universal substance is Spirit. For Marx, it is matter.

For Hegel, the inevitable goal for which the spirit moves is the idea fully conscious of itself. For Marx the inevitable goal is the classless society perfectly organized for production. In the case of both Hegel and Marx, dialectics retains a strong element of mysticism.

As he writes in the preface to the second edition of *Das Capital*, “In Hegel’s writings, dialectic stands on its head; you must turn it right way up again, if you want to discover the rational kernel that is hidden away within the trappings of mystifications”. In this passage Marx claims to have taken the rational kernel contained in the Hegelian dialectic and made the latter intelligible by turning it right way up.

6.2.3. MATERIALISTIC INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY:

The historical materialism does not constitute a novel discovery by Marx. Laski remarks, “Historical materialism is as old as Aristotle”. Materialistic interpretation of History or Historical materialism is another basic principle of Marxism. Marx applied the principle of dialectical materialism to the interpretation of History. According to Marx economic conditions determine historical phenomena. Man must eat to live and his life depends upon the measure of success with which he produces. Production of wealth is the most important human activity. Marx does not insist that the economic motive is the sole explanation of human behaviour, but he does maintain that every fundamental historical development, regardless of its character on the surface, is the result of changes in methods of production and the property relation prevailing at the particular time.

Marx differs radically from the Utopian Socialist thinkers Saint Simon, Fourier and Proudhon. They seek some basis of the stability of social order in non-economic justice. But Marx, on the contrary, insists on the necessity of a class war. Marx emphatically maintains that, “the transition from one system of production to the other is necessarily marked by violent revolution”. In the words of L.W.Lancaster, “The materialistic conception of history starts from the Principle that production, and with production, the exchange of its products, is the basis of every social order; that in every society which has appeared in history the distribution of the products, and within the division of

society into classes or estates is determined by what is produced, and how it is produced, and how the product is exchanged". Thus the historical materialism maintains that in all stages of human life, the forms or conditions of production determine the structure of society.

Marx speaks of four stages through which production passes. The first stage is the primitive communist stage where the means of the production are owned by the community. Ancient stage is the second stage where the owners of slaves and of the means of production get everything that is substantial, and the poor and slaves who means of production get everything that is substantial, and the poor and slaves who receive very little form the exploited lot. The third stage is the Feudal stage in which the feudal baron owns land, the important means of production and exploits the serfs. The fourth stage is the Capitalist stage. Here the capitalist owns all important means of production and makes the workers wage-slaves. Society thus goes through these different stages to ultimately reach a stage of classless society. Each stage is better than the earlier one. The mental attitude of the people is the product of material conditions. Religion and law are also determined by the same conditions.

6.2.4. CAPITALIST ORDER:

Marx condemns capitalism as a system of un-freedom. The capitalist order is characterized by instability and flux caused by the business cycle and the modes of production due to scientific and technological advances. Its life breath is its need for a constantly expanding market for its products, resulting in the growth of world trade, colonization of backward areas, imperialism and urbanization. This leads to the existence of monopolies, which in its turn leads to the concentration of means of production in fewer hands. This concentration of economic power makes the way for concentration of political power. Thus the capitalist class makes use of the state as an instrument of oppression and exploitation. Thus at every stage there are broadly two classes – the exploiters and the exploited. History presents nothing but the record of war between classes. Every exploiting class at each stage gives rise to an opposite class. Hence thesis and antithesis can be noted. Capitalism contains within itself the seeds of its own destruction. Big Business, the thesis creates Big Labour, the anti – thesis. Capitalism will be overthrown by the proletariat

and there will emerge a stage of socialism which is only transitional. The dictatorship of the proletariat will make use of the state to suppress the friends of capitalism and enemies of proletariat. Ultimately, a stage will come where there will be no state at all but there will be only a classless society. Every stage of history which fails to achieve the stage of perfect production carries within it the seeds of its own destruction. Until the classless society has been attained, societies will be short lived.

6.2.5. THEORY OF SURPLUS VALUE:

The theory of Surplus Value is another important contribution of Marx. This theory is an extension of Ricardo's theory, which considers the value of every commodity to be in proportion to the quantity of labour contained in it, provided this labour corresponds to the existing standards of efficiency of production. Labour power equals the brain, muscle and nerve of the labourer. Human labour alone is the creator of all real economic value. Though the labourer is the real creator of value the capitalist does not pay him his full due, but only a part of it. Labour creates two values necessary and surplus. The wage paid to the labourer is the necessary value. The difference between the value of a commodity and the actual payment made to the labourer represents surplus value. This illegal income of the capitalist is called profit. Surplus value is called 'concealed labour' by Marx. 'Capital creates nothing, but is itself created by labour. However the worker does not receive a just share of the value his drudgery or skill creates'. The exploitation of the worker is measured by the amount of this surplus value. The greater the exploitation of the worker the higher is the surplus value.

Marx says that from the point of view of the process of production, the capital is of two kinds, namely, the constant capital and the variable capital. Constant capital includes machinery, raw materials etc. Variable capital is the one expended on labour power. To express the degree of exploitation of labour power by capital surplus value must be compared only with the variable capital. Suppose 'A builds a house at the cost of Rs.25,000. Of this amount Rs. 20,000 is spent on material, etc., and Rs.5,000 on wages. On completion 'A' sells the house for Rs. 50,000. The profit out of this sale deed is Rs. 25,000. This 'Profit is the result of the expenditure of Rs. 5,000 which was paid to the

labour. The rate of surplus value in this case is 500%. The doctrine of Surplus Value powerfully proclaims that a competitive system in which human labour is treated as a commodity is self-destructive, and that, as Engels observes, “the only salvation is socialism, which will emancipate human labour-power from its position as a commodity”. The economic analysis of the nature of capitalism and the doctrine of surplus value along with the theory of dialectical materialism constitute Marx’s greatest and most significant contribution to scientific socialism.

6.3. THEORY OF CLASS STRUGGLE:

Closely connected with Materialistic interpretation of History is the Marxian theory of Class Struggle. If the former may be said to contain his theory of social change, the latter may be regarded as describing its mechanism, Marx holds that every society comes to be divided into two opposed, and hostile classes. By classes Marx meant economic classes. i.e., groups having distinct roles in the production, distribution or exchange of goods.

The communist manifesto begins: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle”. The land owner exploits the landless, and the factory owner exploits the worker. Between the classes, there is hatred and antagonism. Capitalist society is, therefore, a class society. All action is, therefore, class action. Class therefore, is the agent of social change, Marx observes, ‘Freedom’ and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journey man, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried of an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended either in revolutionary reconstitution or in the common ruin of the contending classes. The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society did not do away with class antagonism. It has established new classes, new conditions of oppression new forms of struggle in the place of the old one. This class struggle after traversing all other phases, at last, reaches its simplest phase, when, the capitalist class confronts the proletariat. Capitalism, the thesis, calls into being its antithesis, the organized labour, and from the clash between the two, the final synthesis, the classless society will emerge.

Marx speaks of two forms of struggles, namely, economic struggle and political struggle. The economic struggle is waged for increased wages, a shorter working day and better conditions of work. The workers have to wage political struggle against the whole class of capitalists and against the government that supports that class. Marx says that the workers must have a proletarian political party which will educate them in the ideas of socialism and will guide the mass working class movement. Economic and political forms of struggle are not ends in themselves; they are means to the end which is freedom exploitation. Marx says that, “The class struggle is the mainspring of events”.

6.3.1. DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT:

‘Marx also speaks of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The term ‘dictatorship’ is used by Marx to mean ‘revolution – the use of force’. It meant the actual revolution of the proletariat – “The proletariat organized as the dominating class”, which used its own force to dissolve the state and defeat its enemies. The ultimate aim will be to bring about a classless society. In the transitional period, the dictatorship of the proletariat will seize all capitalist property, abolish all rights of inheritance and centralize means of transport and communication. According to Marx, these measures are the foundation of true democratic institutions. It will be a working class government with new legislative authority, resting on the organized economic power of the working class, a new proletarian judiciary with a new socialist system of laws and there will be universal suffrage. The working formula of the proletarian state shall be “From each according to his capacity, to each according to his work”.

6.3.2. VIEWS ON RELIGION:

“The criticism of religion”, Marx said, “is the beginning of all criticism. According to Marx, Man makes religion; religion does not make man..... Religion is the sign of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world. And the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people”. He linked religion with capitalist exploitation. Capitalist exploiters use religion as a cover to conceal their methods of exploitation. Religion,

according to Marx, is the capitalist tool to deceive the masses of people. As a handmaid of exploiters, religion stands condemned. Religion is a bulwark of social injustice and inequality. As Marx stood for the political and economic emancipation of man, he advocated man's liberation from the fear of the unknown, from the terrors of religion. He did not preach atheism or immorality. He only advocated a 'correct understanding' of the role played by religion in the society.

6.3.3. THEORY OF ALIENATION:

Marx view of religion is related to his concept of alienation. Marx relates the notion of alienation to man's work and his feeling about it and says that human beings have been alienated from the product of their work. The buyers of the products do not think of the persons who created them. Marx says that men have become materially estranged from what they originally were. This alienation of man from his work is a result of the fragmentation of the working process through division of labour. Marx does not wish to return to medieval methods of production. But he believes that modern technology when freed from the curse of profiteering will liberate modern man.

6.3.4. THEORY OF STATE:

Marxist theory of state is not simple and monolithic. In the Communist Manifesto he calls the state, "a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie". Political Power is "merely the organized power of one class for opposing another".

With the help of the State the economically dominant class consolidates social system to its advantage. In relation to the exploiting class, it acts as the guardian of their economic interests. In relation to the exploited class it acts as an instrument of suppression and coercion. In relation of other states it acts as a sword to kill the competing exploiters. Thus, the state is the result of class contradictions.

Marx says that the state apparatus can be used both in the capitalist order and in the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The capitalist state acts in the interest of the ruling class, whereas the proletarian state acts in the interest of the working class. Marx theory of state is flexible. To Marx the

state is not the solution of all things; it is the hard core of the enemy which must be destroyed. As soon as the dictatorship of the proletariat is set up, the process of the withering of the state will begin. Marx says that ultimately the state will wither away. The complete disappearance of the state marks the zenith of Marxian Socialism.

6.3.5. MERITS OF MARXISM:

1) A Tremendous Force: It is strange yet true, that Marx was unwittingly supported by exploiting capitalists themselves through their obduracy and refusal to change their way. Had capitalists in the nineteenth century followed the enlightened and benevolent path chalked out by Robert Owen, Marxism would not have grown so very rapidly. The Capitalists refused to make compromise with the workers, as they failed to see the writing on the wall. They went on exploiting the workers in the name of individualism. Violent was the reaction against capitalist stubbornness. Though Marx himself did not engineer a real revolution, he provided sufficient combustible material for the Russian and Chinese Revolutions. As Marx said, exploiting capitalism carries with it seeds of its own destruction.

2) Hope to workers: At a time Owenism could not cut much ice in the countries in which workers were shamelessly and mercilessly exploited and workers were in need of a great leader, Karl Marx emerged to give a clarion call to workers of the world to unite. His call to the workers was : “The workers have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of the world unite”. Though his teachings had serious flaws, they inspired hope in the underdog, when there seemed to be no hope at all.

3) Clear cut Theory: Marx provided a clear cut theory, which could not be given by leaders of democratic socialism. The theory could be easily understood by workers. The theory which was highly favourable to workers could capture their imagination, particularly in countries in which government and capitalists ground down the have-nots.

4) Terror to exploiters: Capitalist all over the world found Marxism, a nightmare. In the words of Marx and Engels “A spectre is haunting Europe,

the spectre of communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exercise this spectra: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police spies. "Marxism had a sobering effect on capitalists as an exploiting class. All over the world got relief either through a revolution or through reforms introduced by capitalists. Countries which dread communism as plague are trying to fight against in by winning the support of the people through social welfare-activities.

6.3.6. DEMERITS OF MARXISM:

1) Non-economic factors ignored: The materialistic interpretation of history considers the non-economic factors like political conditions, religion, language, art and science as insignificant. Marxian approach to history is very narrow and is absolutely prejudiced in favour of material conditions of life. While it can be admitted that economic conditions are of great importance, it is wrong to say that there is nothing outside them in the life of the individual or in the history of a country.

2) Class War concept misleading: The theory of class war is also incorrect and misleading. To Marx, history is nothing but a record of wars between haves and the have-nots. The concept of class war is artificial, and it is more aimed at capturing the worker's mind than at providing a true theory regarding social relations. It is hardly possible to find in the history of the world only two classes with an unbridgeable gulf between them.

3) 'Surplus Value' Wrong: The theory of Surplus Value also can be criticized strongly. It gives too much importance to labour and ignores other factors of production like land, capital and organization. The theory is best calculated to serve propaganda ends. It flatters the workers wrongly and does gross injustice to other agents of production.

4) State not Obstructive: It is also wrong to say that the state is used as an instrument of oppression and exploitation. Of course it may be true that those in power may abuse the power to serve their own ends. But it is grossly incorrect to say that the state is not a creative force but an obstructive

agency. In modern times governments implementing social welfare schemes have proved, beyond doubt that the state is there to protect the people, to provide security to life and property and to promote their welfare and happiness.

5) State not withering: According to Marx the state will ultimately wither away. Such a condition can better be imagined than realized. In fact, developments in Soviet Russia and Communist China have shown that the State has become all powerful and the individual risks his life and liberty in criticizing its power.

6) Injustice to Religion: Marx does great injustice to religion. Instead of criticizing the weakness of those, who have put religion to the wrong use Marx hits out at religion itself. In the life of every individual and of every nation, religion when rightly used has acted as an elevating, and ennobling force. Marxism makes human beings attach too much importance to materialism, and ignores the spiritual and ethical values of life. It is ant-religious and atheistic.

7) Gospel of Hatred: Through dialectical materialism, historical interpretation, and class war, Marx generated hatred and fanaticism every where. Blinded by fanaticism, followers of Marx talk in terms of class –war and the elimination of the capitalists and the bourgeoisie. Marxism gives no quarter to tolerance, but preaches hatred against the employers, the well-to-do people and the government. Its attitude is cynical and tactics violent and subversive.

8) An Estimate: Karl Marx is regarded as the father of modern socialism because he not only sketched the kind of society that ought to be established, but also prepared a programme of action. Marx was the first intellectually eminent economist to consider the facts of economics from the standpoint of the proletariat.

Marx predicted that the proletariat revolution would occur in industrial society. But it was in Russia, a predominantly agrarian country that the revolution first took place. The Russian Revolution owes much to Marx.

