WESTERN POLITICAL THOUGHT II

MA [Political Science]

First Semester

IV(POLS 704C)

[English Edition]

Directorate of Distance Education

TRIPURA UNIVERSITY

Reviewer

Dr Nivedita Giri

Assistant Professor, Jesus and Mary College, University of Delhi

Authors:

Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty Units (1.2-1.2.1, 2.4.4, 3.4.2-3.4.3, 4.2, 4.4-4.9) © Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty, 2015

Dr Madhusmita Giri Units (1.4, 2.3-2.4.3, 2.5-2.9, 4.3) © Dr Madhusmita Giri, 2015

Vikas Publishing House Units (1.0-1.1, 1.2.2-1.2.3, 1.3, 1.5-1.9, 2.0-2.2, 3.0-3.4.1, 3.5-3.9, 4.0-4.1) © Reserved, 2015

Books are developed, printed and published on behalf of **Directorate of Distance Education, Tripura University** by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material, protected by this copyright notice may not be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form of by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the DDE, Tripura University & Publisher.

Information contained in this book has been published by VIKAS® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, the Publisher and its Authors shall in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use.

Vikas® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT. LTD.
E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)
Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999
Regd. Office: 576, Masjid Road, Jangpura, New Delhi 110 014
• Website: www.vikaspublishing.com • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE

Western Political Thought II

Syllabi			Mapping in Book
Unit-I			
Hume	:	Conception of Reason, Fact and Value; Human Psychology, Idea of Government & Legitimacy.	**Unit 1:** Hume, Bentham and Mill **(Pages: 3-38)**
Bentham	:	Theory of Utilitarianism, Modern State, Notion of Liberty.	
J.S. Mill	:	Critique of Utilitarianism, Gender Equality, Democracy and Representative Government.	
Unit-II			
Kant	:	Political Ideas, Philosophy of History, Notion of Perpetual Peace and Cosmopolitanism	**Unit 2:** Kant, Hegel and Green **(Pages: 39-78)**
Hegel	:	State and Freedom, Dialectics	
Green	:	State, Political Obligation, Concept of Moral Freedom	
Unit-III			
Burke	:	Critique of French Revolution, Political Ideas.	**Unit 3:** Burke, Marx and Lenin **(Pages:79-103)**
Marx	:	Theory of Alienation, Dialectics, State and Revolution.	
Lenin	:	State and Revolution, Party as Vanguard, Dictatorship of the Proletariat.	
Unit-IV			
Mao	:	On Contradictions, On Practice, New Democracy, Cultural Revolution.	**Unit 4:** Mao and Gramsci **(Pages: 105-142)**
Gramsci	:	Hegemony, State and Civil Society.	
Socialism	:	Utopian Socialism, Anarchist Socialism, Fabian Socialism, Guild Socialism, Syndicalism.	

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

NOTES

Every single individual, at one point or another, in his or her life, has thought about the kind of society they would like to live in. Those who become seriously interested in the field have looked towards the theories of political philosophers through the ages to give coherence to their own ideas on society. Thus, it would not be an exaggeration to state that from David Hume to Karl Marx, the thoughts of great political thinkers on subjects as varied as liberty, justice, state, law and property have provided the foundation for the shaping and the development of human society.

It can be said then that the political environment around the world has been moulded by the thinking and visions of famous thinkers like Jeremy Bentham, J.S Mill, Hegel and Immanuel Kant. All their theories covered a wide range of subjects like freedom, law, justice, rights, authority and property. These theories have set a base for triggering revolutions and global changes. The majority of political ideologies of the world owe their guidance to these thinkers. Every person, who is studying political science, has to have a clear understanding of the political theories of the thinkers mentioned in the book. This understanding is critical for analysing any situation in the current scenario of global politics.

The book has been designed keeping in mind the self-instruction mode format and follows a simple pattern, wherein each unit of the book begins with 'Introduction' to the topic followed by 'Unit Objectives'. The content is then presented in a simple and easy-to-understand manner, and is interspersed with 'Check Your Progress' questions to test the reader's understanding of the topic. A list of 'Questions and Exercises' is also provided at the end of each unit that includes short-answer as well as long-answer questions. The 'Summary' and 'Key Terms' section are useful tools for students and are meant for effective recapitulation of the text.

UNIT 1 HUME, BENTHAM AND MILL

NOTES

Structure

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The first unit of the book discusses the different philosophers of classical liberalism. The unit begins with a discussion on the ideas of the 18th century Scottish philosopher David Hume. Hume was an empiricist who devoted himself to understanding human nature. Hume's *A Treatise of Human Nature* was his seminal work in this regard. The unit will discuss his conception of reason, human nature as well as his ideas on government.

The unit goes on to describe various facets and aspects of Bentham's utilitarian philosophy, underlining and explaining Bentham's idea of the nature of government and how it is essential to create a system of right and obligation. The unit also deals with the concept of the Panopticon, the model of a prison which was structured by Bentham for the British government.

Besides Bentham and Hume, this unit covers the ideas propounded by J.S. Mill. John Stuart Mill was a British philosopher, political economist and civil servant who actively contributed to social theory, political economy and political theory. He is considered the most influential English philosopher of the nineteenth century. Mill was a proponent of liberty and woman's rights. He, like Bentham before him, advocated utilitarianism, and wished to offer a solution to issues related to probabilistic or inductive reasoning, such as the tendency of people to support information that conforms to their beliefs (also called confirmation bias). Therefore, he was of the opinion that falsification is a key component in science.

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

NOTES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss Hume's conception of reason
- Describe Hume's idea of government
- Explain the basic tenets of Bentham's ideas of political philosophy
- Discuss Bentham's views on prison reforms and his idea of the Panopticon
- Describe J.S. Mill's views on the rights for women
- Explain Mill's idea of individual liberty
- Describe Mill's view on representative government

1.2 DAVID HUME

David Hume was a Scottish philosopher, economist and historian famous for his radical empiricism and skepticism. His theories is associated with the philosophy of John Locke. His major work was *A Treatise of Human Nature*, published in 1739. The work thoroughly examined the psychological nature of man. In the work, Hume argued against the existence of innate ideas stating that humans have knowledge only of things which they have directly experienced or observed. In justifying the concept of reason, Hume stated that the inductive reasoning and causality cannot be defended rationally. To study the state, government and law, David Hume adopted the idea of logical reasoning in terms of deductive and inductive methods. He laid emphasis on universal values and reasoning. He had his own idea of government and legitimacy which was the embodiment of morality, justice and truth.

Hume drew his conclusions on the basis of the first major premise. In other words, Hume proceeded from the universal to the particular which is the main characteristic of the deductive method. On the other-hand, he used the inductive method in his study of political theory. Here, he preferred to proceed from a particular to a general conclusion. First of all, he observed, analyzed and compared different constitutions of government and then drew the model of an ideal constitution. In this case, the general conclusion was established from particular facts. This is the inductive method. Hume was the first political moral philosopher who adopted this method-in the study of political theory. Since the beginning of the field of political theory, both deductive and inductive methods have been popularly used methods. Besides these two methods, the other methods used for the study of political theory are the historical method, the comparative method, the philosophical method, observational method, experimental method, psychological method, statistical method, sociological method and the juridical method. These are the traditional methods used in the study of political science in term of reasoning.

1.2.1 Conception of Reason

NOTES

The most significant aspect of David Hume's writings is his ideas on the problems of induction. In the 18th century, philosophers and political theorists established their arguments through two approaches, i.e., through induction or deduction. In the deductive method of reasoning, one proceeds from more general propositions to equally general or less general propositions. The deductive method is concerned with implication and here, one may proceed from the general to the particular. All valid reasonings and universal truths are arrived by the deductive method. Here the conclusion only makes explicit what is implied by the premise and one does not bother about the material truth or falsity of the premise or the conclusion. In the deductive method, the formal truth is accepted and is applied to different political situations. Political action is considered as right or wrong on the basis of the general conclusion. This method puts emphasis on universal values and reasoning.

The following are the main characteristics of the deductive method of reasoning:

(i) Hume said that the term 'deduction' means 'reasoning from the general to particular or from the universal to the individual'. Here the conclusion is drawn from the first major premise which is accepted as the self-evident truth. Thus in deductive method, the conclusions are derived from non-verifiable universal concepts which are accepted as self-evident general propositions. To cite an example, when the British politician Lord John Acton stated his famous adage 'Power tends to corrupt and absolute *power corrupts* absolutely', if X is in power, using deductive reasoning we can say that X is corrupt.

(ii) In the deductive method, Hume emphasized that the scholar has to select his problem first and then he has to draw a general conclusion. While drawing the general conclusion, universal values and reasoning are given due consideration. The scholar has to think or speculate about the general reason or cause. Imagination has a greater role to play in the deductive method.

(iii) The final stage of the deductive method is the application of the general conclusions or assumptions to particular cases. The scholar has to observe or test whether his conclusions are becoming true in particular cases. If he succeeds in getting an answer, his general conclusions or inferences become valid and he may build certain theory in his subjectPolitical philosophers like Thomas Moore, Rousseau, Hegel, T.H. Green, and so on, are the great champions of the deductive method.

Hume stated that the deductive method usually makes use of logical processes and the power of reasoning. It leads to high standard of general theory on the basis of which a particular case can be tested. It includes the study of what ought to be and for what one should strive. It is true that man cannot prosper without certain ideals. Political institutions should be judged on the basis of ethical and philosophical norms. The ideal should not be lost sight of and efforts should be made for its achievement.

NOTES

The deductive method avoids unnecessary experimentation by accepting certain universal principles as valid. In fact, experimentation seems to be difficult in political theory which deals with human beings. In the deductive method, it is not required to collect data from large number of particular cases. Hence, it is less expensive and takes less time. It simply tests the logical force of various theories or principles in particular cases.

According to Hume, the deductive method of reasoning has some defects. It is imaginary and fictitious. In this method imagination or speculation has an important role to play. It is not based on reality. Further, it is dogmatic as it is based on abstract reasoning. In the method, 'what ought to be' must as far as possible, coincide with 'what it can be'.

The deductive method also pays less attention to the complex nature of man and society. It makes broad generalizations without going deep into the complex relationship between men or between man and society. Hence the modern school of behaviouralists rejects the deductive method as inadequate to study the complex political phenomena.

When one proceeds from a particular to a general conclusion or from a less general proposition to a more general proposition, the method is called inductive. Here a scholar arrives at a conclusion by a process known as generalization from the particular fact observed within the range of his experience. Induction is defined as 'the legitimate derivation of universal laws from individual cases'. In political theory, the inductive method is used to get general principles from particular experiences. One examines here various facts, experiences and findings. Political Science is such a vast subject that the problems of various individuals, groups and the state may be studied and certain generalization can be made.

The term 'induction' means 'the legitimate inference of the general from the particular or the more general from the less general'. It involves a process where particular cases are studied, verified and tested and then generalization are made. Here the conclusion is more general than the first proposition. From experience it is found out that X, Y and Z while in power become corrupt and hence one-may jump to the conclusion that 'power corrupts'. In this case, one arrives at a conclusion by a process known as generalization from particular facts.

In justifying reasoning Hume puts more emphasis in saying that the inductive method is based on observation of facts. It involves a scientific process of enquiry. Observation, collection and categorisation of data are made in order to establish the general conclusion.

The inductive method of reasoning is scientific and rational as it establishes a general truth of principle by observation, experimentation or reasoning from particular examples. Its findings are mostly correct and it takes reality into consideration. When deductive method is said to be dogmatic, the inductive method is pragmatic.

The inductive method takes into consideration various complex factors in actual life. While advocating empirical investigation, it studies different factors or variables causing such complexities. Its approach is dynamic as it takes changing factors into consideration. A great advocate of the inductive method was the British

philosopher and jurist Sir Frances Bacon. The inductive method of study of political science has given rise to behavioural approaches in recent times. The unit of analysis is the individual person in a political situation. A behaviouralist studies the behaviour of persons whose interactions influence group actions and arrive at conclusions on the basis of actual findings.

The inductive method also suffers from some defects. It is a difficult method because collection of data is extremely time consuming. It is also expensive. Lot of time and money is wasted in the observation and the collection of data.

There are certain limitations while applying inductive method in the study of political phenomena. Hume debated that the human beings are unpredictable objects. Their behaviour and response may vary from time to time and from situation to situation. Political objects are not like physical or natural objects which are subject to laboratory experiments. Hence, scholars should be cautious while making generalizations on the basis of observation and experimentation in political science.

It may be said that both deductive (analytical) and inductive (empirical) methods are used in the study of political science. In fact, these two methods are frequently used in the study of the social sciences. These two methods are not independent of each other; rather, they supplement each other. Both the methods make an attempt to connect the particular with the universal in order to make a system, although they differ in their starting point. While deduction begins with a general principle, induction starts with observation of particular facts. Hence both the methods should be used to study various political objects. Political Science is not merely concerned with generalization or observation of actual findings. It deals with both the ideals and actuals or normative and non-normative values. As the scope of Political Science is ever expanding, both the methods should be adopted in order to make its study effective and complete.

Hume rejected that reason performs a formative role in inspiring or disappointing behavior. Hume emphasized that the seminal factor in human behavior is desire or passion and not reason. As proof, he tries to apprise human events according to the criterion of instrumentalism. Hume concludes that reason alone cannot induce anyone to act. Rather, reason facilitates to arrive at judgments, but individual desires stimulate people to act on or ignore those judgments. Therefore, reason does not shape the basis of morality. It performs the role of an advisor. For Hume, immorality is morally wrong not because it infringes reason but because it is hurtful to us.

1.2.2 Fact and Value

As it is self-evident, fact is something that suggests how the world actually is. For example, New Delhi is the capital of India is a fact. On the other hand, value refers to something that is good, something that one strives for. For example, freedom of speech is something that people generally agree is a good thing. It is a thing that people value. In philosophy and political theory, facts are usually used for making propositions which can be verified as either true or false. On the other hand, values are used for normative prescriptions; to evaluate whether actions are right or wrong.

NOTES

This distinction between fact and value emerged during the Enlightenment period. David Hume specifically wrote about this distinction. According to David Hume, in philosophical or political arguments 'is' statements do not follow from 'ought' statements. To put it another way, Hume believed that human beings are unable to ground normative arguments in positive arguments. What Hume is trying to suggest is that a set of factual statements cannot be used to give moral prescriptions. For example, factual statements such as murder causes suffering, people disapprove of murder does not necessary entail that one ought not to commit murder. For Hume, the inference from 'murder causes suffering' to 'you ought not to commit murder' is invalid. This view that 'ought' statements cannot be logically inferred from 'is' statements has become known as Hume's law. However, it is important to not here that despite what some scholars suggest, Hume here is not suggesting that ethical and other valuations are beyond the scope of rational discussion. On the contrary, Hume wrote a great deal on ethics.

According to the English moral philosopher R.M. Hare, the distinction between fact and value helps explain why 'ought' statements cannot be deduced from 'is' statements. However, a problem emerges from Hume's argument. The problem in Hume's Law as stated above is that any 'ought' statement can be changed into an 'is' statement. To give an example, 'you ought not to steal' can be changed to suggest that 'stealing is wrong'. Generally speaking, an 'ought' statement can be changed into an 'is' statement by predicating it with a normative value such as 'right' or 'good' of that object or state. However, this should not be seen as a counter to Hume's law because it still seems improbable to develop any normative conclusions from a set of factual statements.

Human Psychology

David Hume believed in the bundle theory of personal identity. This theory suggests that the mind is not an independent power, rather it is simple a bundle of perceptions without any sense of unity. To prove his assertion, Hume wants people to think about what impression gives human beings their concept of self. According to Hume, humans beings tend to think of themselves as stable individuals who exist over time. However, Hume argues that no matter how closely humans evaluate their own experiences, they can never observe anything other than a series of fleeting sensations, feelings and impressions. Hume argues that it is not possible for individuals to themselves in a unified manner. There is no imprint of the individual that can help connect specific impressions. To put it another way, Hume believes that human beings can never be directly aware of themselves; they can only be aware of what they are experiencing at a particular moment. Although the relations between an individuals' ideas, feelings, and so on, individual may be traced through time by memory, there is no verifiable proof of any core that joins them together. Positivist philosophers interpreted Hume's suggestion to mean that terms such as 'self', 'person', or 'mind' referred to collections of 'sense-contents'.

1.2.3 Idea of Government and Legitimacy

A significant aspect of Hume's theories is his concern about the value of the rule of law. Hume also emphasizes the significance of 'moderation' in politics in his *Essays*.

By moderation, Hume essentially means public spirit and regard to the community. For Hume, the best governed society is one which has a general and unbiased system of laws. He has less concern about the type of government that governs these laws, as long as it does so in an impartial manner. However, his distaste for absolute monarchy is clear. Hume advices people to only rebel against their government in cases of absolutely scandalous tyranny. Hume was also distrustful of attempts to reform society that did not subscribe to long-established traditions.

Hume suggested what would be the best form of government is his essay entitled *Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth.* The essay is based on the consideration to establish a new type of government that would be 'the most perfect of all' since 'present governments seem to serve the purpose of society, but they are not perfect and do not work accurately'. According to Hume, an established government, recommended by antiquity, has a lot of advantages and is for this reason accepted by people. Although theorists like him respect this, but with their ideas they 'may attempt some improvements for the public good' without changing the very fabric of government. The thrust of Hume's argument should be clear; he is no radical looking to create a new society like Rousseau, rather, he is a reformer looking to make improvements on the existing set-up. However, his essay should not be seen as a call for political reform in England either, as he makes clear what he hopes from the essay is that 'in some future age, an opportunity might be afforded of reducing the theory to practice, either by a dissolution of some old government, or by the combination of men to form a new one, in some distant part of the world'.

According to Hume, the need for government arises because of inherent human weaknesses. The human weakness that Hume speaks about is the tendency of human beings to prefer short term goods despite knowing that it is detrimental to the collective long term interest. Hume states that in a small society, there is no need for a government as people can get by through voluntary compliance of conventions. However, as population increases, and productivity increases, so does the availability of luxurious goods. For Hume, the temptation to acquire such goods results in man acting unjustly. This creates the need for a government that can uniformly enforce laws, resolve disputes and administer justice.

To overcome the inherent human weakness of preferring short term goods instead of long term security, people appoint 'magistrates' (Kings, judges, and so on) who administer society for the greater good. According to Hume, it is possible for human beings to appoint people to become magistrates despite inherent human weakness of looking for immediate gain because Hume suggests that this human weakness only takes into effect when the short-term gain is immediately at hand. In situations where there are two future goods, Hume believes people generally prefer the greater good rather than the short-term good.

The allegiance that people have to their government is not dependent on any divine right of rule or any social contract, but because of the general social value of having a government. Thus, for Hume, there is no reason for governments to be selected by the people to be considered legitimate. Any government, monarchical or otherwise, that looks after the interest of the people and administers the rule of law justly is legitimate. Any rebellion to change government for petty matters of small

NOTES

goods would result in anarchy and defeat the very purpose of government, thus the people's duty of allegiance to their government forbids this. Rebellions can only be undertaken if the government is resorted to absolute cruelty and tyranny.

However, as stated above, Hume does say in his other works that some forms of governments are more preferable to others. For example, for Hume, governments structured by laws are better than those ruled by edicts of monarchs, representative forms of government are better than direct democracy and free governments are better than absolute governments.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What is the bundle theory of personal identity?
2. What is Hume's law?
3. For Hume, what is the best governed society?

1.3 JEREMY BENTHAM

Jeremy Bentham, widely known as the founder of utilitarianism, also played the multiple roles of a philosopher, a jurist, a social reformer and an activist. A leading theorist in Anglo-American philosophy of law, Bentham is to be seen as a political radical whose ideas paved the way for the development of welfarism. He is most popularly associated with the concept of utilitarianism, and the panopticon. His position entailed arguments in favour of individual and economic freedom, usury, the separation of church and state, freedom of expression, equal rights for women, the right to divorce, and the decriminalizing of homosexual acts. He also fought for the abolition of slavery and the death penalty and for the elimination of physical punishment, including that of children. Even though he was on the side of extension of individual legal rights, he opposed the theory of natural law and natural rights. Bentham was one of the most influential utilitarians, and his ideas were brought to the fore through his works and that of his students like James Mill, John Austin and Robert Owen.

The list of books penned by him include - *An Introduction to the principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789), *Anarchical Fallacies* (1791), *Discourse on Civils and Penal Legislation* (1802), *The Limits of Jurisprudence* (1802), *Indirect Legislation* (1802), *A Theory of punishments and Rewards* (1811), *A treaties on Judicial Evidence* (1813), *Papers Upon Codification and Public Instruction* (1817), *The Book of Fallacies* (1824). He also wrote *Rational of Evidence* (1827), which was edited by J. S. Mill. He also had several correspondences with the Indian thinker Ram Mohan Roy, who was his friend. Ram Mohan supported Bentham's negation of the natural right theory and the distinction between law and morals. He was also appreciative of the principle of utilitarianism. Bentham lived till the age of 84 and died on June 6, 1832.

1.3.1 Utilitarianism

NOTES

From the middle of the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, utilitarianism as a school of thought dominated English political thinking. Francis Hutcheson, Hume, Helvetius, William Paley and Cesare Beccaria were some of the early propagators of utilitarianism. However, it was Bentham who systematically laid down the theory and made it popular on the basis of his innumerable proposals for reform. The great philosopher of the twentieth century Bertrand Russell rightly pointed out that Bentham's merit consisted not in the doctrine but in his vigorous application of it to various practical problems.

Bentham's close friend James Mill introduced him to the two of the greatest economists of the time, Malthus and David Ricardo from whom Bentham was able to learn various concepts of classical economics. These thinkers called themselves 'Philosophic Radicals'. Their aim was to transform England into a modern, liberal, democratic, constitutional, secular and market state. The term 'Utilitarianism' was used interchangeably with philosophic radicalism, individualism, laissez faire and administrative nihilism. The principal assumptions of utilitarianism were that human beings, as a rule, sought happiness, that pleasure alone was good, and that the only right action was that which produced the greatest happiness of the greatest number. The utilitarian thinkers reiterated the ideas of the Greek thinker Epicures. Bentham provided a scientific approach to the pleasure–pain theory and applied to the policies of the state, welfare measures and the administrative, penal and legislative reforms. He provided a psychological perspective on human nature.

In his book, *Introduction to the Principles of Moral and Legislation*, Bentham elucidates his theory of utility. The keynote of his principle is that the state is useful only so long as it caters to the *'Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number*'. Bentham aspired to create a complete utilitarian code of law, which he named 'Pannomion'. He proposed several legal and social reforms and set forth a fundamental moral tenet on which the code of law should be based. He stressed that the right act or policy was that which would cause 'the greatest good for the greatest number of people,' (i.e. the greatest happiness principle or the principle of utility. He proposed the Hedonistic or felicific calculus, which is a procedure for estimating the moral status of any action. His utilitarian philosophy was revised and expanded by his student John Stuart Mill. Mill converted 'Benthamism' into a principal element in the liberal conception of state policy objectives.

Bentham classified 12 pains and 14 pleasures. His felicific calculus tested the 'happiness factor' of any action. Using these measurements, he puts forward his views on the concept of punishment and its utilization—whether it would generate more pleasure or more pain for a society. He calls for legislators to assess whether punishment becomes a reason for an even more evil offense. Bentham argues that the unnecessary laws and punishments might ultimately give rise to new and more dangerous offences. According to Bentham, legislators should measure the pleasures and pains related to a law. Then, they should create laws for the greatest good of the greatest number.

NOTES

However, it is said that Bentham's 'hedonistic' theory does not have a tenet of fairness embodied in the theory of justice. As per Bentham, the law forms the fundamental framework of social interaction. It delimits the personal arenas of inviolability within which an individual may create and carry on his own ideas of well-being.

In the pleasure and pain theory, Bentham pointed out that human beings are creatures of feeling and sensibility. Reason is also a handmaiden of feeling or passion. All experiences are either pleasurable or painful. That action is good which increases pleasure and decreases pain, whereas, the action which decreases pleasure and increases pain is bad. The yardstick of judging the goodness or badness of every individual's actions is the pleasure–pain theory. Bentham advocated that, 'nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign master, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. On the one hand, the standard of right and wrong, on the other the chain of causes and effects, are fasten to heir thorn. The achievement of pleasure and avoidance of pain are not only the motivating forces of human behaviour; they also set the standards of values in life'. According to Bentham, what applies to the individual's morals, applies with equal force. For the state, he pointed out that the action of the state is good, which increases pleasure and decreases the pain of the largest number of the individuals comprising it. All action must be judged by this criterion. According to him, if the state promotes the greatest good of the greatest number it is good, otherwise it is bad. The famous American scholar Professor George Sabine in his book, *History of Political Theory,* pointed out that this principle held to be the only rational guide both to private moral and to public policy.

The real function of jurisprudence is sensorial, that is, the criticism of the legal system in order to bring about improvement. For such criticism a standard of value is required, and that can be supplied only by the principle of utility. For Bentham, only the greatest happiness of the greatest number can be the measure of right and wrong. Hence, Bentham's utilitarianism is based on individualism as well as democracy.

According to Bentham, pleasure and pain can be quantitatively calculated and measured. Pleasure and pain can also be compared. To measure pleasure and pain, Bentham advocated the doctrine of felicific calculus. The sum of the interest of the several members composing it is the interest of the community. In calculating the greatest happiness, each person is to count for one and not for more than one.

Bentham identified some factors to measure pleasure and pain, which were: (i) intensity (ii) duration (iii) certainty or uncertainty (iv) nearness or remoteness (v) purity (vi) which extent (vii) fecundity. The first four factors are clear but the fifth factor means that pleasure is one which is not likely to be followed by pain. The sixth factor means the number of persons who are likely to be affected by this particular pleasure or pain. The seventh factor refers to productivity. Bentham's formula of calculation suggests that we should sum up all the values of all the pleasures on one side and those of all the pains on the other. The balance or surplus of any of the sides will show whether it is good or bad. By using his felicific calculus, Bentham

appears tried to make ethics and politics appear as exact sciences like physics and mathematics. In the words of Wayper, the author of *Political Thought,* 'The doctrine of utility is a doctrine of quantitatively conceived hedonism- it can recognize no distinction between pleasure except a quantitative one'.

Bentham agreed that human beings by nature were hedonistic. Each of their actions was motivated by a desire to seek pleasure and avoid pain. Every human action had a cause and a motive. He viewed hedonism not only as a principle of motivation, but also as a principle of actions. Bentham described four sanctions as sources of pain or pleasure, such as physical sanction, political and legal sanction, moral or popular sanction and religious sanction. Bentham pointed out that an adult individual was the best judge of his own happiness, fully capable of pursuing it without harming the happiness of others. He saw an integral link between the happiness of an individual and that of the community, and offered the principle of utility as a yardstick to a legislature to frame laws in order to obtain the overall happiness and welfare of the community. He repeatedly stressed that a person's actions and policies had to be judged by his intention to promote the happiness of the community. Bentham's defence of the principles of utility led him to plead a case for democracy.

1.3.2 Political and Legal Philosophy

Bentham was regarded as the central figure of a group of intellectuals called by Elie Halévy (1904), 'the philosophic radicals,' of which both Mill and Herbert Spencer can be counted among the 'spiritual descendants.' Some of the famous Bentham's works are '*Fragments on Government*' and '*Introduction to the Principles of Moral and Legislation*', in which Bentham has propounded his political philosophies which can be discussed under following heads:

Utilitarian principle

The principle of utility has already been discussed above in detail, however a brief outline can be reproduced here as it is by far the most important political idea of Bentham. Bentham was not the originator of this idea. He borrowed it from Priestley and Hutcheson. But Bentham reformulated the idea and attached such a great importance to this idea that it became the cornerstone of his philosophical system and also a watch-word of the political movement of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth century. The keynote of this principle was that the state is useful only so long as it caters to the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number'. The 'greatest happiness' theory in turn is based on a psychological and hedonistic theory of 'pleasure and pain'. Bentham highlighted that action is good which increases pleasure and decreases pain. The yardstick of judging the goodness or badness of every individual's action is the pleasure-pain theory. According to Bentham, what applies to the individual morals, applies with equal force to the state craft. The grand idea of Bentham is that pleasure and pain can be quantitatively and arithmetically calculated and measured. With the help of his philosophical calculus, Bentham has tried to make ethics and politics as exact sciences like physics and mathematics.

NOTES

Views on Political Society

Regarding the origin of the political society, Bentham out rightly rejected the social contract theory as absurd. He pointed out that there is no justification of children being bound by the oral or written words of their forefathers. He severely criticized the theory of natural rights. According to him, the basis of the state is the selfish interest of the individuals. People obey the state as it promotes their selfish interest, their life and property. The political society has existed and is existing because it is believed to promote the happiness of the individual who are composed of it. Thus, in a nutshell, the origin of the state is in the interest, welfare and happiness of an utility of individuals. It is the principle of utility that binds the individuals together. Utilitarian concept elaborates state as a group of persons organized for the promotion and maintenance of the greatest happiness of the greatest number of individuals comprising it. Bentham's view of the state is that any corporate body, such as state is evidently fictitious. Whatever is done in its name is done by someone, and its good, as Bentham said is the sum of the interest of the several members who compose it.

View on State, Law and Liberty

According to Bentham, the state is a legal entity with the individualism as its ethical basis. He was categorical that modernization of a state required two things: First, a broad based and diversified legal system, which would take into account individuals desires; and second, institutions that would support the legal system, namely bureaucratization of public service and legislation as a continual process, accommodating both change and diversity. Bentham preserved the individualist notion of moral autonomy with priority to individual interest. According to Hume, the Scottish Philosopher, historian, economist and essayist, 'Bentham's theory brought together in a particular way the two great themes of modern political thought: individualism and the modern sovereign state'.

Bentham thought of ideas and devises to guarantee governmental protection of individual interest, namely that public happiness should be the object of public policy. Government is a trust with legislation as the primary function and the uniformity, clarity, order and consistency were essential to both law and order. He was equally conscious of the need for institutional safeguards to ensure that the government pursued public interest. The government could be changed if people desired it for the sake of good government. He championed the universal adult franchise and recommended it to all those who could read the list of voters. Bentham defined a state as a number of persons are supposed to be in the habit of paying obedience to a person, or an assemblage of persons, of a known and certain description. Such persons all together are set to be in a state of political society. Bentham recommended the abolition of monarchy and the House of Lords, checks on legislative authority, unicameralism, secret ballot annual elections, equal electoral districts, annual parliaments and election of the prime minister by the parliament. Bentham viewed representative government as a solution to the problem. He regarded constitutional representative democracy as an overall political arrangement safeguarded by measures like widespread suffrage an elected assembly, frequent elections, freedom

of the press and of associations as a guarantee against misrule. He regarded constitutional democracy as being relevant to all nations and all governments possessing liberal opinions.

NOTES

Bentham pointed out that state was the only source of law. The main purpose of the state was to frame laws which cater to the greatest happiness of the greatest number. According to him, law is the command of the sovereign and as such it is binding on the subjects. But the individuals obey the law of the state only because it promotes their interest. In the words of Wayper, 'because law is a command, it must be the command of a supreme authority. Indeed it is only when such an authority is habitually obeyed that Bentham is prepared to admit the existence of civil society. His state, therefore, is a sovereign state. It is the hallmark of a sovereign state that nothing it does can be illegal'. Law is the only source of rights for the individuals. There is no such thing as natural rights. All rights are civil rights. The individuals can never plead natural law against the state. According to Bentham, natural rights are simple nonsense. The basis of the political obligation is partly habitual obedience of the laws of the state by the individuals and partly the calculated self-interest of the individuals. Though Bentham firmly believed rights cannot be maintained against the state, yet he justified the opposition to the state if that opposition will produce less pain then continued obedience. According to Bentham, liberty is not an end in itself. Happiness is the only ultimate criterion and liberty must submit itself to that criterion. The end of the state is the maximum happiness and not the maximum liberty. Such a concept of state can only be a democracy and has to be a representative democracy. According to Bentham, in a state all men should have equal rights. However, the concept of equality of rights is not based on any abstract notion of natural law but on the concrete idea that every individual seeks to pursue his interest to the best of his mind. All the individuals have equal rights including right of property in the eyes of law though by nature they may not be equal. Protection of property is a measure of achieving the greatest happiness. However, he was also convinced that law should aim at equal distribution of property and removal of gross inequalities. As opposed to natural rights and natural law, Bentham recognized legal laws and rights that were enacted and enforced by a duly constituted political authority or the state. He defined law as the command of the sovereign. He considered the power of sovereign as indivisible, unlimited, inalienable and permanent.

Bentham defined liberty as absence of restraints and coercion. Fundamental to his concept of liberty was the idea of security linking his idea of civil and political liberty. For Bentham, the principle of utility provided the objective moral standard noticeably different from other theories that supplied purely subjective criteria. Even though Bentham undermined the sanctity of natural rights formulations, he recognized the importance of right as being crucial for the security of the individual. He rejected not only the idea of natural and inviolable right to property but also the idea of absolute right to property as the government had the right to interfere with property in order to ensure security. He defended the need for adequate compensation in case of a violation of the individual's right to property. For him, property was neither natural or absolute nor inviolable.

NOTES

View on jurisprudence and punishment

One of the most original aspects of Bentham's political philosophy was in the sphere of jurisprudence and reforms in criminal law and prison. There was no restriction on the legislative power of the state, not even in the customs and conventions. The state may take help from customs and establish institutions but they were no checks on legislative competence of the state. Bentham applied his celebrated distinction between 'descriptive' and 'sensorial' jurisprudence, namely what the law ought to be or whether a particular law was bad or good, to establish the validity of moral propositions about legal rights. Bentham's greatest achievement is that he tried to apply the principle of greatest happiness of the greatest number to all the branches of law, civil and criminal and to the procedural law and to the organization of the judicial system. For achieving this end, he suggested numerous reforms in civil and criminal laws and procedures. He was all out for simplification of the English law and the international law. As a jurist and legal reformer, he suggested liberal reforms in antiquated British law and procedure. The whole of the nineteenth century legislation of England was the result of his endeavors. Bentham suggested ways and means by which justice could be administered cheaply and expeditiously. He pointed out that justice delayed was justice denied. He suggested that the acts of the parliament should be couched in simple and easily understandable language so that the lawyers may not cheat the public at large. The highly technical, rigid, obscure, capricious and dilatory legal procedures prevailing in his time were nothing short of a conspiracy on the part of the legal profession to harass the common man. He suggested that there should be single-judge courts. He also suggested that judges and other officers of the court should be paid regular salaries instead of ad hoc fees. He even attacked the jury system.

As far as the punishment was concerned, he held that penalty is an evil but a necessary evil. It is an evil as it causes pain but it can be justified only if it either prevents a greater future evil or repairs an evil already done. Bentham was firmly of the view that punishment should be commensurate to the crime committed and in no case it should exceed the damage done. He did not favour death penalty except in very rare cases. He was also in favour of eliminating other savage penalties from the British legal system. He suggested numerous reforms in the treatment meted out to the prisoners. According to him the state should adjust the punishment to the offence in such a way as to restrain the offender from committing it, or at least from repeating it. Bentham had given a detailed account of various punishments which should be meted out in particular circumstances.

1.3.3 The Panopticon

The starting point of Bentham's political theory was his conviction that there was a need for extensive reforms in British society and particularly in English law and judicial procedure. He criticized the existing laws and the machinery and methods of executing them and proposed details schemes of his own. Sir Henry Maine once said 'I do not know a single law reform affected since Bentham's day which cannot be traced to his influence'. As earlier stated, Bentham advocated a theory of

punishment. In this connection, he envisaged the construction of a prison which was named as Panopticon. This model prison was designed by him for the British Government in the 1790s. Bentham envisioned that the British Government would buy a piece of land to construct the prison, but to his disappointment the project could not be materialized. Bentham dreamt of the Panopticon to be the cornerstone of utilitarianism. His concept of felicific calculus was to be implemented in this institution. However, it would be pertinent to mention here that the Panopticon envisioned by Bentham was more than a mere prison. It was to serve as a model for any disciplinary institutions. Besides being a jail house, it might include school, hospital, factory, military barracks etc.

Bentham's ideas of Panopticon were severely criticized by the French thinker Michel Foucault. Foucault presented the Panopticon as the quintessence of the disciplinary apparatus of the bourgeois state. According to Michel Foucault, the Panopticon represented one central moment in the history of repression - the transition from the inflicting of penalties to the imposition of surveillance. In his book *Power/ Knowledge*, Michel Foucault elaborated the prison building in detail. Foucault stated, 'the prison was a perimeter building in the form of a ring at the centre of it, a tower pierced by large windows opened on to the inner face of the ring. The outer building was divide into cells, each of which traverses the whole thickness of the building. The cells had two windows, one opening on to the inside, facing the windows of the central tower, the other, outer one allowing day light to pass through the whole cell. The back lighting enabled one to pick out from the central tower the little captive silhouettes in the shape of cells. In short, the principle of the dungeon was reversed; day light and the overseer's gaze captured the inmate more effectively. The prisoner, who had no contact with each other feel as if they are under the constant watch of the guards. There was no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints, just a gaze. An inspecting gaze which each individual under its weight would end by interiorizing to the point that his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself'. Bentham recommended this 'Big Brother' supervision fourteen hours a day.

Bentham also totally rejected solitary confinement as being abhorrent and irrelevant in his utilitarian mission to prevent crime. He advocated punishments like castration for rape. Subsequently, he applied the principle of the Panopticon to poultry, devising the first battery firm. The Mexican prison 'Lecumberri' was designed on the basis of Bentham's Panopticon. In 1791, Bentham sent his plans to English Prime Minister Pitt but the Panopticon, as earlier stated, never really materialized, forcing Bentham to admit defeat.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

4. For Bentham, what is the only measure of right and wrong?
5. What was Bentham's view of the social contract theory?
6. According to Bentham, what is the purpose of the state?

1.4 JOHN STUART MILL

NOTES

John Stuart Mill, a great essayist, economist, reformer and one of the greatest political thinkers of modern times was born in London on 20th May, 1806. His father James Mill was also a political philosopher and contemporary of Jeremy Bentham. Mill had eight younger siblings. James Mill had come from Scotland to London with the desire to become a writer. He tried journalism and then concentrated on writing *History of British India* (1818) which had a great influence on young John Mill. India influenced the life of John Mill which subsequently determined his career. After the publication of *History of British India,* James Mill was appointed as an assistant examiner at the East India House. It was an important event in his life, as this solved his financial problem, enabling him to devote his time and attention to areas of his prime interest: philosophical and political problems. He could also conceive of a liberal profession for his eldest son, John Stuart Mill. In the beginning, he thought of a career in law for his son but when another vacancy arose for another assistant examiner in 1823, John Stuart got the post and served the British government till his retirement. J. S. Mill was a British philosopher and civil servant. An influential contributor to social theory, political theory, and political economy, his conception of liberty justified the freedom of the individual in opposition to unlimited state control. He was a proponent of utilitarianism, an ethical theory developed by Jeremy Bentham, although his conception of it was very different from Bentham's. Hoping to remedy the problems found in an inductive approach to science, such as confirmation bias, he clearly set forth the premises of falsification as the key component in the scientific method. Mill was also a member of the Parliament and an important figure in liberal political philosophy.

Mill became a strong advocate of women's rights and for social reforms such as labour unions and farm cooperatives. In *Considerations on Representative Government,* J.S. Mill called for various reforms of Parliament and voting, especially proportional representation, the Single Transferable Vote, and the extension of suffrage. He was godfather to Bertrand Russell. He died in 1873 at the age of 67.

By the end of his life, he was the acknowledged philosopher-leader of English liberalism and in Lord Morley's words, one of the greatest teachers of his age. In his thinking, he was greatly influenced by the dialogues and dialectics of Plato and the cross questioning of Socrates. He had imbibed Bentham's principle from his father and from Bentham himself, and he found the principle of utility the key stone of his beliefs. He outlined in his own words 'I now had a creed, a doctrine, a philosophy, a religion, the inculcation and diffusion of which would be made the principal out ward purpose of my life.'

Harriet Taylor, a wife of a pharmacist and mother of three, supported social reforms and equal rights for women. Her husband did not support her in her endeavours and provided little intellectual stimulation for her. In 1830, Harriet Taylor met John Stuart Mill for the first time at a dinner party in her home. They quickly recognized their mutual interests and developed affection for each other. She started helping Mill in editing and writing his articles and books.

NOTES

After he met Harriet, Mill was able to create an impression on the intellectual people of England. In 1831, he wrote *The Spirit of the Age*, an essay that used history to show how Britain was going through a transition from feudalism to a new age. To get rid of Britain's old feudal aristocracy, Mill wanted to foster an alliance of the middle and working classes. After his father died in 1836, Mill experienced a personal liberation as his father was a dominating man. At 30, he took over his father's job at India House. Mill published books on logic and economics that made him a more important philosopher than his father. In his economics book, Mill criticized the relentless pursuit of money. He argued that people should give importance to wealth to achieve higher goal of individual self-development which he called 'individuality'. Mill wanted more participation of people as business owners in a free-market economy. For this, Mill suggested that people should pool in their money to buy out private businesses and operate them as cooperative enterprises and wages should be paid wages from the profits of the enterprises. Mill was also against Government central planning, which was supported by most European socialists. His vision was every man and woman can be a business owner. Mill saw this as a way to help them achieve self-development and happiness. Today, historians often classify Mill as a Utopian Socialist. Mill could finally marry Harriet Taylor in 1851 after the death of her husband. Both of them, however, soon suffered from tuberculosis. Believing he would die, Mill spent more time writing his autobiography. But Harriet died in 1858 when they were in France, as her tuberculosis was more severe. Mill buried her there and erected a monument with a long inscription, praising her.

Her influence on his work appeared to have been smaller than his thought. She humanized his political economy, and suggested the chapter on *The Probable Futurity of the Laboring Classes*. She helped him in writing *On Liberty*, published in 1859, the year after her death, and she certainly inspired the book on *The Subjection of Women*. The other great influence on the mind of Mill proceeded from the discussions and deliberations of the Utilitarian Society and Speculative Debating Society founded by him. The Political Economy Club was also equally important which functioned under his fostering care. It was here that he began his public speaking. It was in these societies and clubs that topics pertaining to utility, logic, political economy, and psychology were discussed with a view to have clear knowledge about these subjects. He was a prolific writer and he wrote on different branches of knowledge with equal mastery. His famous works are:

- *System of Logic* (1843)
- *Principles of Political Economy* (1848)
- *Essay on Some Unsettled Questions in Political Economy*
- *On Liberty* (1859)
- *Considerations on Representative Government* (1861)
- *Utilitarianism* (1865)
- *Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy* (1863)
- *Subjection of Women* (1869).

NOTES

An intellectual prodigy, John Stuart who started his education at the tender age of three enriched the philosophical treasures by his clear understanding and deep insight into things. He had a reverence for his intellectual age but with a difference projecting his own personality and ideas in the prevailing theories reduced into writings by different pains. He died in 1873 in Evignon, France.

1.4.1 Equal Rights for Women

J.S. Mill applied the principles of liberalism to issues of political and sexual equality for women. He was as much interested in social reforms as in political speculations. His sense of justice was stirred early in his life by the social discrimination meted out to women. In the mid-Victorian period, the condition of the women in the British society was appalling. Mill argued that women's submissive nature was the result of centuries of subjugation and lack of opportunities. This inequality he regarded as highly unjust. He regarded birth as no basis of excluding women from the rights that they deserve. According to Mill, no person is deliberately created by nature for a particular profession. If women, however, differ from men on the grounds of sex, this distinction should not be made a basis of distinction everywhere. He was eager to emancipate women and was the first to plead their cause in the parliament. He believed that if women were given equal opportunities to men, the result would be beneficial for women, since freedom alone gives happiness and is valuable to the community in general. He believed that the society would benefit from the contributions made by the mental capacities and characteristics of women. Higher education for women would increase opportunities for them and will help open their talents, and would extend to them the franchise and eligibility to public office.

For Mill, improving the position of women in society by providing them with suffrage, education and employment opportunities was a stepping stone to progress and civility. Mill considered the improvement in the position of women as an issue which concerned the whole of society. In this regard, his work *The Subjection of Women* made a strong claim for women's right to vote and women's right to equal opportunities in education and employment. The two themes that is prevalent throughout the writings of Mill is liberty and self-determination. Mill believed that freedom was the most spacious and crucial issue for a human's well-being. In this context, Mill asserted that women were the subjugated sex who were not given access to their own potential and were subjected to their unquestioned prejudices and biases in society. Mill's main concern was equality as a legal right between the sexes. He referred to women as both the subject and the enslaved class for he believed that their position was worse than that of slaves. According to Mill, unlike slaves, women were in a 'chronic state of bribery and intimidation combined.' He pointed out that the capacity of women was spent in seeking happiness not in their own lives, but exclusively in winning the favour and affection of the other sex, which they gained at the cost of their independence. A woman was not free within her marriage, nor was she free to remain unmarried. He explained how unmarried women in the 19th century were deprived of avenues for living a good and independent life. He deplored the lack of freedom of choice for women and contended that equality should be the ordering principle of societal and personal relationships. He pointed

out that opposition to sexual equality was not based on any reason. Mill asserted that to dismiss equality of the sexes as a mere theoretical opposition did not lend credibility to the argument that women were weaker and hence subordinate. He agreed that the majority of the opinions favoured inequality but this he contended went against reason.

According to Mill, the way men dominate women was entirely inappropriate and altogether based on force. Women also accepted it voluntarily without any complaint and became consenting parties to their subordination. Men, on their part, expected not only obedience but also affection from women. This was ensured through education, training and the socialization process. Women from childhood were taught to be submissive, yielding and accommodating, rather than being independent with self-will and self-control. They were taught to live for others, their husband and children. Selfless devotion was considered to be the best feminine trait, the glory of womanhood. In the case of a pre-contractual social arrangement, birth determines ones position and privileges, while the modern society was characterized by the principle of equality. Individuals enjoyed greater freedom of choice to pursue their own life and improve their faculties. However, women continued to be denied of this opportunity, for they were not free to do what they chose to. It seemed paradoxical that the modern world accepted the general social practice of women's equality, but not gender equality. Mill emphatically said that denying women an equal position only demeaned a man. Like Mary Wollstonecraft, he believed that women could earn their liberation with the support of men. Both Mill and Wollstonecraft presented a reasonable critique of male domination within marriage. However, Mill extended it by pleading for a relationship based on mutual friendship and respect. He subscribed to the view that by and large human nature and character were decided by the circumstances in which individuals were found, and unless and until women were granted freedom, they could not express themselves. The process itself could take longer, but that could not be the basis for denying women the freedom and opportunities for their complete development. He believed that women were as bright and gifted as men, and once granted the same 'eagerness for fame', women would achieve the same success. A judgment regarding the capacities and talent in women could be made only after generations of women benefited from equal opportunities through education and employment. He rejected the idea that it was natural for a women to be a mother and wife, and felt that it was the women who should be able to decide whether to marry and manage a house or to pursue a career. He lamented that it was society, however, that decided marriage to be the ultimate aim of women. He articulated and defended the right of women to be considered as a free rational being capable of choosing the life they would like for themselves, rather than being dictated by what the society thought they should be or do. He was of the opinion that women, even if granted freedom and opportunities, would not fail to perform their traditional functions. When he was a member of the British Parliament, he supported a married women's property bill.

According to Mill, the position of the wife under the common law of Britain was worse than that of slaves in the laws of many countries; by the Roman law, for example, a slave might have his peculiar status, which, to a certain extent, the law

NOTES

guaranteed him his exclusive use. He further pointed out that marriage did not give women the dignity and equal status that she ought to get. Once married, she was totally under the control of her husband. She was denied by the law the right to her children and property. Hence, they must have the rights to property, inheritance and custody. He pleaded for the equality of both sexes before the law, for that was crucial to ensuring a just arrangement. This he felt would be beneficial for all. He was of the opinion that a marriage contract based on the equality of married persons before the law was not only a sufficient but also a necessary condition for full and just equality between the sexes. For Mill, equality was a genuine moral sentiment that ought to govern all relationships including the marital one. He also acknowledged the family as the real school of learning the virtues of freedom and liberation, yet it was there that sentiments of injustice, inequality and despotism were taught. He desired a transformation of the family to suit the temperament and spirit of the modern age, namely the spirit of equality and justice, and in the process to bring about a moral regeneration of humankind. The relationship between a man and a woman should be based on mutual respect and mutual love, and giving due regard to one another's rights. This would make women self-reliant and self-sufficient. Mill said, unless the equal and just worth of human beings was recognized, they could not enjoy equal rights and could not realize their full potential as well. A life of rational freedom devoted to the release of their full creative potential was as much a requirement for a man as for a woman. In spite of his insistence on the need to restructure family relationships based on equity and fairness, he continued to pursue the family as one where a man earns for the family and a woman takes care of domestic affairs. He was convinced that if suitable domestic help was made possible, then a women, and in particular the talented and exceptional ones, could take up a profession or a vocation. Like Wollstonecraft and Fuller, he argued that 'the dignity of a woman was guaranteed if she had the power of earning her own living'. A married woman would have full right in her property and earning. She would have the right to enter a profession or take up a career. According to him, women were fully capable of becoming business partners, philosophers, politicians and scientists.

Mill said both the law and the custom prohibited women from seeking any means of livelihood, other than being a mother and a wife. Besides equal opportunity for women in education and property, he also pleaded for political rights to vote and to participate in the government as administrators and rulers. In his book, *The Representative Government*, he commented that the difference of sex could not be the basis of political rights. He desired that the subjection of women be ended not only by the law, but also by education, opinion, habits and finally a change in the family life itself. In his book, *Principles*, he observed the need to open industrial occupations for both sexes.

After *On Liberty* was published in 1859 Mill turned his attention towards reforms in the political sphere. It could be stated that many of his political opinions were contradictory in nature. Although Mill was a strong supporter of giving voting rights to all, especially women, he advocated a contentious voting system. Rather than universal adult franchise, Mill wanted a voting system where people with an education had more voting power than those who did not. Moreover, Mill was not a supporter of the public schooling system believing that such a system would enforce

social conformity. At the same time he supported government subsidies to parents who could not afford schooling for their children. Mill was also an opponent of slavery, something that Britain had abolished in 1833, and was sympathetic to the American North in the American Civil War. When the American Civil War was raging, Mill wrote that if the American South won then this 'would be a victory of the powers of evil, which would give courage to the enemies of progress'.

Mill contested and won a seat in the British Parliament in 1865 on a Liberal Party ticket. He used his Parliamentary position as a platform to give voice to his opinions on social and political reform, especially on issues relating to women. As a parliamentarian Mill helped found the first women's suffrage society in Britain in 1867. Many of Mill's speeches in parliament on issues were many years ahead of his time. He had become a parliamentarian on the condition that he would vote according to his conscience, unfortunately, he was defeated for re-election in 1868 after serving only one term.

The same year that Mill left the British parliament, he published perhaps his most famous work - *The Subjection of Women*. The pamphlet in detail delineates Mill's argument for equality for men and women in society. In it Mill stressed that both women and men should have the same rights to develop their individuality. This entailed both men and women having equal rights to their own property, earn a college education, choose any occupation, and participate fully in politics. Mill's position on the rights of women Mill was sharply different from his father. Mill Sr. believed that women should not have a right to vote since their husbands represented them when they voted. J.S. Mill, on the other hand, stated that a wife's interests are often different from those of her husband, and thus she should have an equal right to vote.

The Subjection of Women and many other works that preceded it galvanized society and played a huge part in breaking patriarchal mindsets and forcing the male dominated society to finally give in to the demand of women's suffrage. This finally occurred in 1918, long after Mill had died.

1.4.2 Individual Liberty

Mill's *Essay on Liberty* is one of the finest discourses on the definition of freedom in general and freedom of thought and expression in particular. He was an ardent champion of liberty. According to him, free discussion alone can nourish fruitful ideas. He pointed out that not even the whole of humankind can coerce even a single dissentient into accepting the majority's view point as nobody knows that majority views may be incorrect. He said the truth will certainly come out of free discussions, but if somebody's views are suppressed, then not only the truth will never come out, but also that particular individual's development will be retarded. There cannot be any self-realization or self-development of individuals without liberty. He passionately advocated the right of the individual to freedom. In its negative sense, it meant that the society has no right to coerce an unwilling individual, except for self-defence. In his words, 'It is being left to one self: all restraints qua restrains are an evil.' In its positive sense, it meant the grant of freedom for the pursuit of the individual's creative impulses and energies and for self-development. If there is a

NOTES

clash between the opinion of the individual and that of the community, it is the individual who is the ultimate judge, unless the community could convince without resorting to threat and coercion. Mill's ideas on liberty had a direct relationship with his theories of utility or happiness. He regarded liberty as a necessary means for the development of individuality which will become the ultimate source of happiness. There was only one road for him to take and that was the road of higher utility. He has done a distinction between higher and lower utility which may better be understood, respectively, as conducting to the good of the society and the good of individuals. He was keen to do good for the society and for individuals as well. Happiness, for Mill, is the ability of individuals to discover their innate powers and develop these while exercising their human abilities of autonomous thought and action. Happiness thus meant liberty and individuality. Liberty is regarded as a fundamental prerequisite for leading a good, worthy and dignified life. J. Gray says, 'The contention of the *Essay on Liberty* is that happiness so conceived is best achieved in a free society governed by the principle of liberty.'

Mill insisted on the liberty of thought and expression as well as the liberty of conduct. He defended the liberty of thought and expression on two important grounds. In the first place, he argued that it is useful to the society. He asserted that rational knowledge is the basis of social welfare, and the only way of confirming the correctness of the knowledge is to submit all ideas, old and new, to the test of free discussion and debate. In the second place, he advocated the liberty of thought and expression on the grounds of human dignity. On the liberty of conduct, he took another line of argument. He drew a distinction between two types of actions of a man: 'self-regarding actions' and 'other-regarding actions'. He advocated complete freedom of conduct for the individual in all matters not affecting the community, i.e. in the case of 'self-regarding actions'. However, in the case of 'other-regarding actions', i.e. in matters that do affect the community, Mill conceded the right of the community to coerce the individual if his conduct is prejudicial to its welfare. In this way, he defended complete freedom of conduct for the individual unless it adversely affects the community. But the state could also interfere in the self-regarding action if it is thought to be very injurious for an individual. He wrote in his *Essay on Liberty*, 'the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.'

Mill defended the right of individuality, which means the right of choice. He explained that as far as self-regarding actions are concerned, coercion would be detrimental to self-development. First, the evils of coercion far outweighed the good achieved. Second, individuals are so diverse in the needs and capacities for happiness that coercion would be futile. Since individuals are the best judge of their own interest, they possess the information and the incentives to achieve them. Third, since diversity is in itself good, other things being equal, it should be encouraged. Finally, freedom is the most important requirement in the life of a rational person. He contended that positive liberty, i.e., autonomy and self-mastery, is inherently desirable and it is possible if individuals are allowed to develop their own talents and invent their own lifestyles, i.e. a great deal of negative liberty. Hence, he made a strong case for negative liberty, and the liberal state and liberal society are essential prerequisites.

NOTES

Mill had no doubt about the utility of absolute liberty of thought and expression. He does not recognize any limitation of any kind whatsoever on the right of free discussion of individuals. According to him, no society in which these liberties are not on the whole respected is free, whatever be its form of government. He was not only concerned with the advocacy of thought and discussion, but also with the development of the individuality of men and women in the community. The freedom of thought and discussion is not the only theme of his liberty. He wanted to promote the development of individual men and women because he was convinced that all wise and noble things come and must come from individuals. In his opinion, there can be no self-development without liberty. It is this connection between liberty and self-development which interested him even though he went on to argue that liberty is also necessary for the happiness of society.

Mill justified restricted interference because of his inherent distrust of authority, and especially of democratically controlled authority. His contention was that individuals in democracy are swamped in general. Democracy prevents them from developing their individuality. From the arguments of Mill and his definitions of liberty, it became very clear that he was a reluctant democrat and all the more a prophet of empty liberty. Mill stated that 'liberty consists in what one desires. You would be justified in preventing a man crossing a bridge that you know to be unsafe. Liberty consists in doing what one desires, and he does not desire to fall into the river.' He had gone far in admitting the extreme idealist contention that one can be forced to be free. C.L. Wayper in his book *Political Thought* elaborates that Bentham must have gyrated in his grave much faster than ever he did from room to room at the thought that his favourite follower could ever contemplate such a non-utilitarian position. Another writer Davidson commenting on Mill's freedom of action writes that his freedom of action or conduct is admirable and his working-out of the theme is skillfully done. But there are certain points that lead themselves to criticism. First, in his argument he identified individual energy with 'genius' or originality. However, he forgot that this energy may be mere eccentricity rather than encouragement. Second, he did not sufficiently recognize that whereas men's desires and impulses are indispensable to the development of their nature, they are not a sure guide to the proper outlet for their activities.

Mill regarded the liberty of conscience, liberty to express and publish one's opinion, liberty to live as one pleases and the freedom of association essential for a meaningful life and for the pursuit of one's own good. His defence of the freedom of thought and expression was one of the most powerful and eloquent expositions in the western intellectual tradition. In his words, 'If all humankind minus one were of one opinion, humankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, then he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing humankind.'

The early liberals defended liberty for the sake of an efficient government, whereas for Mill, liberty is good in itself, for it helps in the development of a humane, civilized, and a moral person. It is beneficial both to the society that permits them and to the individual who enjoys that. He accepted the observation of Tocqueville that the modern industrial societies were becoming more egalitarian and socially conformist, thereby threatening individuality and creativity. He was fearful, 'Lest

NOTES

the inevitable growth of social equality and of the government of public opinion should impose on humankind an oppressive yoke of uniformity in opinion and practice.'

According to Mill, the singular threat to an individual's liberty was from the tyranny of the majority in their quest for extreme egalitarianism and social conformity. This made him realize the inadequacy of early liberalism. He pointed out that in the area of thought and discussion the active and inquiring mind had become morally timid, for it concealed the true opinion when discussed in public. He further said, 'Our merely social intolerance kills no one, roots out no public, but induces men to disguise them, or to an extent from any active effort for their diffusion.'

For Mill, individuality means the power or capacity for critical inquiry and responsible thought. It meant self-development and the expression of free will. He stressed absolute liberty of conscience, belief and expression for they were crucial to human progress. He offered two arguments for the liberty of expression in the liberty of truth: (i) the dissenting opinion could be true and its suppression would rub humankind of useful knowledge; (ii) even if the opinion was false, it would strengthen the correct view by challenging it.

Mill applied the principle of liberty to mature individuals and excluded children, invalids, the mentally handicapped and barbarian societies in which the race itself was considered in its 'nonage'. Liberty could be withheld where individuals were not educated. He considered liberty as belonging to higher and advanced civilizations, and prescribed despotism or paternalism with severe restrictions in the case of lower ones. He also cautioned against sacrifice or infringement of liberty for the sake of making a state strong.

The political theorist Isaiah Berlin is of the opinion that it is generally believed that Mill's *Essay on Liberty* was essentially written with the purpose of defending the idea of negative liberty. It is true that Mill advanced a notion of positive liberty but he valued choice and individuality as ends in themselves, and not because they promoted general happiness. He did not propose a single overarching principle or values which normally accompanied theories of positive liberty. The theme on liberty was not the absence of restraints but the denial of individual autonomy by the coercion exercised by moral majority and/or an intrusive public opinion. It is criticized that Mill's linkage between individuality and liberty made him conclude that only a minority were in a position to enjoy freedom. The majority of the people remained enslaved in customs, and hence unfree. However, in spite of his elitism, he remained an uncompromising liberal for he ruled out paternalism, the idea that the law and society could intervene in order to do good to the individual. He explicitly ruled out interference in self-regarding actions. Mill stated that the right to liberty could be sacrificed only for some 'other right', a point that has been reiterated by American philosopher John Rawls. However, Mill tried to analyse and establish a relationship between freedom and responsibility. It is also argued that Mill failed to specify the proper limits of legislation, and was unclear when it came to actual cases. For instance, he supported compulsory education, regulations of business and industry in the interest of public welfare and good, but regarded prohibition as an intrusion on liberty. The British political theorist Ernest Barker has criticized Mill as the 'prophet of an empty

liberty and an abstract individual.' This observation flowed from the interpretation that the absolutist statements on liberty like the rights of one individual against the rest were not substantiated when one accessed Mill's writings in their totality.

NOTES

For Mill, the sole end for which humankind is allowed, individually or collectively, to interfere with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant. He cannot rightfully be compelled to do or forbear because it will make him happier, because, in the opinion of others, to do so would be wise, or even right. The only part of the conduct of anyone, for which they are amenable to the society, is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns them, their independence is absolute. Over himself, and over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.

Controversially by today's standards, in *On Liberty*, Mill also argued that in 'backward' societies a despotic government is tolerable as long as the despot has the best interests of the people at heart because of the barriers to spontaneous progress. Mill's principles in *On Liberty* seem to be clear. However, there are certain complications. For example, Mill's definition of 'harm' includes both acts of omission as well as acts of commission. Thus, for Mill, not saving a drowning child or not paying taxes are harmful acts of omission that need to be regulated. On the other hand, it does not count as harming someone if— without force or fraud—the affected individual consents to assume the risk. Therefore, it is acceptable according to Mill's standards to offer unsafe employment to others provided that this is done without fraud and deceit. While reading Mill's arguments in *On Liberty* it is important to keep in mind that Mill was a product of his time and also that his arguments are based on the principle of utility and not on appeals to natural rights.

Mill in *On Liberty* also delineates an impassioned defence of free speech. For Mill, free speech is a necessary condition for intellectual and social progress. According to Mill, 'We can never be sure that a silenced opinion does not contain some element of the truth'. He also suggests that the airing of false or uninformed opinions is productive for two reasons. Firstly, he states that an open and frank exchange of ideas will result in people abandoning incorrect beliefs. Secondly, Mill argues that debate forces people to examine and affirm their own opinions and thus prevents these beliefs from declining into mere dogma. In Mill's view, it is simply not good enough if one believes in something that happens to be true; one must also know why the belief in question is true.

Mill believed that people should have the right to have a say in the government's decisions. For Mill then *social liberty* meant limiting the power of rulers so that they may not be able to use power based on whims and thereby bring harm to society. Mill wrote that social liberty is, 'the nature and limits of the power which can be legitimately exercised by society over the individual'. Mill believed that to bring about this social liberty one needed the recognition of certain immunities, called political liberties or rights and also by establishing a system which had 'constitutional checks'.

The limiting of a government's power is not enough for Mill. Mill believed that a society can and does execute its own mandates, and if it issues wrong mandates instead of right, or any mandates at all in things with which it ought not to meddle, it results in a social tyranny more fearsome than many kinds of political oppression.

NOTES

Mill co-wrote *On Liberty* with Harriet Taylor; the work was published a year after Harriet's death and is dedicated to her. *On Liberty* begins with Mill's assertion that democratic nations like the United States would replace absolute monarchies of the past. However, Mill goes on to examine a new problem that would arise with people being control of their governments. Deeply influenced by the works of Alexis de Tocqueville, especially his *Democracy in America*, Mill fears that will of the people in democracies would result in the 'will of the majority'. Mill believed that a tyranny of the majority is a huge threat to individual liberty and self-development if the majority started acting to oppress minority viewpoints and lifestyles. To overcome this threat, Mill proposed what philosophers today call 'harm principle'. Mill's harm principle stated that, 'the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others.' This principle of Mill negates the tyranny of the majority and thus would block democratic majorities from interfering with the liberty of any adult unless that person threatened harm to others.

In *On Liberty* Mill identified various types of liberties. They are enumerated below:

- Liberty of conscience
- Liberty of thought and feeling
- Absolute freedom of opinion
- Liberty of expressing and publishing opinions (freedom of speech and press)
- Freedom to unite, for any purpose (freedom of assembly)
- Liberty of making the plan of our life to suit our own character, of doing what we like, even if this appeared to be foolish, perverse, or wrong

Mill stressed that a society that does not have such liberties is not really free. According to Mill, 'The only freedom which deserves the name is that of pursuing our own good in our own way, so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs, or impede their efforts to obtain it.' Mill argued that truth is found through the 'collision of adverse opinions'. He further wrote, 'He who knows only his side of the case, knows little of that.' When people listen only to one viewpoint, he explained, 'errors harden into prejudices, and truth itself ceases to have the effect of truth, by being exaggerated into falsehood'. At the same time, Mill believed that there needed to be limits on individual liberty so as to prevent harm to others. To explain his point Mill provided the example of an 'excited mob' outside the house of a grain dealer who are shouting that the grain dealer is starving the poor. Mill believed that in such situations the police are justified in arresting those who might incite violence among the crowd.

Mill was also against the censoring of newspaper articles by the government. In Mill's view, 'an atmosphere of freedom' was essential to make sure that all citizens of a nation had the opportunity to develop their own individuality. Condemning the conformist nature of British society, Mill supported original thinkers and non-conformists who experimented with different lifestyles, thus preventing human life from becoming a 'stagnant pool'. Mill declared that the purpose of government was only to provide the necessary conditions so that people could achieve the higher objective of self-development. He cites the example of the prohibition of gambling and also the harassment of Mormons to prove that the government is wrong in stamping out certain lifestyles and behavior. On the other hand in *On Liberty* Mill also argued for not permitting people from getting married if they could not afford to have children. He declared, 'To have a child without a fair prospect of being able not only to provide food for their body, but also to nurture their mind is a moral crime both against the unfortunate offspring and against the society.' From the moment it was published *On Liberty* was criticized from all quarters. Some said that the work promoted anarchy and godlessness, other's critiqued Mill's notion of 'harm' and questioned his assumption that people actually wanted to pursue self-development. Mill himself stated that *On Liberty* was 'likely to survive longer than anything else that I have written'. Mill's prophecy proved to be accurate in *On Liberty* which remains one of his most popular works.

1.4.3 Representative Government

While in his *Essays on Liberty*, Mill's main concern was his passion for freedom of thought and expression, in the treatise *Representative Government*, Mill's concern is institutional reforms in the government so as to make it more representative and responsible. In *Representative Government* Mill asserts that progress requires representative democracy as only representative democracy can permit the full development of the faculties of its citizens. For Mill representative democracy promotes virtue, intelligence and excellence. He strongly believed that interactions between individuals in a democracy ensure that only the best and the wisest leaders emerge. Representative democracy for Mill encourages free discussion which is necessary for the emergence of the truth. According to Mill, representative democracy should be judged on the basis of how far it 'promotes good management of the affairs of the society by means of the existing faculties, moral intellectual and activity of its various members and by improving those faculties'. Unlike Bentham, Mill has assigned some positive reaction of the state. He wants the state to have a positive role in the sphere of education, factory law, economic life, etc. In order to perform its duties well and exercise its power within the limits, every state must have a constitution. Of course, in those countries which have no written constitution, the conventions or customs prescribe the limits of the powers of the government. However, Mill argued there will always be a single repository of ultimate power, whether by a constitutional prescription or by an unwritten custom.

According to Andrew Hacker, Mill tried to reconcile the principle of political equality with individual freedom. Mill asserted that all citizens regardless of their status were equal and that only popular sovereignty could give legitimacy to the

NOTES

government. Democracy was good because it made people happier and better. Mill had identified several conditions for the representative government. First, such a government could only function with citizens who were of an 'active self-acting character'. They must be willing to accept it. The passive citizens in backward civilizations would hardly be able to run a representative democracy. Second, they must be willing and able to do what is necessary to keep it functional. Third, the citizens must be willing and able to do what it requires from them to enable it to fulfil its purpose. Mill was an advocate for liberal democracy where the powers of legally elected majorities were limited by the protection of individual rights against majorities. Mill pleaded for balancing the numerical majority in a democracy by adjusting franchise. For Mill, it was only through political participation that a citizen's intellectual qualities of reason and judgment are developed. Therefore, people had to be free to be able to participate in the government of their country, the management of their work place and to act as bulwarks against the autocracy of modern-day bureaucracy. This feeling of belonging to a community could only come about if all were granted the right to vote. At the same time Mill worried about the consequences that granting universal adult franchise would entailed, namely the trampling of wise and educated minorities by the mass of people. He prescribed compulsory elementary education for that would make citizens wise, competent and independent judges. Mill always emphasized that representative democracy was only possible in a state that was small and homogeneous. Mill also advocated for open ballot for voting. According to Mill, voting was a public trust which 'should be performed under the eye and the criticism of the public.'