Check your
progress questions

4. Examine the
theory of class
struggle

5. Write short
notes on
Dictatorship of
proletariat.

Whether one agrees with Karl Marx or not one has to recognize the tremendous effect which his teachings had over millions of people all over the world. In summing up Marx's contribution, C.L. Wayper says that (a) the existence of classes is only bound up with the particular historic phases in the development of production, (b) the class struggle necessarily leads to dictatorship of proletariat, (c) that this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of all classes and hence to a classless society. The doctrine of historical materialism is not a cut and dried formula capable of mechanical application, but a working hypothesis, a method of investigation. It may help the student of history to understand the pattern of the past and to tentatively predict the course of the future. The economic analysis of the nature of capitalism and the doctrine of surplus value along with the theory of dialectical materialism constitute Marx's greatest and most significant contribution to scientific socialism. In the words of C.L. Wayer, "For the power of his message, for the inspiration of his place in any collection of the world's great masters of political thought".

6.4. SUMMARY:

This unit attempts to study the theory syndicalism and also it provides details to know Marxism it analysis the theory of scientific socialism Karl Marx and engels contribution to Marxism.

6.5. KEYWORDS:

Syndicalism	-	a labour movement advocating transfer of ownership
Dialectical	-	logic dealing with reasoning
Alienation	-	estrangement, transferring ownership
Proletant	-	working class of people

6.6. CHECK YOUR PROGRESS QUESTION AND ANSWER:

For question No. 1	-	Reference Section No. 6.1.
For question No. 2	-	Reference Section No. 6.1.4
For question No. 3	-	Reference Section No. 6.2.2
For question No. 4	-	Reference Section No. 6.3.
For question No. 5	-	Reference Section No. 6.3.1

6.7. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:

Hyde, Douglas: Communism Today

Mark, Max: Modern (Gillamac)

Ideologies (St. James press London)

Coker, Recent Political Thought (A.C.C. or World Press)

6.8. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES:

1. State and criticise the syndicalist theory of state.
2. Explain the term "Scientific Socialism".
3. Give an estimate of Karl Marx's contribution to political theory.
4. Evaluate the theory of Marxism.

Unit -7

LENINISM

INTRODUCTION:

It is said that “Marx and Engels turned Socialism from utopia into a science. Lenin translated the theory of socialism into life. Marx and Engels gave the theoretical grounds for the role of the working class in world history. Lenin led the working class to power and founded a state of workers and peasants. He bequeathed to the working people the science of building socialism. On the basis of new international experiences, Lenin enriched Marxism with great ideas and generalizations and laid down theoretical guidelines for the revolutionary struggle of working class”.

Quite a number of social theories have emerged in this century. Some have gone unnoticed. Others were short-lived. But Marxism-Leninism has been ever more strikingly “confirmed” and has become ever more widespread. There has been a growth in the number of its followers. It is said Leninism “has been embodied in actual social practice in an increasing number of countries”. More or less every literate person in the world knows the name of Lenin to-day.

Lenin succeeded in establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia. But he himself did not belong to that class. His real name was Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov. He was known in exile as Nikolai Lenin and today simply Lenin. His father was a government inspector of schools in Simbirsk Gubernia. Born on April 22, 1870, Lenin has never shared the pangs of misery of the working class or the peasant. On the other hand he had good formal education and enjoyed comfort in his earlier years.

OBJECTIVES:

By study this unit the students will

- a - know the origin of Russian Marxism
- b – Understand the concept Leninism and state
- c – Analyse the Lenin’s views about war communism

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Lenin's life

Czar abdication

Lenin's contribution to the growth of Marxism

Lenin's view about state

War Communism

Lenin and social sciences

Lenin and democracy

Summary

Key words

Check your progress question and answer

Books for further reading

Question and Exercises

7.1. LENIN'S LIFE:

A determining crisis in Lenin's life came in 1887, when he was very young. His beloved brother Alexander was hanged for being involved in the activities of a terrorist organisation against Czar. At the age of 18 Lenin became a socialist and began to read Marx's works. When he was studying law in the University of Kazan, Lenin was expelled for having participated in a student's demonstration against the Dean. However he was allowed to take his examination at the University of St. Petersburg and graduated in 1891. He practiced law for a short time in Samara. In 1894 he joined a larger group of Marxists. There he met his future wife and faithful collaborator, N.K.Krupskaya. He went abroad in the summer of 1895 and exchanged views with leading Russian Marxist exiles. Back in Russia he founded another small clandestine group. In December 1895 he was arrested and sent to Siberia by the authorities of the Czarist regime. He was released in 1900. He left for Geneva and joined the Russian Social Democratic Labour Party (RSDLP) along with the other Marxist exiles. During the period between 1900-1917 he spent most of the years in western Europe. He wrote a revolutionary pamphlet-What is to be done? (1902). In it he clearly marked out the goal, communism and outlined the strategy to be followed to attain it. During the Revolution of 1917 Lenin was present in Russia.

7.1.1. CZAR ABODICATION:

In March 1917 the Czar abdicated and the Mensheviks formed the provisional government under the leadership of Alexander Kerensky. Soon after in November 1917 the Menshevik government was overthrown by the Bolsheviks who were led by Lenin and Trotsky. According to Massimo Salvadori, “the success of the Russian revolution was as important as Lenin’s interpretation of Marx in forging 20th century communism the events of those years have since been an inspiration, an example and a guide of action for communists everywhere. The institution, an example and a guide of action for communists everywhere. The institutions established in Russia and the strategy and tactics and his policies have been ardently followed the party, the Soviets, the Cheka, the Red Army, Terror, economic “War communism” and the NEP were the tools used by the Bolsheviks to achieve and keep power”.

Following the conclusion of the Brest Treaty Lenin evolved a programme for Russia’s socialist reconstruction. “We have won Russia from the rich for the poor, from the exploiters for the working people. Now we must administer Russia”. Lenin wrote soon after the revolution. So the chief task facing the Bolshevik party and the Soviet people then was to administer and build up the undertaking. The tasks outlined were “the further socialization of the means of production, laying of the economic ground work for a socialist emulation, the strengthening of labour discipline, the promotion of initiative and a creative attitude to work and a steady effort to increase labour productivity”-For achieving those ends they used the same slogans, justly scorned by the revolutionary proletariat when the bourgeoisie used them to conceal its rule as an exploiting class.

7.1.2. LENIN’S CONTRIBUTION TO THE GROWTH OF MARXISM:

To understand and appreciate Lenin’s Contribution to the growth of Marxism, we have to necessarily go back a little in Russian history and take note of the various circumstances.

At first sight Russia was hardly the land suitable for revolution. In the mid-nineteenth century Russia had been a byword for reaction and was still basically medieval. Although the serfs had been emancipated in 1861, Russia

continued to be an underdeveloped agrarian society. Nevertheless a few intellectuals were influenced by developments in Western Europe, which were viewed as a model for Russian progress. The autocratic, centralized nature of the state and the lack of industrial development meant that the revolutionary movement, in Russia tended to be composed exclusively of intellectuals who relied more on moral fervor and rhetoric than on systematic, critical detailed analysis.

The most radical of these revolutionary movements was populism, whose most powerful attachment was to the people of Russia and the people's power to regenerate the nation. The populists were mainly concerned with the defence of the Russian peasant commune, firstly against capitalism and secondly as a basis for a socialist society in Russia. As for tactics, there were two different opinions among the populists. Some of them believed in the self-emancipation of the people and the others in the necessity of attacking the autocracy directly through small groups of terrorists.

Although Marxism as an active force inside Russia only emerged with the reawakening of social and political activity following the disastrous famine of 1890, a small group of Russian Marxists had been established in Geneva as early as 1883. It was called the Group for the Emancipation of Labour. One of three members of the group Georgy Plekhanov was the first Russian to embrace Marxism and was also the undisputed intellectual leader of the Russian Marxists until the turn of the century and educator of a whole generation of revolutionaries. His *Monist View of History*, published in 1884, was the first systematic exposition of historical materialism in Russia. It presented Marxism as the inheritor of all the positive tendencies inherent in French eighteenth-century materialism, Utopian socialism and German idealism. Plekhanov's most important contribution was the laying down of an orthodox Marxist perspective for the development of the revolution in Russia. He saw no fundamental difference between Russia and the West. According to him Russia was in some sense already a capitalist country. The emancipation of the serfs had meant the introduction of a commodity market and wage-labour. This demonstrated that, as far as political tactics were concerned, Russia was about to enter the stage of factory. The proletariat would become

the leader in the democratic revolution because it had emerged as a political opposition before the bourgeoisie and had a superior organization. The radical intelligentsia, while appreciating these points, would have the right and duty of leading the proletariat in a political party. This party would fight for i) the overthrow of the autocracy and the establishment of a liberal democracy, and ii) the subsequent seizure of power by the proletariat in a dictatorship. The founding of the RSDLP : The 1880s was a period of stagnation for Marxism in Russia. It was the famine of 1891 which eventually galvanized Marxist circles there and impelled them towards less theoretical activity. Plekhanov himself was one of the first to suggest the transition from broad propaganda to more direct agitation. The Russian Social Democratic Labour party was founded in March 1898. There were two basic trends by this time in Russia. Firstly there were the 'Economists' who wished to separate the workers' struggle from the struggle for political emancipation. Secondly there were Marxist intellectuals who were sometimes known as legal Marxists. In opposition to both these groups, Plekhanov complained that the Economists denied the necessity to organize for political ends. He wished to maintain the independence of the Party from the working class and preserve the level of its consciousness. According to Plekhanov, the Party should be ahead of the proletariat and the orthodox theoreticians should control the Party-an idea that was to be developed with even greater force by Lenin. The next lesson discloses how Lenin came to do it.

According to Lenin, the great opposition by the village bourgeois, the kulaks and the rich farmers, declared an open war against soviet power. The people had to fight for food. Their fight for bread, for food for the people became the fight for socialism. All the forces of the old world had clubbed together in a crusade against the Soviet Republic. They wanted to "strangle the Bolshevik infant at its birth", The White Guards at home joined the powerful foreign interventionists and attacked Russia. Russia stood in mortal danger. By the close of 1920 with the exception of a few nests of counter evolutionary resistance that were completely wiped out later, the White Guards had been completely routed and all foreign forces driven out of the country.

The Eighth Congress of the C.P.S.U. was held in March 1919. It wished for consolidating the worker-peasant alliance and the organizations of the Red Army and adopted a programme for the building of socialism which had been drafted by a commission headed by Lenin. During these days, it was said, he helped to enrich Marxism. In these writings he is said to have analysed the specific features and forms of the class struggle in the transition period from capitalism to socialism and further developed the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In an attempt to “frighten the masses with the horrors of socialist revolution” and to set the non-proletarian segments of the working people against the working class, the bourgeois identify proletarian dictatorship” as anti-democratic. But Lenin explained it saying that “whereas the dictatorship of the bourgeois has always been and to this day remains, an instrument for suppression of the overwhelming majority of the population, the proletarian dictatorship is spearheaded against the exploiters, who make up the minority of the population”. It is according to him a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people including the peasants. This alliance, Lenin said, was “the supreme principle of the dictatorship of proletariat”.

7.1.3 LENIN’S VIEW ABOUT STATE

Lenin regarded the state as indispensable. It is an agency for the proletarian reconstruction of society. The capitalist made use of the state to exploit the proletariat. Similarly, the proletariat must make use of the state for the elimination of the capitalists, their former exploiters. The state will however be class state. It is a state where there will be the domination of one class over the rest of society. It does not represent the entire nation. It represents the proletariat. It is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lenin has expounded a thesis that proletarian dictatorship could take different political forms. All nations should arrive at socialism. However, each one would do so in its own way. The transition from capitalism of socialism could, of course, take diverse forms, but the essence will be one and the same.

7.1.4. WAR COMMUNISM

War communism was an emergency policy adopted because of the tremendous difficulties resulting from “imperialist intervention and blockade and the Civil War”. A key stone of this policy was what was known as the food-surplus requisitioning system, under which the peasants were to handover to the state all food surplus. This policy was no longer called for when the war ended and was given up in favour of New Economic policy. It is said to have provided the political and economic conditions for building the foundations of socialism. The experience of socialist construction had confirmed the importance of combining “centralized economic planning and guidance by the socialist state with the participation of the masses in economic management and with guarantees of the rights and free initiative of local agencies”. Now a state planning commission was set up as the main body responsible for overall planning. Lenin is said to have attached very great importance to industrial recovery and progress and showed keen interest in the development of every branch of industry. He held talks with economic administrators and rank and file workers. He also concerned himself with the development of trade, science, and scientific technological researches.

The crucial questions at that time was that of the formation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He “showed great concern for the well-being of all the nationals and nationalities of the soviet republics without exception”. The national regions were more backward than Russia. So he wanted the party to be more cautions in introducing socialism there. His important objective was to make the previously oppressed and backward nations and nationalities equal with more advanced nations. Disinterested assistance was extended to the working masses of the previously oppressed nations. A lot of money was invested in the development of the national outskirts; workers and scientists were sent there.

Lenin according to the present day Russian Marxists, is a staunch internationalist. The fact that he so skillfully applied Marxist method in solving the problems facing Russia, “does not at all warrant the conclusion

that Leninism is merely the Russian variant of Marxism. On the contrary it demonstrates the extra nationalistic character of Leninism”.

According to Lenin there is one and only kind of internationalism. That is “working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the evolutionary struggle in one’s own country, and supporting this struggle in every country without exception”. He was the inspirer and an undisputed leader of world communist movement. During his days the world communist movements was monolithic in structure. On his initiative in 1919, the communist parties established the third Communist International. This organization played an important role in promoting the liberation movement of the working masses; in helping the forming and strengthening of Communist Parties; in evolving working class tactics; and in training leaders of the communist movement.

Lenin is said to have made valuable contributions to Marxist theory. Even in those days of bitter struggle against the united forces of domestic counter-revolution and world imperialism, Lenin did not fail to devote his attention to questions of theory. During these years the most important books he wrote were “The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky” “A Great Beginning”, Economics and Politics in the Era of the Dictatorship of the proletariat”, and his famous book “Left-wing Communism-An Infantile Disorder”, in which he summed up the Bolshevik experience and underscored its importance for the communist movement. In them he analyzed the specific features and forms of the class struggle in the transition period from capitalism to socialism. And further developed the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat; discussed such important questions as the initial and highest phases of communist society, dialectics of socialism’s development into communism, the material and technical foundations of the new society and how to build them up. He also brought out the significance of socialism’s victory over capitalism in the field of economics.

Lenin is said to be the first Marxist to examine the question of what attitude the triumphant proletariat should take to the old bourgeois intelligentsia. While doing so he pointed out that it was essential to enlist their

cooperation in the effort to build socialism. But he did not fail to emphasize the need to educate a new, truly people's intelligentsia from among the working masses. A notable cultural progress takes place during society's transition from capitalism to socialism. Lenin called this a "cultural revolution". "The entire people," he said "must go through a period of cultural development". This means the attainment of complete literacy, scientific progress and progress in literature and the arts. It also means a serious and through change in the working people's mentality and outlook. Lenin was against a nihilist attitude of the world's cultural heritage. He pointed out that socialist culture should logically rise from the intellectual wealth that man had accumulated from the dawn of civilization.