Mill also prescribed some conditions for voting. He favoured registration tests to assess performances, universal education for all children and plurality of votes to the better educated in order to balance the lack of voting rights to the uneducated. His idea of representative democracy also entailed the disqualification of three other categories of dependence:

- Those who were unable to pay local taxes
- Those who were dependent on public welfare, would be excluded for five years from the last day of receipt
- Those who were legal bankrupts and moral deviants like habitual drunkards

Mill, however, wanted equal voting rights for people irrespective of their gender or skin colour.

Mill also gave his views on the best form of government. According to Mill, the best form of government is the representative government. A despotic government however benevolent can never be a good government as its subjects suffer in their intellectual, moral and political capacities. There is no such thing as a good despotism. An ideal representative government must safeguard the aggregate interest of the society as a whole. The representative government must be supported by any active and critical body of citizens. The government should not be the representative of a minority but of the entire community. The representative body should represent all classes. According to Mill, the first element of a good government was the virtue and intelligence of the human beings composing the community, and it is the foremost

duty of the state to foster these elements in the members of the community. He argues that the sovereign power of the state should reside in the organ of the government which is representative of the people. He was in favour of a representative government, but it does not mean that the representative government could be uniformly applied to all people. This government should be adopted by people who are sufficiently advanced and trained in self-government.

According to J.S. Mill, people may be unwilling or unable to fulfil the duties which a particular form of government requires from them. Rude people, though in some degree alive to the benefits of a civilized society, may be unable to practise the forbearance which it demands: their passions may be too violent, or their personal pride too exacting, to forego private conflicts and leave to the law the avenging of their real or supposed wrongs. In such a case, a civilized government, to be really advantageous to them, requires to be despotic to a considerable degree: to be one over which they do not themselves exercise control, and which imposes a great amount of forcible restraint upon their actions. Again, people who do not cooperate actively with the law and the public authorities in the repression of evil doers must be considered unfit for more than limited and qualified freedom; who are more disposed to shelter a criminal than to apprehend; who perjure themselves to screen those who has robbed them, rather than taking trouble or exposing themselves to vindictiveness by showing evidence against them; and who revolt an execution but are not shocked at an assassination, believe that the public authorities should be armed with much sterner powers of repression as the first indispensable requisites of civilized life have nothing else to rest on. These deplorable states of feeling in any person is when that person has experienced a savage life which is a consequence of a previous bad government that has taught them to regard the law to have been made for other ends than for their good and its administrators to be their worse enemies than those who openly violate it. However, little blame may be given to those in whom these habits have developed and these habits may be ultimately conquerable by a better government. People disposed to such habits cannot be governed as people whose sympathies are on the side of the law and are willing to give active assistance in its enforcement. Again, representative institutions are of little value and may be an instrument of tyranny or intrigue, when general electors are not sufficiently interested in their own government to give their vote or if they vote at all, they do not bestow their suffrages on public grounds but sell them for money or vote as told by others who have control over them. Popular election thus practiced is an additional wheel in its machinery. Besides these moral hindrances, mechanical difficulties are an impediment to government. In the ancient world, though there might be, and often were, great individuals or local independence, there could be nothing like a regulated popular government because physical conditions for the formation and propagation of a public opinion did not exist. It is a quality in which different nations, and different stages of civilization, substantially differ from one another. The capability of any individual of fulfilling the conditions of a given form of government cannot be pronounced by any sweeping rule. Knowledge of particular people, and general practical judgment and sagacity, must be the guides. There is also another consideration not to lose sight of. People may be unprepared for good

NOTES

institutions, but to kindle a desire for them is a necessary part of the preparation. To recommend and advocate a particular institution or form of government, and set its advantages in the strongest light, is one of the modes, often the only mode within the reach of educating the mind of the nation not only for accepting or claiming, but also for running the institution.

It is a quality in which different nations, and different stages of civilization, substantially differ from one another. The capability of any individual of fulfilling the conditions of a given form of government cannot be pronounced by any sweeping rule. Knowledge of particular people, and general practical judgment and sagacity, must be the guides. There is also another consideration not to lose sight of. People may be unprepared for good institutions, but to kindle a desire for them is a necessary part of the preparation. To recommend and advocate a particular institution or form of government, and set its advantages in the strongest light, is one of the modes, often the only mode within the reach of educating the mind of the nation not only for accepting or claiming, but also for running the institution.

This mode of stating the problem gives less help to its investigation and does not even bring the whole question into view as the proper functions of a government are not fixed and it varies from state to state in a society which is much more extensive in backward states than in advanced ones. The character of a government or the set of political institutions cannot be estimated sufficiently.

A government is said to preserve its orders if it succeeds in getting itself obeyed. There are different degrees of obedience and every degree is not commendable. Only an unmitigated despotism demands that the individual citizen shall obey unconditionally every mandate of persons in authority. Orders, thus understood, express, without any doubt, an indispensable attribute of the government. Those who are unable to make their ordinances obeyed cannot be said to be governing. Although a necessary condition, this is not the objective of the government. That it should make itself obeyed is a requisite, in order that it may accomplish some other purpose.

The first element of a good government, therefore, being the virtue and intelligence of the human beings composing the community. The most important point of excellence which any form of government can possess is to promote the virtue and intelligence of the people themselves. The first question in respect of any political institutions is how far they tend to foster in the members of the community the various desirable qualities: moral and intellectual, or rather moral, intellectual and activeness. The government that does this the best has the likelihood of being the best in all other respects, since it is on these qualities, so far as they exist in the people, that all possibility of goodness in the practical operations of the government depends. The goodness of a government is measured by the degree by which it tends to increase the sum of good qualities in the governed, collectively and individually; since besides that their well-being is the sole objective of the government, their good qualities supply the moving force which makes the machinery work. The study on Mill's ideas of a representative government reveals that he was a reluctant and distrustful democrat.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. What was Mill's purpose in writing The Spirit of the Age?
8. According to Mill, what was the reason for women's submissive nature?
9. What were the two grounds on which Mill defended liberty of thought and expression?
10. According to Mill, what is the best form of government?

NOTES

1.5 SUMMARY

- David Hume was a Scottish philosopher, economist and historian famous for his radical empiricism and skepticism. His theories is associated with the philosophy of John Locke.
- Hume's major work was *A Treatise of Human Nature*, published in 1739. The work thoroughly examined the psychological nature of man. In the work, Hume argued against the existence of innate ideas stating that humans have knowledge only of things which they have directly experienced or observed.
- The most significant aspect of David Hume's writings is his ideas on the problems of induction.
- In the 18th century, philosophers and political theorists established their arguments through two approaches, i.e., through induction or deduction.
- In the deductive method of reasoning, one proceeds from more general propositions to equally general or less general propositions.
- When one proceeds from a particular to a general conclusion or from a less general proposition to a more general proposition, the method is called inductive.
- In philosophy and political theory, facts are usually used for making propositions which can be verified as either true or false. On the other hand, values are used for normative prescriptions; to evaluate whether actions are right or wrong.
- According to David Hume, in philosophical or political arguments 'is' statements do not follow from 'ought' statements. To put it another way, Hume believed that human beings are unable to ground normative arguments in positive arguments.
- Hume suggested what would be the best form of government is his essay entitled *Idea of a Perfect Commonwealth.*
- According to Hume, the need for government arises because of inherent human weaknesses. The human weakness that Hume speaks about is the tendency of human beings to prefer short term goods despite knowing that it is detrimental to the collective long term interest.

NOTES

- Jeremy Bentham, widely regarded as the founder of utilitarianism, combined throughout his active life the career of a philosopher, a jurist and a social reformer and an activist.
- Utilitarianism or the principle of utility presents a moral test for the rightness of actions, on the basis of the pleasure or pain they create.
- In his book, *Introduction to the Principles of Moral and Legislation*, Bentham elucidates his theory of utility. The keynote of his principle is that the state is useful only so long as it caters to the '*Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number*'.
- According to Bentham, pleasure and pain can be quantitatively calculated and measured. Pleasure and pain can also be compared. To measure pleasure and pain, Bentham advocated the doctrine of felicific calculus.
- Bentham identified some factors to measure pleasure and pain, which were: (i) intensity (ii) duration (iii) certainty or uncertainty (iv) nearness or remoteness (v) purity (vi) which extent (vii) fecundity.
- According to Bentham, the state is a legal entity with the individualism as its ethical basis. He was categorical that modernization of a state required two things: First, a broad based and diversified legal system, which would take into account individuals desires; and second, institutions that would support the legal system, namely bureaucratization of public service and legislation as a continual process, accommodating both change and diversity.
- Bentham defined liberty as absence of restraints and coercion. Fundamental to his concept of liberty was the idea of security linking his idea of civil and political liberty.
- One of the most original aspects of Bentham's political philosophy was in the sphere of jurisprudence and reforms in criminal law and prison.
- Bentham applied his celebrated distinction between 'descriptive' and 'sensorial' jurisprudence, namely what the law ought to be or whether a particular law was bad or good, to establish the validity of moral propositions about legal rights.
- Bentham's greatest achievement is that he tried to apply the principle of greatest happiness of the greatest number to all the branches of law, civil and criminal and to the procedural law and to the organization of the judicial system.
- Bentham advocated a theory of punishment. In this connection, he envisaged the construction of a prison which was named as Panopticon.
- J.S. Mill is one of the greatest liberals and individualists in the history of political thought. The state, according to him, exists for the individual and not the individual for the state.
- J.S. Mill is one of the greatest and most enlightened champions of individualism and individual liberty, and ranks with Milton, Voltaire, Rousseau, Paine and

Jefferson. He observed that the existence of a state depends on the all round development of its individuals.

- J.S. Mill's contribution remains unparalleled in history so far his recognition of the value of human personality and his insistence on the development of a full individual as the goal of the government is concerned.
- J.S. Mill is also regarded as one of the true and the most efficient democrats that the world has ever produced. He not only advocated the cause of democracy, but also made aware of the dangers of the excesses and misuse of democracy. According to him, the ultimate political sovereignty should lie with the people.
- J.S. Mill's advocacy of rights and freedom for women also deserves utmost appreciation. He was a bold advocate of the enfranchisement of women. He earnestly thought for the rights of women. He championed the cause of their emancipation in both public and private life.
- There is no denying the fact that J.S. Mill was a great man and a great political thinker. His contribution to the growth of political thought is really remarkable. Mill through his writings gave a new direction to the utilitarian tenets so as to enable them to be acceptable in the high political and intellectual circles in particular and the masses in general.
- The world will always remember him for his advocacy of the emancipation of women and their suffrage, liberalism, individualism, classic advocacy of liberty, cautious approach towards democracy and realization of the possible tyranny of the majority rule.
- Today, most consider that J.S. Mill was Britain's greatest philosopher of the 19th century.
- J.S. Mill was also one of the last major thinkers to write on nearly every philosophical topic, ranging from logic to religion. His far-sighted views on democracy, individual liberty and equality for women make him the most relevant in the contemporary world.

1.6 KEY TERMS

- **Individual liberty:** It defines the state of being free to enjoy various social, political or economic rights, free from any government control or restraints in the exercise of those rights. It forms the core of democracy.
- **Good governance:** It defines a form of governance where public institutions conduct public affairs and manage public resources in a way to guarantee the realization of human rights.
- **Subjugation:** It defines the state of gaining control over somebody or something.

NOTES

- **Representative government:** A form of government which is elected by the people; in such a form of government, only those who are the elected representatives have the power to make laws and institute taxes.
- **Utilitarianism:** An ethical theory which states that the right course of action is the one that maximizes the overall 'good' consequences of the action; it thus promotes that the moral worth of an action is determined by its resulting outcome.
- **Panopticon:** A circular prison with cells arranged around a central well, from which prisoners could at all times be observed.
- **Nihilism**: The rejection of all religious and moral principles, often in the belief that life is meaningless.
- **Hedonism:** The ethical theory that pleasure is the highest good and proper aim of human life.
- ***Felicific Calculus:*** The felicific calculus is an algorithm formulated by utilitarian philosopher Jeremy Bentham for calculating the degree or amount of pleasure that a specific action is likely to cause.

1.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The bundle theory of personal identity. This theory suggests that the mind is not an independent power, rather it is simple a bundle of perceptions without any sense of unity.
2. The point of view that 'ought' statements cannot be logically inferred from 'is' statements has become known as Hume's law.
3. For Hume, the best governed society is one which has a general and unbiased system of laws.
4. For Bentham, only the greatest happiness of the greatest number can be the measure of right and wrong.
5. Regarding the origin of the political society, Bentham out rightly rejected the social contract theory as absurd. He pointed out that there is no justification of children being bound by the oral or written words of their forefathers.
6. For Bentham, the main purpose of the state was to frame laws which cater to the greatest happiness of the greatest number.
7. In 1831, he wrote *The Spirit of the Age*, an essay that used history to show how Britain was going through a transition from feudalism to a new age.
8. Mill argued that women's submissive nature was the result of centuries of subjugation and lack of opportunities.
9. Mill defended the liberty of thought and expression on two important grounds. In the first place, he argued that it is useful to the society. He asserted that

rational knowledge is the basis of social welfare, and the only way of confirming the correctness of the knowledge is to submit all ideas, old and new, to the test of free discussion and debate. In the second place, he advocated the liberty of thought and expression on the grounds of human dignity.

10. According to Mill, the best form of government is the representative government.

NOTES

1.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is inductive reasoning?
2. When is Hume's view of the concept of self?
3. What did J.S. Mill intend to convey through his work *Considerations on Representative Government*?
4. What was the panopticon?
5. What are the various liberties that Mill identifies in the essay *Liberty*?
6. What does the study on Mill's ideas on representative government reveal?
7. Write a short note on Bentham's pleasure and pain theory.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Examine the maxim '*Greatest Happiness of the Greatest Number*' in light of Bentham's theories.
2. Discuss Hume's idea of the perfect government.
3. Discuss Mill's contributions towards the emancipation of women.
4. Hume believed that human beings are unable to ground normative arguments in positive arguments. Discuss.
5. Pleasure and pain are the fundamental tenets of utilitarianism. Discuss.
6. According to Mill, 'the position of the wife under the common law of Britain was worse than that of slaves in the laws of many countries'. Discuss the condition of women during Mill's time in light of his statement.
7. Discuss Bentham's theory of punishment.

1.9 FURTHER READING

Parekh, Bhikhu (ed.) 1993. *Jeremey Bentham: Critical Assessments*. London: Routledge.

Stark, Warner. 2004. *Jeremy Bentham's Economic Writings: Critical Edition*. London: Francis and Taylor.

NOTES

Semple, Janet. 1993. *Bentham's Prison: A Study of the Panopticon Penitentiary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Subrata, Mukharjee and Susila Ramaswamy, 2007. *A History of Political Thought: Plato to Marx*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

Iain, Hampsher – Monk. 1992. *Modern Political Thought: Major Political Thinkers from Hobbes to Marx*. Oxford: UK, Blackwell Publisher Ltd.

Thomas Hobbes, C.B. Macpherson (ed.). 1968. *Leviathan*. London: Penguin.

Todor, Jones. 2002. *Political Thinkers and Ideas: A Historical Introduction*. New York: Routledge Publication.

UNIT 2 KANT, HEGEL AND GREEN

NOTES

Structure

2.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will learn about the theories of George Willhelm Friedrich Hegel, Immanuel Kant and T.H. Green.

Hegel was the founder of modern idealism. He innovated dialectic method and the theory of self-realization. He was critical of purely reflective knowledge. His famous work *Philosophy of Right* deals with key issues of law, politics and morality, and makes an important distinction between the state and civil society. According to some scholars and researchers, it was Hegel who was the first thinker to have understood very clearly that questions concerning morality change from one particular place and time to another, and there was nothing called a permanent moral question. The dialectic between civil society and the state of restoration is not incidental in Hegel's philosophy. Hegelian idealism is often referred to as absolute idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood.

Thomas Hill Green was a leading British philosopher and political figure and founder of the school of British Idealism. He pioneered in questioning the traditional

NOTES

liberal antithesis between the state and the individual. He emphasized on individualism which is very strong in all liberal thought. Yet, when compared to the body of preceding liberal thought, he can be seen to have replaced the former's emphasis of the autonomy of the individual with an emphasis on the 'organic' society, and the value of community ethos.

Immanuel Kant was a great German philosopher of the 18th century Enlightenment. Kant's most important work, the *Critique of Pure Reason*, aimed at uniting reason with experience to move beyond what he considered to be failures of traditional philosophy and metaphysics. He hoped to end an age of speculation where objects which could not be experienced were used to support the futile theories. Thus, he opposed the scepticism and idealism of philosophers like Descartes, Berkeley and Hume. Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason* deals with ethics and the *Critique of Judgement* looks at aesthetics and teleology. He aimed to resolve disputes between empirical and rationalist approaches. He was of the opinion that using reason without applying it to experience will lead to theoretical illusions.

Kant's ideas influenced many thinkers in Germany during his lifetime. He moved philosophy beyond the debate between the rationalists and empiricists. The philosophers like Fichte, Schelling, Hegel and Schopenhauer developed the Kantian system, which, in turn, brought about various forms of German idealism. German and European thinking progressed after his time, and his influence is inspiring philosophical works even today.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss Kant's political philosophy
- Describe the concept of idealism as propounded by Hegel
- Describe Hegel's notion of the state
- Examine the 'dialectic theory' of Hegel
- Explain Green's views on the theory of social contract and punishment

2.2 IMMANUEL KANT

Let us begin the theories of Kant by trying to understand his philosophical ideas. According to Immanuel Kant, the Enlightenment period was shaped by the Latin saying *Sapere aude* ('Dare to Know'). Kant believed that an individual should think autonomously; the individual should be free of the dictates of external authority. Kant's theories resolved many of the divergences between 18th century rationalist and empiricist traditions. He asserted that due to the limitations of argumentation in the absence of indisputable evidence, one cannot really know whether there is a God and an afterlife or not. People are, according to Kant, reasonably justified in believing in them to save the society and morality.

There were two interconnected foundations of Kant's 'critical philosophy'. These were:

- Epistemology of transcendental idealism
- Moral philosophy of the autonomy of practical reason

These teachings placed the active, rational human subject at the centre of the cognitive and moral worlds.

Conceptual unification and integration is conducted by the mind through concepts or the categories of understanding. This operates on the perceptual manifold within space and time. Hence, the objective order of nature and the causal necessity that operates within it depend on the mind's processes, the product of the rule-based activity which Kant called 'synthesis'.

Kant also talks about the *transcendental object.* For Kant, the transcendental object is a product of human understanding as it tries to imagine objects in abstraction from the conditions of sensibility. Echoing this, other scholars have stated that the notion of 'thing in itself' does not represent a separate ontological domain; it is simply a way of envisaging objects by means of the understanding alone. This is referred to as the two-aspect view.

As far as morality is concerned, Kant states, 'The source of the good lies not in anything outside the human subject, either in nature or given by God, but rather is only the good will itself.' A good will, according to Kant, is one that acts from duty according to the universal moral law an autonomous human being freely gives itself. This law obliges one to consider humanity as an end in itself rather than just a means to other ends the individuals might hold.

2.2.1 Kant's Theory of Perception

Kant's theory of perception can be found in his work *The Critique of Pure Reason*. Scholars and theorists consider the treatise to be one of the most important works of metaphysics and epistemology in modern philosophy. In the work, Kant suggests that human understanding of the external world is based not only on experience, rather it is based on experience as well as priori concepts. Kant, therefore, provides a non-empiricist critique of rationalist philosophy. He refers to this as his 'Copernican revolution'.

Let us see how Kant differentiates between analytic and synthetic propositions.

- **Analytic proposition:** It refers to a proposition whose predicate concept is contained in its subject concept. For example, the statement 'All human bodies need food'.
- **Synthetic proposition:** It refers a proposition whose predicate concept is not contained in its subject concept. For example, the statement 'All cricketers are happy'.

Analytic propositions are factual statements based on the meaning of the words that comprise the sentence. We do not require any other knowledge except for an understanding of the language to understand the proposition. On the other hand, synthetic propositions are those that communicate us something about society.

NOTES

According to Kant, elementary mathematics is synthetic *a priori*, in the sense that its statements provide new knowledge. This knowledge is not established from experience. He is of the view that the possibility of experience is dependent on certain essential conditions—referred to as *a priori* forms—and that these conditions hold true of the world of experience. His main arguments in favour of 'transcendental aesthetic' are: (i) mathematic judgements are synthetic *a priori* and (ii) space and time are not derived from experience but rather are its preconditions.

Kant asserts that experience is based on two factors: (i) the perception of external objects and (ii) a priori knowledge. The external world provides us with those things that can be sensed by us. It is, however, our mind that processes this information about the world and gives it order. Only then we are able to comprehend the information. The conditions of space and time to experience objects are supplied by our mind. As per the 'transcendental unity of apperception', the concepts of the mind (i.e., understanding) and the perceptions or intuitions that garner information from phenomena (i.e., sensibility) are synthesized by comprehension. It means that if there are no concepts, intuitions are non-descript; if there are no intuitions, concepts are meaningless. This has led to the famous statement, 'Thoughts without content are empty, intuitions without concepts are blind.'

2.2.2 Categories of the Faculty of Judgement

While studying the works of Kant, one needs to realize that there is a distinction between 'understanding' as the general concept and the 'understanding' as a faculty of the human mind. In much English language scholarship, the word "understanding" is used in both senses.

According to Kant, human beings have some objective knowledge of the world. However, this knowledge relies on synthetic, *a priori* laws of nature, such as causality and substance. The problem, then, is how this is feasible. Kant's solution was to reason that the subject must supply laws that make experience of objects possible, and that these laws are the synthetic, *a priori* laws of nature.

According to Kant, 'Judgements are the preconditions of any thought. Man thinks via judgements, so all possible judgements must be listed and the perceptions connected within them put aside, so as to make it possible to examine the moments when *the understanding* is engaged in constructing judgements. Categories are equivalent to these moments, in that they are concepts of intuitions in general, so far as they are determined by these moments universally and necessarily. Thus, by listing all the moments, one can deduce from them all of the categories.'

As far as the number of possible judgements is concerned, Kant believes that:

- All the possible propositions within Aristotle's syllogistic logic are equivalent to all possible judgements.
- All the logical operators within the propositions are equivalent to the moments of the understanding within judgements.

Hence, Kant listed Aristotle's system of judgement in four groups of three:

- **Quantity:** Universal, particular and singular
- **Quality:** Affirmative, negative and infinite
- **Relation:** Categorical, hypothetical and disjunctive
- **Modality:** Problematic, assertoric and apodeictic

NOTES

You can draw the parallelism with Kant's categorization of judgement, which is as follows:

1. **Quantity:** Unity, plurality and totality
2. **Quality:** Reality, negation and limitation
3. **Relation:** Substance, cause and community
4. **Modality:** Possibility, existence and necessity

The fundamental building blocks of experience, i.e., objective knowledge, are as follows:

- First there is the sensibility, whose function is to supply the mind with intuitions. This is followed by the understanding, whose function is to produce judgements of these intuitions and subsume them under categories.
- These categories lift the intuitions up out of the subject's current state of consciousness and put them within consciousness in general, leading to the production of universally necessary knowledge.
- For the categories are instinctive in any rational being, so any intuition thought within a category in one mind will essentially be subsumed and understood identically in any mind. Thus, we filter what we see and hear.

2.2.3 Kant's Moral Philosophy

Kant developed his moral philosophy in the following three works:

- *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*
- *Critique of Practical Reason*
- *Metaphysics of Morals*

In the *Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals*, Kant's method attempts at converting humanities rational knowledge of morality into philosophical knowledge. *Critique of Practical Reason* and *Metaphysics of Morals* followed the method of using 'practical reason'. This method is based only upon things about which reason can inform us. It does not derive any principles from experience to reach conclusions.

The moral philosophy of Kant may be summarized as follows:

- According to Kant, there is a single moral obligation, referred to as 'categorical imperative', which is derived from the concept of duty.
- The demands of the moral law are defined as 'categorical imperatives'. Categorical imperatives are beliefs that are inherently valid; they are good in themselves; they must be obeyed in all situations and circumstances by human beings if human behaviour is to observe the moral law.

NOTES

- Kant states that from the categorical imperatives, all other moral imperatives are established. It is from the categorical imperatives that all other moral obligations are generated, and by which all moral obligations can be tested.
- The moral means and ends can be applied to the categorical imperative.
- Rational beings can pursue certain 'ends' using the appropriate 'means'.
- Ends that are based on physical needs or wants will always give merely hypothetical imperatives.
- The moral law is a principle of reason itself and is not based on contingent facts about the world.
- A categorical imperative is an unconditional obligation, that is, it is an obligation that has to be adhered to irrespective of human will and desire.
- Kant also says that if an action is not done with the motive of duty, then it is without moral value. Every action should have pure intention behind it; otherwise it was meaningless.
- For Kant, it is wrong to assert that the final result is the most significant aspect of an action. How the person feels while carrying out the action is the time at which value is set to the result.
- There is a difference between preferences and values and considerations of individual rights temper calculations of aggregate utility. This is referred to as a 'counter-utilitarian idea'.
- Everything has either a *price* or a *dignity*. Whatever has a price can be replaced by something else as its equivalent. But that which constitutes the condition under which alone something can be an end in itself does not have mere relative worth, i.e., price, but an intrinsic worth, i.e., a dignity.

2.2.4 Kant's Idea of Freedom

Kant's ideas about freedom may be summarized as follows:

(a) Kant differentiates between the transcendental notion of freedom, which, as a psychological concept, is 'primarily empirical'. The transcendental notion of freedom talks about 'the question whether we must admit a power of spontaneously beginning a series of successive things or states as a real ground of necessity in regard to causality'.

(b) Kant finds it hard to swallow that the practical notion of freedom is based on the transcendental notion of freedom. However, he accepts it for practical reasons.

(c) He calls practical 'everything that is possible through freedom'. According to him, the pure practical laws that are never given through sensuous conditions but are held analogously with the universal law of causality are moral laws.

(d) Kant believes that reason can give us only the 'pragmatic laws of free action through the senses', but pure practical laws given by reason *a priori* dictate 'what should not be done'.

2.2.5 Political Philosophy: Notion of Perpetual Peace

NOTES

Kant in his work *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, provided a wide variety of conditions that he thinks are critical to end wars and create an everlasting peace. One of the things that it encompassed was a world of constitutional republics. His classical republican theory was extended in the first part of *Metaphysics of Morals*— published separately as *Science of Right.*

Kant was opposed to 'democracy', which during his period meant direct democracy. Kant asserted that direct democracy resulted in majority rule which was a huge threat to individual liberty. Kant considers democracy to be nothing less than despotism since it results in an executive power where 'all decide for or even against one who disagrees; that is, all, who are not quite all, decide, and this is a disagreement with the general will with itself and with freedom.' Like other philosophers of his period, Kant categorizes three forms of government, namely democracy, aristocracy and monarchy. For Kant, a mixed government is the most ideal form of government.

Kant wrote his social and political philosophy with the objective of championing the enlightenment in general and the idea of freedom in particular. Kant believed that every rational human being had both an inherent right to freedom and a duty to enter into a civil condition governed by a social contract so that he can realize and preserve that freedom.

Kant's political philosophy may be discussed under the following heads:

(a) Freedom as the basis of the state

- According to Kant, 'There is only one innate right, i.e., right to freedom (independence from being constrained by another's choice).' Kant does not agree to any other basis for the state. Kant's view on freedom as the basis of the state may be summarized as follows:
- He believes that the welfare of citizens cannot be the basis of state power.
- He asserts that a state cannot justifiably force any particular conception of happiness upon its citizens.
- He asserts that the state should treat its citizens as children, assuming that they are not capable of understanding what is truly useful or harmful to them.
- In *Groundwork,* he distinguishes the ethics of autonomy from those of heteronomy. In autonomy, the will is the basis of its own law, whereas in heteronomy, something independent of the will, such as happiness, is the basis of moral law.
- In his work, *Critique of Practical Reason,* Kant asserts that happiness is not specific enough to demand any general desires in human beings.
- He believes that no specific notion of happiness can becoming the basis of the pure principle of the state. Moreover, he believes that the general notion of happiness is so ambiguous that it cannot become the basis of a law. Thus, Kant cannot imagine a 'universal principle of right' that is based upon

NOTES

happiness; this principle of right can only be based on something truly universal, such as freedom.

- For Kant, freedom means 'independence from being constrained by another's choice'.
- The core of Kant's political philosophy is the notion of individual freedom of action. Kant makes the assumption that an individual's use of choice is free in the transcendental sense. As all individuals enjoy transcendental freedom by virtue of being rational, freedom of choice is a universal human quality, which needs to be respected and promoted, even when it is not exercised in rational or virtuous way.
- Kant believes that freedom of choice can be comprehended both in terms of its content, i.e., the specific decisions of people, and their form, i.e., the free, unconstrained nature of choice of any possible particular end.
- Kant argues that freedom is universal. It can be comprehended in such a way that it is vulnerable to specification without losing its universality.
- According to him, the state is not a barrier to freedom; rather, it is the means for freedom. State action maintains the maximal freedom that is consistent with identical freedom for all without reducing it.
- In the work *Theory and Practice*, he makes freedom the first of the following three principles:
  - The freedom of every member of the state as a human being.
  - His equality with every other as a subject.
  - The independence of every member of a commonwealth as a citizen.
- He believes that equality is not substantive; it is formal. Before the law, each member of the state is equal to its every other member.

(b) Social contract

Kant's views on social contract may be summarized as follows:

- According to Kant, the sovereign needs to recognize the 'original contract' as an idea of reason that forces the sovereign to give his laws arising from the united will of the people. Kant believes that the sovereign should regard each subject, insofar as he wants to be a citizen, as if he has joined in voting for such a will.
- Kant stresses that any rights and duties arise from an initial contract due to the rightful relations embodied in it and not owing to any particular historical provenance. He points out that unlike a historical act, an empirical cannot be the basis of any rightful rights and duties.
- Kant believes that the idea of an original contract limits the sovereign as a legislator. There cannot be a law which has the consent of all the people.
- Kant argues that the set of actual particular desires of citizens cannot be the basis of deciding if they could possibly consent to a law. In fact, the type of

possibility at issue is one of rational probable unanimity based upon fair sharing of burdens and rights. This could be better understood with the help of two examples provided by Kant.

Examples: Kant's first example speaks of a law offering inherited privileges to members of a certain class of subjects. For Kant, such a law would be unjust since it would be illogical for people not belonging to this class to give their consent to tolerate lesser privileges than individuals of the class. It may be argued that empirical information cannot possibly make sure that all people to agree to this law. Kant's second example speaks of a war tax. According to Kant, if the tax is governed and overseen in an unbiased manner, it cannot be called unjust. He states that even if the actual citizens are against the war, the war tax would be just since it is possible that the war is being fought for correct reasons, which the state, but not citizens, know about.

- Kant's social contract theory is similar to that of Hobbes in a few important characteristics. Like Hobbes, Kant stresses that the social contract is not a historical document and does not entail a historical act. Rather, the social contract is a rational justification for state power. He asserts that it is not based on deals between individuals or between individuals and a government. Kant also agrees with the Hobbes' assumption that the social contract is not voluntary. For Kant, people can be forced into the civil condition even if they do not give their consent.
- An important difference between the social contract theory of Kant and Hobbes is that the latter establishes his theory on the individual benefit for each party to the contract, while the former establishes his theory on right itself, comprehended as freedom for all persons in general. Thus, it can be stated that here Kant is influenced more by Rousseau's idea of the General Will.

(c) Republics and democracy

Kant's ideas on republics and democracy may be summarized as follows:

- Immanuel Kant does not emphasize self-government. In the work *Perpetual Peace*, Kant discusses the conventional separation of the types of government. Kant categorizes governments in the following two dimensions.
  - **Form of sovereignty:** It concerns who rules. He identifies the three conventional forms, namely rule by one person, rule by a small group of people and rule by all people.
  - **Form of government:** It concerns how those people rule. Here he provides either republican or despotic, which is a variation on the traditional good–bad dichotomy.
- By 'republican', Kant means a state where there is a division between the executive power (the government) and the legislative power. On the other hand, in despotic governments, both are united such that the monarch has given laws to himself and in essence made his private will into the public will.

NOTES

- According to Kant, Republics need representation to make sure that the executive power only imposes the public will by insisting that the executive implements only those laws that are made by representatives of the people and not the executive itself. Kant states that a republican government need not involve actual participation of citizens in making the legislations so long as the legislations are promulgated with the united will of the people. Kant firmly believes that an elected representative legislator is the best form of a republic.
- When Kant discusses voting for representatives, he follows many prejudices that were prevalent during his day. According to Kant, the right to vote requires 'being one's own master'. This meant only those had a right to vote who possessed property or had some skill that would help support themselves independently. Kant also does not believe women need a right to vote because of what he calls 'natural' reasons. He does not say what these reasons are.
- Kant asserts that insistence on a representative system is not insistence on an *elected* representative system. However, as stated before, that such an elected representative system is the ideal form of government.
- Kant firmly believes that republican constitutions help avoid war because when the consent of the people is needed, they think about the costs that accompany a war like taxes, loss of life and property, on the other hand, a non-republican monarch has no such concerns.

(d) Property and contract right

Kant's view on property and contract right may be summarized as follows:

- According to Kant, rightful possession must be possession of an object without holding it so that another's usage of the object without the possessor's permission harms him even when he is not physically affected and not currently using the object. Kant terms this 'intelligible possession'.
- Kant says that there must be an intelligible possession rather than just physical possession for something to be considered rightful possession. This refers to the application of individual choice. An object of choice is one that some individual has the capacity to use for his purposes. Rightful possession would be the right to make use of such an object.

  Example: To explain his argument, Kant provides an example. According to Kant, suppose there is an object and no one has rightful possession of it. It means that a usable object would be beyond possible use. Kant asserts that this condition does not controvert the principle of right since it is compatible with everyone's freedom in accordance with universal law. However, keeping an object beyond rightful use when humans have the capacity to use it would 'annihilate' the object in a practical sense.
- According to Kant, Intelligible possession is required by right so that free individuals can achieve their freedom by using objects for their freely selected aims. This conclusion involves the existence of private property but not any particular distribution of private property. The state ensures that all individuals

respect the property of other individuals. Without a state, property rights cannot be applied.

- Kant disagrees with Locke's theory of property. His reason is that Locke's theory makes property a relation between an individual and a thing rather than between the wills of numerous individuals. Kant states that since property is a relation of wills that can occur only in a civil condition under a common sovereign power, prior to this civil condition, property can be procured only in anticipation of and in conformity with a civil condition.
- Kant categorizes property rights into three types:
    - o Firstly, the right to a thing, to corporeal objects in space. One example of this type is land.
    - o Secondly, the right against a person, the right to coerce that person to perform an action. This refers to contract rights.
    - o Thirdly, the right to a person akin to a right to a thing. Kant says that some of the examples of this type of right are spouses, children and servants.

(e) Rebellion and revolution

Kant considers the idea of revolting against the government to be illogical. This is because he believes that the source of all rights is the state. Kant here is not suggesting that any actually existing state is invariably just or that merely by virtue of its power, the state could determine what justice is. What he is trying to suggest is that a rightful condition can only occur when there is some means for people to be administered by the general legislative will. This can only occur in a state.

Kant's ideas on rebellion and revolution may be summarized as follows:

- For Kant, any type of state will embody the general will of the people better than no state at all. Kant's seemingly pragmatic logic is based on the notion that a rightful condition requires the centralizing of coercive power in a state as the only means to bring about reciprocal coercion and obligation.
- Kant also asserts that a right to rebel suggests that people should be given power to resist the state. Kant believes that such kind of authorization for action is an exercise of sovereign power, and for any type of people to assert such a right would mean that the people rather than the state embodies sovereign power. This is of course unacceptable for Kant.
- According to Kant, those who argue for people to be have a right to revolt do not understand the nature of the social contract. Since the social contract is only a notion of reason which sets moral limits to the sovereign's legislative acts, and the sovereign's judgment alone decides how these limits are to be interpreted, there is no independent contractual agreement to which individuals can refer in their complaints.
- Though Kant asserts that the people cannot rebel against the state, he does not say that people have to obey the state all the time. He has no problems with passive civil disobedience. This takes two forms:

NOTES

- In a republican representative system, such as the one prevalent in England, there can be a negative resistance, i.e, a refusal of the people (in Parliament) to accept every demand the government puts forth as needed for governing the state.
- The second form of acceptable resistance is for individuals. Kant states that individuals are obligated to obey the sovereign in 'whatever does not conflict with inner morality'. However, he does not specify what inner morality means.

- Kant, however, does not always rejects the action of revolutionaries. According to him, if a revolution is successful, individuals are obligated to obey the new government just as they did the old one.

2.2.6 History and Cosmopolitism

Kant's views on international relations and history is stated below:

- According to Kant, states must be seen to be in a state of nature relative to one another. Like individuals in the state of nature, states must be considered to be in a state of war with each other. Therefore, like people, states should leave this state of nature and come together to form a union such as a league of states.
- Before the establishment of such a league, Kant says that states do have the right to go to war with each other if a state threatens them. However, a declaration of war should be affirmed by people 'co-legislating members of a state'.
- Once war begins, states have a duty to fight the war under principles that allow the possibility of an eventual league of states. Therefore, those actions that undercut trust between states like assassinations are prohibited.
- Kant holds that the league of states is only analogous, not equivalent, to a state created by people, since each particular civil state is indissoluble.
- Kant's idea of historical progress is linked to his notion of international relations. He actually presents several versions of his argument for the progress of humanity toward the ideal condition in which states, each governed by a republican civil constitution and thus each providing maximal consistent freedom for its citizens, all collaborate in a league of states.
- Kant believes that incessant war will eventually result in rulers understanding the importance of peaceful negotiations. In such a situation, they will step by step increase the freedoms provided to their citizens, because freer citizens are economically more productive and hence make the state stronger in its international dealings.

Cosmopolitan Right

Cosmopolitanism is the ideology that all human ethnic groups belong to a single community based on a shared morality. This is contrasted with communitarian and particularistic theories, especially the ideas of patriotism and nationalism.

Kant's views on cosmopolitan right may be summarized as follows:

- According to Kant, since human beings share a limited amount of living space due to the spherical shape of the earth, the totality of which they must be understood to have originally shared in common, they must be understood to have a right to possible communication with one another. This cosmopolitan right is restricted to the right to offer to participate in commerce, not a right to demand actual commerce.
- A person belonging to one state may try to create connection with people belonging to other state; he asserts that no state has the right to stop foreign people from visiting their lands. However, they do have rights to restrict settlement of foreigners.
- Kant firmly believes that cosmopolitan right is a critical aspect of perpetual or everlasting peace. According to Kant, since interactions between people all over the world has increased over time, now 'a violation of right on one place of the earth is felt in all' as people depend upon one another and know more and more about one another. Thus, Kant states, violations of the cosmopolitan right would make it more difficult for states to build trust and cooperation that is need for perpetual peace.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What are the two interconnected foundations of Kant's 'critical philosophy'?
2. What is cosmopolitanism?

2.3 FRIEDRICH HEGEL

George Willhelm Friedrich Hegel was born in Stuttgart, Germany on 27 August, 1770. He was nineteen when the French Revolution broke out. His father was a civil servant in the department of finances of the state of Wurtemberg. Most of his relatives were either teachers or liberal ministers. He grew up with patient and methodical habits of those civil servants whose modest efficiency had given Germany the best governed cities in the world. Hegel, as a student, was highly industrious and hardworking and he made full analysis of all the important books he read. He was sent to the grammar school at Stuttgart for his education. At school, Hegel was a brilliant student; he excelled and won a scholarship to a reputed seminary at Tubingen in 1788, where he studied philosophy and theology; he devoted himself thoroughly in theological studies in preparation for the Lutheran ministry. Later on, he felt disgusted with the orthodox tenets of Christianity and abandoned the career which his parents wanted him to pursue. After completing his studies, he accepted the position of a family tutor with a wealthy family in Switzerland from 1793–1796. This was followed by a similar position at Berne and Frankfort from 1797–1800. His philosophical speculation began at this time. After his father died in 1799, Hegel inherited a modest

NOTES

fortune. He gave up tutoring and took to writing. He published a book differentiating the philosophy of Johann Fichte and Friedrich Schelling. In collaboration with Schelling, he edited the *Journal fur Philosophie*. His well-known work *Phenomenology of Mind* appeared in 1807. He was a university lecturer at Jena from 1801 to 1807. After working for a year as a newspaper editor in Bamberg, he moved to Nureberg as headmaster of a high school in 1808, and continued in this position till 1816. His long work, *Science of Logic* in three volumes, appeared in 1812, 1813 and1816. By this time, he became quite well known, and in 1816 he was invited to take up the post of professor of philosophy at the University of Heidelberg.

Two years later in 1818, he was called to the University of Berlin as the only man who could fill with credit the chair of philosophy that had been vacant since the death of Johann Fichte. At the University of Berlin, he created a name for himself and became a favourite of the government and in a sense its official philosopher. His doctrines were highly favoured and appreciated by the Prussian Government and he was signally honoured in many ways and attracted a large following. His influence extended all over Germany. In the last phase of his life, Hegel was a devout follower and admirer of the Prussian police state, just as he had previously admired Jacobinism and Napoleon.

His principal works were *The Phenomenalogy of Spirit* (1807), *Science of Logic* (1812–1816), which captivated Germany by its unintelligibility and won him the chair of philosophy at Heidelberg. In 1817, he wrote his *Encyclopedia of the Philosophical Sciences* on the strength of which he could get a position at the University of Berlin. In 1821, he published his *Philosophy of Right* and his *Philosophy of History* was published posthumously in 1837. In all these works, Hegel covered many aspects of political theory.

Hegel was the founder of modern idealism and the greatest influence in the first half of the eighteenth century when the entire academic community in Germany was divided between Hegelians, the left Hegelians and the right Hegelians. He innovated the dialectic method and the theory of self-realization. He propounded a new theory of history, which according to him was the human spirit writ large, the 'march of reason in the world'. He was critical of purely reflective knowledge. His famous work *Philosophy of Right* deals with key issues of law, politics and morality, and made an important distinction between the state and civil society. Towards the end of his life, Hegel started attracting large audiences from the entire German speaking world and many became his disciples. His other works were *Lectures in the Philosophy of History, Lecture on aesthetics, Lecture on the Philosophy of Religion* and *Lectures on the History of Philosophy.* In recognition of his work, in 1830, Hegel was elected rector of the University. He died suddenly on 14 November 1831, after suffering from cholera for one day.

2.3.1 Idealism of Hegel

Hegel is considered an idealist thinker. He started with the assumption that the universe is a coherent whole. This organic unity, what he also refers to as idea, or spirit or reason, or the divine mind, is the only reality. Everything, including matter or

NOTES

the external world, is the creation of this idea or spirit or reason or the divine mind. Hence, it is true to say that reason is the sovereign of the world. In Germany, it was considered that if the contemporary reality was not based on reason, then the reality had to be altered. This framework of general political theory was given a highly sophisticated personal touch by Hegel with his two-fold argument that, first, history was not merely a chronological table but had a meaning which was both profound and purposeful, the particularly important thing for him being to recreate Greek harmony within the context of modern society based on individualism and reason. Second, as Alasdair Chalmers MacIntyre, a British philosopher, observed, it was Hegel who was the first thinker to have understood very clearly that questions concerning morality change from one particular place and time to another, as such and there was nothing called a permanent moral question. This led to the important assertion of Hegel that the history of philosophy was the core of philosophy. What logically followed was the important conclusion that history represented particular levels of development, and had to be judged on the basis of the advancement towards the realization of reason. Hegel was convinced that reason, truth and freedom were identifiable, and that the process of reaching the final stage and even a blue print of the final stage was conceivable as history.

Hegel's system is associated with a definite political philosophy and a political order. The dialectic between civil society and the state of the restoration is not incidental in Hegel's philosophy, nor is it just a section of philosophy of right. The Romantic Movement in Germany influenced Hegel considerably, though he rejected the ideas of the movement. Among all the philosophers of the German Romantic movement it was Emanuel Kant who influenced Hegel's mind the most. Kant's famous work *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) was a synthesis of the two different ideals of the enlightenment–Newtonian Physics and Helvetian Empiricism. Newton offered definite and unalterable laws for all the occasions and places. On the other hand, Helvetious and Hume argued that rational belief emanated from our own sensual encounters. Kant's important contribution emerged with his assertion that these two different perceptions would be reconciled by the fact that all our experiences ended in a Newtonian certainty, by the nature of the concepts and categories with which we understand the world. This interrelationship was crucial, as 'concepts without percepts are empty: percepts without concept are blind'.

Kant was the exponent of practical reason, which was based on belief in God, freedom and immortality. Within this framework, any meaningful moral category had to have a universalistic basis, for instance, when all nations became a republic there need not be any war. This was similar to a popular assertion in the late twentieth century that democracies do not fight one another. The condensation of history and the rejection of the past as essentially resonated in the writings of Hegel, and subsequently in those of Marx. Karl Marx's assertion, 'one hundred years of capitalism did more wonders than all the preceding history taken together', echoed the optimism and confidence that Kant and Hegel excluded.

Hegel criticized Kant's handling of reason while dealing with the challenge of empiricism. If things in themselves were beyond the scrutiny of reason then reason

NOTES

remained merely subjective, without control over the objective reality, leading to an unacceptable division of the world between subjectivity and objectivity. The relation between subject and object was complex but an interrelated one, with the unity of the opposite subjects or matters both in theory and practice leading to a 'praxis'. This conflict was of crucial importance to Hegel, as his seminal contribution of alienation originated with this formulation. The alienation of mind originated when the objective factors which were originally produced by human labour and knowledge became detached and unrecognizable to man. In such a situation, theory did not reflect reality, and truth had no meaning in the real world. As a result, human frustration and helplessness increased. To end this separateness in all its manifestations, the entire framework of inquiry was brought within the ambit of reason. Separateness had to be ended by a theory of unity of totality in philosophy. This utmost emphasis on reason was of tremendous importance to Hegel, as human emancipation–a distinct possibility in the modern period could only be realized on the basis of reason. Hegel emphasized the human capacity to cherish freedom, and in that sense had the capacity to transcend the imperfections of contemporary nature and society by the process of mediation. Reason and human action led to mediation by new concepts and category replacing old ones, which at one time looked stable. This was the driving force of the Hegelian dialectic, which made his philosophy a negative one.

Hegelian idealism is often referred to as absolute idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood. There is another dimension of Hegelian idealism, which may be called the idealist interpretation of history. According to this theory, ideas constitute the true motor of history whereas what gives momentum to history is the development of ideas. All changes in society, economy, polity and culture take place because of development of these ideas. All changes in society, economy, polity and culture take place because of development of ideas. Hegel's idealism, which is often called absolute idealism, sees a certain relationship between the subject and the object. It is a relationship between the subject and the object. It is a relationship between a knowing subject and the objective world, i.e., the relationship between the mind and the world.

2.3.2 Dialectical Method

The most distinctive feature of Hegel's philosophical system was his dialectical method. The dialectical method is as old as Socrates, but in the hands of Hegel it was given a universal validity and application that was more moral and profound. According to Hegel, the movement of thought was dialectical. By applying the categories of a thesis, and anti-thesis and a synthesis, Hegel's major thrust was to solve the problem of contradiction. Hegel's dialectical method attempted to reconcile the many apparent contradictory positions and theories developed by earlier thought processes. As a method of interpretation, it attempted to reconcile the various different traits developed in the past. He never claimed to be its inventor, and even acknowledged that the ancient Greek philosopher Socrates used it. According to Hegel, every truth is the synthesis of two contradictory elements. Affirmation leads to dogmatism, negation to skepticism, and only through the systematic mediation of

mysticism can the real truth emerge. According to Hegel, human progress does not take place in a positive straight line. It is always a zig-zag movement. It is just like 'a ship tackling against an unfavourable wind'. The world, according to Hegel, is not static, but dynamic. The true concept of this world must be an active, moving process, a process of evolution. In evolution, something that is underdeveloped, undifferentiated or homogenous develops by assuming many different and opposing or contradictory forms. It then unites again in a new concrete form. It does not remain what it was, but it is preserved in a higher form. This whole process was given the name of 'dialectic' by Hegel.

Hegel's own use of the dialectical method originated with his identification of Kantian critical theory, which meant the rejection of the Enlightenment philosophical method based on the scientific approach of studying nature. Crucial to this method was a belief that accuracy came out of a method of reduction, which meant that knowledge emerged out of the detailed study and analysis of parts. Hegel's dialectical method pre-supposed that ideas and beliefs were to be related to their institutions and social structures, i.e. the spheres of the subjective mind and the objective mind had to converge. The categories of subject and object were to go together as theory and practice. What apparently looked contradictory were actually dialectical terms, inter-dependent. This method was to be internally linked to the subject matter. It did not just record and observe but attempted to build an edifice of a well-connected discourse, which one may accept or reject. It accepted dialogue and conversations and the very basis of the dialectical method was a constant endeavour to convert every occasion of non-agreement into an occasion of agreement. In *Phenomenology*, Hegel gave an example of the use of dialectics in human consciousness but a more comprehensive political use was found in the *Philosophy of Right*, in which the dialectical process reflected the evolution of world history from the time of ancient Greece to Hegel's time. According to Hegel, there was a dialectical pattern in history, in the state representing the ultimate body, highly complex formed as a result of a synthesis of contradictory elements at different levels of social life. However, the relationship between contradiction and synthesis was within the concepts saved by human practices. Marx too discerned a dialectical pattern in history, but then understood contradictions between the means and relations of production and different stages of history.

Everything, as Hegel expressed, is to be understood, not only by what it is but what it is not. The opposite of being is not being, and being and not being are alike summed up and carried further towards reality. Each stage, or thesis reached by the ideal until it has arrived at its goals, must fall short of perfection. Its imperfections will call into being a movement to remove them or the anti-thesis. There will be a struggle between thesis and anti-thesis until such time as a synthesis is found, which will preserve what is true in both thesis and anti-thesis. The synthesis, in its turn, will become a new thesis, and so until the idea is at last enthroned in perfection.

According to Hegel, the dialectic is the only way in which the human mind can arrive at the truth about anything. As human beings you formulate a doctrine about something. That doctrine will contain elements of truth but also since all human beings are passionate, self-centered, fallible and limited by their particular historical

NOTES

perspective, elements of error–other individuals perceiving the error in that doctrine will formulate a doctrine, which will be precisely the opposite. Their doctrine–will contain elements of both truth and error. A third doctrine is necessary in order to preserve what is true in both, only a synthesis can reconcile the thesis and its anti-thesis. The third doctrine again became a new thesis subject to self-contradiction and you are faced with the problem again of constructing a new synthesis out of this third doctrine and its anti-thesis. This process presumably continues indefinitely although each synthesis is thought to be closer to the absolute truth then each presiding synthesis.

All finite things, according to Hegel, are contradictory in themselves. Moreover, it is not men who remove these contradictions but reason itself, if not us, but the very force, within the thesis and the anti-thesis, which is the reason that promotes development. Contradiction or the dialectic is, therefore a self-generating process. It is the principle of the world.

Dialectic is, therefore, a theory which explains how history is the story of the continuous development of the spirit. Since all the former steps of the spirit are preserved in the new ones taken it emphasizes the continuity of that story of the increasing revelation of the spirit. History is a process by which the spirit passes from knowing nothing to the full knowledge of itself. It is the increasing revelation of the purposes of the rational mind. Hegel applied his dialectical theory to the explanation of the progress of society and its institutions. The purpose of the dialectics is to display what Hegel calls 'necessity in history'.

The historical necessity which Hegel saw in history was a physical and moral compulsion. He had before his eyes the picture of Germany after the Battle of Jena, which was hopelessly miserable. He wanted Germany to stand and rise and become a world spirit. In other words, Germany should dominate the entire world. When he said that Germany must become a state he meant that it ought to do so and the highest interest of civilization and national life required it to advance in that direction. Germany must become a state not because the Germans wished it but because the growth of Germany into a world-state was in line with the whole direction of moral and scientific development as it was the present bearer of the world spirit. The disunion and feebleness of Germany, he says, were not the marks of her decay but rather the travel of the German spirit about to give birth to a new social and political order. It is in this way that Hegel made an appeal to the fidelity of German nation and idealized and exalted the state to its mystical height. Thus, dialectic was not only a logical method of arriving at the truth; it was also a moral instrument for bringing about the unification of Germany and its emergence as a great nation.

The first criticism of Hegel's methodology is that the dialectic is very vague and ambiguous. The American scholar and philosopher Professor George Sabine contended that the most obvious error in Hegel's dialectic was the extreme vagueness, not to say the ambiguity, of his use of terms and the extreme generality that he attributed to words, which are notoriously hard to define. He uses words like 'thought,' 'contradiction', 'absolute idea', 'civil society', 'march of God on earth' to mean what he wants them to mean. His use of these and so many other words is

unconventional, vague and ambiguous. Hegel's theory of dialectic was full of over-simplification and over-generalization.

The second criticism of Hegel's method was that the dialectical method, as a synthetic logic, which Hegel wanted to replace, supplement and supersede the logic of the understanding, it was neither convincing nor effective.

Thirdly, according to Hegel's dialectical and historical method, the course of history is determined. In the words of American author and scholar Professor Lancaster, 'it is a necessary result of following the dialectical method that the individual wishes and preferences are reduced to the level of mere caprice. The actors in human history are not but vast in personal forces'.

Fourth, the dialectical method of Hegel was criticized as a double-edged sword, which was used by Hegel as an instrument of conservatism, while in the hands of Marx and Engels was a tool for bringing about revolutionary communism.

Fifth, Sabine pointed out that Hegel's theory of the logical emergence of the German national state out of the dialectical logic was not correct. Hegel's theory of nationality was not the outcome of the dialectic but was occasioned by the revolutionary upsurge of contemporary France.

Sixth, Hegel's method was also criticized on the basis that logic as such cannot be the only basis of all human activities. Dr Mac Taggart has pointed out three difficulties in Hegel's dialectics, which are as follows:

- The first difficulty is that the thesis, the anti-thesis and the synthesis cannot be recognized except in relation to one another.
- The second difficulty is that in religion, liberty, history, law and philosophy, the dialectical process is affected by the external influences.
- The third difficulty is that in the application of the dialectical method to the field of natural and social sciences, you will be dealing with a subject matter which is highly intricate and not sufficiently systematized.

2.3.3 Theory of State and Freedom of Individual

Hegel regarded the state as the embodiment of the Giest or the universal mind. The state, according to Hegel, was the representative of the divine idea or divine purpose. As such, he regarded it as essentially divine in origin. The state, as such, must be looked upon with great reverence. Since Hegel regards the state as the product of the divine will; he rejects the social contract theory as the origin of the state altogether. The social contract theory makes the state an artificial institution—a position which Hegel is not prepared to accept. The idea that men in the state of nature were free and equal appeared to be absorbed and ridiculous to Hegel. The life of men in the state of nature, according to Hegel, was marked by injustice and violence and it was mostly dominated by natural impulses and feelings. He regarded the state not as a conception of individuals, but as a product of a long process of evolution. It marked the advancement from a lower group life to higher and more perfect institutional life. It grew from the family which was replaced by civil society, and the civil society was replaced by the state. At every stage of this development, Hegel saw the

NOTES

working of the universal mind or the hand of the spirit, which was God. This is the Hegelian concept of the state as the march of God on earth. Through his 'logic' Hegel tries to prove that the state is God in human history. It is a unity between particularity and universality and, therefore, it constitutes perfect rationality. To Hegel, what is rational is real and what is real is rational. The state is perfectly rational and, therefore, it was perfectly real. Since, perfect reality is God; the state is, therefore, God in the phenomenal existence.

According to Hegel, the state represented universal altruism. It synthesized dialectically the elements within the family and civil society. As in the case of the family, the state functions in a manner that the interests of everyone were furthered and enhanced. It represented the universal tendencies within civil society, thus giving rise to the notion of civil society. The state had 'its reality in the particular self-consciousness raised to the place of the universal'. The state was 'absolutely rational' and had substantive will for realizing itself through history, and was therefore, internal. Hegel perceived the state as an end in itself; it was mind realizing itself through history. As an idealist, Hegel viewed the state as an organism having the highest right over the individual, whose highest duty in turn was to be a member of the state. He emphasized the public nature of the state, yet he did not distinguish between the private and the public spheres. Hegel examined the different components of the state like the rule of law, the bureaucracy and the monarchy.

According to Hegel, the state also is an end in itself. It is not only the highest expression that the spirit has yet to attend; it is also the final embodiment of spirit on earth. There can thus be no spiritual evolution beyond the state anymore, and then there cannot be any physical evolution beyond man. The state too is a whole, which is far greater than the parts which compose it and which have significance only in it. The state is unchecked by any moral law, for it itself the creator of morality. This can be seen clearly in its internal affairs and in its external relations. Firstly, it lays down what shall be the standard of morality for its individual citizens. It goes without saying that they can never plead conscience or the moral law against it. Kant had believed that the individual conscience or the practical reason of the individual was the guide of guides to cling to. Hegel, while going beyond Kant to J.J. Rousseau, maintained that conscience can only tell us to do what is right. It cannot tell us what is right. Conscience itself must be informed by the traditions of the community. According to him, wisdom and virtue consist in leaving conformably to the customs of one's people, which are indeed the collective reason of the past and the state is the truest interpreter of the tradition of the community. It can tell us what is good, and conformity with its decrease, or social ethics, is thus the highest morality. The state can recognize no obligation other than its own safety in its relations with the other states. Its own welfare is its highest law. It is a generally acknowledged and a well-known principle that the particular interest of the state is the most important consideration. Against this no plea based on hypothetic morality can be allowed. In *Ethics*, Hegel writes categorically 'the state is the self-certain, absolute mind which acknowledges no abstract rules of good and bad, shameful and mean, craft and deceptions.' International relations, therefore, are relations between sovereign states who believe that what is in their own interest is right and that the only sin is to act

knowingly against those interests. He further writes 'the fundamental propositions of the international law remain a good intention. States look upon the stipulations which they make with one another as provisional. Hence when the particular wills of states can come to no agreement; the controversy can be settled only by war.' Moreover, war is not to be regarded as an absolute evil. For Hegel peace corrupts and everlasting peace would corrupt everlastingly. War is the state of affairs which deals in the earnest with the vanity of temporal goods and concerns – a vanity at other times a common theme for edifying sermonizing. He writes that successful wars have prevented civil broils and strengthened the internal power of the state.

According to Hegel, the state is an individual in history. It is to history what an individual is to biography. The state was the achievement of freedom because it was the embodiment of freedom. The real freedom of the individual consists in obeying the laws of the state and cultivating the habit of looking at the common wealth as our substantive purpose and the foundation of our lives. From the point of view of will it is the incarnation of the general will or real will. The state represents the best in the individual will. It has a will and a personality of its own apart from and superior to the will and personality of its members. The individual can attain his true freedom only as a member of the state. Rights are derived from the state and therefore, no man can have any right against the state. The end of the state is the glorification of the state itself. The British politician and sociologist Professor L. T. Hobhouse summed up the Hegelian theory of the state by calling the state as a greater being, a spirit, a super—personal entity, in which the individuals with their private conscience or claims of right, their happiness or their misery are merely subordinate elements. The state also represented the highest social morality and it led down the standard of morality for its individual members. Hegel regarded the state as a mystic transcendental unity, the mysterious union of all with the entire greater whole which embraces all the other institutions of social life. Hegel morally and rationally exalted the authority of the state. Hegel completely subordinated the individual to the authority of the state. His personality has been reduced to a zero. The English philosopher Professor C.E.M. Joad drew the following paradoxical conclusions from Hegel's theory of the state:

- The state can never act unrepresentatively. For example, the policeman who arrests the burglar and hands him over to the magistrate, and the magistrate who sends him to the jail expresses the will (real will) of the burglar to be arrested and to be locked up.
- The bond which binds the individual to other individuals in the community and to the state as a whole forms an integral part of his personality. He cannot act as an isolated unit but only as an integral part of the state. The will with which he acts is not purely individual will but a part of the will of the state as well.
- The state contains within itself the social morality of all its citizens. It is a supreme moral community, a guardian of the whole moral world and not a factor within an organized moral world.

NOTES

2.3.4 Freedom of the Individual

Hegel's concept of freedom was based on the old Greek idea of an individual finding his true self, freedom and personality in and through the state. According to Sabine, Hegel swung back in the direction of Greek political theory towards the view that an individual good implies the performance of a socially valuable task. According to Hegel, freedom is the very essence of man. It is his distinctive quality to renounce freedom and to renounce one's humanity. Not to be free, therefore, is to cease to be a human being. It is however not the freedom of any and every casual will of which he talks. Hegel's freedom consists in rendering obedience to the real will or the reasonable will. In this concept of freedom he was very much indebted to Rousseau and Kant. In developing their theories and freedom, in fact, both Kant and Hegel have started from Rousseau's concept of moral freedom as the peculiar and distinctive quality of man, and both considered the state entirely in its relation to this freedom. But the Kantian concept of freedom was negative, limited and subjective in meaning, which made his attitude to the state somewhat individualistic. Kant had interpreted freedom as the right to will a self-imposed duty, and he insisted that every man possessing in virtue of his reason such a will, existed, and ought to be treated, always as an end in himself and never as merely a means. To Hegel, freedom of this kind is negative because it wears the face of beauty, and it is limited because it isolates each man as an end in himself. Such freedom is, again subjective because it resides in the inner world of intention and conscience, and does not find a free issue outwards into the objective life.

According to Kant, freedom consists in obedience to any moral will, but according to Hegel, freedom consists in obedience to the dictates of social morality, to the moral will of the community. According to Hegel, freedom consists in obedience to the dictates of the universal reason, but he identifies the dictates of universal reason with social morality rather than with the isolated moral will of the individual. The state, for Hegel, is the crystallization of this social morality; it is the embodiment of the community.

According to Hegel, freedom consists in willing to make your natural self (composed of particular interest and passion) conform to the thinking self (reason). A person realizes freedom when he submits to the law, to the rules of social morality and to the institutions of the national state. The state is the highest and the most perfect embodiment of social morality. It is sustained by personality as freedom of will transcends by compelling to contemplate a good beyond its own personal interest.

Hegel equates liberty with law. Law may guarantee and safeguard liberty but sometimes it may also go against liberty. In order to justify his equation of liberty with law Hegel says that only that authority has the power to make laws or thus guarantee liberty which can represent the spirit of the nation. The spirit of the nation cannot be represented by the majority of the people or by an assemblage of man. It can only be represented by one actual decreeing individual, i.e., the monarch. In other words, Hegel identifies the will of the monarch with the liberty of the individual. According to Hegel, each and every element in the society can reach its free resistance only in an absolute monarchy like the one prevailing in the then Prussia.

NOTES

Hegel emphasized that freedom consists of complete obedience to the laws of the state. He argues that the state is the embodiment of reason. The laws of the state are the outward expressions of reason. According to German idealism, freedom lies in the obedience of reasons. Another argument put forward by Hegel is that the essence of spirit, which seeks to know itself, is freedom. The history of mankind is the history of the evolution of spirit and hence of freedom. When the state is the embodiment of freedom, all the individuals live under freedom. The individual realizes freedom to the extent to which he identifies himself with the spirit or the essence of the spirit. There are two wills existing side by side in the individual mind – real will and actual will. Real will represents the rational will and takes care of the interest of the community as a whole while the actual will looks after the personal and private interest of the individual alone.

According to Hegel, freedom for the individual consists in subordinating the actual will to rational will. By serving the interest of the community alone, the individual can get the fulfilment of his personality. The impulsive will being very powerful, the individual himself cannot subjugate it without the help of the state. The only way to be free is the voluntary submission of the impulsive will to reason which is expressed in the state. According to Hegel, an individual is free only if he identifies voluntarily, willingly and consciously with the laws of the state. If an individual obeys the state due to fear or punishment he is no longer free. Hegel does not conceive of the freedom in terms of the rights of the individuals. The state according to him is omnipotent. The individuals do not possess any rights against the state. He does not give any rights of speech, or expression or association to the individual in conflict with the state. In the state alone, man can find freedom, while without it, he is completely in subjugation.

Hegel's ideas of freedom was both objective and creative, and it outwardly expressed itself in a series of outward manifestations—first the law, then the rules of the inward morality; and finally the whole system of institutions and influences that make for righteousness in the national state. The whole system of institutions and influences was called social ethics by Hegel. The state should be envisaged in terms of social ethics. The social morality is the product of a free will seeking to realize itself in a positive and objective form; and the state, as the highest expression and organ of social morality. Individual freedom therefore was a social phenomenon. It consisted in participation of the moral life of the community. Freedom to Hegel meant willing of what is rational of what the spirit would desire and the power to perform it. It consisted in total obedience to the state and performance of duties.

Sabine states that, '(the) theory of freedom was a part of the widespread reaction against the violence of the French revolution'. There was a sound reason why the case against the revolution should have appealed to a German philosopher. The theory of natural rights, while of course fully known to educated Germans, had never made itself part of the popular consciousness in Germany. In England and France, the seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries had seen the theory made into a defense of revolution and Germany was a country in which there was no revolution. Hegel's view on freedom implied two things. Firstly, he continually implied that no genuine conflict of interest can arise between the individuals and the society they

NOTES

belong to, and secondly, the state is continually represented as standing for the possible ethical value. These two phases of Hegel's philosophy, though they are perfectly comprehensible when viewed in the light of the circumstances in which he wrote, are nevertheless the causes of great confusion in his thoughts.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

3. Why is Hegelian idealism referred to as absolute idealism?
4. According to Hegel, what was the state a representative of?
5. For Hegel, what does freedom consist of?
6. What does Hegel's concept of freedom based on?

2.4 THOMAS GREEN

Thomas Hill Green, English philosopher, political radical and temperance reformer, and a member of British idealism movement, was born in Yorkshire, England in 1836. Like all the British idealists, Green was influenced by the metaphysical historicism of Hegel.

Green was one of the thinkers behind the philosophy of social liberalism. He was the son of a clergyman in the Church of England. On the paternal side, he was a descendent of Oliver Cromwell. He entered Balliol College, Oxford in 1855 where he was destined to spend the remainder of his life. At Balliol, Green came under the influence of the renowned theologian and Oxford tutor Benjamin Jowett and by this inspiring contact was fired to more definite and purposeful intellectual endeavours. Green was elected a fellow of Balliol in 1860 and continued in this capacity right up to 1878. In 1878, he was chosen as Whyte Professor of Moral Philosophy. He married Miss Charlotte Symonds, a sister of John Addington Symonds in 1871. John Addington Symonds was a noted critic and poet of his days. Green's teaching at the University of Oxford covered a wide range of subjects including history, ethics, logic, metaphysics, education and the history of philosophy. Green was not merely a clustered pedagogue. He took an active part in public affairs and was a member of the Oxford town council for many years. Green was a frequent campaign speaker for the liberal party, served as member in several committees and commissions and was a prominent worker in the temperance movement. He was stricken with blood poisoning in 1882 and died at the age of forty–six.

In his political philosophy Green was highly influenced by his studies of the Greek classics. According to the English political scientist Ernest Barker, 'The influence of Plato and Aristotle has been peculiarly deep in England'. The curriculum of the oldest and most important branch of studies in Oxford finds in the '*Republic*' of Plato and the '*Ethics*' of Aristotle in its central texts; and truths drawn from Greek thought have been taught in Oxford and enforced in the world, not only by the thinkers, but also by the man of action who have been trained in this curriculum. Green himself was a product of the University of Oxford and there he had also

served as a Professor of moral philosophy. The ultimate basis of his philosophy is to be found in the writings of Plato and Aristotle. Another and more important influence on the political ideas of Green was that of German philosophy. Green drew his inspiration from the writings of Kant and Hegel. Among the philosophers of the European continent who exercised a tremendous influence on the writings of Green was the author of the *Social Contract*, i.e., Rousseau. What Green found permanently valuable in Rousseau was the conception of the state or sovereign as representing a General Will, and as authorized or entitled to obedience on that account.