7.2. LENIN AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Lenin paid great attention to the development of the social sciences, to the ideological work of the party, to the system of educating the working people in the spirit of communism, and to the struggle against bourgeois ideology. He regarded Right wing revisionism and opportunism, and social reformism, as the chief enemies of Marxism and the world communist, working-class, and national-liberation movements. At the same time he warned of the immense danger emanating from "Left" opportunism, dogmatism, and sectarianism. He described "Left" opportunism as a "pretty-bourgeois revolutionaries" akin to anarchism. He said that a salient feature of "Left" opportunism which makes it particularly dangerous, is its attempts to cover up its utterly wrong theories and policies with "revolutionary" phrasemongering and with allegations that Marxists-Leninists are "reformists", "revisionists". "Left" opportunism and its policies, he said, tend to isolate the Communist Parties from the masses and to undermine the revolutionary movement and the unity of all democratic forces under working class leadership in the struggle against imperialism.

Lenin outlined the principle features of the imperialist epoch, which are of decisive significance to the international revolutionary movement. He said that the proletariat of the world have a common enemy, namely imperialism. Further he said that the revolution will break out at the weakest links of imperialism and not simultaneously in all countries. This leads to the

formation of the revolutionary front of the world socialist system as the centre of World Revolution. In 1920 on this basis, Lenin pointed out that the relations among the peoples, in the entire world system of states were being determined by the struggle of the Soviet Union against imperialism.

Lenin firmly believed that the export of capital and the cultivation of huge capitalist monopolies led to imperialism and scramble for markets. This leads to war among the capitalist nations. The proletariat as such have no stake in such a war. Peace will help the development of man.

The enormous load of work, extreme fatigue and the consequence of the grave wounds caused by the shot of Kaplan, in 1918, all combined seriously to undermine Lenin's health. On March 10, 1923 Lenin had a serious attack-sclerosis of the blood vessels of the brain. Slowly he recovered. But on January 21, 1924 he died. Though he did not will about a heir apparent, J.V. Stalin his close collaborator, succeeded him.

Lenin was the architect of the Bolshevik Revolution. He was both an extraordinary theoretician and a practical politician. Writing about Lenin, G.G. Maxey says, "Nikolai Lenin, the now beatified saint of Bolshevism was not only a revolutionary leader of great sagacity and practical ability, but also was a writer and thinker of exceptional penetration and power. He claimed to be nothing more than a faithful disciple and an authentic interpreter of Marx and Engles, but he was also a thorough student of Hegel, and his writings reveal a mind quite aware of the deeper philosophical implications of Marxian creed". During 35 years of intense formulated by Marx and Engles. He uncompromisingly accepted the key philosophical, economic, and political philosophy of Marx. He was a man of iron-will, great intellectual capacity, and of absolute personal integrity. He lived exclusively for the cause he believed in. When he could not be active as an organizer, he thought or wrote. He was a born leader. He laid great emphasis on the importance of the communist party. The credit of making the party the vanguard of the proletariat goes to Lenin. Under his leadership the communists knew their destination. It was clearly marked out and the way to reach it was also well-known. He was a practical-minded leader. So he was cautious in following

Check your Progress questions.

1. What is Leninsm?
2. Give short notes on State
3. Write briefly about War Communism

Marxism. He applied Marxism to the then needs of Russia. As a committed Marxist Lenin put first and foremost the conquest of state. It was an obsessive goal to which everything else was subordinated. Strategy and tactics for the conquest of power vary according to situations. Marx's idea about dictatorship of the proletariat was vague but Lenin's was the genuine conventional objective dictatorship of one or preferably by a few. Their will is carried out by an obedient oligarchy.

7.2.1 LENIN AND DEMOCRACY

Lenin considers that religion is not consistent with communism. As a matter of fact it is a definite obstacle to the realization of their programme. The communists, therefore, seek to destroy religion. His government did not prohibit the practice of religion, but the priests and monks were denied political privileges.

Marx had been vague on how the working class takes power. Rather he was deliberately silent on how an entire class could take power and what they would do with the power after they had taken it. The few remarks that he made on this were taken literally by Lenin and again by Stalin-abolition of Market, universal and centralized rationing etc. Both Lenin and Stalin blindly followed Marx in this respect.

But Lenin, however, "was an innovator. He was a theoretician, a technician. He knew how to take and wield power. Conspiracy Centralised organization, military discipline, the ability to stir, manipulate and coalesce discontent and hatred. He knew the art and science of seizing power, holding it, wielding it extending it in width and depth"

According of Prof. V. Venkata Rao. "Lenin was a self – less egoist. His selflessness had been commenced on and stressed virtually by all who have written on his. We never catch him glancing at himself in the mirror of history. His work contains almost no personal autobiography or overt expression of personal feelings and sentiments".

7.3. SUMMARY

This unit dealt with the concept of Leninism and Lenin's Contribution to Marxism. It also attempts study about state and war communism. It explains Lenin views on social sciences and views about democracy as well.

7.4. KEYWORDS

Leninism	-	Principles of Lenin
Deconstruction	-	an exhibition of force
Clandestine	-	concealed
Abdication	-	given up
Radical	-	advocating change
Utopian	-	Imaginary invisionary

7.5. CHECK YOUR PROGRESS QUESTION AND ANSWER:

For question No. 1	-	Reference Section No. 7.1.
For question No. 2	-	Reference Section No. 7.1.3
For question No. 3	-	Reference Section No. 7.1.4

7.6. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:

R.N. Bernstein, Evolutionary socialism, New York.

E.Derfler, Socialism Since Marx – I Schoken – 1961- Macmillan – 1973.

J.Joll, The Anarchists, London, Methuen – 1979.

Hyde, Douglas, Communism Today (Gill & Mac)

7.7. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES:

1. Examine Lenin's Contribution to Marxist theory.
2. Explain Lenin's views about Democracy.

UNIT – 8

STALIN AND HIS REGIME

INTRODUCTION

Stalin was the absolute ruler of the Soviet Union and high priest of the world communist movement from the end of 1927 until his death early in 1953. During these years communists seized power in fourteen countries and came close to doing so in several others. It may seem strange that Stalin in spite of his long tenure as head of the State, and the indelible imprint he had left on the Soviet life, has made only a few minor contributions to the development of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Lenin had provided the broad outlines of the way which the people should follow during the transitional stage. What was now required was an efficient practitioner to transform those outlines into reality. If Lenin had provided all the theoretical bases for the future erection of the glorious edifice of Soviet Marxism, Stalin used them with a vengeance. Stalin's greatest and most lasting contribution to socialism was the organization of the collective economy; what had been a mere idea at first became a blue-print and then a reality. Lenin had no clear ideas on the subject of organizing collectivism. But for Stalin and his followers, collectivism was rationalisation of economic life, efficiency, and, foremost, industrialization.

OBJECTIVES:

- a - Learn Stalinism and its objective
- b - Understand Stalin's views on five year plan
- c - Analyse the Rise of Modern Communism
- d - Know the concept of Marxism and political thought

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Stalin's Early Life

Stalin's Objective

Stalin on five year plan

Russian culture

Communist party

Developments after Stalin

The 20th Congress of the CPSU

The Rise of Modern Communism

Mao's Early life

October Revolution

Long march

The Political Thought of Mao –Tse-Tung

Mao's Contribution to Modern Communism

Cultural Revolution

Mao's views on war

Summary

Key words

check your progress question and answer

Books for further Reading

Questions and Exercises

8.1. EARLY LIFE:

Joseph Stalin, the son of a shoe-maker was born in 1870 in a small village in the Caucasus Mountains of Georgia. His father died when he was young. Through untold personal sacrifice his mother was able to provide the means for him to study in Tiflis, the major city of Georgia. There he received his education in a seminary. Here he came across radical ideas which were spread by a Marxist Organisation. For his progressive ideas and for his reading banned books, he was finally dismissed from the seminary in 1899. From then on he became a committed Marxist. Yet many a commentator doubts whether his knowledge of Marxism was thorough. He was arrested for his revolutionary activities and exiled to Siberia in 1902. Soon after his return he began his underground activities once more and was exiled again. Thus Stalin had to spend most of his time in and out of Siberia. All these facts indicate his undaunted spirit of leadership of Lenin in 1917. He became a member of the politbureau of the central committee in 1920. He played an important role during the Revolution and during the civil war. He accumulated a variety of titles and posts the most important being the general secretary of the Party (1922). These offices and titles proved quite useful to him in his bid to become Lenin's successor.

Lenin fell ill in 1922. During his illness Lenin's relationship with Stalin began to sour. Factions had been forming around Trotsky, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Bukhanin, and Stalin. Though Lenin was aware of what was going on he lacked the strength to intervene. He became increasingly distressed with the problems of the arbitrary use of power by some of his subordinates. Stalin, in particular, seemed guilty of these offences. Lenin became suspicious of Stalin. So in his so-called testament, a letter addressed in December 1922 to the party congress he vaguely advocated collective leadership.

The death of Lenin on January 21, 1924, created a new situation. Stalin had been little known. But his position as head of the party organization had already given him greater real power than any of his rivals. Further he was exactly the type of person that Lenin needed for whom he was a trusted functionary for a pretty long period. He was tough, efficient, brave and above all loyal. He was the one who interpreted Lenin in the best possible manner.

There were dissensions among the rivals on internal and external questions. On the NEP, policies towards the peasantry, the attitude to be adopted towards other socialist and non-socialist movements, the timing of the revolutionary activities, the choice between all out efforts or a cautious long range policy, and the technique of industrialization.

8.1.1. STALINS OBJECTIVE

In 1924 Stalin described his position clearly towards those questions in a series of lectures he delivered. "Objective" to consolidate the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. Main forces: the dictatorship of the proletariat in one country, using it as a base for the overthrow of imperialism in all countries. Main reserves : the semi proletarian and small peasant masses in the developed countries, the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries..... Direction of the main blow: isolation of the democrats. By about 1927 Stalin was able to get rid of his opponents.

"Stalin was no economist. All he did was to apply Lenin's basic political formulae to the economy". Lenin had seen a main factor of

industrialization in the development of electricity. So he set up a committee to control power plants and the distribution of power in 1921. This committee had grown into a central economic commission by 1925. Later under the orders of Stalin this commission drafted a blue-Print known as the Gosplan, for the whole of the Soviet Economy. Soon after the 15th Congress expelled the Trotsky-Zinoviev group, the first five year plan was introduced. For practical as well as ideological reasons Soviet Union needed an expanding collective economy. Stalin was in a hurry to carry them out.

8.1.2. STALIN ON FIVE YEAR PLAN

During the seven years of NEP (1921-1927) a remarkable economic recovery had taken place. The wounds caused by the war, the revolution and the civil war had been healed and production had been restored to the pre-war level. Now with the introduction of the First Five Year plan (1928-1932) mechanization and collectivization of agriculture and the greater emphasis on heavy industry brought the U.S.S.R. next to the U.S.A. Her economic achievements came at a time when the American and Western European countries were undergoing the pangs of the great depression and so it caught the imagination of the people of the world. It is said that “during the first five year plan, the rate of increase in industrial production averaged 22 percent annually”. This was done through able propaganda which intelligently exploited a number of motives – “from love of fatherland to fear, from devotion to an ideal of greed”.

By 1930 all kinds of internal opposition were finally liquidated. The establishment of economic collectivism and the fast growing tension in international affairs helped Stalin to consolidate and concentrate his power. The assassination of Kirov, the party leader in Leningrad area, supposed to be a close collaborator of Stalin, served as a pretext and a starting point for launching a campaign to destroy his opponents and would be opponents. The secret police and public prosecutors were given a free hand. “An iron curtain” was wrung down. No one was allowed to stir out of U.S.S.R., or come in. It is said that those who had been Lenin’s closest collaborators during the first six years of proletarian dictatorship were tried and condemned to death. Forced

labour camps were filled again. By the mid 30's communism came to be identified with Stalin and his policies were known as Stalinism.

Though Politically as well as economically Stalin had completed Lenin's work, he is said to have differed from Lenin's position in one point. He is said to have been "less of a genuine internationalist" than either Lenin or any other communist leader prominent in 1917-27 period. He was considered to be an expert on national questions. Because of this he was appointed as the head of commission for the nationalities in 1917. He was instrumental in establishing the Soviet System among the ethnic minorities in former Russian territories occupied by the communists in 1918-22. Though internationalism was not overlooked by Stalin, he considered nationalism to be the soul, from where the spirit of internationalism springs.

8.1.3. RUSSIAN CULTURE

Stalin was, therefore, interested in spreading Russian culture and language throughout the ethnically diverse country controlled by the Bolsheviks. He was equally interested in proletarianising the people. For that it was necessary to eradicate bourgeois values and to develop a new "Soviet man", loyal to the regime and dedicated to the advancement of the Soviet State. Utilizing a sort of centralized control with the Communist party and the secret police as his primary tools, Stalin Produced the first truly totalitarian state the world ever seen. Everything, even private affairs of men were now matters of state concern. A gigantic propaganda machinery, youth organizations, art, music, drama, etc., were all used to impose a proletarian consciousness from above. School books were written a new reflecting the proletarian values. Socialist realism in art became the only permissible form. A rigorous system of censorship was instituted to safeguard against any deviation from the approved party line. The worship of Stalin as a great man, the personality cult, became an integral part of the ideology.

Stalin continued Marxism – Leninism as far as it was consistent with his policy of exercising as much power of the state had to increase as the U.S.S.R. was surrounded by capitalist states. It is said that, in championing the cause of communism in a single country, Stalin dissolved the Comintern, an

international organization of Communist parties of the world as an unnecessary obstacle in the way of Russia's efforts. Between nationalism and internationalism he seemed to have preferred the former. On the basis of these actions, Stalin was accused by his opponents and few commentators of "Great Russian Chauvinism".

8.1.4. COMMUNIST PARTY:

Stalin's way of dealing with Communist parties and their leaders was significant. He wanted to control the Communist parties of all the countries of the world by controlling and guiding their leaders. Stalin came to be regarded as the high priest of Communism. Through the leaders of the Communist parties, he was able to interfere in the affairs of other countries. Stalin planned to have as many Communist as well as non-communist countries as the Soviet Union's satellites.

Stalin as the head of the state, supported even Hitler and had made the communists of various countries of the world, oppose war against Hitler as an imperialist war. But situation changed when in 1941 Hitler attacked Soviet Union. Now Hitler became an "imperialist" and obviously "the imperialist war against Hitler" became a people's war an anti-fascist war, a war of liberation". Communist Russia fully cooperated with all the capitalist powers like the U.S.A., U.K., and France and did not lag behind in taking a share in the spoils of war. All these were in keeping with his position as a high priest of communism.

The monolithic structure of the communist movement could not last long. In consequence of the policy of Stalin, the Communists of several countries rose up in open rebellion and defied Stalin. It was the Chinese Communists who formed an independent policy and devised new strategies and tactics to capture power and through them succeeded in establishing their power. Josip Broz Tito had succeeded in establishing a socialist regime in Yugoslavia with the help of a partisan army formed to combat the Nazi enemy. Tito simply refused to become a satellite of the U.S.S.R. This led to his expulsion from the international communist movement in 1948.