Green was involved in local politics for many years, through the University, temperance societies and the local Oxford Liberal association. During the passage of the Second Reform Act, he campaigned for the franchise to be extended to all men living in boroughs, even if they did not own real property. In this sense, Green's position was more radical than that of most other British Liberals, including William Ewart Gladstone. It was in the context of his Liberal party activities that in 1881 Green gave what became one of his most famous statements of his liberal political philosophy, the *Lecture on Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract.* At this time, he was also lecturing on religion, epistemology, ethics and political philosophy.

Green was most influential during his lifetime as a teacher and it was not until after his death that his most important works were published. His *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation* were first delivered during his tenure of the chair of moral philosophy at Oxford in the winter of 1879–80 and first published in 1882. Likewise, his *Prolegomena to Ethics* was also published after his death.

2.4.1 Notion of Social Contract Theory and State

Green did not approve the social contract theory of the origin of government. He considered it a confused way of stating truth. Green's rejection of the social contract theory was based on the reason that it makes the state a voluntary association. He also rejected the force theory of the origin of the state because it makes the force as the very basis of the state. The basis of the state is not consent, neither is ii force, but it is will. This conception of his becomes clearer when he analyses the British jurist John Austin's definition of sovereignty.

It is not the existence of supreme coercive power that makes a state but 'supreme coercive power exercised in certain ways and for certain ends viz. exercised according to law written or customary, and for the maintenance of rights.' The state maintains through a system of law, the possibility of freedom that otherwise would not exist. Green himself says that the state is justified in using force to repeal a force which is opposed to freedom. Hence, it can be said that apart from the state the individual can have no existence as a person. Green regards the state as natural and necessary. He considered it as an ethical institution essential to the moral development of man. Its primary purpose is to enforce rights, even by compulsion if necessary. Although natural and necessary but the authority of the state is neither absolute nor omnipotent. It is limited both from within and without. It is limited from within because the law of the state can deal only with the externality of an action and intentions. It cannot deal with motives. The state cannot promote morality directly. It can simply

NOTES

remove obstacles to good life. It is limited again by the fact that in exceptional circumstances particularly when the laws of the state are tyrannical and the state fails to promote the common good, the individual has the right of resistance. According to Green, resistance under these circumstances is not merely a right but it becomes a duty.

Green further recognized that the various permanent groups with society have their own inner system of rights and that the right of the state over them is one of adjustment. According to Barker, the state adjust each group its system of rights internally and it adjusts each system of rights to the state externally. Since the power of the state is that of adjustment, it therefore, had ultimate authority. Green mentioned that the existence of groups in society contains the germs of the theory of pluralism. But Green has not taken up the pluralistic position at all.

The authority of the state is limited from without in the sense that it has to show its respect to the existence of international law. Like Kant and unlike Hegel, Green is a believer in international law and international organizations. The right of every man as man to free life involves the conception of a common humanity and of a common social organism. According to Green, the function of the state is negative. Good life for the most part is self-earned. The state cannot promote it directly. Its business was simply removing obstacles to freedom. The three greatest obstacles to freedom, as he saw it, were ignorance, drunkenness and poverty. It is the function of the state to remove such obstacles. Classical liberalism, he thinks went wrong in regarding freedom simply in negative forms; freedom is positive. Thus, Green led the intellectual foundations for the modern social welfare state, for old age pensions, unemployment and insurance, health insurance, and all the other legislative schemes designed to promote 'self-security'.

Commenting upon Green's theory of state actions Professor Sabine says, 'Green's general principle that a liberal government ought to legislate in any case where the law can remove an obstacle to the highest moral development of its citizens, provided at least the framework for a wholly different conception of government form that held by the older liberalism'. In place of *laissez-faire* and freedom of contract it opened the way, in the name of positive freedom, for any degree of social legislation that could be justified as particularly effective in improving the standard of living. What Green added to liberal theory was his conception of collective well-being as a pre-condition of individual freedom and responsibility. Thus, in principle, Green's revision of liberalism closed up the gap which *laissez-faire* has placed between politics and economics and put on government the duty of regulating the economic system.

The state, Green insists, is the only source of actual rights. He says rights may be conceived which are not in the state; only when they are in it do they become rights. Green's state like Hegel's, is a community of communities, but again like Hegel's, there is no question that it is supreme over all the communities. The members of the state derive the rights which they have as members of other associations from the state and have no rights against it.

NOTES

For all his belief that the state was the embodiment of the Divine Spirit, Green never regarded the state as an end in itself. It was a means to an end, and that end was the full moral development of the individuals who composed of it. He believed in the existence of the 'General Will'. He was convinced that this 'General Will' is the real basis of the state. Legal sovereignty, he agreed with Austin, must reside in the supreme authority within the state, in that body which recognizes no power above itself. But behind this legal sovereign is the General Will, and this General Will, not force or fear is what really determines the habitual obedience of people. Men habitually obey only those institutions which, perhaps unconsciously, they feel represent the General Will. This is true irrespective of the form of government the state may possess, since even an absolute monarchy must inspire loyalty and voluntary submission in its subject. According to Green, 'General Will' is the true sovereign of the community.

Green believed that the state should foster and protect the social, political and economic environments in which people will be able to get their chance to act according to their conscience. It is the responsibility of the state to decide which liberties to curtail and in which way. Over-enthusiastic or clumsy state intervention could reduce or close the opportunities for conscientious action. This will eventually stifle the moral development of the people. The state should intervene only when it is sure that a particular liberty is enslaving a person. Even under such a situation, Green was of the opinion that the community should react to such a situation instead of the state as local councils and municipal authorities tended to produce measures that were more imaginative and better suited to the daily reality of a social problem. Hence, Green favoured the 'local option' where local people decided the issuing of liquor licenses in their area through their town councils. He stressed the need for specific solutions tailored to solve specific problems. Green also thought that there are no inevitable solutions or timeless division of responsibilities between national and local governmental units. The distribution of responsibilities should be based on the participation of as many individuals as possible to exercise their conscientious will in particular circumstances. This would help to foster individual self- realization in the long-run. If the local and municipal departments are unable to control the harmful influences of some social evils then the national state should take responsibility for the public policy of this area. Green argued that the ultimate power to decide on the allocation of such tasks should rest with the national state. The national state according to Green upholds a system of rights and obligations that is likely to help in individual self-realization. Even after all this, the most appropriate structure of this system cannot be determined by purely political calculation nor by philosophical speculation.

2.4.2 Punishment

T.H. Green's views on punishment are essentially related to his theory of state action. In order to maintain conditions and remove obstacles, the state must positively interfere with everything tending to violate conditions or impose obstacles. It must use force to repeal a force which is opposed to freedom. According to Barker, punishment is not inflicted with any direct reference to the moral guilt of the offender

NOTES

in the past; or to his moral reformation in the future. If it were imposed with reference to moral guilt, it would have to be graded according to the degree of moral guilt, and here we are at once made by the insuperable difficulty that moral guilt cannot be measured by degrees because we cannot enter into the recesses of the will to discover its intensity or quality. If again punishments were imposed with reference to moral reformation in the future, it would not only lose its power as a deterrent, but it would deprive the criminal of the possibility, let us rather say, the fundamental duty of regenerating his own will.

The criminals who are anti-social, constitutes a force opposed to freedom. Punishment in such a case is a force directed against that force. Punishment is not inflicted with any direct reference to the moral guilt of the offender in the past or to his moral reformation in the future. If it were imposed with reference to moral guilt, the difficulty would arise that moral guilt cannot be measured by degrees. If again punishment were imposed with reference to moral reformation in the future, it would not only lose its power as a deterrent, but it would deprive the criminal of the possibility of regenerating his own will. Actually punishment is adjusted to maintaining the external conditions necessary for the free action of will; it is not adjusted to the inner will itself. It is in fact directed to secure the external conditions necessary for moral action. Punishment therefore, like all state action, has a moral purpose. It is moral in the sense that its ultimate aim is to secure freedom of action for the moral will of every member of the community.

According to Green, the primary objective of punishment is not to cause pain to the criminal for the sake of causing it nor chiefly for the sack of preventing him from committing the crime again, but to associate terror with the contemplation of the crime in the minds of others who might be tempted to commit it. The future prevention of crime is the chief aim of punishment. Green said that the state looks not to virtue and vice but to rights and wrongs. It looks back to the wrong done in the crime which it punishes; not however, in order to avenge it, but in consideration of the sort of terror which needs to be associated with such wrong-doing in order to ensure the future maintenance of rights. Actually punishment is adjusted to maintain the external conditions necessary for the free action of will; it is not adjusted to the inner will itself. Its ultimate aim is to secure freedom of action for the moral will of every member of the community. It implies that punishment should be given according to the importance of the right violated.

For Green, punishment has both direct and indirect defects. Directly, it is a force preventive of a force opposed to rights. Indirectly, punishment is, and in order to be effectively preventive must be a reformation of the will, or rather a shock which makes criminal reformations possible. Even in this aspect, punishment is a removal of obstacle; for the obstacle which the criminal opposes is not only a force, but a will. Green states that 'it is commonly asked whether punishment according to its proper nature is retributive or preventive or reformatory. The true answer is that it is and should be all three'. The Italian jurist Cesare Beccaria had previously attempted to do the same with a theory of deterrence and an aspect of retributivism, but he failed to keep his theory consistent.

NOTES

Before we take a look at T.H. Green's views on crime and punishment, let us try and understand the two theories of retributivism and deterrence, which Green tries to connect through his arguments.

Immanuel Kant advanced the theory of *Retributivism*, and derived its right to punish from the theory of social contract. For this, Kant created a framework labelled the 'categorical imperative'. Kant stated that this framework meant one should 'act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law'. Kant believes that the notion of punishment restores the injustice that is done when moral laws are infringed upon. He says that the individual responsible for infringing moral law has brought the punishment upon himself. Kant asserts that the punishment the individual has to receive must match the gravity of the crime committed. For example, for killing a fellow human being, a grave moral crime, the punishment is execution. Thus, for Kant, for each crime that is committed, there is an equal physical punishment and there can be no question of using discretion in the matter. In this theory, punishment of the crime is the core principle. Deterrence or reformation may occur, however, they are merely by products. A person who has reformed still has to be punished. Thus, it can be said that Kant's theory of retributivism focuses on personal responsibility of the individual committing the crime rather than the greater good of society. There are many failings with this theory, the most apparent one is that not every crime has an equal physical punishment. Moreover, this theory can also be criticized since it lacks compassion.

On the other hand, deterrence theory is the polar opposite of Kant's theory of retributivism. Deterrence theory evolved from utilitarianism, which as you know, believed in the 'the greatest good for the greatest number'. Bentham was a great proponent of the deterrence theory. In this theory, the notion of individual responsibility for the crime is largely absent. Only happiness matters. Anything that is an obstacle to the utilitarian maxim of the greatest good for the greatest number must be avoided. Punishment can be seen as something that causes unhappiness, until it can be proven that the act of punishing an individual causes more happiness than harm.

In Bentham's theory then, deterring harm is the central objective. Thus, unlike the Kantian notion of punishment, there is no need for punishment to correlate to the crime that is committed. The only thing that matters is deterring the individual and others from committing the similar crimes. A major flaw with this theory is that it can be argued that according to utilitarian notion, an innocent person may be punished for a crime he has not committed, as long as it deters others from committing similar acts.

Green attempted to unite both these opposite theories. As you can see, both the theory of deterrence and retribution have justifications for punishment. On the other hand, Green's theory of punishment is derived from rights. Green stated, 'The right.....of free life in every man rest on the assumed capacity in every man of free action contributory to social good'. Green goes on to assert that individuals cannot possess natural rights in the state of nature. Rights can only be obtained if there is a society that regulates these rights for the common good. 'Natural rights', for Green, 'so far as there are such things, are themselves relative to the moral end to which

NOTES

perfect law is relative'. A law, therefore is not good because it puts into effect 'natural rights' but because it adds to the achievement of a certain result. Human beings can only understand what rights can be considered natural when they consider what powers must be secured to a man in order to achieve this result. These powers a perfect law to secure its full extent.

Green believes that this framework of the common good creates the basis of human society's existence as well as the morality of a person. Green agreed with Kant on the notion of the 'categorical imperative' and accepted that individual morality derived from it. He went on to extend the Kantian notion of the categorical imperative by arguing that possession of these natural rights encompass that no other individual of a society interferes with an individual's rights and that an individual recognizes that other people have the same natural rights. What this means is that an individual should accept the moral agency of other individuals as long as these actions do not prove to be an obstacle to the common good of society. Green goes on to argue that 'associated men' have the right to obstruct and even avert actions as interference contributory to social good. This is Green's theory of the right of punishment, which is 'the right to use force...as may be necessary to save others from this interference.'

Thus, Green's idea of punishment is not to reprimand moral wickedness. Its aim is the 'protection of rights, and the association of terror with their violations'. What this suggests is that the framework of rights need a framework of enforcement of these rights, that is, punishment. Thus, it is the duty of the state to do what is necessary to uphold these rights and the common good that comes with it. Green, however, states that a punishment would be unjust if the action is not an impingement of a known right. This is Green's framework of punishment. However, to ensure that punishment that is meted out is just, Green believes the following aspects need to be incorporated.

According to Green, the punishment of crime aims to prevent a crime; however, it is not 'preventive of any or every evil or by any and every means, but . . . justly preventive of injustice; preventive of interference with those powers of action and acquisition which it is for the general well-being that individuals should possess, and according to laws which allow those powers equally to all men'. However, to ensure that it attains its goal of prevention, and to do so in a just manner, it must also be reformatory.

To comprehend what Green is trying to suggest, it is critical to examine each aspect of his theory. According to Green, although punishment needs to be just as well as retributive, it is not vengeance. Only the state has the right to inflict this punishment on an individual who has committed a crime. Nobody else has the right to inflict this punishment. The state only has this right to prevent others from committing similar acts and if that fails, to punish the offender. The quantum of punishment to the offender must be equal to what is necessary to ensure protection in the future. It should not be excessive or based on vengeance. According to Green, 'Crime should be punished according to the importance of the right which it violates, and to the degree of terror which in a well-organized society needs to be associated with crime in order to protection of the right'.

NOTES

However, it should be noted that although Green argues that the theory of punishment is deterrence, he does not ignore that punishment also needs to be both retributive and reformatory. Echoing Kant, Green asserts that punishment is in its own right an act returning on himself, in the sense that it is the essential result of an offenders act in a society governed by the notion of rights, a notion which the offender recognizes and to which he does involuntary reverence.

Green agrees with Kant that the infringement of a right necessitates retribution and that the offender should 'have his due, and….should be punished justly.' However, he then goes on to differ with the Kantian notion. For Green, a just punishment is not the same as 'equal' punishment. This is so because the suffering that a crime causes cannot be measured. Then how can equal punishment be inflicted while trying to punish an offender? To argue his point, Green provides an example of hard labour. Green asks how can the punishment of hard labour be the equal of robbery? Green asserts that retribution is an element of punishment. The already complicated aim of trying to assess the penalty of a crime must not be complicated further by adding to it the goal of trying to make the strictness of the penalty proportional to the moral evil committed by the offender. However, law must establish categories for each crime and fix penalties for crimes. This is because the punishment should not be completely out of proportion with the right that is violated. Green asserts that more central the right the more severe the punishment. Thus, for Green, the severity of the punishment increases with the seriousness of the crime. As Green says, 'It amounts to this, that the crime which requires most terror to be associated with it in order to its prevention should have most terror thus associated with it.'

Green believes that a just punishment is one that is preventative in nature. This does not mean that retribution is completely ignored. An offender is still being punishment according to the seriousness of his crime. Green asserts that punishment should not be 'preventive of any or every evil or by any and every means, but.....justly preventive of injustice'. What this means is that the state has the right to punish an individual for the crime that is committed and no other thing. The punishment for the crime will be fixed based on crime as well as the consideration of the type of 'terror' that needs to be associated with such crimes to prevent them in the future and to maintain future rights of individuals.

Green asserts that no punishment can be justified if a right has not been violated. What this suggests that no innocent person can be punished for a crime even if the nature of punishment acted as deterrent for future crimes. Only when a right has been infringed upon the individual intentionally can one claim just punishment. So far, Green's conception of punishment seems to be more of a theory of deterrence rather than one of retribution. Green himself asserts that the first purpose of punishment is deterrence of future crime. However, despite using deterrence as his main argument, he does provide certain examples that contradict the principle. Green states that to execute a man for stealing sheep is not just punishment, even if the stealing of sheep becomes an extremely common problem. Under the concept of Utilitarianism, the execution of thieves or robbers can be justified. For Green, however, 'a society where there was any decent reconciliation of rights no such terror as is caused by the punishment would be required for the punishment of death.' Thus for

NOTES

Green, the punishment needs to be corresponding to the severity of the crime that is committed.

The quantum of punishment that is inflicted on the offender is a core component of whether a punishment can be considered just or unjust. As you have learned, Kant's view of punishment has a major drawback that it is not possible to determine the quantum of punishment equal to every crime that is committed. As Green says, 'The amount of pain which in any kind of punishment causes to a particular person depends on his temperament and the circumstances, which neither a state nor its agent the judge, can ascertain'. For Green, a just punishment is one that has the aspects of deterrence, retribution as well as reform.

For Green, the duty of the state to punish offender also has to do with deterring others from committing similar crimes. Thus, the quantum of punishment should be prospective rather than retrospective. In case of a crime that has been committed a right has been violated. Therefore, no amount of punishment can change what harm has been done or ease the suffering of the individual who rights have been violated. Punishment can only help in decreasing the occurrence of such crimes in the future. Thus, the purpose of punishment is not to punish a particular person for committing a crime, although that is an aspect of it, rather the purpose is to create fear and ensure that such acts are not committed in the future.

In terms of reform, Green asserts that punishment in order to be effective and just must also be reformatory. A punishment must not only deter others from committing a crime but must also deter the offender from committing the crime in the future too. For Green, reform of the criminal is an important and significant by-product of preventative punishment. As an offender loses some rights due to his actions, Green believes it is desirable that the offender should be able to reform and regain the right that he has lost. By dealing with the offender in this manner, Green believes will make the offender realise the nature of his anti-social acts.

Thus, it can be said that Green's theory is one of deterrence. Green himself suggests this numerous times in the text. However, Green also asserts that punishment must also be just and by exploiting the drawbacks of Kant's theories and building upon them, Green makes a case for uniting both theories. Green's theory remains one of deterrence and though he adds elements of retribution, it cannot be said that Green followed the tradition of Immanuel Kant in his theory of punishment. This does not mean that Green did not improve Kant's theories by ironing out its major drawbacks as well as the problems with deterrence theory.

2.4.3 Political Obligation

The problem of political obligation is one of the most important issues of political philosophy. Green belongs to the idealist school of political obligation. It was his idealism coming to the fore when Green declared that government cannot claim an unconditional obedience of its citizens. He argued that individuals owe their allegiance to society, not to the state or government. Accordingly, the organized power of society should be recognized as political authority for the purpose of determining political obligation. Green's concept of political obligation is based on his concept of the 'common good'.

NOTES

Green writes, 'To ask why I am to submit to the power of the state, is to ask why I am to allow my life to be regulated by that complex of institutions without which I literally should not have a life to call my own, nor should be able to ask for a justification of what I am called on to do. For that I may have a life which I can call my own, I must not only be conscious of myself and of ends which I present to myself as mine; I must be able to reckon on a certain freedom of action and acquisition for the attainment of those ends, and this can only be secured through common recognition of this freedom on the part of each other by members of a society, as being for a common good.'

The law of our being involves in its turn civic or political duties. Moral goodness cannot be limited or constituted by the cultivation of self-regarding virtues. It consists of the attempt to realize that moral ideal to us as our ideal. From this arises the fact of political obligation as the institutions of political or civic life are the embodiment of moral ideas in terms of our day and generation. We have a criterion by which to test these institutions since society exists only for the proper development of people. It is obvious that the final moral ideal is not realized in any civic institutions but the same analysis that demonstrates this points out the direction in which true development will take place. Due to this rights and duties should be formulated and be maintained by law, as opposed to those actually maintained. As stated before, the state represents a 'General Will' that is a desire for a common good. Its basis is not a coercive authority that has been imposed on the citizens from without, but consists in the spiritual recognition on part of the citizens of that which constitutes their true nature.

He pointed out that it is society, not the state, which is the pivot of the common good. Green is quite different from utilitarian view so far as the notion of human nature is concerned. Whereas utilitarian's treat human beings as a pleasure-seeking animal, Green holds that human beings do not seek pleasure as such. In his opinion, the rational basis of human activity is will or reason, not desire or passion. As self-conscious beings, man and women wish to realize the good which they grasp along with other members of the community. He further says that human beings do not identify their self-interest as distinctly as they identify the common good. Common good not only comprehends the good of all members of the community, but their conceptions of the common good are also identical. In his lectures on the principles of political obligations Green argued that the state itself is obliged to promote the common good as conceived by its citizens, and that individuals are obliged to obey only those laws which promote the common good. If individuals think that they will serve the cause of the common good by defying any command of the state, their political obligation does not prevent them from such defiance.

In Green's view, it is the consciousness of the common good which prompts human beings to accept their duties. They tend to sacrifice their self-interest for the sake of the common good for they realize that they can attain self-realization only as members of the community, not as separate individuals. The question of priority between the individual and the community is irrelevant because individuals have no existence outside the community, and no community can exist without its constituent individuals. The true basis of the community lies in each individual treating every other individual as an end in itself, because each member of the community is

NOTES

recognized as capable of pursuing ideal object. The true goal of politics as well as of morality is to improve the moral character of individuals. This should be the criterion of evaluation of any institutional law. In other words, each institutional law should enable the citizens to exercise their good will and reason in the conduct of their affairs. It is the moral nature of human being which postulates his freedom. Freedom requires all members of the community to have equal opportunity of self- development. It is the duty of the state to create such conditions that are conducive to human freedom. Green points out that law can force the individual to perform certain acts, but this would be external acts only. No law can make them moral because morality is dependent on something freely willed. Will, not force, is the very basis of the state, Green writes.

Green thus, emphasizes the moral nature and capacity of human beings. The principal function of the state is to secure the common good as conceived and defined by its citizens. By recognizing the organized power of the community rather than the state as the object of political obligation, Green rules out the claim of any government to demand unconditional obedience from its citizens.

2.4.4 Concept of Moral Freedom

According to Green, freedom is power 'necessary to the fulfillment of man's vocation as a moral being'. This moral freedom links rights with the moral development of man and looks at rights essentially from the moral point of view.

The theory of moral freedom has been criticized as being vague and ambiguous. The conditions supposed to be aiming at the moral perfection of the individuals cannot be assessed. Extreme idealists do great harm to freedom of the individual by asking them to obey the state, implicitly without giving them the right to criticize the state or to resist laws, which are bad and harmful to them. The rights of the individual are made subordinate to the society. Green's vision on freedom greatly reflected the influence of political thinkers like Hegel and Kant. Green believed that freedom was the greatest of all the blessings and a fundamental condition for the moral development of the individual. It may be stated that for Green, the goal of human life was not the search of external ends like pleasure or happiness, but the moral development of life. He would like the individual to be left free to follow this end and did not favour any state interference in this regard. However, he was in favour of the state removing all those obstacles which stood in the way of the individual's moral development. But he was clearly against extreme state interference or a paternal government.

For Green, man's condition will be deplorable, if he does not have moral, liberty or freedom. Moral liberty consists in acting in accordance with one's rational or real self. It is related with the self-realisation of the individual. It means freedom to do things according to the dictates of one's conscience. Political liberty and civil liberty do not have much significance without moral liberty. Green paid much attention to it. Thus, moral liberty has a meaning only in the context of the common good, and it includes the good of each member and postulates free scope for the development of his personality.

NOTES

Green also agreed with Hegel's view that freedom was something global and positive and could be realized only through contribution in the state. However, he did not agree with Hegel that the state is the realization of freedom. Green by keeping away from the two extreme views of Kant and Hegel steered through the middle path and asserted that man free when he is in that 'state in which he shall have realized of himself, shall be at one with the law, which he be familiar with as the which he ought to obey, shall have become all that he has it in him be, and so fulfil the law of his being'. However, he asserted that freedom was not inevitable. It was depended upon to the realization of self-consciousness. As he stated, 'any direct enforcement of outward conduct, which ought to flow from social interests, by means threatened penalties and a law requiring such conduct essential implies penalties for disobedience to it is interference with the spontaneous action of those interests and consequently checks the growth of the capacity which is the condition of the beneficial exercise rights'.

Since Green could not recognize either Hegel or Kant's view of freedom in its entirely, he had to find a justifiable basis for positive liberty which would shun the extremes. Somehow he had to bring together what he considered sound in the stark individualism of Bentham's philosophy and the insight of the idealists. Green solved this dilemma by developing the concept of positive freedom. By positive freedom Green means 'a positive power or capacity of doing or enjoying something worth doing or enjoying and that too; something than we do or enjoy in common with other'.

In short we can say that to Green freedom is amazingly positive. It is the power of enjoying something worth doing or enjoying something in common with others. Secondly, it is determinate and does not include freedom 'to do anything and everything'. It includes the pursuit of only those goals which make our lives better. This point is fully borne by the following observation of Green. Green states that, 'Social institutions render it possible for a man to be freely determined by the idea of a possible satisfaction of himself, instead of being driven this way and that by external forces, and thus they give reality to the ability called will and they enable him to realize his reason, i.e. his idea of self- perfection by acting as a member of a social organization, in which each contributes to the well-being of all the rest'.

In justifying moral freedom, Green believed that the freedom of self- realization could be possible only through institution of certain universal and impartial rights which could be enforced through the state. Therefore, he implies by right 'the claim on an individual to will his own ideal objects and developing his capacities of reason and will'. According to Green, the basis of rights was not legal recognition but common moral consciousness. In other words, he emphasized that right are more relative to morality than law and were the essential condition for the fulfillment of man's moral end.

Green highlighted the social side of rights. To quote Green, 'The capacity, then, on the part of the individual of conceiving a good is the same for himself and others, and of being determined to action by that conception, is the foundation of rights; and rights are the conditions of that capacity being realized. No right is justifiable or should be right except on the ground that directly or indirectly it serves this purpose.

NOTES

Conversely every power should be a right, i.e., society should secure to individual every power that is necessary for realizing this capacity.' Thus no one could have right except as a member of the society.

Green also rejected the concept of natural rights in so far as it implied the existence of certain rights in the pre-social state. He asserted that there could be no rights without recognition. However, in a different context he considers the rights as natural. Thus, Green considered rights as natural for the realisation of the moral capacities of man. Viewed in this context his natural rights were both broader and deeper than the actual rights granted to the citizens by the states.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. What is the ultimate basis of Green's philosophy?
8. Why did Green reject the social contract theory of the state?
9. For Green, what is the purpose of punishment?
10. According to Green's philosophy, what is the principal function of the state?

2.5 SUMMARY

- Kant's theories resolved many of the divergences between 18th century rationalist and empiricist traditions.
- Kant suggests that human understanding of the external world is based not only on experience, rather it is based on experience as well as priori concepts. Kant, therefore, provides a non-empiricist critique of rationalist philosophy.
- Kant in his work *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, provided a wide variety of conditions that he thinks are critical to end wars and create an everlasting peace. One of the things that it encompassed was a world of constitutional republics.
- Kant believes that incessant war will eventually result in rulers understanding the importance of peaceful negotiations.
- In the entire tradition of western political theory of over two thousand years, no other thinker has aroused as much controversy about the meaning of his discourse as Hegel did.
- Hegel's works were difficult to dissect and because of the critical nature of his philosophy and the operation of the dialectics, the inner essence was always vulnerable to more than one plausible interpretation.
- The debate as to whether Hegel was a conservative, a liberal or a totalitarian continues till today.
- The credit of creating a philosophy of will, in the real sense, goes to Hegel.
- As a corrective to the extreme individualism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Hegelian philosophy emphasized the organic nature of society

and the fact that individuals had not only rights as over against other individuals but duties as well.

- Hegel's political theory contained all the essential elements of fascism, racialism, nationalism, the leadership principle, government by authority rather than consent, and above all the idealization of power as the supreme text of human values.
- The claim of Hegel that each sovereign state is sufficient for its members is the greatest danger to modern civilization.
- Hegel lacked proper understanding of the role of science in changing the societal process. His thesis was in itself a key expression of the history of his time and place.
- The Hegelian political philosophy goes beyond the idealism of Kant and of Fichte to embody a historical, evolutionary doctrine, which transforms the will into an aspect of pure abstract intelligence.
- Hegel rejected the instrumentalist conception of the state as a political community for the promotional and protection of individual aspirations and ambitions.
- The Hegelian state did not permit individual judgment or choice. It emphasized obedience.
- The basic problem with Hegel's liberalism was that it was ambiguous and placed a great deal of emphasis on the state.
- Hegel was too authoritarian to be a liberal and too liberal to be authoritarian. He exerted considerable influence on subsequent political theory, particularly Marxism and existentialism. He is considered the philosophical inspiration for both communists and fascists.
- Thomas Green propagated the theory that ethics apply to peculiar conditions of the social life.
- Thomas Hill Green was an English philosopher, political radical and temperance reformer, and a member of British idealism movement that was born in Yorkshire, England in 1836.
- Most of Green's major works were published posthumously, including his lay sermons on *Faith and The Witness of God*, the essay *On the Different Senses of 'Freedom' as Applied to Will and the Moral Progress of Man*, *Prolegomena to Ethics*, *Lectures on the Principles of Political Obligation*, and the *Lecture on Liberal Legislation and Freedom of Contract*. His other famous book was *Lectures on Liberal Legislations and Freedom of Contract*.
- Green also rejected the force theory of the origin of the state because it makes the force as the very basis of the state. The basis of the state not 'consent', neither it is force, but it is will. This conception of his becomes clearer when he analyses Austin's definition of sovereignty.

NOTES

- Green further recognized that the various permanent groups with society have their own inner system of rights and that the right of the state over them is one of adjustment.
- The state, Green insists is the only source of actual rights. He says idea rights may be conceived which are not in the state; only when they are in it do they become rights. Green's state like Hegel's, is a community of communities, but again like Hegel's there is no questions but that it is supreme over all the communities it contains.
- Green believed that the state should foster and protect the social, political and economic environments in which individuals will have the best chance of acting according to their consciences.
- Green's views on punishment are essentially related to his theory of state action. In order to maintain conditions and remove obstacles, the state must positively interfere with everything tending to violate conditions or impose obstacles. It must use force to repeal a force which is opposed to freedom.
- According to Green, the primary object of punishment is not to cause pain to the criminal for the sake of causing it nor chiefly for the sack of preventing him from committing the crime again, but to associate terror with the contemplation of the crime in the minds of others who might be tempted to commit it.

2.6 KEY TERMS

- **Cosmopolitanism:** It is the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, are (or can and should be) citizens in a single community. Different versions of cosmopolitanism envision this community in different ways, some focusing on political institutions, others on moral norms or relationships, and still others focusing on shared markets or forms of cultural expression.
- **Dialectic method:** The method of argument for resolving disagreement that is central to Indian and European philosophy is known as the dialectic method.
- **Totalitarianism:** A political system where the state, usually under the power of a single political person, faction, or class recognizes no limits to its authority and strives to regulate every aspect of public and private life wherever feasible.
- **Liberalism:** The belief in the importance of liberty and equal rights is known as liberalism.
- **Retributivism:** It is a policy or theory of criminal justice that advocates the punishment of criminals in retribution for the harm they have inflicted.
- **Subserve:** It means to help to further or promote.

2.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

NOTES

1. There were two interconnected foundations of Kant's 'critical philosophy'. These were:
   - Epistemology of transcendental idealism
   - Moral philosophy of the autonomy of practical reason
2. Cosmopolitanism is the ideology that all human ethnic groups belong to a single community based on a shared morality.
3. Hegelian idealism is often referred to as absolute idealism because it provides us with a set of categories in terms of which all human experiences of the past and the present can be understood.
4. The state, according to Hegel, was the representative of the divine idea or divine purpose.
5. According to Hegel, freedom consists in obedience to the dictates of social morality, to the moral will of the community.
6. Hegel's concept of freedom was based on the old Greek idea of an individual finding his true self, freedom and personality in and through the state.
7. The ultimate basis of his philosophy is to be found in the writings of Plato and Aristotle.
8. Green's rejection of the social contract theory was based on the reason that it makes the state a voluntary association.
9. The purpose of punishment is not to punish moral wickedness; rather its purpose is the 'protection of rights, and the association of terror with their violations'.
10. The principal function of the state is to secure the common good as conceived and defined by its citizens.

2.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What does Kant mean when he refers to cosmopolitan rights?
2. What is Kant's notion of judgement?
3. What influenced Green's political philosophy?
4. Write in brief about the early life of Hegel.
5. Hegel's dialectic method is the crux of his philosophy. Elucidate.
6. What was Green's concept of political obligation?
7. What is Green's concept of moral freedom?

NOTES

Long-Answer Questions

1. Examine Kant's idea of perpetual peace.
2. For Kant, freedom is the basis of the state. Discuss.
3. Explain Hegel's idea on the state and freedom of the individual.
4. According to Hegel, the state is an individual in history. Explain.
5. Discuss Hegel's concept of individual freedom in your own words.
6. Write a brief note on Green's idea of state.
7. Explain how Green interpreted the purpose of punishment.

2.9 FURTHER READING

Sullivan, J. Roger. 1989. *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kant, Immanuel. 2008. *Critique of Judgement*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Wempe, Ben. 2004. *T.H. Green's Theory of Positive Freedom: From Metaphysics to Political Theory.* Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Cater, Matt. 2004. *T.H. Green and the Development of Ethical Socialism*. Exeter: Imprint Academic.

Beiser, Frederick. 2005. *Hegel*. New York: Routledge.

Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought.* New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wolff, Jonathan. 2006. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, India.

Strauss, Leo, Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Miller, David, Janet Coleman, William Connolly et.al. 1991. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

UNIT 3 BURKE, MARX AND LENIN

NOTES

Structure

3.0 INTRODUCTION

For over 150 years the world has been challenged by a system of thought known as Marxism. Marxism has questioned the basis of class society in general and capitalist society in particular, and it was the foundation of a new kind of state, namely, a socialist state. A socialist state is a structured and organized economy where all means of production are controlled by the government. It is a state formed on the basis of centralized economic planning for the welfare of the masses. Two of the most outstanding proponents of this system of thought were Karl Marx of Germany and V. I. Lenin of Russia. Marx, the proponent of Marxism, discovered the law of class contradiction and declared that, without a revolution of the proletariat, there cannot be an end of exploitation of the working people. Lenin gave an organizational shape to this doctrine by setting up a revolutionary party that captured power in Czarist Russia and transformed it into a socialist state. We will study the thoughts of both of these philosophers in this unit. However, the unit will begin with a discussion on the British philosopher and political theorist Edmund Burke.