All these difficulties were to produce problems for international communism after Stalin's death.

In spite of "all these excesses and crimes committed by Stalin", he has to be regarded as a great nation builder. His rise to heights of power from humble origins, was no mean achievement. The spectacular achievements through his five year plans brought Soviet Russia to the forefront and she could bargain on terms of equality with the western powers. From the ideological perspective, perhaps the best word for summing up the career of Stalin is consistency. From his early days, his vision of the path to pure communism required a Soviet nation-state, economically and militarily powerful. He was prepared to sacrifice anything to achieve that goal. This resulted in the slaughter of thousands of dedicated Bolsheviks within the country. Externally, once potent international Communist movement was reduced to a mere puppet of the Soviet Union. The bad results of the Stalinist era were due to the exercise of unlimited personal power by a single person. Yet from an ideological perspective, there was a cruel logic to his actions. His task was to drag the young Soviet state into the 20th century to develop a strong economy, and to eradicate any vestige of bourgeois life. By the time of his death in March 5, 1953, he had succeeded in many respects.

8.2. DEVELOPMENTS AFTER STALIN:

When on March 5, 1953 Stalin died, communists all over the world were stunned. For nearly a quarter of a century Communism and Stalinism had been one. The Communists and their fello-travellers all over the world grieved for, in spite of Stalin's blemishes, the rank and file loved him and admired him. There was no uprising and there was little chaos following his death. It is a great tribute to the success of his policies. There had been speculations about an heir apparent earlier. But now Stalin had left no heir to his throne. Therefore many aspired to become the head but none was powerful enough or well-known. So the exercise of power devolved automatically on the members of the Presidium of the CPSU. Thus began the period of 'collective leadership'. With it a process of silent de-Stalinization began. This period of collective leadership was full of strife among the few men who composed it.

The Collective leadership had dissension on questions of internal and external policy. "There were at least four major issues upon which divergence of views between members of the presidium were evident..... the perennial question of the relative importance to be attached to the production, of the means of production and to the consumer goods.....agricultural policy..... decentralization of control over industry instead of improved centralized controlrelations with Yugoslavia". To these issues, issues of foreign policy should be added. So these bitter dissensions divided the collective leadership. There was a 'thaw' in the Soviet Union.

So there was 'thaw' in the countries directly controlled by it. There was a relaxation of the pressure exercised by the state and the party in relation to national minorities, intellectual activities, and supposedly dissident communists. People all over the world heaved a sigh of relief and expected a process of liberalization. The factional struggle for succession weakened the efficiency of the leadership. The 'thaw' was only the indirect outcome of that weakness.

The foreign policy of the members of the collective leadership was on the lines traced by Stalin during his last years. "Stalin wanted peace". Great stress was laid on peace. The various congresses held in the different communist capitals laid great stress on peace. The soviet leadership also decided to do what Stalin had refused to do till his death-to establish friendly relations with Tito of Yugoslavia.

In 1954 Malenkov became the head of the state. He advocated a 'new look'. It was centered on two themes-a better life for the Soviet people and peaceful coexistence with capitalism. Consumers were told that there would be more goods available; farmers were told that they would no longer be discriminated. But in 1955 Khrushchev, the new rising star, attacked Malenkov in the name of heavy industry and on the ground that stress on consumer goods was a betrayal of Communism. Malenkov was demoted. The next two and a half years were the years of Bulganin and Khrushchev Bulganin as the Prime Minister, Khrushchev as the First secretary of the party. Khrushchev followed the foreign policy Malenkov. Internally capital

investment was switched from agricultural and consumer goods to heavy industry, scientific research and space exploration. Externally the Soviet Bloc was strengthened by various treaties such as the Warsaw pact. Diplomatic relations were established with countries with which no such relations formerly existed. Cultural exchanges with democratic and under developed countries were approved of and promoted. Economic aid was also extended to foreign countries both communist and non-communist. The climax came in July 1955, when the Geneva Summit conference was held. World applauded it. Khrushchev's popularity rose to dizzy heights.

8.2.1 THE 20th CONGRESS OF THE CPSU:

The 20th Congress of the CPSU was held in 1956. It was attended by the representatives of all the communist parties. Khrushchev delivered the opening speech. That long speech indicated that he was the first among equals and that the one man leadership which had been the corner stone of Stalin's regime had been abandoned. Again in the final closed session Khrushchev made a long speech. In it he accused Stalin of harming the communist cause by his cruelty towards communists and non-communists. The speech contained nothing new. But it divided the communist movement which was monolithic in structure and controlled by one Supreme centre. There arose grounds that strongly resented the attack on Stalin in all communist parties. Among them China and little Albania were the most important. Khrushchev and his friends were in the minority ranged against a disunited majority. Only by taking the lead in attacking Stalin's excesses they could save themselves. They did it at the proper time in the name of Lenin, whom all accepted as a beatified saint, using the so-called testament written by Lenin, profitably for their selfish ends.

Stalinist censorship system was loosened. All types of criticisms of Stalin and his regime appeared in print. It was a liberalization of considerable magnitude when contrasted with the previous 25 years, and in a limited way a return to some of the principles of Lenin. But it is fact that these very leaders who were condemning Stalin and his policies after his death, had risen to their positions of leadership under Stalin, cooperating with him and executing his will. As students of politics, we know that this is only natural for the collective

leadership to find fault with its predecessor to hide their own weaknesses and infighting, to divert the attention of the people.

By their policies, speeches and actions the international Communist movement became divided and the Soviet Union lost its leadership. So they tried all means to bring the 'Revisionist' Tito, who had been expelled from the international Communist movement in 1948, back into the fold of international Communist movement. This was considered as one method of establishing their legitimate claim for the leadership of international Communist movement. That was not to be, for, Tito refused to give up his independent line.

At the Twentieth Party Congress, Khrushchev and Several others formally proclaimed the doctrine of different paths to socialism. At least three different paths were recognized: the traditional Russian Revolution Model; the nationalist oriented partisan army type and a democratic revolution. They are not to be considered departures from the original tenets of Marxism. For Marx himself has admitted the possibility of a democratic revolution in countries like England. Now the question was how much deviation from Moscow's wishes was possible and how much of independence could be tolerated. As a result of these changes the doctrine of peaceful coexistence became a necessity. To justify the policies and actions, the leadership group proclaimed that socialism had achieved sufficient power so it cannot be strangled or threatened with annihilation by the capitalist powers. Modern weaponry, particularly the development of nuclear devices, made the prospect of an all out war between the two opposite camps less than desirable. Thus, co-operation with the class enemy was seen as a necessity. This did not alter the basic truth of Marxism-Leninism that Communism would eventually triumph. In other words the broad outlines of Marxism-Leninism remains fairly in tact.

Generally communists different on policies and the pace at which they should be pursued. These were enough to cause tension among them. Such a tension was caused between the two communist powers the Soviet Union and China. It is often said that "the real cause of the dispute between the two powers-Soviet Union and China-was a rivalry over the leadership of the world

revolutionary movement”. It may – be an exaggeration. But the ambition to be the top leader undoubtedly played its role.

At the conference of communist parties held in Moscow at the end of 1960 with the participation of Chinese delegates, agreement had been reached on four positions: War was not inevitable; the U.S., as the leading “imperialist” nation was the chief enemy; communist parties were organizationally autonomous; Communists everywhere must be concerned first and foremost with the unity of the communist movement.

Since the Bay of Piga (near Cuba) episode in 1961 (When disaster met the attempted landing of American-Supported exiles) there had been close military cooperation between the Soviet Union and Cuba. At this time in October 1962, Chinese armed forces opened fire on an Indian border patrol and then came their massive surprise attack. The Chinese met with little Indian opposition. So they were able to advance quickly into Indian territory. World opinion was literally against the Chinese. And they were unable to count on Soviet help in case of a confrontation. So the Chinese army later withdraw unilaterally to certain positions fixed by themselves-a new phenomenon in the history of the world. The Soviets did not ‘help a brother against a friend’. The Chinese took it as a betrayal. They saw the triumph of co-existence with “Imperialism”. The Chinese did not believe in co-existence. “at that time”. Khrushchevites accused Chinese of adventurism and irresponsibility and of damaging the communist cause in the neutral and uncommitted nations.

Finally as the result of Cuban crisis in October 1962, there arose a new situation in the development of international communism. A split occurred in the communist movement of the world. The split was effected throughout the communist parties of the world-those who supported the “Soviet Line” and those who supported the “Chinese Line”. Stood ranged against one another-brother against brother-enabling their enemy to fish in troubled waters. The Chinese approach to the socialist world was different. The Soviet Union became its main enemy and the target of attack. It “has in the process also developed into an inveterate enemy of peace, democracy and socialism”.

All was not well on the Soviet Scene. By about 1964 the great popularity enjoyed by Khrushchev revealed that he had gone too far in making a nonperson of the man Stalin, to whom Communism owed a great deal. So in October 1964, while he was vacationing, Khrushchev was ousted from power. This ouster was engineered by Leonid Brezhnev and Alexi Kosygin. They later co-opted Nikolai Podgorny as the third member of the Troika. This Troika governed the Soviet Union and led the majority faction of world Communism during the rest of the 1960's and the 70's. These three were according to Massimo Slavadori "What Marxist-Leninist should be deeply committed, intelligent, well-informed, unemotional and reflective before acting, quick and consistent in action. They were hard-working and efficient and could count on capable and ambitious younger peopleThey made such major decisions as ousting khrushchev in 1964, occupying Czechoslovakia in 1968 and coming to an agreement with the U.S.A., in 1972", and sending troops to safeguard the interests and results of the Afghan revolution. "They never acted impulsively. When they took risks they did so with full awareness of the dangers involved. During their tenure of office, the Soviet Union has become a world military power". This Troika wished fervently to end the Maoist schism. But Mao and his followers were not for a rapprochement. Their final price for a reconciliation was nothing short of a war with the U.S.A., which the Soviet trio did not want to risk. Relations with China continued to deteriorate.

8.2.2. THE RISE MODERN COMMUNISM

Massimo Salvadori, in his 'The Rise of Modern Communism' say that, "since coming to power the Brezhnev led team (from which Podgorny had been dropped) could look with pride at the present and with confidence to the future. Internally, The Soviet Union was at peace. There was no opposition worth mentioning. Manifestations of youthful alienation, from hippies to vandalism were suppressed as quietly and as efficiently as expressions of dissatisfaction among intellectuals and nationalistic sentiment among the non-Russian people of the Union. Statistics did not mention unemployment or families living below a poverty lineIlliteracy had been eliminated, the number of students in institutions of higher education had increased a hundred-fold, the number of hospital beds had increased.....Soviet foreign

trade was nearly one third of that of the U.S.A. Recessions in the United States and steady economic advance in Soviet Union had narrowed the GNP gap in the early 1970.

“Internationally, American weakening through demoralizations at home coupled with Soviet improvement of its armed forces, had made the Soviet Union the Strongest military power in the world..... Experts debated who was leading in the space exploration; whether the Soviet Union or the United States, the race was undoubtedly close”.

To quote Massimo Salvadori again, “The masses of Soviet Union took Communism for granted. Some, perhaps many, thought of changes within the regime, but hardly anyone thought of a change of regime. A turn toward democracy was as much out of questions as a return to Czarism. Whereas in America the negativism of articulate section of an intelligentsia enjoying freedom of expression made Americans aware of everything wrong with democracy, in the Soviet Union a servile intelligentsia praised the system and made the public aware of achievements only. Foreign observers could say that, except for a few, life in the Soviet Union was drab and boring. Most Soviet Citizens, having no terms of comparison, were satisfied with what they had. Media writers and teachers reminded them all the time of how much better their life was than before the revolution, how infinitely better it was than life in “Capitalist” countries.

MAO TSE-TUNG AND HIS IDEOLOGY

“People have been talking about Mao Tse Tung for a long time. For a long time it has been almost impossible to pick up a newspaper or turn on the radio without seeing or hearing his name. The “great man” is in vogue. No politician in the past twenty years has elicited such ballyhoo and such glorification. Hour after hour and day after day millions of people in his country are told over and over again about his grandiose ideas, his deeds and omniscience; about the millennia in terms of which he thinks, and about the perspicacity with which he rules the destinies of the world. He and he alone in the whole world is capable of this. The world has never known anyone like him. The “great man” sits in his palace. He creates, he renders decisions, he

rules". This is how a famous writer sums up the position and stature of Mao Tse-tung, the first President of the Peoples Republic of China.

More than a hundred years have passed since Karl Marx and Engels proved that the aggravation of the capitalist system's contradictions, its revolutionary overthrow, and the transition to socialism were a law, and showed the historic role of the working class, Lenin enriched and developed the Marxist teaching relative to the new historical conditions. Mao Tse-tung has amended Marxism by his "new democracy doctrine" in the light of his experiences in an underdeveloped, peasant dominated country like china. His general line based on the "Three Red Banners" (the great leap, peoples communes, and general line) and his "cultural revolution" are well-known to the world.

8.2.3. MAO'S EARLY LIFE:

Mao was born on December 26, 1893, in the village of Shoashan, Hsiangton country, the Southern province of Hunan. According to Mao himself his father bought rice from the peasants and sold it to merchants in the town for a higher price. There was little which mao's father could do in the way of giving his son an education, for he himself had only two years of schooling. Mao's mother was illiterate and was deeply religious. She was the only person whom he remembered with veneration. She had a strong influence-over her son.

At the age of eight he went to a normal school but at 13 he had to drop his studies on his father's insistence and began working and helping his father to keep, accounts. At 14 he was married to a girl who was six years his senior (nothing more is known about the marriage). Soon Mao ran away from home and began to take lessons from an unemployed law student. Then after six months he began reading Chinese classics and modern literature.

At 17, Mao enrolled in a school in Tungshan, Hsiang Country, Hunan Province. In the Meantime turbulent events were coming to a head in China. Floods, draughts, famine and misrule stirred up peasant risings and urban unrests. The Wuchang revolt exploded in central China on October 10, 1911.

It triggered the revolution of 1911. The aim of the revolution was to depose the monarchy and establish a republic.

After the revolution began, Mao joined the army in 1911. There he picked up socialist ideas for the first time from the newspapers. In 1913 he went to Changsa, capital of Hunan Province determined to continue his education. But he could not make up his mind about a profession. In the long run, he decided to become a teacher and in the same year enrolled in a normal school, which he finished in 1918. Mao was very much interested in the political and military history of the West. He read widely in western political and economic thought.

The Ching empire fell under the onslaught of the Hsinhai revolution. The rulers of the Ching Dynasty abdicated on February 12, 1912. The Nationalist Party-Kuomintang absorbed all the liberal-bourgeois organizations and individuals. But its programme marked a significant retreat from the programme proclaimed by Sun-Yat-Sen, the noble and heroic revolutionary.

The political situation of that period showed that the progressive parties and groups of China had National liberation as their key demand. Mao too was carried away by this turbulent current. Like his teacher Chang Chi, Mao never ate in the morning and always washed in cold water in order to toughen his body, to withstand the onslaught of the coming years of struggle against the bourgeois.

Mao began writing as contributor to the Journal New Youth in April 1917. This was an enlightened journal which popularized Marxist views along with many other things. In his article he said, "Our nation is wanting in strength". Soon Mao helped to set up the New People's Study Society. It had 'few score of hot-headed Young people', mostly Mao's fellow-students.

8.2.4. THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION:

The October Revolution in Russia and the establishment of soviet power gave powerful impulse to the national liberation and democratic

movements of the world. In China too it gave a powerful stimulus to the democratic and the socialist movements. The first revolutionary-democratic association of students, which subsequently produced many prominent personalities of the Communist Party of China, sprang up.

In 1918 Mao went to Beijing and was able to become an assistant to become an assistant to Li Ta-chao, then Librarian at Beijing University. Li was an erudite Marxist and an outstanding personality. He organized a Marxist study group in Beijing. Mao had the possibility of joining it.

In 1919 he returned to Hunan and became the editor of a journal. It was soon closed down. He took part in the 'May Fourth Movement' which protested against the Japanese seizure of Shantung and the misrule of the war-lords.

In 1920 he was appointed headmaster of an elementary school at Changsha. This gave him a better financial and social standing and he married (second marriage) Yang Kai-hui, the late professor's (Yang Chang -Chi) daughter. He became a "Marxist in theory and, to some extent, in practice" in the summer of 1920 after reading the manifesto of the Communist Party by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

In the spring of 1921 there were six small communist groups in China. After preliminary consultation the 1st Chinese Communist Party Congress was held in Shanghai in July 1921, Mao represented the human group. There is nothing to indicate that Mao distinguished himself at the congress. The 2nd Congress was held in 1922. It decided that the CPC should join the Comintern and adopted two programmes, the maximum and the minimum. Mao did not attend the Congress. On the recommendations of the Comintern, the CPC sought co-operation with the Kuomintang. In 1923 the 3rd Congress, which concentrated on CPC's tactics, in other words, its attitude to the Kuomintang, decided that the Kuomintang must assume leadership of the national revolution.

Mao was one of the proponents of this line. This gave him a new status in both CPC and the Kuomintang. At the 3rd Congress he was elected CC member and was appointed head of the Organisation Department. He was also elected an alternate member of the Executive Committee of the Kuomintang at its 1st Congress. Later he became one of the directors of the courses, organized by the Kuomintang to train leaders for the peasant movement.

Mao along with Chou En lai worked among peasants. During this period Mao wrote mainly stressing the important role played by the peasantry, merchants and the national bourgeois as they were the main driving force of the liberation movement. Mao along with Chou En lai encouraged peasants to overthrow the landlords and set up peasant communes.

Soon after the death of Sun-Yat-Sen on March 12, 1925, Chiang Kai-Shek removed communists from leading positions.

Many communists were arrested and imprisoned. However the communists and the left forces in the Kuomintang managed to prevent the breakup of the united front. Mao continued taking part in many of the measures organized by the Kuomintang peasant movement. Again on April 27 Chiang Kai shek effected a counter revolutionary Coup in Shanghai. The communists were expelled from the Kuomintang. A wave of mass arrests and killing of revolutionary workers and peasants swept across the country. United Front was broken. Civil war erupted. Communists now formed their own armed forces from August 1927. By this time the peasant movement and reached the largest dimensions. Mao now went to his native province. He wrote that it was no longer possible to march under its banners, for this would spell out defeat.

Henceforth Mao began to assert that in China peasants made up ninety percent of the population. Therefore it is they who would lead the revolution and not the industrial worker as asserted by Marx and Lenin. Here he deviated from the core of Marxism and further he was sure that China cannot follow

the Russian example. In other words China must carve out its own path to socialism; that it needs only a 'Sinicised Marxism'.

By 1928 the communists had an army of about ten thousand. They formed their first 'soviet', the Kiangsi-Hunan republic. Intensive propaganda work was undertaken to spread communist ideologies in the countryside. Many 'cells' or units of workers were formed to activate the peasants. Between 1931 and 1934 Chiang sent his armies five times to capture the Communist republic. Each time he failed. Many of the Kuomintang men deserted and joined the 'Red army'. In 1934 the communist leaders evacuated Kiangsi Hunan in order to save themselves from annihilation.

8.3. LONG MARCH

Mao and his friend decided and left to another mountainous region, two thousand miles away. It is known as the 'Long March'. Chu Teh was the head of the army. After innumerable hardships Mao and his soldiers reached Shensi, where they set up a new state, the Shensi soviet. This was the headquarters of the Chinese Communist Party till they came to power in 1949. By 1949 Mao was able to drive the Kuomintang forces from the mainland to Formosa. From 1950 to 1976 when he died, he put his political thoughts into action as the unquestioned leader of the Chinese people.

8.3.1. MAOISM, THE POLITICAL THOUGHT OF MAO TSE-TUNG:

The term Maoism is a word coined by the Harvard scholars. It describes the theory and practice of revolution enunciated by Mao Tse-tung. Maoism is a collection of ideas representing a further development of Marxism-Leninism, largely through the experiences gained by the application of these ideas to Chinese conditions.

Lenin studied the problems of the growth of democratic revolution into socialist revolution as a natural historical process. In analyzing the objective conditions for the democratic revolution growing into socialist revolution in Russia Lenin showed that two groups of contradictions had taken shape in the epoch of imperialism and that they had given rise to two social conflicts.

1. The social conflict between the developing productive forces and the survivals of feudalism and serfdom in the social and political sphere.
2. The developing productive forces had not only grown out of feudal-serf relations but also of capitalist relations of production. The conflict between the social character of production (working people) and the private capitalist form of appropriation (capitalist class) becomes acute. This he said, is the objective basis of the class struggle between proletariat and capitalists. The bourgeois-democratic revolution can resolve the first group of contradictions that is put an end to feudal property. But it cannot bring about a change in the character of production and the form of appropriation. Inevitably, the revolution proceeds onwards; “the bourgeoisie-democratic revolution grows into socialist revolution”.

Mao did not accept this until 1964. Mao accepted the bourgeoisie elements as allies. But he said that in the second revolution they must be annihilated. Mao continually warned the people about the resolvable conflicts within the masses. The ‘class enemies’ would use these conflicts to attack socialism. He said that the intelligentsia were being misled ‘by old thoughts and feelings’ – that is they, like the bourgeoisie, want to hold property, make profit through trade. They must be cured of these. To do so they must live among the peasants and adopt the culture of the peasant folk. The struggle against the elites the intellectuals, the experts, and the party members who were supposed to be the cultural bearers of the society has been the main spring of the Cultural Revolution. This is in fact against the views of Lenin for this leads up to a final negation of cultural legacy, whether foreign or national. The ‘cultural revolution’ had eclipsed Emperor Chin Shih Huang in “burying of books and burying of scholars”. Mao demanded that artists should serve the people. To carry out what he desired, he enlisted the cooperation of the students who went and worked among the people. They listened to and re-educated the peasants. They helped to promote the study of Mao’s works among the workers and the peasants.

8.3.2. MAO'S CONTRIBUTION TO MODERN COMMUNISM:

Mao's greatest contribution to modern communism was the rural strategy. The three important elements of the rural strategy are 1) a revolution led by poor peasants. 2) a base in the inaccessible country side. 3) the advocacy of guerilla warfare. This strategy is adopted in order to gain control of the countryside gradually for here the armies of the capitalists are vulnerable. After the villages, the communist army guerillas are to attack the capitalists strongholds, the metropolitan cities. It resembles what Lenin wanted in the under-developed dependent countries. He wanted those countries to cut off the mother country's sources of profits and force them to give up internal exploitation. The essential element in guerrilla warfare, according to Mao, is the ability of the armed forces to live with the people and to be able to fade back once more, if need arose, into the mass of peasants. From the rural area, the guerrilla forces would launch periodic attacks on the enemy. They will always avoid a major confrontation where the enemy is superior in power. All the while the aim of these confrontations is to bring a large area under their control and attracting the people to their side by their notable example of simple communistic life. It is clear that this rural strategy is only an adaptation of the basic teachings of Marx and Lenin to the peculiar Chinese circumstances. Mao advocating the leadership role of the peasantry was undoubtedly dictated by the large number of peasants in China whose support was necessary for a successful revolution. In a way Mao was altering the doctrine to maximize his support but the alteration in Marxist-Leninist theory nevertheless remains. Thus he denied the special leading role played by the proletariat and the importance of its tactical guidelines.

Lenin saw the role played by the proletariat and considered it as one of the conditions for the victory of the bourgeois democratic revolution and for its growth into socialist revolution. Owing to the extremely backward state of the Chinese economic base, it was generally conceded that the country could not immediately move into a socialist phase after a successful revolution. Mao realized that it would be necessary for them to retain the technical skills and to gain the general support of many classes in order to develop the industrial base necessary for the onward march towards communism. In his

on New Democracy he defined ‘the Chinese revolution as a bourgeois democratic revolution that would evolve into a socialist revolution’. He wrote that for a long time “there would be in China a unique form of power and a unique form of authority absolutely vital and regular for China and at the same time, differing from the system in Russia, namely, a new democratic state and a new democratic organization of authority. This would be the alliance of a number of democratic classes”.

Thus he has for the most part deviated from the accepted forms of Marxism –Leninism, where they talk of a bourgeois revolution, evolving into a dictatorship of the proletariat. It is said that he very often confused his followers with the use of ‘dictatorship of the working class and peasantry’, ‘dictatorship of the coalition forces’, ‘democratic dictatorship of the people’ and the like. Mao’s ‘one hundred flowers speech of 1957, had been a ruse to encourage dissidents to express their views so that they may be persecuted at a later stage.

Despite his repeated exhortations to the people to educate themselves, Mao seems to have had a dislike for formal education. He had great contempt for intellectuals and a great dislike of scholars and educated persons. There are numerous references in his writings to the basic wisdom of the uneducated masses and warnings against producing technologically sophisticated elite that is divorced from that wisdom. He very often referred to the idea that “the uneducated should overthrow the educated”.

8.3.3. CULTURAL REVOLUTION:

In the summer of 1966 under the flag of a “cultural revolution”, Mao launched his revolutionary campaign. The chief objective of the campaign was to “substitute thoughts of Mao Tse-tung” for the thoughts of Marxism-Leninism and to make them the sole basis for the country’s internal and external political guidelines and policies.

During this period, ‘the Little Red Book’ containing a synthesis of Mao’s slogans, the ‘Red Guards’, as the youthful militants were called, ran through the streets laying hands on whoever they did not like, burning shops

and houses and throwing stones at will on the persons and things they sighted in frenzy. It seemed as though this was done to emulate the heroes of the Long March and the many battles they had fought against the troops of Japan and American puppets. The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was expected to make Maoism the strongest revolutionary force in the world. During this revolution the name of Mao appeared on posters, newspapers and other media. In August 1966 violent demonstrations began against Mao's real or supposed opponents in the administration, the schools and factories. There was wholesale massacre and persecution of the cadres and rank and file party members. Assassinations were carried out and executions were ordered. The atrocities committed in the name of the cultural revolution paled so called atrocities of Stalin in the Soviet Union into insignificance. "Such was the veneration of the people, the Red Guards in particular, had for Mao. For Mao was a symbol of dedication and a model for emulation. They were ready to do anything for him". His reliance on youth, willingness to experiment with all sorts of techniques to advance his cause, and his emphasis on the contribution of every individual in society seem to be popular themes throughout the world.

Mao is said to have made genuine theoretical break-through, specially in the study of dialectical materialism notably through his scholarly exposition of contradiction in socialist society. During and immediately after the Chinese revolution, Mao said there would be different classes in the society who have come together for the specific purpose of opposing imperialism. Therefore he said that there would be conflict between these groups. These conflicts are resolvable as these groups are moving towards a particular goal. ; He did not stop there but asserted that these contradictions between people would continue even under socialism. He said that the state would be needed to deal with them and so would not wither away foreseen by Marx. This doctrine of non-antagonistic contradictions constituted a specific denial of existing Marxist-Leninist ideology and seems to be a genuine addition to the doctrine. The opponents of Mao consider it a kind of revisionism or a deviation.

Check your progress
questions

1. What are the objectives of Stalinism?
2. Write short notes on Five year plan
3. Give brief note on October revolution

Classical Marxism considers the antagonism between labour and capital as the major source of conflict in the world. When once such a source of conflict is eliminated and a classless society is established peace and

harmony will prevail Soviet Union adhering to the classical line had long ago asserted that conflict and contradiction had ceased to exist within its territory. But Mao believes that the basically antagonistic nature of the class conflict can be resolved only through complete victory of the proletariat. There can be no compromise in the unending battle with the capitalist. But there are other types of contradictions which exist among the people which are not antagonistic and which can be peacefully resolved. According to Mao this type of Non-antagonistic contradiction during the building of socialism is a desirable thing for it would produce, in the dialectical fashion, a series of qualitative or quantitative changes in the society. The changes thus produced would be like a spiral rising higher and higher, better than previous order. Thus a socialist society would be in a state of permanent revolution with the result of these contradictions constituting qualitative changes or revolutions. But Marxism-Leninism asserts conflict even after the establishment of pure communism. There will be no further changes in social order or economic form. Therefore the dialectical process itself would have ended.

8.3.4. MAO'S VIEWS ON WAR

According to Mao politically conscious dedicated and armed people cannot be defeated. It is the people who win wars not the machines. Therefore, the revolution has, in the long run, nothing to fear from even such mighty technologically advanced giant imperialist powers as the U.S.A. - So a war need not be feared. It is also a welcome relief for a revolutionary such as Mao for he insistently linked it with revolution. To back up his arguments he referred to history. Therefore to bring about a great revolution, a war should be aimed at.

Maoism wants and itches for a war. It asserts that the road to the future lies through another world war and that to think otherwise is tantamount to believing in "paper tigers". From the very beginning this was the source of one of the main disagreements between them and the communists of the whole world. Maoist stand point rejects Lenin's interpretation of the general crisis of capitalism as an historically manifold process of revolutionary transition from world capitalism to world socialism.

Mao, when outlining his global design is said to have expressed his desire point blank. “We must conquer the globe. Our target is the entire globe, where we shall create a mighty power”. Therefore the main task is to win over the majority of the developing countries, against its enemy or enemies (more often than not it is the Soviet Union) and use them in the interests of its strategy. Thus Maoism seeks to detach the national – liberation revolutions from the socialist revolutions, thereby repudiating Lenin’s proposition that an indivisible link exists between them. Maoism has propounded the ‘theory of intermediate zone’ comprising the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America ranged against the world socialist system and against American imperialism the two super powers and identifies itself with third or the intermediate zone.