Today, Burke is considered to be the philosophical founder of English Conservatism. During his time, he was a staunch supporter of the American Revolution and the removal of discriminatory laws against Catholics in Britain. At the same time, and contradictorily, he was also a fierce critic of the French Revolution. In India, Burke is best known for his role as the prosecutor for the impeachment of

the First Governor-General of Bengal Warren Hastings. The unit will discuss Edmund Burke's political ideas as well as his critique of the French Revolution.

NOTES

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss Edmund Burke's political ideas
- Describe Burke's critique of the French Revolution
- Explain Karl Marx's tenets of Marxism
- Examine the Marxist concept of historical and dialectical materialism
- Discuss the Marxist concept of the state
- Describe Lenin's theory of imperialism

3.2 EDMUND BURKE

Edmund Burke was a British conservative thinker from the 18th century. He is perhaps best known for his vehement criticism the French Revolution of 1789. At the same time, he was a supporter of the American Revolution against English injustices as well as a critique of the policies of the East India Company in India. The core of his philosophical ideas was the promotion and retention of customary social institutions.

Scholars trace Burke's conservatism to his reaction to the events surrounding the French Revolution of 1789. Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) is still considered to be the archetypical declaration of conservatism. Burke argued that the revolutionaries in France and the British radicals of his day, who were calling for worldwide voting rights and the elimination of the monarchy, had a mistaken faith in reason and conceptual ideas. For them, a simple belief in natural rights, or freedom and equality, was enough basis for improvement existing governments. For Burke, such radicals and revolutionaries undervalued the complication of organizations and the depth of their roots in history and tradition. Burke was distrustful of all intellectuals who sought to generate an ideal new political order instead of becoming compliant to what history had shaped. In Burke's view, unfairness and unhappiness are best defeated through gradual processes of improvement and reform, not through critical revolutionary transformation.

3.2.1 Critique of the French Revolution

Burke's critique of the French revolution took the form of a comprehensive letter written to a young man named Charles DePont, who had asked Burke for his view on the revolution. This is how *Reflections on the Revolution in France* came into being. It first appeared in print on 1 November, 1790 and sold twelve thousand copies in the first month alone. By 1796, over thirty thousand copies had been put on

NOTES

the market, making it one of the most powerful political books published at that time. The French Revolution resulted in the annihilation of the French monarchy, the recognition of France as a republic, and was followed by decades of violent political turmoil known as the Reign of Terror. It finally culminated in the dictatorship of Napoleon Bonaparte, who brought many of the founding ideals of the revolution, namely Liberty, Equally, Fraternity, to different corners of Western Europe and posed a challenge to old feudal monarchies throughout the European continent.

The French Revolution put an end to many of the laws that exploited the common people for the benefit for the minority wealthy aristocracy. The Revolution eliminated 'tithes' owed to local churches as well as feudal dues billed to local landlords. The revolution also resulted in the abolishment of the guild system, which the revolutionaries considered a 'worthless remainder of feudalism'. The revolution also did away with the highly inefficient system of tax farming, whereby private individuals would gather taxes for a hefty fee. However, many of the progressive laws passed failed to provide relief to the people due to corruption and inefficiency which followed the general chaos of the revolution.

In Britain, an overwhelming majority opposed the French Revolution. In fact, Britain led and supported a series of coalitions that fought France from 1793 to 1815, and then helped re-established the Bourbons aristocracy in France after Bonaparte's defeat. Despite the apparent injustices committed by the French aristocracy on the French people, Burke argued against the French Revolution. In spite of this, he considered the main evils that led to the French Revolution to be 'bottomless money owing, competition between social classes, and the unlawful behavior of the king'.

The main argument that Burke makes against the Revolution is that it was based on abstract ambiguous principles, which for him ignored the complexities of human nature and society. For Burke, it was important to focus on practical and tangible solutions instead of aiming for abstract ideals. As Burke write, 'What is the use of discussing a man's abstract right to food or to medicine? The question is upon the method of procuring and administering them. In this deliberation I shall always advise to call in the aid of the farmer and the physician, rather than the professor'. Although an opponent of the divine right of monarchs to rule and a firm believer in the right of people to throw out an unjust ruler, Burke advocated gradual changes and reform rather than radical revolution. Burke in *Reflections* firmly asserts that idealist proclamations like 'liberty, equality and fraternity' and the rights of man can be used by unscrupulous men to justify tyranny. Instead of such ambiguous idealist principles, he advocates rights based on principle and tradition, such as the Magna Carta and the 1689 Declaration of Rights enacted in the British Parliament, and other constitutional measures to guard against governmental injustices.

Many of the predictions that Burke made in *Reflections* proved to be true. The revolution in spite of its revolutionary ideals resulted in general chaos and a period known as the 'Reign of Terror' began in France. This reign of terror ended with the military dictatorship of Napoleon Bonaparte.

NOTES

3.2.2 Political Ideas

As you have learned, today, Burke is considered to be the philosophical founder of conservatism. However, during his lifetime, he became a member of parliament from the Whig Party, a largely liberal dispensation. After his death, he was praised by both English conservatives and liberals alike. Burke's friend Philip Francis writing about Burke after his death said that Burke 'was a man who truly & prophetically foresaw all the consequences which would rise from the adoption of the French principles' but since Burke wrote with passion, people doubted his arguments. The poet William Wordsworth criticized Burke after reading his views of the French Revolution, however, he later came to admire Burke as a politician who whose predictions 'time has verified'. On the other hand, Karl Marx wrote a devastating critic of Burke, especially his contradictory positions in regards to the American and the French Revolution.

Marx wrote, 'The sycophant (Burke)—who in the pay of the English oligarchy played the romantic *laudator temporis acti* against the French Revolution just as, in the pay of the North American colonies at the beginning of the American troubles, he had played the liberal against the English oligarchy—was an out-and-out vulgar bourgeois. Burke wrote "The laws of commerce are the laws of Nature, and therefore the laws of God." No wonder that, true to the laws of God and Nature, he always sold himself in the best market.'

Burke was an Irish political elite. His thoughts on politics must be seem corresponding to the ideas of the members of his class. The Irish educated elite in the 18th century, which was a tiny minority, generally believed in the improvement of masses in the widest possible sense. What this meant was that they linked self-improvement through the guidance of the arts and sciences, and through the improvement of intellectual skills, alongside morality and economic prosperity. This elite believed that it was the duty of the elites to guide the masses towards their self-improvement, an idea that Burke retained throughout his life. Any other way of improving the life of the masses would lead to violence. These general ideas lie behind Burke's political theories.

As a Member of Parliament, Burke believed that it was the responsibility of the elected political representative to act like representative of his constituency and not as a mere delegate obeying all whims and fancies of his constituents. The elected representative must keep in mind the interests of the nation based on his conscience and not think about his electoral prospects while taking decisions.

In his political philosophy, Burke represents a decisive break from the ideas of John Locke, who had dominated the political theories of the 18th century. Burke attacked the individualistic doctrine of the 'rights of man' inherited from Locke, considering it totally ambiguous. Disagreeing with the social contract theory, and the belief that states form on the basis of contracts between free individuals, Burke states that the individual is a product of society. For Burke, the individual is born with an 'inheritance of rights' but also has a set of corresponding duties. Burke argued that societies are not formed on the basis of contract, but because they are needed. The factors that shape society are not pre-conceived abstract inherited rights, but

rather 'convenience'. Of these conveniences or rights, two of the most important are government and prescription, i.e., the existence of 'a power out of themselves by which the will of individuals may be controlled,' and the acknowledgement of the hallowed nature of prescription.

Burke believes that no matter how a state may have been formed, because of invasions or revolutions, because of time the institutions and rights of the state come to rest upon prescription. Without a state people are vague, loose individuals and nothing more. Thus, no individual has the right to rebel against a state at will. Rebellion is always to be used as the last resort. He calls revolution as the 'extreme medicine of the constitution' that must only be undertaken when some rights have been infringed. And only when after weighing the pros and cons of such drastic action.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What is the core of Edmund Burke's philosophical ideas?
2. What is Burke's principal argument against the French Revolution?

3.3 KARL MARX

As you have studied previously, in the 19th century Hegel's influence on philosophy was such that later philosophers in Germany came to be divided into left-wing and right-wing Hegelians. The left-wing Hegelians included Bruno Bauer, Friedrich Engels and Marx. They were also referred to as the Young Hegelians.

While Marx remained a relatively obscure figure in his own lifetime, his ideas play a significant role in both the development of modern social sciences and also in the socialist political movement. In the 20th century, revolutionary socialist governments following Marxist concepts took power in a variety of countries leading to the formation of socialist states like the Soviet Union. The 20th century also saw the development of various theoretical variants of Marxism, such as Leninism, Trotskyism and Maoism. Marx's notable works include the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) and *Das Kapital* (1867–1894), many of which were co-written with his friend, the fellow German revolutionary socialist Friedrich Engels. Marx lived in a time where there were a lot of industrial jobs, and he noticed that there was a big difference between the quality of life led by property owners and the workers. Marx argued that there would always be a big gap between property owners and those without property as long as capitalism existed. The reason was that the point of a business, in a capitalist system, is to make money. The only way for a business to make money is to pay a worker less than what he brings to the company. Marx noticed this trend in capitalism, and believed it was exploitation. He wanted to share that argument with the world, and he so he laid it out in the *Communist Manifesto*.

The foundational principles on which Marx based his ideas can be seen in the carved engraving on his tombstone in London, which bear the messages: 'WORKERS OF ALL LANDS UNITE', and 'The philosophers have only interpreted the world

NOTES

in various ways, the point, however, is to change it.' Today, Marx is typically cited, along with Émile Durkheim and Max Weber, as one of the three principal architects of modern social science. In a 1999 BBC poll, Marx was voted the 'thinker of the millennium' by people around the world.

3.3.1 Brief Life Sketch

Karl Heinrich Marx was born on 5th March 1818 in the city of Trier in the Rhineland province of Prussia into a Jewish family. His father was a moderately well-to-do lawyer. Marx's parents were descendants of a long line of Jewish rabbis. However, his father became a protestant Christian when Marx was six years old. Marx was also baptized in that faith and changed his middle name from Hirschel to Heinrich. In 1835, when Marx was seventeen years of age, he began the study of law at the University of Bonn. However, he soon abandoned the study of law in favour of philosophy, the study of which he pursued at the University of Berlin and Jena in 1836. He changed his course to philosophy under the influence of the Young Hegelians. As you learned earlier, Marx had become an active member of Young Hegelians while he was a student but soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. He was also influenced by some of the major movements of his times.

During Marx's formative years, the idea of evolution was very much in the air in one form or the other. One of the versions of it was articulated by Hegel (*Evolution of Absolute Idea or Spirit*) while another version was propounded by Charles Darwin in his famous book *Origin of Species*. Marx, though accepted some of the themes propounded by these writers, he also rejected many of them. He offered an alternative theory of historical evolution which is called the theory of dialectical materialism. Marx also had polemical arguments with many of his contemporaries which included Proudhon and Bakunin and various socialist groups. Marx completed his doctorate in philosophy in 1841. He then married his childhood sweetheart, Jenny, a daughter of Baron Ludwig von Westphalen, who was his spiritual guide since his adolescence, in 1843 after a seven year period of courtship. Following this, he was unable to secure a University appointment as a teacher. Therefore, he joined the staff of the Rheinnische Zietung, a democratic newspaper in Cologne. The following year the paper was suppressed by the Prussian Government and Marx was forced to flee to Paris, then considered the European headquarters of radical movements. In Paris, he met Proudhan, the leading French socialist thinker, Bakunin, the Russian anarchist, and Friedrich Engels, who soon became his lifelong companion and close collaborator. Engels was the first to draw the attention of Marx to England as a laboratory in which industrial capitalism could be accurately observed.

To understand Marx's fascination with industrial capitalism, one must look at the socioeconomic, political, cultural and intellectual universe which Marx encountered and entered as a young liberal idealist in western Germany in the mid-late 1830s. Marx grew up in a society in which a developing industrial economy, based on modern technology, both confronted and coexisted with a political and cultural complex inherited from the late medieval world. The year Marx graduated the equivalent of

high school, in 1835, the first railroad was launched in Germany. In 1837, August Borsig founded a subsequently famous machinery works in that German city. At the same time, despite its liberal mask, the Prussian state was an oppressive absolute monarchy. When the Prussian king died in 1840 and was succeeded by his religious son, an even more repressive policy toward academic and intellectual life was instituted. One consequence was that Marx left Germany and moved to Paris, which was then the center of the communist and socialist movements. It was then and there that Marx himself became a communist.

Marx first entered the political scene in 1837 as part of a radical intellectual circle called the Left Hegelians or Young Hegelians. In 1843, Marx published an important work in which he called for eliminating the "Middle Ages" in Germany because the heritage of the Middle Ages was so strongly present in the Germany of the day. In 1844, while Marx was in Paris, he became interested in the working class movement and political economy. During that period, Marx and Engels began working on the *German Ideology* (1847). Marx was expelled from France in 1845 by the intervention of the Prussian Government, following which he went to Brussels. It was there that Karl Marx with the aid of his friend Friedrich Engels composed the most influential of all his writings *The Communist Manifesto*. Marx actively participated in the revolutions that took place in France and Germany in 1848; thus, in 1849 he was expelled again by the Prussian Government. In the late summer of 1849, he went to London where he became a permanent resident for the rest of his life. In 1848, Marx and Engels helped in the founding of the Communist League, which existed till 1950. He worked and studied in the British museum from 1850–1860. In September 1864, Marx was an active member in the formation of the International Working Men's Association in London. After moving to London Marx began contributing articles on the German situation to the *New York Daily Tribune*. Some of his other major works included *The Holy Family*, *Poverty of Philosophy* (1847), *Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and *Das Capital*, the first volume of which appeared in 1867. Marx died on March 14, 1883.

3.3.2 Dialectical Materialism

In the *Theses on Feuerbach* (first published as an appendix to the 1888 edition of Engels' *Ludwig Feurbach*), Marx led the foundation for what he called dialectical materialism. According to Engels, dialectic is nothing more than the science of the general laws of motion and development of nature, human society and thought. Thought itself is a natural process, acting upon and being acted upon by the natural environment in which it takes place. It is impossible to transcend the natural process – there are, 'the general laws of motion and development' and that is all.

Marx borrowed his dialectical method from German philosopher, G. W. H. Hegel and sought to combine it with his materialism. Hegel has postulated that 'idea' or 'consciousness' was the essence of universe, and that all social institutions were the manifestation of changing forms of idea. Ideas evolved into new forms because of their inherent tension, exemplified in the clash between thesis (partial truth) and anti-thesis (again a partial truth) resulting in synthesis (which is nearer the truth). As long as synthesis itself contains partial truth, it takes the role of thesis and

NOTES

undergoes the same process until this process reaches absolute truth, exemplified in 'absolute idea' or 'absolute consciousness'. In Hegelian philosophy, dialectics applied to the process, evolutions and development of history. He viewed history as the progressive manifestation of human reason, and the development of a historical spirit. History recorded increasing awareness and greater rationality as exhibited in human affairs. Human consciousness and freedom expanded as a result of conflicting intellectual forces, which were constantly under tension. Hegel believed in a movement from a rudimentary state of affairs to a perfect form. The process of history, for Hegel was marked by two kinds of causation:

- Individual spirit which desired happiness and provided energy
- World spirit which strived for higher freedom that came with the knowledge of the self

However, though Marx agreed with Hegel that there was a constant movement in the dialectical process he believed that 'matter' and not the 'idea' as the essence of universe, and the social institutions were the manifestation of changing material conditions. Matter undergoes the dialectical process because of its inherent tensions, until perfect material conditions, exemplified by a 'rational mode of production' come into existence. Marx emphasized the real rather than the ideal, the social rather than the intellectual, matter rather than mind. For Marx, the key idea was not the history of philosophy, but the history of economic production and the social relation that accompanied it. Marx acknowledged Hegel's great contributions, which was to recognize world history as a process- changing, transforming and developing — and to understand the internal connection between the movement and its development. From Hegel, Marx also learned that various angles of the developmental process could not be studied in isolation, but in their relations with one another and with the process as a whole. Hegel applied dialectics to the realm of ideas. However, Marx as a materialist believed that consciousness was determined by life, and not the other way around. Unlike the latent conservatism and idealism of Hegelian philosophy, Marxism rejected the status quo – capitalism – as intolerable. For Marx, social circumstances socially changed, with no social system lasting forever. Capitalism arose under certain historical circumstances, which would disappear in due course of time. Thus, Marx, like Hegel, continued to believe that dialectics was a powerful tool. It offered a law of social development and in that sense Marx's social philosophy was a philosophy of history like Hegel's.

Engels, in his book, *Anti-Duhring* (1878) postulated three laws of material dialectics or dialectical materialism, which are as follows:

(i) Transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa

(ii) Interpretation of opposites

(iii) Negation of negations

These principles signify the process of resolving contradictions of material conditions of human life which pave the way for social progress. Class conflict is also a manifestation of this process.

Karl Marx does not systematically explain his theory of dialectical materialism anywhere in his works. However, he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical not mechanical. In mechanical materialism, evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of their environment. In dialectical materialism, evolution is the development of matter from within, with the environment helping or hindering, but neither originating the evolutionary process, nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Motion in dialectical materialism is the mode of existence of matter. The ultimate reality in matter is motion. Moreover, this is a dialectical process, the reconciliation of opposing movements in an endless effort to achieve a more perfect harmony. Matter to the dialectical materialist is active not passive and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. It contains within itself the energy necessary to transform it. Matter is self-moving or self-determining. The universe is self-sufficient, self-creating and self- perpetuating. Hegel explained the dialectical process as the activity of god in the world, Marx borrows the 'energy' from Hegel's immanent god in the world, dissociates it from god and locates it in matter itself. The dialectical materialism is more interested in motion than in matter, in a vital energy within matter in veritably deriving it towards perfect society just as Hegel's demi-urge drove forward to the perfect realization of spirit. As Engel said, 'the dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas, essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death'.

3.3.3 Historical Materialism

While dialectical materialism represents the philosophical bases of Marxism, historical materialism represents its scientific basis. It implies that in any given epoch, the economic relations of society – the means whereby men and women undertake production, distribution and exchange of material goods for the satisfaction of their needs – play an important role, in shaping their social, political, intellectual and ethical relationships. Marx applied dialectics to the material or social world consisting of economic production and exchange. A study of the productive process explained all other historical phenomena. Marx noted that each generation inherited a mass of productive forces, an accumulation of capital and a set of social relations which reflected these productive forces. The new generation modified these forces, but at the same time, these forces prescribed certain forms of life, and shaped human character and thought in distinct ways. The mode of production and exchange was the final cause of all social changes and political revolutions. Marx considered matter as being active, capable of changing from within. It was not passive, needing an external stimulus for change, a conception found in Hobbes.

The theory begins with the 'simple truth, which is the clue to the meaning of history that man must eat to live'. His very survival depends upon the success with which he can produce what he wants from nature. Production is, therefore, the most important of all human activities. Men in association produce more than men in isolation, and society is thus the result of an attempt to secure the necessities of life. But society has never accomplished that to the satisfaction of all its members, and has in consequence, always been subject to internal stresses and strains. The Marxian interpretation of human history is economic. Marx saw evolutionary changes in the

NOTES

ethical, religious, social, economic, and political ideas and institutions of mankind. According to him, institutions and ideas, and therefore, action are subject to endless change. The chief motive force which brings about this change in human beings is not the Hegelian idea but the material conditions of life. Human history, therefore, has a material basis.

The Marxist perspective postulates that the structure of society may be understood in terms of its base (the foundation) and superstructure (the external build-up). The base consists of the mode of production while the superstructure is represented by its legal and political structure, religion, morals, social practices, literature, art and culture etc. The mode of production has two components—forces of production and relations of production. Forces of production cannot remain static; they have an inherent tendency of development in the direction of achieving the perfect society. Forces of production have two components—means of production (tools and equipments) and labour power (human knowledge and skills). Men and women constantly endeavour to devise better ways of production. Improvement in the means of production is manifested in the development of technology. This is matched by development of human knowledge and skills as required to operate the new technology. Hence, there is the corresponding development of labour power. On the other hand, relations of production in any given epoch are given by the pattern of ownership of means of social production. This gives rise to two containing classes – haves and have-notes.

Marx talked of four stages of human history—ancient times, medieval times, modern times and future society based on communism. In earlier stages of historical development, development of the forces of production fails to make any dent in the pattern of ownership. In other words, changes in the mode of production bring about changes in the nature of contending classes but they do not bring about an end of the class conflict. Change in the nature of contending classes is itself brought about by a social revolution. When material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, these relations turn into their fetters. The new social class which comes to own new means of production, feels constrained by these fetters and overthrows the old dominant class in a revolution. As a result of social revolution, an old social formation is replaced by a new social formation. In this process, world contending classes are replaced by new contending classes but class conflict continuous on a new plan. This has been the case still the rise of capitalism, which will be overthrown by a socialist revolution leading to the eventual emergence of classless society.

Marx, in his analysis of history, mentioned the important role of ideology in perpetuating false consciousness among people, and demarcated the stages which were necessary for reaching the goal of communism. In that sense both the 'bourgeoisie' (the capitalist wealth owning class) and the proletariat (the working class) were performing their historically destined roles. In spite of the deterministic interpretation of history, the individual had to play a very important role within the historical limits of his time, and actively hasten the process.

Marx had a very powerful moral content in his analysis, and asserted that the progress was not merely inevitable, but would usher in a perfect society free of

alienation, exploitation and deprivation. His materialistic conception of history emphasis the practical side of human activity, rather than speculative thought as the moving force of history. In the famous speech, Engels claimed that Marx made two major discoveries—the law of development of human history and the law of capitalist development.

3.3.4 The State and Revolution

Marx critically dissected the Hegelian theory of the modern state and its institutions in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1843). According to Marx, Hegel's separation of civil society and the state was only relevant in his perception of a particular historical context. The state was not eternal. It would eventually disappear. Marx contended that the state was not 'a march of god on Earth' as Hegel described, but an instrument of the dominant economic class exploiting and oppressing the other sections of society. Marx rejected the dichotomy between civil society and the state in Hegelian philosophy, and concluded that the state and bureaucracy did not represent universal interests.

Marxism advocated the class perspective of the state. It treats the state neither as a 'natural institution' nor as an 'ethical institution' as the organic theory has held. It treats the state as an artificial device that is neither a manifestation of the will of the people, nor as an instrument of reconciliation of conflicting interests. According to the class theory, the state comes into existence when society is divided into two antagonistic classes, one owning the means of social production and the other being constraint to live on its labour. In other words, it is the emergence of 'private property' that divides society into two conflicting classes. Those owning the means of production acquire the power to dominate the other class not only in the economic sphere but in all spheres of life. In an antagonistic class society the state is a political instrument, 'a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another'. The economically dominant class that possessed the means of production acquires a powerful instrument for the subjection of the oppressed and exploited in the state. The state has a clearly defined class character. Being the principal component of the superstructure founded on the economic basis of society, the state takes every measure to strengthen and protect this basis.

With the emergence of 'private property', society is divided into 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes. The dominant class, in order to maintain its stronghold on economic power, invents a new form of power – political power. The state is the embodiment of political power. It is therefore, essentially subservient to economic power. Thus, according to the class theory, the state neither originates in the will of the people, nor does it stand for the benefit of all society, but is an instrument devised by a dominant class for its own benefit. It is imposed on society from above to serve the interest of a particular class. The state has not existed from eternity. It came into existence at a particular stage of historical development. It is a product of the conscious effort of the dominant class which first acquires the means of production and there after political power. The state is therefore, by no means, a natural institution as the organic theory has maintained.

NOTES

Marx further observes that at a later stage, when the means of production are somewhat developed, that is, when the hunting, fishing and food-gathering economy is replaced by an economy based on animal husbandry, domestic agriculture and small industry, there is 'surplus production' which is cornered by a class owning the means of production. As a result, 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes come into existence. The structure of society is always determined by the prevalent form of production. The hand-mill gives one a society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill gives one a society with the industrial capitalist. The attitudes and outlook of society – the legal, political and intellectual relations as well as the religious and social systems are also determined by the material conditions of life. This means that whatever the form of the state, it is invariably an instrument of the dominant class.

Bourgeois ideologists claim that the state does not have a class character and is merely an arbiter called upon to resolve disputes which arise between people regardless of their class affiliation. Such a theory of the state solved to justify the privileges of the bourgeois and the existence of exploitation and capitalism. Marx and Engels, in the *Communist Manifesto* (1848), observed, 'Political power, properly called is, merely the organized power of one class for oppressing other'. Thus, in contrast to bourgeois ideologists, Marx demonstrated that the state is not something introduced into society from outside, but is a product of society's internal development. The state was brought into being by changes in material production. The succession of one mode of production by other causes a change in the state system. According to Marx, the state has not always existed. Primitive society which had no private property and no classes had no state either. Naturally there were certain social functions, but they were performed by men chosen by all of society which had the right to dismiss these people at any time and to appoint others. In those distant times relations between people were regulated by public opinion. However, the further development of productive force, led to the disintegration of primitive society. Private property appeared, accompanied by classes – slaves and slave-owners. It became necessary to protect private property, the role and security of its owners, and this brought the state into being. The birth of the state and its further development were accompanied by a fierce class struggle. It is, thus, evident that the state is a product of class society. It arose with the appearance of classes and it will vanish with the disappearance of classes. But this will happen only under communism. The alternative that Marx envisaged was a classless, stateless society of true democracy and full of communism, in which the political state disappeared.

According to the Marxist view, the main feature of the state is the existence of public authority representing the interest of the class which dominates economically and not of the entire population. This authority rests on the armed forces – the army and the police. In a society divided into hostile classes, the armed forces are in the hands of the ruling class and are used to suppress the people, to subordinate theme to a handful of exploiters. Representative bodies (parliaments), the huge bureaucratic machine with a whole army of official, intelligence agency, the courts, procurators offices and prisons – are all used for the same purpose. All of them combined make of the political authority of the exploiting state.

NOTES

As class contradictions deepen and the class struggle intensifies, the state machinery expands. The process is particularly intensive in contemporary capitalist society where the state machine and the armed forces have grown to an unprecedented size. The maintenance of these colossal state machine and the armed forces is a heavy burden for the people, especially when imperialist circles are engaged in an arms race. The state, therefore, is 'an executive committee of the bourgeoisie' serving the interest of the capitalist class; this state will have no reason for existence in a classless society. A classless society based upon the doctrine 'from everyone according to his ability and to everyone according to his needs, will come into existence'. According to Marx, the state, regardless of the forms of government, is an evil, because it is a product of a society saddled with irreconcilable class struggles. It belongs to the realm of the super structure, as it was conditioned and determined by its economic base. In the course of history, each mode of production would give rise to its specific political organization, which would further the interest of the economically dominant class.

For Marx and Engel, the state expressed human alienation. It was an instrument of class exploitation and class oppression, as in a state, the economically dominate class exploited and oppressed the economically weaker class. The state apparatus served the ruling class, but acquired independence and became autonomous when adversarial classes were in a state of temporary equilibrium. This phenomenon was described as Bonapartism. In such a situation, the dictator with the support of the state apparatus became its guardian.

In his book *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1852), Marx denounced the bureaucratic and all-powerful state advising the proletariat to destroy it. Thus, Marx advocated a violent revolutionary seizure of power and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. However, in countries with democratic institutions, the transition from capitalism to socialism could be peaceful. Marx and Engels elaborated that a communist society would eliminate all forms of alienation for the human individual from nature, from society and from humanity. It does not merely mean consumer satisfaction, but the abolition of all forms of estrangement, the liberation of human forces and enhancement of personal creativity. The institution of private property and division of labour identified as the source of alienation would be destroyed as a pre requisite for the new and truly human phase in history. Marx and Engels viewed the proletariat as an agent and not as a tool in history, and their liberation would result in the liberation of society.

The transitional phase, the phase between the destruction of the bourgeois state and the inauguration of a communist state or society, symbolized by the dictatorship of the proletariat, generated a great deal of controversy in Marxist political theory. Interestingly, one of the well-known utopias was the least delineated. Marx's cautious productions were imposed by his own epistemological premises. The concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat held the key to the understanding of Marx's theory on the nature of communist society and the role of proletarian state. Marx and Engels spoke about the political rule of the proletariat, advising the workers to capture the state, destroy all privileges of the old class, and prepare for the eventual disappearance of the state. Marx and Engels were convinced that

NOTES

existing state whether as instruments of class domination and oppression, or ruled by bureaucratic forces on the whole of society, would grow inherently strong and remain minority states representing the interests of the small, dominant and powerful possessing class. It was only when the proletarian majority ceased the states structure that the state became truly democratic and majoritarian. Irrespective of the form the state assumed, it was a fight with which the proletariat had to contend with during the revolution.

3.3.5 Social Revolution

On the basis of the scientific analysis of the system of capitalism, Marx had declared that a social revolution was inevitable. Revolution was certain to come because the forces of discontent would eventually accumulate and break through all obstacles. Marx had no doubt about the inevitability of revolution but questions remained as to how it would come and what would follow. For these questions, Marx had definite answers. For Marx, the proletariat had to organise for political action and make revolution. The *Communist Manifesto* declared that all the presiding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation. In such a scenario, the working class could not become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their previous mode of appropriation.

All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of the society, cannot stir, cannot rise itself of without the whole super incumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air. Therefore, the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

According to Marx, social progress would have to come about through a violent struggle between the classes. By progress, Marx meant the expansion of the productive capacity of both society and individual human beings. This would ultimately lead to greater freedom and equalities and to the realization of man's capacity. Marx observes the dramatic conflict of classes, intensified during a period of social upheaval, reached its climax in a political revolution. The fundamental cause of any revolution was the desire and endeavour of a subject class to capture state power from the ruling class by force and to reorganize the state apparatus to suit its own specific needs. The final struggle takes place in the political realm by social and economic objective which divide the warring class formation are really the true cause of revolution. A successful revolution would remove those social, economic and political institutions which obstruct the development of the class for whose benefit the revolution has been carried out.

The Marxist Theory of Revolution is the consequence and the concentrated expression of Marx's view of historical development, that is to say, of the sequence of social formation in history. He saw the driving force of social development in the historical tendency towards establishing property relations which corresponded to the level of development and character of the technique used in production at a

particular period. Marx found the key to understand the sequence of the various modes of production in the law of motion, which was activated by social classes whose interest coincided with the developing tendency. For Marx, social revolution is an ongoing process in which causes and effect are dialectically related. According to Marx, 'in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relation that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces…..At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or what is but a legal expression for the same thing – with the property relation within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution.' Marx also observed that, 'what is the basis of a partial, purely political revolution? It is that a part of civil society emancipates itself and attains universal domination, that a particular class undertakes the general emancipation of the society from its particular situations. This class frees the whole of society but only under the pre-supposition that the whole of society is in the same situation as this class, that it possesses, or can equally acquire for example, money and education.'

It is necessary to remember that Marx emphasized the human causes of revolution. He said, 'of all the instrument of production, the greatest productive force is the revolutionary class itself. The organization of the revolutionary elements as a class presupposes the existence of all the productive forces that could be endangered in the womb of old society'. But the proletariat had to undergo a massive transformation through its own education in the school of class struggle before it could become a fit agent of revolution. In the revolution, the proletariat will acquire the capacity of undertaking the task of socialist reconstruction. The name that Marx gives to this activity is 'revolutionary praxis'. It embodies through a dialectical unity of theory and practice, the subjective and objective causes of revolution. He sums this up in the following words, 'in revolutionary activity the changing of oneself coincides with the changing of circumstances'. It implied that the proletariat must become a class 'for itself' by developing class consciousness which is necessary cause and precondition of a successful revolution.

By 1851, Marx was convinced of the primacy of economic factors in determining the possibilities of revolution. His considered view about revolution now was that only a severe economic crisis caused by a falling rate of capitalist profits in a slump could precipitate it. The effective cause of revolution has to be located in economic situation and nowhere else and new revolution is possible only as a consequence of a worsening trade cycle leading to increasing misery of the proletariat. Marx became so convinced of economic determinism of the revolutionary process that he was prepared to dissolve to *Communist League* when it appeared to be falling under the control of leaders who believed in attempting a revolution irrespective of the economic situation. During the next decade, he expected the capitalist crisis to breakout that would provoke a socialist revolution.

Marx's materialist view of history would indicate that it was most likely to breakout in the most advanced industrial countries like Britain, France or the United

NOTES

States. In a letter to Engels in 1859, Marx mentioned that 'revolution is imminent on the continent and will immediately assume a socialist character. Can it avoid being crushed in the small corner, because the moment of bourgeois society is in the ascendant over much larger areas of the earth?'. However, Marx also believed that in some developed countries such as Germany, a bourgeois revolution could spark of a subsequent socialist revolution. Later in his life, he came to believe that backward Russia might prove the starting point of a new European revolution, initially bourgeois but ultimately proletarian in character. Lenin implemented this Marx's theory of two-stage revolution in his own way in the Russian Revolution in 1917 and Mao did the same in his own characteristic way in bringing about the Chinese Revolution. While Marx generally regarded force as the midwife of the revolution, he conceded that socialism could come about as a culmination of a peaceful mass movement in some of the capitalist democracies.

Marx was opposed to the use of revolutionary terror as it weakened the cause of revolution. He strongly criticizes the use of terror by the Jacobins in the French revolution. Physical force, however, as opposed to terror, was to Marx a perfectly acceptable revolutionary weapon provided the economic, social and political conditions were such as to make its use successful. It was also Marx's view that a successful revolution in one country could not be stabilized if it remained confined to the borders of a single country.