Maoism as a revolutionary practice would seem to be appropriate only for countries more or less comparable with China. It is not clear that it can be modified to work in industrially advanced countries like the U.S.A. But philosophical Maoism has a strong appeal for revolutionary youngsters, students, and intellectuals in general. “Comparing it with the conservative oppressive and state imposed communism of U.S.S.R. Maoism seems to be a ‘liberal’ and a ‘purer’ ideology. It seems to be much nearer to humanism in its insistence of the importance of the people rather than the state. Its belief and its insistence on the importance of people over the war machines helps them gain a confidence in their might and overcome fear. In theory, too, it is nearer to the ideas of Lenin’s cultural revolution that is to say, it offers much less power to the party bureaucracy than does Russian communism and therefore seems to be more democratic”. A major achievement of Mao is that he has remoulded Marxism, giving it an Asiatic character in place of its European character.

Check your progress questions

4. Explain the Political thought of Mao

5. What is cultural Revolution.

8.4. SUMMARY

This unit provides details to study Stalinism in details and also describes objective and five year plan of Stalin. You are also able to know Maoism and his views on modern Communism. More over this unit plans Mao’s views on cultural revolution and views on war in detail.

8.5. KEY WORDS

Transitional	-	Processes of Changes
Collectivism	-	The doctrine all means of production
Monolithic	-	the doctrine one being
Peasant	-	a farm labourer
Antagonism	-	opposed to

8.6. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

QUESTIONS:

- For question No.1. Reference Section No. 8.1.1
For question No.2. Reference Section No. 8.1.2
For question No.3 Reference Section No. 8.2.4
For question No.4. Reference Section No. 8.3.1
For question No.5. Reference Section No. 8.3.3

8.7. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

Coker, Recent Political Thought (A.C.C. or world Press)

Hyde, Douglas. Communism Today (Gill & Mac) Dent. 1979.

E. Durbin, The Politics of Democratic Socialism, London, Routledge -1940. ...

8.8. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISE:

1. Bringout the ideological differences between Stalinism and the orthodox Marxism.
2. Discuss the salient features of Marxism.

UNIT 9

REVISIONISM

INTRODUCTION:

Revision of Marxism (now Leninism included) is one of the chief manifestations in the International Communist movement. Revisionism is by no means novel to the working class. Immediately after the death of F. Engels in 1895, the struggle against Revolutionary Marxism took the form of 'correction' and 'amendment' of Marxist theory. The emergence of revisionism was by no means fortuitous. It cannot be attributed to mistakes of individuals or groups. Its roots are to be sought in the economic and political system. Revisionism is only a continuation of the ideological struggle started among the Marxist revolutionaries in the 90's of the 19th Century.

As in other movements linked to influential thinkers, there is a distinction between the position formulated by the founders and the simpler one formulated by the followers. Marx and Engels formulated their theory which later came to be known as Marxism. Marxism according to Massimo Salvadori can be summed up sketchily in a few major propositions.

OBJECTIVES:

By studying this unit students will

- a) Understand the concept of Revisionism
- b) Analyse Laski's views about pluralism
- c) Know Laski's ideas about sovereignty.

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Massimo Salvadori Propositions

Bernstein's views on workers

Karl Kautsky

Jaures a French Revisionist

Concept of State

The Theory of Pluralism

Harold Joseph Laski

Laski on Sovereignty

Laski's approach

Cole advocates consumer's groups and producer's groups

Mac Iver's view

Krable

Summary

Keywords

Check your Progress question & Answer

Books for further reading

Questions and Exercises

9.1. MASSIMO SALVADORI PROPOSITIONS:

Only matter is reality, there is neither spirit nor transcendence; ideas and emotions are induced by the economic conditions in which human beings –who are entirely mouldable –live.

‘Mankind’s unit is the economic class, formed by those who share the same relationship with the means of production and exchanges; what counts is the group. Thus there is no individual autonomy and no individual responsibility.

‘The dialectical process is the law of the universe; the law is inexorable and men cannot modify (but can accelerate or slow it where it affects them, according to their level of comprehension).

‘The class struggle is the manifestation of the dialectical process in human affairs; it is the outcome of the forcible appropriation by parasites of the wealth created by toilers, to whom is left what is barely enough for their survival.

‘The next step in the dialectical process will be the replacement of capitalism first with Communism, of private with collective ownership of property, of competition with cooperation, of production for profit with production for service.

‘The step is inevitable because of the capitalists’ concentration of wealth, the toilers’ (now the proletariat’s) increasing poverty, and the growing tension between capitalists and toilers which will erupt into violence.

‘Having seized the state, the proletariat will set up its dictatorship and will use the state for the establishment of collectivism and the realization of socialism.

‘Once production, rationally conducted, has reached the level enabling all to satisfy their needs (communism) the state will wither away and liberty will be total; the dialectical process having been completed, peace also will be total’.

During the pre-1914 period Marxists were influential in the European Socialist parties. However, pre-1914 Marxian Socialism was far from a homogeneous block. Divisions concerned three major practical problems; structure of socialist organizations; method to be adopted for the conquest of power; and relations with non socialists, particularly with progressive liberals.

On the first problem there was antagonism between advocates of democratic structure (free elections of leaders, freedom of dissent and so on) and advocates of disciplined and cohesive authoritarian structure.

On the second problem there was bitter contrast between those who relied on violence and those willing to use the means made available by liberal democratic regimes (parliamentarians, freedom of the press, and the freedom of association).

On the third problem, there was conflict between advocates and opponents of collaboration.

The right wing spokesmen such as the German, E.Bernstein, the Italian F. Turati and the Swede H.Branting, “urged collaboration with other parties of the left..... It wasmanifest that the workers could improve their lot within the frame work of the existing societies..... that state interference was growing, and that a gradual transition from capitalism to socialism was under way”.

An “extremist left wing”, which had as spokesmen, R.Luxemburg and V.I.Lenin, was convinced that the capitalist societies would “founder in a series of ever-increasing economic crises. The end would be the upheaval of the proletariat which would organize a collective society instead of the existing individualist one”.

Between right wing and left wing there was the large Marxist center among whom the best –known spokesmen in 1914 were Guesde, Plekhanov and Karl Kautsky. The center accepted the use of democratic procedure for the conquest of power but rejected collaboration with non-socialist movements and parties and refused to participate in the parliamentary game it despised.

Where democracy was concerned, the Marxist right wing was as democratic as non-socialist democrats, whereas the centre conceived democracy as a system from which non-socialists would be excluded and the left wing rejected it even if limited to socialists.

Each is right in his own light, But in today's context, after the October Revolution, Marxism advocated and followed by Lenin "has been approved, as the right kind of Marxism". Therefore any deviation from it is considered as a kind of revision of Marxism or revisionism. Those who uphold revisionism are termed as revisionists.

Lenin associates the appearance of revisionism with the name of Edward Bernstein who wrote a number of articles for *Die Neue Zeit*, the organ of the German Social Democratic Party in the period 1896 to 1898. It was Bernstein, (1850 – 1932) a one time orthodox Marxist who gave "his name to this trend by coming forward with most noise and with most powerful expression of amendments to Marx, revision of Marx, revisionism.

In Philosophy, revisionist in general opposed both, materialism and dialectics as propounded by Marx and Engels. According to Marx, economic factor would determine the course of history. But Bernstein denied that the general course of social revolution was determined by economic forces. Bernstein also questioned, the soundness of Marx's conception of surplus value, though he accepted that there is surplus value. For, he said, the rate of surplus value bore no constant relation to the high or low standard of wages of the workers whose exploitation it was supposed to measure. According to him the whole concept was abstract and that it cannot be verified. He further added that it was created by society not by labour. It was also said that it would not be amiss to correct Marx's theory of value in accordance with Bohm Bowerk.

Marx had said that there would be capitalist concentration. This kind of concentration of capital will intensify the capitalist contradictions. As a result there will be growing impoverishment and the process of proletarianisation will be quickened. Though Bernstein accepted that there was concentration of capital, he asserts that it did not take place as rapidly as predicted by Marx.

According to him, the joint stock companies were increasing in number. There was a diffusion of share holding. Though the business concerns were getting bigger incomes, they had many owners, most of whom had only a small capital interest. This means, according to him, that instead of being pauperized, and becoming a proletariat, the middle class was only changing. It did not die altogether. According to him the middle class was healthy not only economically but also morally. Further the big business was not driving out small. The same is the case with agriculture, and industry.

Marx had prophesied that the increase in production would bring into existence economic crises. Bernstein, on the other hand, had argued that with the extension of markets and improved forms of credit economic crises had become rarer and weaker. It was also said that cartels and Trusts would probably enable capital to eliminate them altogether. Bernstein also said that “the theory of collapse” to which capitalism was said to be heading, was unsound for there was a tendency of class antagonism to become milder and less acute.

The late 90's had no crises. Production had been increasing fast. Unemployment had not been increasing so fast. Trade had expanded. New areas were being opened up. Therefore there was no ground for anticipating a speedy collapse of capitalism. So it is better, according to Bernstein, to secure the largest concession that could be won within the limited conditions. This was the central point of his thesis. This amounts to denying the ‘inevitability of a revolution’ predicted by Marx.

9.1.1. BERNSTEIN'S VIEWS ON WORKERS

Therefore Bernstein urged the workers to use their power to collectively bargain to obtain protective legislation from the state as well as to bargain with employers for improving their condition. The trade unions would then be elevated to the status of a party and would no longer be mere auxiliaries.

Bernstein attacked the notion of dictatorship of the proletariat. Democracy according to him means the suppression of class government, not the substitution of one form of it to another. Even if the majority constituted

the majority of the people that would not give it a right to disregard the rule of justice.

According to him, even if the workers were successful in seizing power, the vast majority of the enterprises would have to be left for the time being in the hands of the persons who knew how to manage them, for the workers would not be capable of exercising their power effectively.

Bernstein said that in the present context the old proposition of the Communist Manifesto that the working men have no country is rendered untrue. He also supported colonialism, which Marx and Engels opposed.

Bernstein said that in the present context the old proposition of the Communist manifesto that the working men have no country is rendered untrue. He also supported colonialism, which Marx and Engels opposed.

Bernstein thought that a good deal of Marx's doctrine was not scientific at all. Such then is the revisionist case presented by Bernstein.

9.1.2. KARL KAUTSKY:

There is the centrist Karl Kausky (1854-1938) who attacked Bernstein as a revisionist. He in turn was called a 'renegade' by Lenin, the extremist. After Marx and Engels the leader of the orthodox wing of Marxism was Karl Kausky. He was considered to be the foremost theorist of the Marxism socialism. He believed in the complete correctness of Marx's social diagnosis. He accepted the 'class contradiction' the final crisis, - growth of big business at the expense of the small, the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few and the progressive socialization of production as preparing the way for socialism. He echoed Marx's view that the state is an instrument of class oppression therefore the enemy of the workers. So the socialists must always try to weaken its authority. In his view, the time for the constructive use of the state could come only when the proletariat had seized it. Here comes the crux of the problem; unlike Marx, he said that, to seize power the democratic party must fight its way to power, as a party representing the workers. To enlist the support of others, who oppose the capitalists and the imperialist, the socialist party should not give up its class war doctrine. For he like Marx, thought that by the development of capitalism, the petty bourgeois and a few others would be reduced to the proletarian status. The socialists should not make a

compromise with them. If they do so, it will degenerate into mere opportunism.

However, this defender of revolutionary Marxism, envisages the overthrow of the existing state and the proletarian conquest of power by peaceful methods-propaganda and Parliamentary methods. He thought that the end is more important than the means adopted. According to him the conquest of power will become possible by a sudden attainment of power by the socialists inside and outside the parliament, which the upholders of capitalism would not be able to resist. The contradiction of capitalism would become more and more acute, class antagonism would sharpen and ultimately result in the establishment of socialism. Further he said that socialism should come only when capitalism has fully developed a view which Trotsky also is said to have had. Kautsky also maintained that in order to capture power the socialist party must always be a revolutionary party of the working class. The orthodox socialists did not believe that a revolution should be attempted prematurely. They must wait till the opportune moment. Till then they must pay attention to organization, education and propaganda. They must observe order and discipline in all social actions. when the opportune moment comes, power must be conquered by conquering the enemies and not by compromising with them.

Again according to the orthodox socialists, the state cannot be dispensed with. So they said the proletariat-must try to obtain universal suffrage and other political rights and expedients indispensable to the effective exercise of their vote. Kautsky was an advocate of centralized planning and planned economy. But he said that can be done only when all political power has passed into the hands of the socialists. Nationalization is not desirable under all circumstances. for the state ownership will not bring about a change unless the state itself is fundamentally transformed. Such concessions extended by the capitalists can be accepted only if it helps the strengthening of the socialist movement. Further they said that they must encourage the non-socialist cabinet to commit mistakes and exploit those blunders to their advantage.

Kautsky expressed his doubts as to the validity of several of Marx's theories.

Here is another socialist who did not agree with some of Marxist philosophy. It is Rosa Luxemburg. He argued that now a days huge advances are made by financial capital. This would lead to intense imperialist rivalry and conflict. It will be accompanied by the exploitation of cheap colonial labour and thereby reduce the middle class to the level of a proletariat and the working class to the level of paupers, on the other it will lead to war not crists. Though he accepted the revolutionary ideas of Marx as advocated by Lenin, the extremist, he was a supporter of world Revolution, like Trotsky. Therefore he was called a revisionist by Lenin.

9.1.3. JAURES WAS A FRENCH REVISIONIST:

Jaures was French Revisionist. He also rejected Marxist prophecy. Jaures maintained that since Marx made his prophecy, the prevailing tendency has been for the proletariat to rise than to sink economically. The rich were growing richer but they have increased in number. The poor were not growing poorer and more numerous as foreseen by Marx. Berntsein and Jaures agreed with Marx in one thing that the capitalist society mercilessly exploits the proletariat. Therefore it was not possible for them to attain a position of plenty.

Jaures wants the formation of a Proletarin Socialist party. It is the first step to democreacy. The main task of socialist is to break the supremacy of one class over another by transferring the ownership of the means of production to the organized community. This will help to abolish class differences. Jaures pleaded for reform legislation and nationalization. Jaures also wanted the socialist to work with other parties that are willing to advance socialist reform. They should support progressive ministries as against conservatives and reactionaries. They should, according to Jaures, accept office in the ministries formed by the liberals for it would be foolish to reject opportunities for the promotion of socialism.

compromise with them. If they do so, it will degenerate into mere opportunism.

However, this defender of revolutionary Marxism, envisages the overthrow of the existing state and the proletarian conquest of power by peaceful methods-propaganda and Parliamentary methods. He thought that the end is more important than the means adopted. According to him the conquest of power will become possible by a sudden attainment of power by the socialists inside and outside the parliament, which the upholders of capitalism would not be able to resist. The contradiction of capitalism would become more and more acute, class antagonism would sharpen and ultimately result in the establishment of socialism. Further he said that socialism should come only when capitalism has fully developed a view which Trotsky also is said to have had. Kautsky also maintained that in order to capture power the socialist party must always be a revolutionary party of the working class. The orthodox socialists did not believe that a revolution should be attempted prematurely. They must wait till the opportune moment. Till then they must pay attention to organization, education and propaganda. They must observe order and discipline in all social actions. when the opportune moment comes, power must be conquered by conquering the enemies and not by compromising with them.

Again according to the orthodox socialists, the state cannot be dispensed with. So they said the proletariat-must try to obtain universal suffrage and other political rights and expedients indispensable to the effective exercise of their vote. Kautsky was an advocate of centralized planning and planned economy. But he said that can be done only when all political power has passed into the hands of the socialists. Nationalization is not desirable under all circumstances. for the state ownership will not bring about a change unless the state itself is fundamentally transformed. Such concessions extended by the capitalists can be accepted only if it helps the strengthening of the socialist movement. Further they said that they must encourage the non-socialist cabinet to commit mistakes and exploit those blunders to their advantage.

sovereign legal, person gave to it legal omnipotence. Socialist doctrines also helped the building up of the doctrine of state sovereignty, though it was indirect. All this resulted in a tremendous centralization of state power and a very wide expansion of its activities. But this view of state has come to be attacked most recently by pluralists among whom Professor Laski, Lindsay, G.D.H. Cole, Barker, Duguit and Krabbe are the most important. Pluralism is a relatively modern term in political Science. The Pluralistic theory of sovereignty is a reaction against the absolute of sovereignty.

The basic postulates of the pluralist doctrine are; 1) that the State is one of the numerous social, economic, and political associations, through which man in society seeks to satisfy his multifarious interests and promote his welfare; 2) that these groups or associations are not the creatures of the state; that they arise independently of the state and they get power and prestige not given by the state; 3) that the various associations and the groups are on par with each other and the state enjoys no superior values; that these various associations like trade unions, churches, etc, are as useful and important as the state; and 4) that the state is not capable of wielding absolute authority over such bodies but capable of regulating their affairs intelligently or administering them efficiently. Pluralism decries the monist theories of sovereignty and argues that while authority is federal, law is the outcome of social solidarity. Pluralism opposes a centralized, all powerful state, and urges a division of power along the lines of functional democracy. The pluralists do not want to do away with the political state altogether. They want to retain the state. But their state is not a sovereign state.

Three factors have been chiefly responsible for the attack on the traditional theory. Firstly, tremendous change has taken place in the functions of the state. Secondly, international cooperation has become a necessity and it is being emphasized everywhere. Thirdly there are groups or associations to satisfy numerous needs of individuals.

9.2.1. THE THEORY OF PLURALISM:

The theory of Pluralism in its present form originated in the writings of Gierke and Maitland in the last quarter of the 19th century. Their doctrine is that various associations which exist within any society possess personalities

which are real and not hypothetical fictitious or created from without. These associations have rights and duties as groups. Another pluralist Figgis gives to the state a superior right over all other associations but this right is only of coordination and adjustment. Prof. Laski is another political thinker who gives to all associations complete autonomy. He regards the parts of state as real as the whole. According to him "because society is federal, authority must be federal also". This pluralist doctrine has been advocated by many writers during the 19th and 20th centuries.

The pluralist theory has been criticized on many grounds. It has been said that the logical conclusion of pluralism is anarchism. If every association is given an equal footing with the State and there is no coordinating power there is bound to arise confusion and chaos in the society. The division of sovereignty into many parts will destroy the very idea of sovereignty. It is for this reason that even after dividing sovereignty among the group, the pluralist advocate that the power of coordination and adjustment in society should be given should be given to the State. But this function cannot be performed unless the state is given the position of legal supremacy.

It has been pointed out that the quarrels among the various associations will not be automatically adjusted by the process of give and take. Such a possibility is remote. In order to avoid the anarchy of associations and to save society from collapse and dissolution the authority of the State has to be maintained. Again, critics have pointed out that pluralist theory is based on wrong assumptions. It is wrong to think that the various associations run along parallel lines and there is no overlapping of functions. As society is constituted by men there is always a clash of interests and a conflict of loyalties. So provision should be made for the prevention of such clashes. As Gettell says, "Pluralism is the point of view of a situation when new conditions find existing legal categories unsatisfactory with no adequate and recognized procedure to adjudicate resultant conflicts. Monism is a conservative political theory; pluralism is critical political theory. It is an accident that pluralism is closely associated with syndicalism, guild socialism and internationalism".

In spite of many short-comings in the logic of pluralism we cannot help saying that it was a welcome reaction against the ever increasing glorification of the state. There is no denying the fact that it has done a lot of service to modern political theory by bringing into importance the reality of group life. The pluralism have failed to get rid of the concept of sovereignty from Political Science. But they have succeeded in forcing the monists to revise the traditional doctrine and bring it more in accordance with the realities of life.

9.2.2. HAROLD JOSEPH LASKI:

Harold Joseph Laski was born in the year 1893 in Manchester, England. His father Nathan was a prosperous cotton shipper and a leader of the orthodox jewish community. Even while he was a student at the Manchester Grammar School, young Harold's article "On the Scope of Eugenics" appeared in the Westminster Review in July 1910. After leaving the school Laski pursued his interest in eugenics in association with Karl Pearson at University College in London.

In 1911 Laski joined New College, Oxford. After studying science for a year, he shifted to history, Laski's teachers included H.A.L. Fisher and Ernest Barker. He was also greatly influenced by the writings of F.W.Maitland. During his student days, Laski and his wife were active supporters of the women's suffrage movement. Laski obtained his degree in 1914. He wrote, articles for the Daily Herald on Ireland and constitutional issues affecting labour. He then became lecturer in history at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. In 1914 he accepted a post as instructor in history at Harvard University. Four years later, he left 1926 he succeeded Graham Wallas as Professor of political science, which post he occupied until his death in 1950. During his 24 years of service there, his name and the London School became almost synonymous terms.

Laski's first book entitled 'Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty' was published in 1917. His Authority in the Modern State appeared in 1919 and the Functions of Sovereignty, and Other Essays in 1921. These books attacked the myth of the sovereign, omnipotent state and defended political

pluralism. Laski's pluralistic view of the state was influenced by Gierke, Maitland and Figgis. The anti-statist and anti-idealist views of political thought which were strong before and after World War I also influenced Laski's thinking. In his *Grammar of Politics*, (1925) however, Laski moved away from his pluralism and accepted the view that the state "the fundamental instrument of society". The purpose of the state was to 'satisfaction organize the satisfaction of the wants of men on the largest possible scale'. Yet he advocated a large measure of decentralization, consultation with organized groups and restraints on governmental powers. His commitment to a democratic or Fabian socialism was expressed in his plea that political democracy was meaningless without economic democracy or socialism.

Laski suggested in his book *Communism* (1927) that the ruling class should offer major concessions to the working class because the latter no longer accepted capitalism. In *Liberty in the Modern State*, (1930) he warned that unless the capitalists took steps towards the establishment of a more equal society, the price of social conflict would be that included *Democracy in Crisis* (1933), *The State in Theory and Practice* (1935), *The Rise of European Liberalism* (1936), and *Parliamentary Government in England* (1938). He had abandoned his faith in Fabianism and favoured the Marxist view that a democratic political system was incompatible with a capitalism in crisis. Laski argued that if the operation of political democracy threatened the continued existence of capitalism, the ruling class would destroy democracy and the labour movement, and would initiate an authoritarian regime. The liberal and socialist alternatives to the communist doctrine would then become untenable. Revolutionary socialism and fascism would be left as the only serious contenders for power. Laski based these views on the experience of France, Germany and England.

9.2.3. LASKI ON SOVEREIGNTY:

Laski is highly critical of the legal theory of sovereignty expounded by John Austin. He viewed Austin's concept of sovereign power should be exercised with restraint and responsibility. Laski argues that in the theoretical sense, it is difficult to locate sovereignty in a federal state like the United

States, where the written constitution is supreme, and therefore sovereignty there can be traced to those who have the right to amend the constitution.

Custom and tradition substantially limit the exercise of sovereign power. Although law is the command of the sovereign, he cannot act in an unwise, dishonest or unjust manner. Laski asserts that “ No parliament would dare to disenfranchise the Roman Catholics or to prohibit the existence of trade unions”. The state is also compelled to grant concessions to various groups against its own will; on several occasions, it has failed to enforce its will against its will against recalcitrant groups. Thus the sovereign has to respect public opinion, the social, economic and religious forces within the state.

9.2.4. LASKI’S APPROACH:

Laski’s approach to the problem of sovereignty is pluralistic. In this he was influenced by William James, Gierke and Maitanald. He emphasizes group and corporate personality. According to him, “the state is seeking to lay down the general principles by which the life of the society as a whole may be directed. It is building, not an ultimate unity, but necessary unities of conduct. “ Man’s loyalties are numerous; they are not exhausted by any single association including the state. It is impossible to make an all-inclusive and all-regulating state. Like other pluralists, Laski holds that man is far more complex than a mere political animal. Their view as expressed by K.C.Hsiao is, that man “has more than one allegiance, more than one interest, more than one will; to merge his personality into citizenship is to say the least, to render the expression of his freedom incomplete”. The difference between these two lies in the power of the state to inflict corporal punishment whereas an association can only impose fines on its members or expel them from its membership. Otherwise, “these associations are, in their sphere, not less sovereign than the state itself”.

From the above arguments, it follows that there is not only one, but are many sources of law; that the state is not the only association to which the individual owes allegiance; and that the character of society is federal and not unitary. While trying to liberate the individual from the uniformity of the state,

Laski is also aware of the danger of group egoism. He says "Like the nation-state, it tends to exclusiveness as a means of self-protection..... It asks of its members a surrender of their personality to the prevailing tone and atmosphere..... It will insist that its partial good is good itself and its glimpse and interests of truth the whole truth..... Its leaders, like the governors of a state, will tend to develop purpose and interests different from, often in antagonism to, the purpose and interests of the general body of its members.....Absorption in any group tends to mean narrowness instead of breadth, regour instead of plasticity, unquestioning acceptance instead of enlightened in the agreement". In his later writings Laski became critical of the pluralist attitude. He abandoned attempts to dethrone the state and realized the need for state regulation of individual and group life. for it is the state which protects the wholeness of men over and above parts which express themselves through groups. As M.P Follett points out "The true state must gather up every interest within itself. It must take our many loyalties and find how it can make them one". Laski later recognized the pluralist attitude to the state as a stage on the road to the acceptance of the Marxian attitude to it. The inadequacy of pluralism is that it did not sufficiently realize the nature of the sate as an expression of class-relations. It did not sufficiently emphasize that fact that it was bound to claim and indivisible and irresponsible sovereignty because there was no other way in which it could define and control the legal postulates of society.

Laski's views on sovereignty can be summarized thus:

- a) Sovereignty is not monistic, but pluralistic;
- b) Sovereignty is not absolute, but constitutional and responsible
- c) The State cannot make any claim to a supreme positions
- d) The State is one of the many associations, which play an important part in man's life; the state can be only first among equals.
- e) Association must be completely autonomous;
- f) Authority cannot be unitary, it has be federal, as society itself is federal;
- g) The State can act only as a coordinating authority among associations.

Check your progress questions

1. Write note on French Revisionist

2. Explain the theory of Pluralism

3. Discuss Laski's View son sovereignty.

9.3. COLE ADVOCATES CONSUMER'S GROUPS AND PRODUCER'S GROUPS:

G.D.H. Cole another advocate of pluralism pleads like other guild socialists for the formation of consumer's groups and producers' groups which are to be given co-sovereign status. He goes to the extent of saying that national producers' guilds should be given legislative authority besides administrative. This suggestion is indeed revolutionary, as it would bring the guilds on par with the state. He also speaks of consumers' parliament and producers' parliament

9.3.1. MACIVER'S VIEW:

The onslaughts on absolute sovereignty by MacIver are also terrific. He condemns the legal concept of sovereignty as false and speaks of the state as one among many associations, which are not the creations of the State. The state should bring about coordination and unity in the activities of these numerous associations, which like the State, work for the common interests of the people.

9.3.2. KRABBE:

Krabbe holds that owing to the rise of important economic association like the labour unions, the state can no longer pretend to be the one all powerful agency of social life. Pluralism is approached from the angle of law by Krabbe. His endeavour is to separate law from political sovereignty. For him law is independent of, and superior to the State. He cognizes only the sovereignty of law.

Regarding pluralism the following conclusion can be drawn:

- a) Pluralists have done well in upholding the importance of associations, for which they claim much autonomy;
- b) They are however guilty of confused thinking;
- c) They undermine the very basis of the State by breaking sovereignty;
- d) They indirectly admit the need of sovereign State, which can coerce all individuals and associations into submission.

9.4. SUMMARY:

This unit attempts to analysis the concept of Revisionsm in detail. It also provides details to study about the concept of pluralism and Laski ideas about sovereignty and so on.

9.5. KEYWORDS:

Revisionism	-	a awakening
Pluralism	-	referring to more than one
Monistic	-	the doctrine one being exists
Collectivism	-	the doctrine all means of production under the control of people

9.6. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

QUESTION:

For question No.1	-	Reference section No.9.1.3.
For question No.2	-	Reference section No.9.2
For question No.3	-	Reference section No.9.2.3.

9.7. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING:

Arblaster, the Rise and Decline of western liberalism, Oxford, Blackwell, 1984

R.N. Bernstein, Evolutionary Socialism, New York, Schoken – 1961

Coker, Recent Political Thought (Accorworld Press)

Hyde, Douglas: Communism Today (Gill & Mac)

9.8. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES:

1. Examine the impact of the revisionist philosophy.
2. Critically assess Harold J.Laksi as a pluralist.

UNIT 10

FASCISM AND NAZISM

INTRODUCTION:

One of the evilforces that emerged in the interwar period (1919-1939) in the twentieth century was Fascism.

OBJECTIVES:

By Studying this unit the students will

a – Know the meaning origin and growth of Fascism and Nazism

b – Study the main elements of Fascism

UNIT STRUCTURE:

Definition and meaning

Origin and growth

Fascism in Action

The main elements of Fascism

The fascist ideology

Evaluation of Fascism

Nazism

Summary

Keywords

Answer for check your progress questions

Books for further reading

Questions and Exercises

10.1. DEFINITION AND MEANING:

The term Fascism is derived form the Latin word Fasces, which means bundle. In ancient Rome, a bundle of rods with an axe was the sign of authority, which included the power of life and death.

Fascism emerged in the twentieth century as a reaction against liberalism and democracy. J.S.Roucek in his introduction to political science observes: “Mussolini has declared that Fascism was an ideology compounded of the teachings of Machiaveli’s doctrine of opportunism, Hegel’s political

absolutism, Sorel's doctrine of violence, and William James' pragmatism. Fascism did not have a dogmatic ideology and adapted its doctrine as the exigencies of the moment required.

Maxey observes in his *Political Philosophies*: "To trace all of the source of the philosophy now known as Fascism is not easy. It is compound of many ingredients which have been blended together with great ingenuity. We may perceive, among others, borrowings from Machiavelli, Hobbes, Fichte, Hegel, Marx, Sorel, Bergson, James and Pareto".