Marx's Vision of Socialism

Marx's concept of socialism follows from his concept of man. For Marx, socialism is not a society of regimented individuals, regardless of whether there is equality of income or not, and regardless of whether they are well fed and well clad. It is not a society in which the individual is subordinated to the state, to the machine, to the bureaucracy. In fact, as Marx says quite clearly in the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, 'communism as such is not the aim of human development.' What, then, is the aim? Quite clearly the aim of socialism is man. It is to create a form of production and an organization of society in which man can overcome alienation from his product, from his work, from his fellow man, from himself and from nature; in which he can return to himself and grasp the world with his own powers, thus becoming one with the world. Socialism for Marx was, as Paul Tillich put it, 'a resistance movement against the destruction of love in social reality.'

Socialism, for Marx, is a society which permits the actualization of man's essence, by overcoming his alienation. It is nothing less than creating the conditions for the truly free, rational, active and independent man; it is the fulfilment of the prophetic aim: the destruction of the idols. A socialist society, for Marx, is a society which serves the real needs of man. Man's real needs are rooted in his nature; this distinction between real and false needs is possible only on the basis of a picture of the nature of man and the true human needs rooted in his nature. Man's true needs are those whose fulfilment is necessary for the realization of his essence as a human being. As Marx himself stated, 'The existence of what I truly love is felt by me as a necessity, as a need, without which my essence cannot be fulfilled, satisfied, complete.'

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

3. Who were the young Hegelians?
4. What is the Marxist notion of historical materialism?
5. For Marx, what are the four stages of human history?
6. What is Marx's understanding of socialism?

NOTES

3.4 VLADIMIR LENIN

Vladimir Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world, i.e., the Soviet Union. Along with Marx, he also became a philosopher and a guide for communists and revolutionaries all over the world. According to the author and scholar Professor C.C. Maxey, 'Lenin, now the beatified saint of Bolshevism was not only a revolutionary leader of great sagacity and practical ability, but was also a writer and thinker of exceptional penetration and power.' Long before the Russian Revolution, Lenin had a positive and coherent political philosophy, and this philosophy after he became head of the Russian state, governed all his public decisions and acts. It became and has remained to a very large degree of the political road map of Russian communism. Lenin brought updated and adapted Marx's philosophy to unique Russian conditions. Let us now discuss Lenin's contribution to Marxist thought at length.

3.4.1 Lenin's Theory of Imperialism

Lenin's 'Theory of Imperialism' is found in his book *Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism*. Lenin regards imperialism as the highest form of capitalism. He argues that as capitalism develops, industries unite and become bigger and then begin collaborating and acting like cartels to create what is known as monopoly capitalism. In the financial world a similar process takes place. When banks combine and become the master of capital, they assist industrialists with the capital, thus encouraging the transformation of monopoly capitalism into finance capitalism. Monopoly and finance capitalism have a great tendency of expanding very rapidly and aggressively. The primary export of finance capitalism is money or capital, and the consequences of its enforcement are the exploitation of colonial people, whom it oppresses and subjects to the law of the capitalist society, thus increasing misery amongst the people and destroying their liberty and freedom. As Lenin stated, 'If it were necessary to give the briefest possible definition of imperialism we should have to say that imperialism is the monopoly stage of capitalism.'

According to Lenin, 'Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopoly and finance capital has taken shape, in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance in which the division of the world by international trusts has begun, and in which the portion of all the territory of the earth by the great capitalist countries has been completed.'

NOTES

Lenin identified five distinct features of imperialism, which can be stated as follows:

- The concentration of production and capital develops to such a high stage that it creates monopolies which play a decisive role in economic life.
- The merging of bank capital with industrial capital, and the creation, on the basis of this finance capital, of a financial oligarchy.
- The export of capital as distinguished from the export of commodities acquires exceptional importance.
- The formation of international monopolist capitalist combines which share the world among themselves.
- The territorial division of the whole world among the biggest capitalist powers is completed.

Lenin claimed that imperialism in spite of being the highest stage of capitalism also contains various contradictions within itself, which shall destroy capitalism and bring in socialism. The first contradiction is that of the antagonism between the labour and capital. The labour is exploited by the capital, thus feelings of revolution would be ignited in exploited workers. If it will be materialized, the spirit of socialism will start. He also identified another feature of imperialism- the decay of capitalism. Lenin asserted that imperialism is not only the period of monopoly capitalism, but it is also the period of decaying capitalism- the decay resulting from its monopolistic character. As he stated, 'the tendency to stagnation and decay, which is the feature of monopoly, continues, and in certain branches of industry, in certain countries, for certain periods of time, it becomes prominent'.

3.4.2 Theory of Party

The greatest contribution of Lenin to Socialism is his theory of the party. While Marx laid too much emphasis on the development of class consciousness among the workers, Lenin laid emphasis on the party organization. According to him, 'The proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for power except organization.'

Constantly pushed out of depths of complete poverty, the proletariat can and will inevitably become the unconquerable. The party is needed not only before the revolution to arouse the revolutionary spirit in the proletariat but also after the revolution to annihilate the capitalist state so that the dictatorship of proletariat can be established.

According to Lenin, workers do not become socialists automatically. They become trade unionists. Socialism has to be brought to them from outside and this is done by the party which is in reality the 'vanguard of the proletariat'. It must be able to lead the proletariat to elevate them to the level where they can understand their class interests and purpose with great vigour and determination. The party must act as the General Staff of the Proletariat. Lenin wrote thus, 'The Communist Party is a part of the working class, the most advanced most class conscious and hence the communist party has no other interests other than the interests of the working class as a whole. The Communist Party is differentiated from the working class in its totality. The Communist Party is the organizational and political lever which the

most advanced sections of the working class use to direct the entire mass of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat along the right road.'

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

NOTES

Lenin described the proletariat dictatorship as the stage which would come during the transitional period of the state, i.e. when the state would transform into socialism from capitalism. Lenin accepted Marx's doctrine of proletariat dictatorship in full but he succeeded in converting it to the dictatorships of the communist of socialist ideological party.

Tactics of Revolution

According to Sabine, 'No principle of Marxian strategy was better settled than the rule that it's impossible to make a revolution by force of conspiracy before the time is ripe, that is, before the contradictions in a society have produced a revolutionary situation.' It was this principle which distinguished Marx's scientific socialism from Utopianism or mere adventurism. This view led to the emergence of two views in Russia, one held by the Mensheviks and the other by the Bolsheviks, regarding the tactics of socialist revolution and the slow growth of the proletariat into a majority. The other group was led by Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. According to Trotsky, it is easier for the proletariat to take over the ruling class in an economically backward country then in a country where capitalism has reached the advanced stage.

Lenin thought in terms of tactics. According to him, insurrection is an art which can be taught. His tactics came to have certain maxims such as:

(i) Never play at uprising but once it is begun remember firmly that you have to go to the very end

(ii) One must strive to take the enemy by surprise to take advantage of a moment when his troops are scattered'.

Lenin was opposed to a large diffused party and he wanted the party to consist of professional revolutionaries and must be organized as secretly as possible. According to Lenin, a revolution becomes possible only when the lower classes do not want the old way and the upper classes cannot continue with the old way.

3.4.3 Socialism in One Country

For Lenin, with the concept of the vanguard party and of imperialist capitalism, the theory of communism as a logical structure was complete, yet it lacked what proved to be its main driving force as a political system. This was the 'concept of socialism in one country' developed by Joseph Stalin, which was his sole venture into theory. In a sense this was a normal capstone to Leninism—at least to the concept of Leninism developed in this way. For Lenin's achievement as it has been described here, was to produce a version of Marxism applicable to an industrially underdeveloped society with an agrarian peasant economy. Socialism in one country, therefore, completed the divergence between Lenin's Marxism and the Marxism of Western Europe, which had been conceived by Marx and Marxists as a theory to transform a highly industrial economy from a capitalist to a socialist society.

NOTES

Industrial and military power

Socialism in one country became the operative factor in Leninism. Under this slogan, communist Russia emerged as a great industrial and military power. Initiated in 1928, four years after Lenin's death. the first of the five-year plans began a revolution with far greater long-term political and social consequences than Lenin's revolution of 1917. By harnessing communism to the tremendous driving force of Russian nationalism, the five-year plans became the first great experiment with a totally planned economy. Due to its success, Russian communism became a model likely to be followed by peasant societies with national aspirations all over the world. In 1924, Stalin put forward very abruptly the thesis that Russia 'can and must build up a socialist society.' Only a few months before he had repeated the conventional opinion, current since 1917 and before, that the permanence of socialism in Russia depended on Socialist Revolutions in Western Europe. Stalin argued that the only obstacle to a complete socialist society in Russia was the risk created by 'capitalist encirclement' (the intrigues), the 'espionage nets,' or the intervention of the capitalist enemies. There was nothing new, of course, in the belief that communist and capitalist states could not permanently coexist.

Lenin held this opinion, but this was not the obstacle, from the standpoint of Marxism, for completing socialism in Russia. Marxists had supposed that socialism required an economy with a high level of production and hence, an industrial society, which Russia was not. Stalin did not meet this argument but argued instead that socialism could be built in a country of great extent with large natural resources. In effect, he neglected the economic argument normal to Marxism and substituted a political argument. Stalin assumed that, given adequate resources, an adequate labour force, and a government with unlimited power, a socialist economy could be constructed as a political policy. This of course is what socialism in one country became, and in theory it is quite different from the supposed dependence of politics on the economy which had been a principle of Marxism. On the other hand, Stalin's assumption fitted rather easily with some elements of Leninism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

7. What is the primary export of finance capitalism?
8. Why is imperialism a period of decaying capitalism?
9. What is the greatest contribution of Lenin to Socialism?
10. Why is the theory of 'socialism in one country' considered significant in Marist thought?

3.5 SUMMARY

- Edmund Burke was a British conservative thinker from the 18th century. He is perhaps best known for his vehement criticism the French Revolution of 1789.

NOTES

- The main argument that Burke makes against the French Revolution is that it was based on abstract ambiguous principles, which for him ignored the complexities of human nature and society.
- Burke was an Irish political elite. His thoughts on politics must be seem corresponding to the ideas of the members of his class.
- In his political philosophy, Burke represents a decisive break from the ideas of John Locke, who had dominated the political theories of the 18th century.
- Burke attacked the individualistic doctrine of the 'rights of man' inherited from Locke, considering it totally ambiguous.
- Karl Marx was a German philosopher, sociologist, historian, political economist, political theorist and revolutionary socialist, who developed the socio-political theory of Marxism.
- Karl Marx with the aid of his friend Friedrich Engels composed the most influential of all his writings *The Communist Manifesto.*
- In the *Theses on Feuerbach* (first published as an appendix to the 1888 edition of Engels' Ludwig Feurbach), Marx led the foundation for what he called dialectical materialism.
- Although Marx agreed with Hegel that there was a constant movement in the dialectical process he believed that 'matter' and not the 'idea' as the essence of universe, and the social institutions were the manifestation of changing material conditions. Matter undergoes the dialectical process because of its inherent tensions, until perfect material conditions, exemplified by a 'rational mode of production' come into existence.
- Marx emphasized the real rather than the ideal, the social rather than the intellectual, matter rather than mind.
- Karl Marx does not systematically explain his theory of dialectical materialism anywhere in his works. However, he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical not mechanical.
- While dialectical materialism represents the philosophical bases of Marxism, historical materialism represents its scientific basis.
- Historical materialism implies that in any given epoch, the economic relations of society – the means whereby men and women undertake production, distribution and exchange of material goods for the satisfaction of their needs – play an important role, in shaping their social, political, intellectual and ethical relationships.
- The Marxist perspective postulates that the structure of society may be understood in terms of its base (the foundation) and superstructure (the external build-up).
- The base consists of the mode of production while the superstructure is represented by its legal and political structure, religion, morals, social practices, literature, art and culture etc.

NOTES

- Marx talked of four stages of human history—ancient times, medieval times, modern times and future society based on communism.
- Marxism advocated the class perspective of the state. It is different from the mechanistic theory as well as from the organic theory of the state.
- According to the class theory, the state comes into existence when society is divided into two antagonistic classes, one owning the means of social production and the other being constraint to live on its labour. In other words, it is the emergence of 'private property' that divides society into two conflicting classes.
- Marx and Engels provided a blue print for a future state which would be based on communism. They elaborate that communist society would eliminate all forms of alienation for the human individual from nature, from society and from humanity.
- On the basis of scientific analysis of the system of capitalism, Marx had declared that a social revolution was inevitable. Revolution was certain to come because the forces of discontent would eventually accumulate and break through all obstacles.
- According to Marx, social progress would have to come about through a violent struggle between classes. By progress Marx meant the expansion of the productive capacity of both society and individual human beings. This would ultimately lead to greater freedom and equalities and to the realization of man's capacity.
- Marx did not believe in revolutionary prophecy. He did not go into detail concerning the exact nature strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution he thought to be imminent.
- A socialist society, for Marx, is a society which serves the real needs of man. Man's real needs are rooted in his nature; this distinction between real and false needs is possible only on the basis of a picture of the nature of man and the true human needs rooted in his nature.
- Man's true needs are those whose fulfilment is necessary for the realization of his essence as a human being. As Marx himself stated, 'The existence of what I truly love is felt by me as a necessity, as a need, without which my essence cannot be fulfilled, satisfied, complete.'
- Vladimir Lenin was the architect of the first communist state in the world, i.e., the Soviet Union. Along with Marx, he also became a philosopher and a guide for communists and revolutionaries all over the world.
- Lenin regards imperialism as the highest form of capitalism. He argues that as capitalism develops, industries unite and become bigger and then begin collaborating and acting like cartels to create what is known as monopoly capitalism.
- According to Lenin, 'Imperialism is capitalism in that stage of development in which the domination of monopoly and finance capital has taken shape, in

which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance in which the division of the world by international trusts has begun, and in which the portion of all the territory of the earth by the great capitalist countries has been completed.'

- The greatest contribution of Lenin to Socialism is his theory of the party. While Marx laid too much emphasis on the development of class consciousness among the workers, Lenin laid emphasis on the party organization.
- According to Lenin, workers do not become socialists automatically. They become trade unionists. Socialism has to be brought to them from outside and this is done by the party which is in reality the 'vanguard of the proletariat'.

3.6 KEY TERMS

- **Laudator temporis acti:** It is a Latin phrase literally meaning a praiser of time past, i.e., someone who does not like the present and prefers the things of the past.
- **Tithe:** A tithe is a one-tenth part of something, paid as a contribution to a religious organization or compulsory tax to government.
- **Alienation:** In Marxist analysis, alienation is the systemic result of living in a socially stratified society, because being a *mechanistic part* of a social class alienates a person from his and her humanity.
- **Dialectical Materialism:** It is a strand of Marxism, synthesizing Hegel's dialectics, which proposes that every economic order grows to a state of maximum efficiency, while simultaneously developing internal contradictions and weaknesses that contribute to its systemic decay.
- **Primitive Communism:** It is a term used by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels to describe what they interpreted as early forms of communism. As a model, primitive communism is usually used to describe early hunter-gatherer societies that had no hierarchical social class structures or capital accumulation.
- **Proletariat:** Workers or working-class people, regarded collectively.
- **Class struggle:** The conflict of interests between the workers and the ruling class in a capitalist society, regarded as inevitably violent.
- **Vanguard:** It refers to a group of people leading the way in new developments or ideas.

3.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The core of Burke's philosophical ideas was the promotion and retention of customary social institutions.
2. The main argument that Burke makes against the French Revolution is that it was based on abstract ambiguous principles, which for him ignored the complexities of human nature and society.

NOTES

3. In the 19th century Hegel's influence on philosophy was such that later philosophers in Germany came to be divided into left-wing and right-wing Hegelians. The left-wing Hegelians included Bruno Bauer, Friedrich Engels and Marx. They were also referred to as the Young Hegelians.
4. Historical materialism implies that in any given epoch, the economic relations of society – the means whereby men and women undertake production, distribution and exchange of material goods for the satisfaction of their needs – play an important role, in shaping their social, political, intellectual and ethical relationships.
5. Marx talked of four stages of human history—ancient times, medieval times, modern times and future society based on communism.
6. Socialism, for Marx, is a society which permits the actualization of man's essence, by overcoming his alienation. It is nothing less than creating the conditions for the truly free, rational, active and independent man. A socialist society then is a society which serves the real needs of man.
7. The primary export of finance capitalism is money or capital, and the consequences of its enforcement are the exploitation of colonial people, whom it oppresses and subjects to the law of the capitalist society, thus increasing misery amongst the people and destroying their liberty and freedom.
8. Lenin asserted that imperialism is not only the period of monopoly capitalism, but it is also the period of decaying capitalism- the decay resulting from its monopolistic character. As he stated, 'the tendency to stagnation and decay, which is the feature of monopoly, continues, and in certain branches of industry, in certain countries, for certain periods of time, it becomes prominent'.
9. The greatest contribution of Lenin to Socialism is his theory of the party. While Marx laid too much emphasis on the development of class consciousness among the workers, Lenin laid emphasis on the party organization. According to him, 'The proletariat has no other weapon in the struggle for power except organization.'
10. Socialism in one country completed the divergence between Lenin's Marxism and the Marxism of Western Europe, which had been conceived by Marx and Marxists as a theory to transform a highly industrial economy from a capitalist to a socialist society.

3.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on Burke's critique of the French Revolution.
2. What did Stalin mean by the phrase 'Socialism in one country'?
3. What did Marx's theory of alienation state?
4. Why, according to Marx, was a social revolution inevitable?

5. How did Lenin define imperialist capitalism?
6. What does Marx's mean by class conflict?
7. Write a short note on the life of Karl Marx.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss Edmund Burke's political ideas.
2. How were Marx's thoughts similar to those of G. W. H. Hegel?
3. What was Marx's main thesis?
4. What do you understand by dialectical materialism of Marx?
5. Explain the concept of historical materialism.
6. With the emergence of 'private property', society is divided into 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes. Discuss.
7. Describe the concept of socialism according to Lenin.

NOTES

3.9 FURTHER READING

Jha, Shefali. 2010. *Western Political Thought: From Plato to Marx*. New Delhi: Pearson Education India.

Strauss, Leo and Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mcclelland, J.S. 1998. *A History of Western Political Thought*. London: Routledge.

Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels. 2011. *Communist Manifesto*. New Delhi: Penguin Classics.

Singer, Peter. 2000. *Marx: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNIT 4 MAO AND GRAMSCI

NOTES

Structure

4.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will learn about the theories of Mao Tse-tung and Antonio Gramsci. Mao Tes-tung was the father of the People's Republic of China. As a political theorist, politician and revolutionary, Mao not only moulded the destiny of over a billion Chinese citizens, he also became one of the most important Marxists political theorists of the twentieth century and gave the Asiatic version of Marxism to the world.

Antonio Gramsci was an extremely influential Italian Marxist and also a socialist theorist. Gramsci is known for using the term hegemony to denote the predominance of one social class over others. This represents not only political and economic control, but also the ability of the dominant class to project its own way of seeing the world so that those who are subordinated by it accept it as 'common sense' and 'natural'.

The final section of the book discusses non Marxist socialist movements in Europe like Utopian Socialism and Fabian socialism. These movements provide a bridge between the thoughts of the liberal philosophers of the 19th century like Mill and Bentham and the revolutionary philosophies of theorists like Marx. The section also discusses anarchism, another radical philosophy.

4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

NOTES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the basic principles of Maoism
- Examine Gramsci's conception of civil society
- Describe Gramsci's notion of hegemony
- Discuss the anarchist view of the state
- Examine the major tenets of Henry George's philosophy

4.2 MAO TSE-TUNG

Mao Tse–tung, also known as Mao Zedong, the father of modern communist China, was not only an important political leader who moulded the destiny of the Chinese people and made China as one of the most powerful nations of the world, but he also an important Marxian philosopher who gave Marxism its Asiatic form.

Mao was born in a family of peasant farmers in the Huan province in 1893. As a child, Mao was required to work hard in the fields and thus was forced to give up his education at the age of 13. However, as someone who was keen on having an education, Mao rebelled against his family and left to pursue his education in the neighbouring county. There he came in contact with revolutionaries ideas of Chinese thinkers like the nationalist Sun Yet-sen. He also started reading historical books on Rousseau, Gladstone and Napoleon. He also studied the histories of various countries. No sooner had he started reading revolutionary texts, the Chinese revolution of 1911 against the Chinese Emperor started. Mao soon enlisted as a soldier in the revolutionary army and spent six months fighting for the democratic revolution against absolute monarchy. After the Republic of China came into being with Dr. Sun Yet-sen as president, Mao once again started to pursue his education. In 1919, Mao joined the elite Peking University. It was here that he came into contact with two people who were to influence his thoughts and ideas greatly - Li Dazhao and Chen Duxiu. Both Dazhao and Duxiu were principal figures in the formation of the Communist Party of China (CPC). Moreover, Mao attended Peking University at a time when the May Fourth Movement was taking place. The May Fourth Movement was to a considerable extent the fountainhead of all of the changes that were to take place in China in the ensuing half century. Soon Mao came to be influenced by the teachings of Marx and the revolutionary uprising that had taken place in the Soviet Union. Mao's life as a revolutionary began in 1921, when he attended the first congress of the Chinese Communist Party.

As a revolutionary, Mao strived to bring about a cultural, economic and political revolution in China. His goal was to create a new society and state by establishing the tenets of socialism for China. His definition of a new society and state were designed to have a new political structure and a new economy, along with a new culture. He wanted China to come out of political oppression and economic exploitation and gain political freedom and economic prosperity. In order to understand the Socialism

that Mao formulated, it is important to understand the socio-economic conditions that prevailed in China in the first half of the twentieth century.

4.2.1 The Political Thoughts of Mao

NOTES

The political theory espoused by Mao Zedong is known as Maoism. The followers of Mao's political theory, known as Maoists, consider Maoism as an anti-Revisionist form of Marxism-Leninism. Maoism was developed during the 1950s and 1960s and was widely applied as the guiding ideology of the Communist Party of China (CPC). However, it must be noted that the term Maoism is never used by the Communist Party of China as it believes that Mao did not change, but rather developed further the theory of Marxism-Leninism.

The model for Mao's theory of revolution was the Chinese Communist insurgency against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government in the late 1920s and 1930s, which resulted in Communist Party of China becoming a powerful fighting force strengthened on the backs of the colossal support that the CPC enjoyed among the rural peasantry. The CPC eventually overthrew the Nationalist government in 1949 and came to power. Mao's dependence on the rural peasantry rather than the urban working to instigate a socialist revolution distinguishes him from his predecessors like Marx, Lenin and Trotsky. As Mao himself was from a peasant family, he was able to cultivate his reputation among the farmers and peasants and introduced them to Marxist revolutionary ideologies. Mao jotted down his thoughts on revolution in his two most famous essays, both written in 1937, called '*On Contradiction'* and '*On Practice'*. The essays, part of his famous '*Red Book*', are concerned with the practical strategies of a revolutionary movement and emphasize the importance of practical, grass-roots knowledge, which can only be obtained through experience. Written during the Second Sino-Japanese War, both essays reflect the guerrilla roots of Maoism in the need to build up support in the countryside against a Japanese occupying force and emphasise the need to win over hearts and minds through 'education'. The essays warned against the behaviour of the blindfolded man trying to catch sparrows, and the 'Imperial envoy' descending from his carriage to 'spout opinions'.

Let us now look at the basic principles of Maoist theory.

One of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is the belief that the urban proletariat or the working class is the main source of revolution. This is because Marxism believes that a true socialist society can only emerge after capitalism has been firmly established. Thus, in Marxism-Leninism, the rural countryside, consisting of landless peasants, is largely ignored. On the other hand, Mao, perhaps because of his own upbringing as a peasant, believed that the peasantry could be shaped into a revolutionary force under the knowledge, leadership and guiding principles of a communist party. Another significant characteristic of Mao's belief was his concept of people's war to achieve socialism. Mao wanted the simultaneous execution of two revolutions, one against imperialism and the colonial rule and the other against the feudal landlords. He was sure that it was not possible for the rule of the feudal landlords to end until the rule of imperialism was overthrown. On the other hand, it was not possible to form a powerful contingent to overthrow imperialism, unless the

NOTES

farmers were assisted in overthrowing the feudal landless class. Mao emphasised that these two front wars were to be fought by the masses that were politically structured, rather than by representing the masses. He considered people to be more important than the weapons and wrote, 'Weapons are an important factor in war but not the decisive factor; it is people, not things, that are decisive.'

Moreover, unlike the other forms of Marxism-Leninism where large-scale industrial development is seen as a positive force, Maoism prioritised rural development. For Mao, such a strategy was the most logical taking into account the fact that in a developing country like China the majority of the population were not the industrial urban proletariat, but rather the rural peasantry. Another major difference of Maoism from other socialist and Marxist theories is the Maoists contains an integral military doctrine and explicitly ties its political ideology with military strategy.

Mao in his '*Red Book'* stated that, 'political power comes from the barrel of the gun' and the peasantry can be mobilized to undertake a 'people's war' of armed struggle involving guerrilla warfare in three stages. The three stages are:

- The First Stage – Mobilisation and organisation of the peasantry
- The Second Stage - Setting up of a rural base and increasing coordination among the guerrilla organizations
- The Third Stage – Transitioning into conventional warfare

According to Mao, 'Revolution is not a dinner party, nor an essay, nor a painting, nor a piece of embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another.' The military doctrine of Maoism equates Maoist guerrillas to fish swimming in a sea of peasants who provide logistical support to them. Another key feature of Maoism is that Mao emphasised the revolutionary mobilisation of the masses, i.e., the physical mobilisation of the majority of the people in the struggle to defeat capitalism and create socialism. Maoist theory applies the Marxian Theory of Productive Forces – the theory that changes in the means of production will result in changes in the relations of production – to village-level industries which are independent of the outside world. In Maoism, deliberate organizing of massive military and economic power is necessary to defend the revolutionary area from outside threat, while centralization keeps corruption under supervision, amid strong control.

Mao once famously stated, 'the bourgeoisie in a socialist country is right inside the Communist Party itself', implying that the Communist Party may become corrupted and start subverting the path of socialism. Thus, Mao believed that even when the proletariat has seized state power through a socialist revolution, the potential remains for the bourgeoisie class to restore capitalism. This is another key concept that contrasts Maoist theory with Marxism and other left-wing revolutionary ideologies. Maoism believes that because of the essential antagonistic contradiction between capitalism and communism, class struggle continues throughout the entire socialist period. This fundamental belief of Mao resulted in the Cultural Revolution in China from 1966 to 1976 where Mao exhorted the public to 'Bombard the [Party] headquarters!' and wrest control of the government from bureaucrats perceived to

be on the capitalist road. The Cultural Revolution in China had disastrous effects for the population of China and resulted in the persecution of millions of Chinese citizens.

Criticisms

NOTES

Today, in the People's Republic of China, Mao's theories have largely been repudiated. This is because of the disastrous consequence of the two major initiatives of Mao after seizing power – The Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. Both of these initiatives resulted in the deaths of millions of people. After the death of Mao, Deng Xiaoping, the most influential leader of China who led China into the path of the market economy stated that, 'Mao was 70% good, 30% bad'. He believed that Maoism showed the dangers of 'ultra-leftism', manifested in the harm perpetrated by the various mass movements that characterized the Maoist era.

According to one biographer of Mao, 'Mao turned China from a feudal backwater into one of the most powerful countries in the World ... The Chinese system he overthrew was backward and corrupt; few would argue the fact that he dragged China into the 20th century. But at a cost in human lives that is staggering.' Some political philosophers, such as Martin Cohen, have seen in Maoism an attempt to combine the Chinese philosophy of Confucianism and Socialism to create 'a third way between communism and capitalism'. The Marxist-Leninist theorist Enver Hoxha criticised Mao considering his theory of the three worlds as 'counter-revolutionary' and questioned Mao's guerrilla warfare methods.

4.2.2 Historical Background: The Struggle for Socialism

For a long part of his life, Mao struggled to bring about a cultural, economic and political revolution. His goal was to create a new society and state by establishing the tenets of socialism for China. His definition of a new society and state were designed to have a new political structure and a new economy, along with a new culture. He wanted China to come out of political oppression and economic exploitation and gain political freedom and economic prosperity. He also wanted that China should come out of the ignorance and backwardness of the old culture, and transform to become enlightened and progressive. The aim of Mao Zedong was to create a novel cultural sphere for China.

China's Historical Characteristics

Ideologically, every culture reflects the way the economy and politics of the society functions. But it is true that both politics and economics go hand-in-hand. They both play an important role in the determination of culture. Marx said, 'It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness.' He further added, 'The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways, the point, however, is to change it.' In the history of mankind, for the first time, these scientific formulations have proved accurate in resolving the problematic aspects of the relations between the existence and the human consciousness. And these formulations are the fundamental ideas and concepts that underline the dynamic and radical theory of knowledge, as something that reflects the material reality of the world, which so vigorously explained and expanded by Lenin.

NOTES

It is important to keep these fundamental concepts in mind while discussing the problems pertaining to China's culture. Thus, it is evident that Mao wanted to remove those elements from the old national politics, which reacted to the tenets of the old national culture. On the other hand, the new national culture which he had in mind was interlinked with the new national politics and economics. The old culture was based on the ideas of old politics and economy of the China. Similarly, the new politics that Mao had in mind was based on the new kind of economic and political models, which was to become the foundation a new culture in China.

China's Old Politics, Economics and Culture

Since the rule of the Chou and Chin, the society of China was feudal, just like its politics, economy and dominant culture. There had been various changes of a colonial, semi-colonial and semi-feudal nature in Chinese society, ever since it was invaded by foreign capitalism. China in the first half of the twentieth century was both feudal and semi-feudal in the areas which were occupied by Japan. Mao stated that the political and economic characteristics of the Chinese society were prevalently colonial, semi-colonial, and semi-feudal, and also the reverent culture, which was the reflection of political and economic image, was also feudal and colonial in nature. The revolution that Mao had in mind specifically focused on the eradication of these prevalent economic, political, and cultural forms.

Mao wanted to create a new kind of politics and economy, which then would give rise to a new kind of culture. According to Mao, in the course of its history, there were two stages through which it was important for the Chinese revolution to go through: the first stage was that of democratic revolution, and the second stage was the socialist revolution. It is important to understand that both the stages are different from each other. In this case, the first category does not include democracy. It can be said that the new politics, the new economy, and the new culture of China emerged from new democracy. It is not possible for any political group, party or individual, who had no understanding of such themes, to direct the revolution to victory.

As stated above, Mao believed that the Chinese revolution is divided into a democratic revolution and a socialist revolution. Democracy here does not mean the general democracy, but it refers to the Chinese form of democracy. This characteristic was not an abrupt development as the result of the Opium War, rather it was shaped after the Second World War and the Russian Revolution. Thus, we can divide the Chinese revolution into two stages: the first stage was the transformation of the colonial and feudal aspect of the society into a democratic form of society, and the second stage was the continuation of the revolution for the establishment of socialist form of society. This can be called the trend in the development of socialism.

The first stage of this revolution began to shape up after the Opium War of 1840, i.e. when feudal China began to undergo transformations. It began to change into a partially colonial and a partially feudal society. This was followed by the various movements of Taiping Heavenly Kingdom, the Sino-French War, the Sino-Japanese-War, the Reform movement of 1898, the Revolution of 1911, the May 4th

Movement, the Northern Expedition, the War of the Agrarian Revolution and the War of Resistance against Japan. In combination, all these movements consumed an entire century by representing the struggles of the people of China on various occasions and in different degrees against both the imperialist and the feudal forces in order create a free and democratic state, and thereby completing the first stage of the revolution. Socially, the nature of this first stage of revolution is not that of proletariat-socialist, but bourgeois-democratic. But still, it required continued efforts, since it is still confronted with strong resistance of the feudal ruling classes. When the first president of the Republic of China, Sun Yat-Sen said, 'The revolution is not yet completed, all my comrades must struggle on,' he referred to the bourgeois Democratic Revolution. Changes in the China's democratic revolution began to take place after the outbreak of the First World War, and the establishment of socialism in Russia after the Russian Revolution. Prior to these happenings, the bourgeois-democratic revolution of China was part of the bourgeois democratic world revolution. This revolution underwent changes after these happenings.

4.2.3 New Democracy or New Socialism

Mao thought that it would be best if the economy of China followed the path of capital regulation and landownership equalization. He advocated that the economy must never be owned by few individuals, and that a few capitalists and landlords should never be allowed to dominate the livelihood of the people. This type of economy that Mao advocated is known as New Socialism of Mao Zedong in China. Its politics are concentrated expressions of the economy of New Democracy.

Opposition to Capitalism

Like Marx, Lenin and Stalin, Mao was also against capitalism. He emphasized the inability of true peace or accommodation to exist, along with capitalism. This was because the two systems contradicted each other. A dynamic tussle struggle between these two antagonistic systems was unavoidable, though it was likely to be averted for the time-being through mutual restrain. However, Mao was flexible in his belief pertaining to the inevitability of conflict between the capitalists and the socialists.

People's War

Another significant characteristic of Mao's belief was his concept of people's war to achieve socialism. Mao wanted the simultaneous execution of two revolutions, one against imperialism and the colonial rule and the other against the feudal landlords. He was sure that it was not possible for the rule of the feudal landlords to end until the rule of imperialism was overthrown. On the other hand, it was not possible to form a powerful contingent to overthrow imperialism, unless the farmers were assisted in overthrowing the feudal landless class. It was emphasized by Mao that these two front wars were to be fought by the masses that were politically structured, rather than by representing the masses. He considered people to be more important than the weapons and wrote that 'Weapons are an important factor in war but not the decisive factor, it is people, not things, that are decisive.' Thus, he stressed on the theory of total revolution by the totality of the masses.

NOTES

If it is not possible to follow the capitalist road of bourgeois dictatorship, Mao suggested, then it is possible that one can follow the road that leads to the socialist-proletarian dictatorship. He said that the ongoing relationship is the first step, which soon will pave way for the second stage of the revolution, which will be the arrival of socialism. Mao believed that the people of China could only be happy when they entered the socialist era. However, until feudalism was not eradicated, it was not right to impose socialism in society. According to Mao, the first important task was to combat the imperialist forces and establish a democratic society. Only after this task is accomplished, socialism can prevail. There can be no Chinese revolution without both, new democracy and socialism. New democracy will take much time and is not an easily achievable task. Mao said that 'we are not utopians and cannot divorce ourselves from the actual conditions confronting us.' According to the Marxist view of the development of the revolution, the two stages are consecutive without any intervention of the dictatorship of the bourgeois. Mao considered this is a utopian ideal, which the true revolutionary cannot accept.