In the words of W. Ebenstein, "Stripped to its essentials, Fascism in the totalitarian organization of Government and Society by a single-party dictatorship, intensely nationalist, racialist, militarist and imperialist. In Europe, Italy (1922) was the first to go Fascist, followed by Germany (1933). In Asia Japan went Facist in the nineteen thirties, gradually evolving totalitarian institutions out of its own native heritage".

Mussolini, writing on fascism stated, "Fascism does not generally speaking, believe in the possibility or utility of perpetual peace. It therefore discards pacifism as a cloak for cowardly supine renunciation in contradistinction to self-sacrifice. War alone keys up all human energies to their maximum tension and set the seal of nobility on these people who have the courage to fact it".

10.1.1. ORIGIN AND GROWTH

The original forerunners of Italian Fascist Political theory were a group of intellectuals who had adopted with their modifications the philosophy of Hegel. Taking as their fundamental position the Hegelian idea that the state is the supreme manifestation of God on earth, they demanded that Italians should submerge their individual and class interests in a united endeavour to revive the greatness of their nation.

Fascism strongly manifested itself in Italy after World War I under the leadership of Benito Mussolini in Italy. It was essentially an authoritarian movement, which took advantage of the chaotic conditions that rose in Italy.

Benito Mussolini the Fascist leader was able to seize power in Italy and establish his dictatorship. After establishing itself in Italy in 1922, Fascism spread in other countries. Mussolini boasted that Fascism would be a world movement and Italy would be the leader of the world. Though Fascism did not spread all over the world, it made rapid progress in European countries in the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century. Governments of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, Greece, Rumania and Poland accepted Fascist principle by 1936. The spread of Fascism in all these countries had much to do with the outbreak of the World War II in 1939. During the Second World War, Italy, Germany and Japan were called Axis Powers. In the early stages of War the Axis Powers did well and Fascism became a real menace to the world. In the later stage of war, Fascism got a set-back and ultimately with the fall of Italy and the death of Mussolini, Fascist hopes were shattered to pieces. Fascism played a vital role in bringing much misery to the modern world.

10.1.2. FASCISM IN ACTION

Italy provided many of the ingredients of totalitarianism at the end of World War I. The country was economically poor and was torn by regionalism. The government was corrupt and was associated with the wealthy classes. The local governments were unable to inspire confidence in the people. Of course the unified Italy had a parliamentary system of government under a constitutional monarchy. But as Herman Finer points out, "Italy from 1870 to 1892 had a parliament but no parliamentarianism". They were too many political parties with none of them being able to gain political control. The coalition Governments lacked definite programmes, responsibility and popular support.

Italians were frustrated because the country had not gained vast territory in the first World War, though it was on the victorious side. This frustration provided the basis for an authoritarian policy. Further the growing communist influence in the northern industrial areas alarmed the middle classes, whose fear was another basis for the growth of fascism.

It was under these circumstances that fascism arose in Italy. Its leader Benito Mussolini was a member of the socialist party to begin with. Entering

journalism, he eventually became editor of the official party journal, *Avanti*. His was an unpredictable personality. When the socialist party decided to oppose entry of Italy into World War I, Mussolini took up the cause of an Anglo-Italian alliance, and was therefore, alienated from the party. When Italy entered war in May, 1915, Mussolini saw service at the front.

Between 1920 and 1922 Italian politics was in a critical condition. Several cabinets rose and fell. Inferiority feelings and uncertainty marked the period. The socialists had lost their prestige because of their war attitudes. The workers started seizing factories. The upper and middle classes were worried about their properties. The unstable government of time were impotent. Mussolini's fascist squads called the Black Shirts move swiftly and violently to put down demonstrations by the leftists. This was a welcome relief to Government. With the rise of popularity, the fascists got 35 seats in parliament in 1921 as against none in the election 1919.

In 1922 there was more violence. The other political parties could not stop the rising tide of fascism. The king Victor Emmanuel was unable to form long lasting cabinets. In the midst of threatening marches and demonstrations by the fascists, he invited Mussolini to head a coalition government. Once established as Prime Minister Mussolini brushed aside his coalition partners. The vestige of a constitutional government were eroded in two phases: first between 1922 and 1926 the emphasis was on consolidation of power within the existing frame work and secondly, after 1926 the parliamentary system gave way to the Fascist Grand Council, Mussolini himself was the president of the thirty-man Council which emerged as the heart of new political system.

10.1.3. THE MAIN ELEMENTS OF FASCISM

The main elements of fascism were distrust of reason, denial of human equality, code of behaviour based on violence, government by elite, totalitarianism, and opposition to international law and order. Italian fascism was free of fascism for a long time. However, during World War II, on the insistence of Adolf Hitler, some slight gestures were made in this direction.

Regarding the origin of fascism, there was considerable influence of Machiavelli on Mussolini. Machiavelli's emphasis on decisive action and the exertion of will appealed to him. The elitist theorist, Pareto had a definite impact on the mind of Mussolini. Pareto emphasized the significance of self-confidence in politics. There was also the intellectual influence of a few Heglians like Giovanni Gentile who later became Mussolini's Minister of Education and an important formulator of fascist ideas.

Italian Fascism was rooted in pragmatism. It distrusted any action which followed merely abstract theory. Mussolini made it clear when he said, 'we do not believe in dogmatic programmes, in that kind of rigid frame which is supposed to contain and sacrifice the changeable, changing, and complex reality'. He agreed that those having a consciousness of mission and the will to act on it should first seize political power and then, in the content of actual experience formulate their doctrine. According to him, "Our programme is simple; we wish to govern Italy. They ask us our programmes, but there are already too many. It is not programmes that were wanting for the salvation of Italy, but men and will power".

Mussolini criticized modern liberalism, democracy and socialism. The social atomism of liberalism falsely holds that human beings are isolates having a life of their own that can exist apart from the state. The liberals hold that freedom of these isolates from controls is very important. They believe that individual gains will add up to the social good. Mussolini attacks their views as based on sterile ideas of sentimentalism and visions of individual satisfaction.

Liberal governments have not been able to deliver the goods. The political will is lacking in them. Therefore they think that they can govern by talk and appeal to intellect. Fascists see an Marxism yet another version of liberalism because it appeals to men's particularly interests and builds up conditions for political chaos. Instead of promoting class collaboration by means of intuitive understanding and action, Marxists aid and abet class consciousness.

For Fascists, man is an emotional creature who attains his true nature only when the few men of will organize his life in the state. A leadership conscious of its own call to rule is essential. It is with that leadership that man is ennobled, and finds fulfillment. This view is akin to the position of the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche, but is alien to traditional psychology and ethics.

According to the fascist doctrine, leaders of will are the bearers of the spirit of the state, which is essential for the individual. While liberalism seeks for a life of men outside the state, fascism insists that the entire energy of men must be absorbed with the state. The state is a spiritual personality where the nation realizes its oneness. As Giovanni Gentile puts it, the nation "must act in such a manner as to realize its own personality in the form of the State beyond which there is no collective will, or no common personality of the people. And it must act seriously, sacrificing the individual to the collective whole, and welcoming martyrdom, which in every case is but the sacrifice of the individual to the universal, the lavishing of our own self to the ideal for which we toil" It is implied by such views that all the other associations owe not only their legal recognition to the state but also their very being. As the state is their creator, so it can destroy them. Even the family has no independent right to exist. In fascist theory one of the most important functions of the family is to furnish soldiers for the state.

The fascist state is to be oriented towards power and activism. Its aggressive bent is expressed by Mussolini as follows: "Fascism above all does not believe either in the possibility or utility of universal peace. It therefore rejects the pacifism which masks surrender and cowardice. War alone brings all human energies to their highest tension and sets a seal of nobility on the peoples who have the virtue of facing it". This veneration of the state as force and power leads to disciplinarianism. The strong state demands self-sacrifice discipline and obedience.

Fascism holds the state to be everything-political, economic and moral. It demands total subservience to the state and does not tolerate internal opposition. As Mussolini puts it, "..... for the Fascist, all is comprised in the

State and nothing spiritual or human exists-much less has any value –outside the state. In this respect Fascism is a total-lising concept, and the Fascist State – the unification and synthesis of every value – interprets, develops potentates the whole life of the people. No individuals nor groups (political parties, associations, labour union, classes) outside the State...” Thus fascism rests on totalitarianism.

10.1.4. THE FACIST IDEOLOGY OF WAR

The facist ideology of war was characterized by its exaltation of war. Although the cult of violence had been advocated by several other ideologies too, it was fascism that emphasized the glory and desirability of war more than any other creed. This is testified by Italy’s assault on “Ethiopia”, military intervention in Spain, the conquest of Albania and ultimately its partnership with Germany in World War II.

The most novel feature of fascism was Mussolini’s concept of the “Corporate State”. The corporate state was an institutional arrangement which effectively guaranteed political control over economy. The idea of the corporate state rests on two assumptions. First, general political problem are too complicated for the mass of the people. In the scheme of representation, man must be thought not as a citizen, but as a worker, entrepreneur, farmer, doctor, or lawyer. Second, members of the small ruling elite, understand broad problems that affect the whole society. They alone are qualified to govern the community. This platonic in origin and has found support from burke and Hegel. But this view is rejected by the democratic theory.

While secret police and concentration camps characterized the political side of fascist regimes, corporatism marked the social and economic aspects of fascism. It reject both laissez-faire and socialism. The objective of the corporate state is the preparation of a permanent war economic,aggressive imperialism being the ultimate aim of fascist foreign policy. All economic activity was divided into various fields or corporations. The corporations consisted of two associations or syndicates – one for the employers and the other for the employees. Each one these syndicate was legally recognized as the sole barining agent for all workers or employees within a given

corporation. The officials of the syndicates were fascist politicians. In effect, the Syndicates were nothing but instruments of state policy.

The corporations were administrative agencies designed to unite and control the associations of workers and employers in each industry. Above them was a governmental ministry of corporations. In 1930 the ministry was replaced by a National Council of Corporations. The fascists had full control over production, price, wages and labour disputes. Eventually political representation was replaced by a system of economic representation and the convention a chamber of deputies gave way to the chambers of fascies and corporations in 1939. Mussolini appointed all the 700 members of the chambers, representing party, government and corporations. This gave the fascists the type of homogeneity they had longed for.

10.2. EVALUATION OF FASCISM:

Let us briefly discuss the merits and defects of Fascism:

Merits: After the end of the First World War, when Italy was facing numerous problems, it was Fascism that rescued her from demoralization. Secondly, Mussolini and other Fascist leaders working under him galvanized and vitalized the Italian nation. Thirdly, Mussolini raised great hopes and expectations among the people to see their nation once again as the leader of the world.

Defects: Fascism is based on aggressive nationalism, imperialism and war, Nationalism developed by Fascists perverted, and is the younger brother of imperialism.

Thirdly, Fascism does not recognize the dignity of the human personality, and sacrifices the individual at the altar of the state. The individual has no right in the Fascist State.

Fourthly, Fascism has contempt for Democracy and all that is allied to it. Fascism becomes the basis of dictatorship of the worst type.

Lastly, it misled the Italians by upholding false ideas. Mussolini invited ruin to himself and to Italy.

Check your progress questions

1. Explain the "term" "fascism"?
2. Write a note on origin and growth of fascism
3. What are the elements of Fascism
4. Define the term "Nazism"

10.2.1. NAZISM:

There is a certain resemblance between Mussolini's fascism and Adolf Hitler's National Socialism. But there were obvious points of difference too. While Mussolini made his way to power by coup, Hitler found greater profit at the polls; what World War I contributed to the fascists was the frustration of paradise lost, whereas to the Nazis it was a national humiliation demanding satisfaction. Two other factors sharpen the contrast even more. The first difference is between fascist and Nazi ideologies with respect to 'race'. Mussolini found it useful to play with his myths about a superior fascist type. But it was not a vital part of the system. With Hitler, however, the myth of a super race translated into a pathological compulsion to eradicate its opposite number. In other words, there is no equivalent in Italian racism to the Nazi's hatred of the Jews, the resultant persecution, concentration camps and attempts at genocide. The second major distinction was with regard to territorial conquests. Fascism was not in league with Nazi expansionism. By the measure of its aggressiveness, Hitler's version of totalitarian politics proved far more threatening than Mussolini's terms both of its potential and its actuality.

Still, a superficial likeness may be found between the two regimes. There is a crude similarity in the tortuous path which both traveled to power. Both drew capital from charismatic rhetoric; both were carried to power with the aid of an extremist following, intimidation and manipulation and both were determined to stand atop the very pinnacle of the state to reconstruct it in the image of a totalitarian ideal.

Another similarity lies in the circumstantial opportunity which paved the way to power. Both Hitler and Mussolini exploited conditions of acute national distress, together with moods of widespread despair and frustration. These events were a fertile breeding ground for the cult of fascist and Nazi militants. They also provoked a challenge from the socialist and communist left. Of the two, communism was seized upon as a highly useful and convenient target by both Hitler and Mussolini. Finally, there was the conspicuous absence of an effective resistance to either fascists or Nazis. Each found little to fear from a highly fragmented and unstable multiparty system.

10.3. SUMMARY:

This unit describes the concept of Fascism and Nazism elaborately. More over it explains the main elements of both Fascism and Nazism in detail. You are also able to understand fascism in action.

10.4. KEYWORDS:

opporfunism	-	One who takes advantages of circumstances to gain benefits
Pragmatim	-	Practical
Ingenurty	-	Cleverness
Pathological	-	Study of the causes
Charismatic	-	Some quality to attract people

10.5. ANSWER FOR CHECK YOUR PROGRESS QUESTIONS

For question No:1 refer section No.10.1

For question No.2 refer section No.10.1.1

For question No.3 refer section No: 10.1.3

For question No:4 reference section No.10.2.1

10.6. BOOKS FOR FURTHER READING

Mark, Māx, Modern Ideologies (St. James Press. London)

J.Joll, The Anarchists, London, Methuon-1979

M.Kitchen, Facism, London Dent 1979

Hyde, Douglas; Communism Today (Gill & Mac)

10.7. QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES:

1. What are salient features of Fascism?
2. Trace the influence of fascist ideology in modern political thought.

MODEL QUESTIONS – I

1. Trace the History of Liberalism
2. Explain the representative form of democracy
3. Describe the growth of Democratic Socialism from 19th Century.
4. Asses the Fabian Contribution to socialist ideology.
5. Explain the form “Scientific Socialism
6. Give an account of theory of class War
7. Bring out the ideological differences between Stalinism and Marxism
8. Discuss the Salient features of Maxosim
9. Examine the impact of the revisionist philosophy.
10. What are the salient features of Fascism?

MODEL QUESTIONS – II

1. What you mean by political ideology? give the importance
2. Explain the different kinds of liberty.
3. What are the problems faced by Modern democracy
4. Discuss the bask tendencies of socialism
5. Examine the principles of Democratic Soccalism
6. State and criticize the syndicalist theory of state
7. Evaluate the theory of Marxism
8. Analyse Lenin’s contribution to Marist theory
9. Discuss the salient features of Maoism
10. Critically assess Harlod J. Laski as a pluralist