4.2.4 The Cultural Revolution

Mao's 'Hundred Flowers Policy' forms the part of the new ideology which Mao advocated during the period of the Cultural Revolution. Mao asserted that it would be wrong to think that in any society there should be only one ideology or only one state. He held that 'each thinking was a flower and let such hundred schools of thought contend.' Through his theory of hundred flowers, Mao was asserting that society had the capacity to find out the rotten and outdated ideas and get rid of the same only if all the ideas were permitted in free expression. In short, this policy emphasized that coercion should not be used in ideological matters. However, in practice, during the Cultural Revolution, coercion was routine.

The Cultural Revolution itself was basically a social-political movement that took place in the People's Republic of China from 1966 through 1976. The stated goal of the Cultural Revolution was the enforcement of communism in the country by removing capitalist, traditional and cultural elements from Chinese society, and to imposing Maoist orthodoxy within the Chinese Communist Party. This revolution should be seen in the context of Mao's beliefs that because of the essential antagonistic contradiction between capitalism and socialism, class struggle continued throughout the entire socialist period. The Cultural Revolution had disastrous effects on China. Millions of people were oppressed in the violent struggles that ensued across China, and suffered a wide range of abuses including public humiliation, arbitrary imprisonment, torture, sustained harassment, and seizure of property.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

1. What is the model for Mao's theory of revolution?
2. State one difference between Maoism and Marxist-Leninism.

4.3 ANTONIO GRAMSCI

NOTES

Antonio Gramsci was born on 22 January 1891 in the town of Ales, an island in Sardinia, which was one of the poorest regions of Italy. He was the fourth of seven children born to Francesco Gramsci and Giuseppina Marcias. His relationship with his father was never very close, but he had a strong affection and love for his mother, whose resilience, gift of story-telling and pungent humour made a lasting impression on him. Of his six siblings, Antonio enjoyed a mutual interest in literature with his younger sister Teresina, and seems to have always felt a spiritual kinship with his two brothers, Gennaro, the oldest of the Gramsci children, and Carlo, the youngest. Gennaro's early embrace of socialism contributed significantly to Antonio's political development.

Antotio Gramsci's father was a minor public official who worked as a land registrar and his mother belonged to a local landowning family. His father had faced many financial problems and also had difficulties with the police. So as a family they were always forced to move from one village to another in Sardinia City. Finally the family settled in a village called Ghilarza. Gramsci's father was associated with politics but was unsuccessful in the parliamentary election which was held in 1897. In that period corruption and local disputes played a major role in Sardinian politics and Gramsci's father laid himself open to reprisal. When Gramsci was a small child his father was arrested and sentenced to five years of imprisonment on embezzlement charges because of which Gremsci and his family had to face a lot of problems. One to financial problems Gramsci was taken out from his school at the age of eleven. After some elementary education Gramsci started working in an office. He worked as a tax officer in Ghilarza to help his family. After that he had worked in many casual jobs until his father's release from the prison in 1904.

Gramsci continued his studies privately during that period. When his father was not at home the family lived in utter poverty. During this time, Gramsci suffered physical deformity and developed a hunchback. Due to his ill health Gramsci was plagued by various internal disorders throughout his life. He later wrote that the doctors had given up on him and until about 1914 his mother kept a small coffin and little dress which he would wear after his death. His sickliness and the visibility of his disorder in health left Gramsci particularly in vulnerable condition to the harshness of village life and made him an introvert.

Gramsci's personality would resurface at regular intervals throughout his life. Gramsci described himself as a worm inside a cocoon that was unable to unwind itself. After his father was released from prison their financial conditions improved and again he went to school for completing his education.

At the age of 17, Gramsci and his elder brother moved to Cagliari which was the capital of the island. Gramsci completed his secondary school in Cagliari where he was studying with his elder brother Gennaro. His brother was a soldier who believed in socialist thinking. Because of this he was known as the militant socialist in his mainland. In 1911 he won a scholarship and joined the university which was

NOTES

situated in Turin. Gramsci was in Turin at the time when it was called the red capital of Italy. It was the home to the most advanced industry in the country and above all it was described as the motor manufacturer. During the period of the First World War almost 30 per cent of the population was industrial workers and despite this almost 10 per cent of the populations were in army. Turin was on the brink of witnessing countless demonstrations and general strikes for the next twenty years and later in 1919 there began a movement for the occupation of the factories and also setting up of factory councils. Gramsci encountered all these upheavals when he went to Turin for his higher studies which invariably affected his thinking for the rest of his life.

When Gramsci was in the University of Turin he had come in contact with the thoughts of famous people like Antoni Labriola, Giovanni Gentile, Rodolfo Mondolfo and Benedetto Croce. Benedetto Croce was the most famous and a highly respectable intellectual in Italy of his time. These thinkers promoted the thought of Hegelian Marxism and for which Antoni Labriola had given the name as a philosophy of praxis. But Gramsci had later used this term to escape the prison censors. His relationship with this phrase was mainly to develop the current thought which was ambiguous throughout his life. Gramsci's writings were famous from his study period and in 1914 onwards he started writing for the socialist newspaper *Grido del Popolo*. His writings made him famous and he gained his position as a notable journalist. He was an articulated and prolific writer of political theory. He also proved a formidable commentator and his writings were based on all aspects of Turin's social and political life.

Lots of problems were taking place in Cagliari relating to working class movement and many people lost their lives due to this unrest. At the time Gramsci reached Cagliari for his studies his elder brother Gennaro was the secretary of the local socialist party. After reaching Cagliari Gramsci met a friend called Raffa Garzia who was also his teacher at that school. His friend Garzia was also involved in the movement and commissioned articles from the students for the newspaper called *Sardinian Nationalist*. Gramsci was also influenced by the thoughts of radical socialist Gaetano Salvemini. He argued against the exploitation of the Mezzagiorno group in the northern side.

Gramsci met Julka Schucht in Russia who was a violinist and also a member of the Russian Communist Party. Eventually he married her and had two sons named Delio and Giuliano. Gramsci joined the socialist party in 1913 by becoming the general secretary of the newly formed Italian Communist Party in 1921. Although he was elected as a member of parliament, he was imprisoned by Mussolini in 1926. On 9 November 1926, the fascist government enacted a new wave of emergency laws that were taking as an alleged attempt on Mussolini's life.

As mentioned earlier, Gramsci was the supporter of socialist thoughts and this increased further by reading pamphlets which were sent from Sardinia by his elder brother. His political thought was enlarged by his experiences at the university and also in his new city where his family was staying. At that time Gramsci had the work to mainly develop and organize political activities. He became the first Marxist

theorist to work with the problems and also deal with them. He had to also deal with the revolutionary changes which were taking place in the twentieth century of Western European society and was the first to identify the importance of the struggle against the Bourgeois values such as ideological and cultural struggle.

NOTES

Gramsci's stress on informal education was mainly based on three aspects. Firstly, his exposition of the notion of hegemony provides a way to understand the context in which the informal educators can easily function and have the possibility to criticize and transform. Secondly, his concern was essential for the role of organic intellectuals which helped the people to understand about the place and also informal educators. Lastly, his interest in schooling and also in more traditional forms of education system points towards the need to dismiss more traditional forms. Gramsci enrolled as the faculty of letters. He met Angelo Tasca and other people in Turin University with whom he shared struggles first in the Italian Socialist party and also after the split that took place in January 1921.

Gramsci was a great academic scholar who became an active member of the Socialist Party. In 1915, he also started a journalistic career that made him one of the most feared and critical voices in Italy of that period. His writings in the Turin edition called *Avanti* were widely read by many people. He used to talk to the workers in Turin during his stay in the university. He discussed many topics such as novels of Romain Rolland with whom he felt great affinity, The Paris Commune, the French and Italian Revolutions and also the writings of Karl Marx.

It was done at that time when the war dragged on and the Italian intervention had become a bloody reality. At that time, Gramsci had taken an undecided stand but he knew that the basic position was that the Italian socialists should use these interventions as an occasion which turned Italian national's sentiments in a revolutionary way rather than towards chauvinist direction. During 1917 and 1918 he began to predict that the need of integration was essential between political and economic actions with cultural work. This took the form of a proletarian cultural association in Turin. In October 1917, the outbreak of the Bolshevik revolution further stirred his revolution and a reminder of the war. After few years Gramsci identified himself closely although not entirely with the methods and aims of the Russian Revolution.

In 1919, Gramsci made contact with other scholars such as Angelo Tasca, Umberto Terracini and Togliatti. They started a periodical called *The New Order: A weekly Review of Socialist Culture* which within a few days became an influential periodical and later on a bi monthly periodical for almost five years. This periodical was famous among the radicals and also with the revolutionary left in Italy. The review of the periodicals gave much attention to political and literary thinking of the people in Europe, USSR and also in United States of America. At that time, Gramsci devoted most of his time for the development of the factory council movement for next few years. He was known as the militant journalist and sided with the communist minority within the PSI at the Party's Livorno Congress. He became the member of PCI's Central Committee but did not play any significant role for several years. He was among the most prescient representatives of the Italian left at the inception of

NOTES

the fascist movement. Many occasions predicted that unless the unified action taken against the rise of Mussolini's movement, Italian Democracy and also Italian socialism would suffer a disastrous defeat.

The period between 1921 and 1926 is called the 'year of iron and fire' and Gramsci called them more eventful and productive. In 1924, Gramsci lived in Moscow as an Italian delegate to the Communist International election mainly to the Chamber of Deputies and also his assumption of the position of general secretary of the PCI.

Gramsci was arrested on 8 November 1926 in Rome. This was done mainly in accordance with a series of exceptional laws which enacted by the fascist dominated Italian legislature who committed to solitary confinement at the Regina Coeli prison. He was in jail for almost 10 years with lots of physical and psychic pain He died in 1937 at the Quisisana hospital in Rome at the age of 46 years. His ashes are buried in the protestant Cemetery of Rome. His book *Notebooks*, written in 1929 to 1935, tried to counterbalance the emphasis within orthodox Marxism on scientific determinism by stressing the importance of the political and intellectual struggle. Although proponents of Eurocommunism have claimed him as an influence, he remained throughout his life a Leninist and a revolutionary.

4.3.1 State and Civil Society

In the history of political thought the concept of civil society is quite old. However, over a period of time, this concept has undergone a considerable change. Originally the terms civil society and political society were used as conterminous. Thus, the term civil society was applied synonymously with state. But under the complex conditions of present day society it is necessary to recognize the distinctive feature of civil society.

Antonio Gramsci sought to distinguish civil society from political society in the context of his analysis of capitalist society. Conventional Marxist theory had held that economic mode of production of any society constituted its base while the legal and political structure and various expressions of its social consciousness including religion, morals, social customs and practices constituted its superstructure. It believed that the character of the superstructure was determined by the prevailing character of its base. During the course of social development the changes in the base led to corresponding changes in the superstructure. So it focused on changes in the base; the superstructure was not regarded to deserve an independent analysis. Gramsci did not accept this position. He suggested that the superstructure of contemporary western society had attained some degree of autonomy; hence its analysis was also necessary.

Gramsci particularly focused on the structures of domination in the culture of the capitalist society. He identified two levels of this superstructure:

- Political society or state which resorts to coercion to maintain its domination. The whole organization of government including police, judiciary, prison, and so on, comes within its purview. The structures associated with this part of superstructure are called structure of coercion.

- Civil society which resorts to obtaining consent of the citizens to maintain its domination. This part of superstructure is closer to the base and is relatively autonomous. The structures associated with this part are called structures of legitimation.

NOTES

Gramsci pays special importance to this part of the superstructure. According to Gramsci, the institutions of civil society like the family, school and church familiarize the citizens with the rules of behaviour and teach them to show natural respect to the authority of the ruling classes. These structures led legitimacy to the rule of capitalist class so that even injustice involved in this rule would carry the impression of justice. That is why these are called structures of legitimation. They enable the capitalist society to function in such a manner that the ruling classes seem to be ruling with the consent of the people. When the power is apparently exercised with the consent of its subject, it is called hegemony.

Gramsci points out that the structures of legitimation within the capitalist society tend to prevent any challenge to its authority. Capitalist society largely depends on the efficiency of these structures for its stability. It is only when civil society fails to prevent dissent that political society is required to make use of its structures of coercion including police, courts and prisons.

This analysis leads us to the conclusion that the strategy of communist movement should not be confined to the overthrow of the capitalist class but it should make a dent in the value system that sustains the capitalist rule. This value system is likely to persist through the institutions of civil society even under socialist mode of production. Fresh efforts will have to be made to transform the culture of that society by inculcating socialist values in the mind of the people. According to Gramsci, it would be futile to hope that true socialism would automatically grow from the ashes of capitalism.

Gramsci tried to convince Marxist theorists that they should emerge from the spell of economics and continue their ideological warfare in the field of culture, art, literature and philosophical debates. The revolutionaries must infiltrate the autonomous institutions of civil society and create a new mass consciousness informed by the socialist value system.

Gramsci was primarily a humanist. He was opposed to any type of tyranny. He did not want to use revolution in order to set up a coercive state, but wanted to democratize all institutions. In fact he sought to replace the state by regulated society where all decisions would be made through consensus and not by means of coercion.

Gramsci followed Marx and tried to develop his theory of state which takes into account the reality of civil society. His main proposition is that one cannot understand the state without understanding the civil society. He says that the state should be understood as not only the apparatus of government but also the private apparatus of hegemony or civil society. Building on the Marxian nation of the state, Gramsci makes a distinction between the state as a political organization and the state as government. The integral state keeps reproducing itself in the practices of everyday life through activities situated in civil society. It is hegemony which provides moral and intellectual leadership to practices in civil society. Hegemony, for Gramsci,

NOTES

works for both for the dominant as well as the subaltern class in civil society. According to Gramsci each class must hegemonise social relations in society before seizing power.

Gramsci enriched the concept of civil society to a great extent. Retaining Marx's idea of class war, he focused as much on war as on class. He understood politics as a kind of war and used metaphors from military warfare to explain its many processes. But unlike in military warfare, in politics, the battles are not limited to the use of sheer force. Although force is used as well, the battle in the field of ideas is most important. Civil Society for Gramsci is a space where this battle for the control of ideas takes place. According to him, the dominance of the ruling classes is not maintained solely on the basis of their control of the coercive apparatus of the state, namely the police and the army. They also need to acquire a dominant intellectual and moral leadership in civil society.

In Gramsci's view, exploitative class relations of capitalist society have to be made to appear right and proper in order to establish legitimacy of the ruling exploitative class. In other words, the ruling classes need to create a false perception among the working classes of their own social situation. Since human beings define themselves in terms of ideals and values, the ruling classes need to control those institutions where ideas, ideals and values are formed. This function according to Gramsci's conception is performed by the various institutions of civil society. These civil society institutions are churches, parties, trade unions, universities, the press, publishing houses and voluntary associations of all kinds. By disseminating the ideology of the dominant class the institutions ensure its cultural and moral supremacy over the subordinate classes. In this way the ruling class obtains the consent of the latter of their own subordination.

The theory of hegemony given by Gramsci is tied to his conception of the capitalist state. Gramsci does not understand the term state in the narrow sense of the government. He has done a division between state and economy. The political society was the arena of the political institutions and also legal constitutional control. The civil societies commonly seen as the private or non-state sphere mediates between the state and the economy. But Gramsci stressed on the division which is purely conceptual and in reality often overlap. Gramsci claims that the capitalist state rules through the force with consent such as political society is the realm of force and civil society in the area of consent. Gramsci said that under modern capitalism the bourgeoisie can maintain its economic control by making certain demands which was made by trade unions and also by mass political parties within the civil society that would be met by the political sphere. Thus it can be said that the bourgeoisie engages in a passive revolution which was going beyond its immediate economic interests and also allowing the forms of hegemony to change. Gramsci said that the movements such as reformism and fascism as well as the scientific management was also the assembly line methods of Frederick Taylor and Henry Ford.

Gramsci in his writing *The Modern Prince* argues that the revolutionary party is the force that will allow the working class mainly to develop the organic intellectuals and also an alternative hegemony within the civil society. Gramsci has

given a description about the complex nature of modern civil society which means war of position. This was carried out by the revolutionaries through political agitation, trade unions, advancement of proletarian culture and also other ways to create an opposing civil society. This was necessary because of the 'war of manoeuvre' which means a direct revolution. This was in order to have a successful revolution without any danger for a counter revolution or degeneration. Despite many claims, Gramsci rejects the state of worship which results from identifying the political society with civil society which was mainly done by the Fascists and Jacobins. Gramsci believes that the proletariats have always done historical task that was mainly to create a regulated society and also mainly to define the withering away of the state for the full development of civil societies and the ability to regulate itself.

Gramsci defined civil society as the vast range of institutions which were also super structural in nature. Gramsci also argues that the state provides an important mechanism for connecting the civil society with economy but also in another way civil society becomes a more encompassing term. Gramsci has given the widest term of definition on civil society of an ensemble of organisms that are commonly called private. It is therefore described as a matter of individual behaviour, tastes and values as it is the matter of regulated institutions. This is the model which was clearly known as the superstructure which is far removed from Marx's assertion and also it is the set of institutions which transmit a monolithic bourgeois ideology. The civil society has many definitions as it includes the legal apparatus but it also includes other things such as children parties, shopping trips and going on holidays.

As you know, the civil society is involved with the everyday life so it's very difficult to recognize and also have some connection with the operations of power. Thus, civil society overlaps significantly with Gramsci's category of common sense. The civil society can be expressed in terms of other social divisions such as gender, age, etc. rather than class. So it is precisely in this private sphere that the ruling values seem to be more natural and also unchangeable. The outcome of this is mainly for the transformative politics which could thoroughly enter this sphere in both successful and durable ways. The civil society therefore absolutely acknowledges that there are issues in circulation which are different than class. So it can be said that the earlier version of the concept of civil society as was defined is only useful for sustaining an unequal society. For this Gramsci argues that a complex and well-articulated civil society would be necessary even after revolutionary action.

4.3.2 Gramsci on Hegemony

Hegemony is in its simplest sense means the ascendency or domination of one element of a system over others. In Marxist theory, the term is used in a more technical and specific sense. In the writings of Antonio Gramsci, hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion. As a non-coercive form of class rule, hegemony is typically understood as a cultural or ideological process that operates through the dissemination of bourgeois values and beliefs throughout the society. However, it also has a political and economic dimension: consent can be manipulated by pay increases or by political or social reform.

NOTES

Gramsci drew attention to the degree to which the class system is upheld not simply by unequal economic and political power, but also by bourgeois hegemony. This consists of the spiritual and cultural supremacy of the ruling class, brought about through the spread of bourgeois values and beliefs via civil society: the media, the churches, youth movements, trade unions and so forth. What makes this process so insidious is that it extends beyond formal learning and education into the very common sense of the age. The significance of Gramsci's analysis is that in order for socialism to be achieved a battle of ideas has to be waged through which proletarian principles, values and theories displace or at least challenge bourgeois ideas.

Gramsci used the term hegemony to describe all the process through which the dominant class attained this intellectual and moral leadership. Through the concept of hegemony he also emphasized that the ruling classes rely more on the institutions and civil society than those of the state for obtaining the consent of the subordinated. The coercive apparatus of the state is used only where spontaneous consent has failed. The concept of hegemony has a strategic importance in Gramsci's own political practice. He argued that in order to properly fight the revolutionary battle for the working classes and peasantry, communist parties in different countries need to contest the hegemony of the ruling classes in civil society.

Gramsci admired the Bolshevik revolution of Russia as a victory of people's will power over economic conditions. He also warned that this strategy would not be suitable under the conditions prevailing in the western society where the working class had come to accept the existing arrangements. He set aside certain assumptions of classical Marxism and produced a new analysis of the bourgeois state. Previously the term hegemony was described and also used by the famous Marxists such as Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. He used this term to symbolize the political leadership of the working class for the democratic revolution. After that Gramsci greatly expanded this concept for developing a sharp analysis for the ruling capitalist class and also for the bourgeoisie which establishes and maintains its control in the society. Orthodox Marxism always predicted that the socialist revolution was inevitable for capitalist societies. This type of revolution was popular in the advanced nations by early twentieth century. The concept of capitalism seemed even more fixed than ever in Western societies. Thus, according to Gramsci, in such societies capitalism was maintained through ideology and not just through violence, political and economic coercion. At that time, the bourgeoisie developed a hegemonic culture which mainly propagated its own values and norms. This was mainly done so that the vales of the bourgeoisie become the common sense of values for all. The people who were in the working class identified their own good with the good of the bourgeoisie class. Thus, the working class helped the bourgeois maintain the status quo rather than revolt.

He said that the bourgeois class had the values which represented natural and normal values for the society and this helped them to maintain control of the working class; thus, the working class needed to develop a culture of its own in opposition to this 'hegemonic' culture. Lenin held that the culture was ancillary to political objectives, but for Gramsci it was fundamental for the attainment of power. In his view a class in a society cannot dominate conditions without advancing its

own economic interests. This domination did not come about through either force or coercion. So it can be said that it must have intellectual and moral leadership and also make compromises and alliances through a variety of forces. Gramsci calls this union of social forces 'historic blocs' a term taken from the famous philosopher Georges Sorel. This bloc forms mainly on the basis of consent for making a certain social order which produces and also reproduces the hegemony of the dominant class. This was mainly done through a nexus of institutions, social relations and also their ideas. For this, Gramsci developed a theory which emphasized the importance of the political and ideological superstructure which was mainly for maintaining and fracturing relations of the economic base.

Ideological Hegemony

Gramsci in his book *Prison Notebooks*, written between 1929-35, emphasized the degree to which capitalism was maintained not merely by economic domination, but also by political and cultural factors, and he called this ideological hegemony. He accepted the description of capitalism put forward by Marx earlier and also accepted that the struggle between the ruling class and the subordinate working class was the main driving force which moved towards the society at that time. People did not accept the traditional Marxist view. Traditional Marxists mainly believed how the ruling class ruled at that time. Gramsci made a great contribution towards modern thought by thoughts on his ideology. The term ideology was mainly seen as a simple system of ideas and also beliefs. But the term was closely tied with the concept of power and also the definition which was given by another philosopher called Anthony Giddens. Giddens gave the definition of ideology was easy to understand by the masses. According to Giddens, the term ideology was defined as the shared ideas or beliefs which serve to justify the interests of the dominant groups. He also said that the relationship to power is mainly to legitimize the differential power that the groups hold. This is mainly to distort the real situation that the people find themselves within it. It is said that the traditional Marxist theory of power was one sided and was based on the role of force and coercion as the basis for the ruling class for domination. This was mainly reinforced by Lenin during the success of Russian Revolution in 1917. During that time, Gramsci felt that there was something missing and that may be the understanding of the subtle but pervasive forms of ideological control and manipulation which affected all the repressive structures.

Gramsci identified two different forms of political control such as:

- The domination which referred the direct physical coercion by the police and the armed forces.
- The hegemony which referred to both ideological control and more crucially consent.

He also assumed that no regime, how authoritarian it might be, could sustain itself through the organized state power and also the armed forces. If we think about the long process then it had to have some popular support and also legitimacy in order to maintain stability. Gramsci thought that hegemony meant the permeation throughout the society of an entire system of values, attitudes, beliefs and morality that effected the status quo in power relations. So hegemony in this sense might be

NOTES

defined as an organized principle that is diffused by the process of socialization which is focused in every area of social life. It can also be said to an extent that this prevailing consciousness is internalized by the population which becomes the part of the common sense so that the culture, philosophy and the morality of the ruling class comes to appear as the natural order of things. As according to Marx, the basic division of society is mainly the base represented by the economic structure and a superstructure represented by institutions and beliefs prevalent in society and accepted by many Marxists followers. Gramsci took this belief a step further and he divided the superstructure into those institutions that were overtly coercive and also those that were not. The coercive ones are basically those which were the public institutions such as the governments, armed forces, police and the legal system. He also said that the state or political society and the non-coercive ones were those he regarded as civil society. To some extent schools come into both the categories. As we all know that the parts of school life are quite clearly coercive but some others are not like the hidden curriculum of the school. So for this, Gramsci said that the society was made up of the relations of production, the state or the political society and the civil society.

Gramsci's analysis about the society went much further than the Marxist theory which provides a clear understanding of why the European working class had failed totally to develop the revolutionary consciousness after the First World War and had instead moved towards reformism. This can be understood through some example such as tinkering with the system rather than working towards overthrowing the system from its existing place. It was a very subtle theory of power and went a long way to explain how the ruling class ruled during that period. So if the hegemony of ruling capitalist class resulted from an ideological bond between the rulers and the ruled then what will be the strategy which was needed by the employed persons? The answers to these questions were mainly those who wished to break that ideological bond and had to build up a counter hegemony for the ruling class. They had to see the structural changes as part of the same struggle. It is mentioned that the labour process was the main class struggle but it was the ideological struggle that had to be addressed. Workers should be allowed questioning their political and economic masters for right to rule. It was the popular consensus in the civil society that had to be challenged and this can be seen as a role for the informal education. It's said that overcoming popular consensus is not easy. At that period there were many complaints raised about the ways things were run and people looked for improvements and reforms. But the basic belief and also the value system underpinning in the society were seen as general applicability in the class structure of the society. Marxists may have seen that the people in the society are always asking for bigger role in the society or higher responsibility in the government sector. For this Gramsci used the term hegemony as a tool for analysing the historical and political issues of the society. As we have already seen that Gramsci used this term in many ways and it also changed according to time and relations to his subject. Before his arrest by Italian fascists Gramsci wrote that some aspects of the Southern question are unambiguous about the nature of hegemony. Again he said that the working class becomes a leading and dominant class to the extent that it succeeds in creating a system of class alliances. So this alliance allows it to mobilize the majority

of the working population against capitalism and the bourgeois state. As the struggle which rose in Italy was mainly because of historical development in the society it did not have any proper impact on the economic inequality. It is essential to understand properly the working class movement issues which were culturally important to the peasants mainly because it would help to lead the other groups within the working population of Italy.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

3. According to Gramsci, what is the purpose of institutions like the school, church and the family?
4. How does Gramsci define hegemony?
5. According to Gramsci, what are the two forms of political control?

4.4 SOCIALISM

Let us now study the different types of socialist ideas that have been espoused by various philosophers. Let us begin with utopian socialism.

4.4.1 Utopian Socialism: Robert Owen

When in the latter half of the 19th century, the revolutionary dogmas of Marx and his school had become most conspicuous in the social movement, the earlier systems became known, by way of distinction, as Utopian socialism. Under this term were included the doctrines and projects of Robert Owen. The name was in some sense justified by the ideal societies that were advocated and put to all practical tests by these thinkers and their followers. But while Plato and Thomas Moore and Tommaso Campanella had constructed their fanciful commonwealths with no expectation of their being realized, the 19th century Utopians were profoundly convinced that their several systems were destined in no distant future to effect an entire transformation of social life. In the governmental reforms that were so much at issue in their time, these philosophers had little or no interest. According to them, the political would disappear with the social evils when society should be reorganized on the proper principles. These utopian socialists believed that all the schools found in history evidence that the normal course of mankind in progress toward its goal had been checked and deflected by ignorance and error concerning the principles of collective life - a correct understanding of those principles would bring naturally the resumption of progress.

All agreed that an important, if not the most important, source of the ills that afflicted mankind was poverty and its consequences. All agreed that the 'prevalence of poverty was due largely, if not exclusively, to the exaggerated recognition of self-interest as the 'mainspring of human action, and that the existing system of industry and commerce, based upon this principle and operating by unrestricted competition, must unendingly increase the misery of the race. All scored the injustice of unearned wealth as vehemently as they lamented the sufferings of undeserved poverty.' All

NOTES

denounced the existing capitalistic system. Robert Owen, however, found capital indispensable, subject to the regulations imposed by his system. Owen maintained that when his simple rational laws for the creation of what is good for men should prevail, there would be no 'useless private property'; but St. Simonians announced as the most important means to the realization of social justice that the right to unearned property, so far as it depended on inheritance, must be abolished. The error that has led men astray, so the Utopians, all argued, has been the assumption that nature designed the individual rather than the group to be the basis of social existence. Society is not a deliberately created service of previously isolated men for the promotion of their several selfish interests; it springs from the feeling not from the reason of mankind. Sympathy the 'sense of alikeness — brings men' inevitably together; 'benevolence — willing the good of all — is the 'natural 'principle of association. 'These basic factors have been almost wholly lost sight of in the theory and practice of social life. Rivalry, competition, strife and war,' (The unit of this new order is to be a community of with the endless exploitation of the weaker by the stronger have become the accepted methods for determining the relations of individuals and of peoples to one another. The internal affairs of the community are to be directed to one another. To change all this and restore the reign of nature's peace and order to humanity, is the proclaimed purposes of all the Utopians).

The projects of the various schools for the achievement of this end had some things in common, but were; for the most part widely divergent from one another. Owen and the Owenites chiefly devoted themselves to the improvement of conditions in the industrial'world. Philanthropic devices for the benefit of the labourers were managed by precept and by example upon the obdurate British factory owners, and the legislation that was at last secured, against the bitter opposition of the laissez-faire economists, received hearty support from the Owenites. The most characteristic feature of their work, however, was the establishment among the working classes of cooperative societies for the supply of their needs. This form of voluntary association for the production and exchange of commodities, attained great prominence and wide vogue in the 1820s and the 1830s. Cooperation was hailed as the much-desired expedient for escaping the evils of the strife between capital and labour. The success of this device confirmed Owen in his belief that he had solved the problem of society in general, and he set forth with fanatical fervour his scheme of a reorganized world.

The unit of this new order is to be a community of families numbering from 500 to 3000 persons, living on a tract of land large enough to support the members. The internal affairs of the community are to be directed by a council consisting of all the members from thirty to forty years of age; relations with other communities are in the charge of a like council of the members from forty to sixty years. Unions of these primary communities will be constituted under similar councils for larger areas. All the councils are to act in conformity to the code that Owen formulates, the basis of which is the fundamental law of nature that the individual's character is not formed by himself, but is the result of the circumstances and education to which he has been subjected. The chief prescriptions of the code are those that insure the 'same general routine of education, domestic teaching and employment' to all children of both sexes, who are put from birth under the care of the community. Members

NOTES

who, despite their education, fail to act rationally are to be removed to the hospitals for physical, mental or moral invalids, where their cure is to be affected by the mildest possible treatment. If any directing council contravenes the fundamental laws of human nature it will be supplanted by a new one consisting of the members of the community between twenty and thirty or over sixty years of age. It is not explained how this substitution is to be effected, and there is nowhere in the scheme, save in the clause referring to the hospitals, any suggestion of coercive government. What is to become of the existing political systems of the world is not discussed, but the thought is not obscure that they will fade, imperceptibly away in the light of the new order.

Robert Owen's project for escape from the evils of civilization took shape in that form of communal life which became famous as the phalange. His primary concern was with agricultural rather than industrial production, with the household rather than the factory. The true principles of association he worked out in an elaborate system wherein much acute and suggestive reflection was made useless by incoherent presentation and pedantic terminology. The outstanding feature of his social philosophy was the doctrine of what he has called passionate attraction. According to this doctrine, the passions or feelings of men, rather than their reason, must be considered the basis of every kind of association, and particularly of that cooperative union through which the primary needs of physical life are satisfied. Naturally 'all men dislike the incessant, monotonous labour that produces' the necessities of life. Naturally every man finds 'relative if not absolute pleasure in some species of labour or in some alternation in species of labour'. Ignorance or disregard of these basic facts accounts for the evils of social life whether in ancient or in modern times. Slavery, serfdom and the wages system, with the governmental institutions that accompany and sustain them, are but different forms of the distortion that results from the effort of certain classes, by deliberate liberate association, 'to put all the repellent labour of social life upon others and retain the agreeable for themselves alone.

Robert Owen said that the way out is to transform the social organization in the light of the principles that Owen has discovered. Labour must be made attractive, and therefore productive beyond all comparison with earlier ages. Every variety of taste, talent and other endowment must be recognized and utilized in the proportion that science shows to be requisite for the harmony of the whole and the happiness of the individual members. The typical association for this end is a group of five hundred families, fifteen to eighteen hundred persons, voluntarily united in a community which Owen called, true socialism. It should include capitalists, labourers and persons of talent, each contributing as he is able to the productiveness and agreeableness of the community's life. Through the organization and specialization of the functions essential to the industries carried on, occupations suited to every taste would be available with the result that every member would labour with the zest of pleasure. 'Passional attraction' rather than competitive greed for gain would rule the community life. No wages should appear in the system. Every species of necessary labour must be performed by the members, participation of all in the generally repulsive kinds being stimulated in various in genius ways. Every member of the community must be a shareholder, whose part in the profits shall be determined in accordance with a

NOTES

scale that assigns a fixed proportion to capital, to labour and to talent. But every member must be guaranteed a minimum return sufficient to free him from anxiety for himself or his family, and every member must possess the right to labour in such occupations as are adapted to his preference and his capacity.

In the words of Robert Owen, with the establishment of such a system of social organization Owen believes that poverty will disappear, true liberty will be assured to every individual, the real natural rights of man will be recognized, happiness and order will be universal, and consequently government, so far at least as its coercive activities are concerned — armies, scaffolds, prisons, courts of justice — will have no longer any cause for existence. There never appears in Owens writings the slightest suggestion of revolutionary violence. His conviction is unfaltering that the great truths he has revealed will make their way by their own virtue.

4.4.2 Anarchist Socialism

Anarchism is an extreme theory regarding the necessity and the function of the state. The theory is hostile to the 'coercisive state' and wants to see it abolished. Anarchism asserts that political authority, in any of its forms is unnecessary and undesirable. In recent anarchist theory, theoretical opposition to the state has usually been associated with opposition to the institution of private property and also with hostility to organized religious authority. For the Russian philosopher Peter Kropotkin, the most intellectual exponent of the doctrine, the essential feature of the anarchistic regime is that there will be no compulsion, no law, and no government exercising force. In the words of the author Richard Garner, 'the anarchist is opposed to every existing system of government not only because it exercises compulsion upon the individual without his consent and is therefore an enemy to liberty and genuine self-government, but also because all governments without exception have proved themselves inefficient; they are arbitrary and tyrannical and therefore hateful; they are conducted in the interests of the privileged classes; the alleged equality of treatment which they profess to mete out to all has no real existence. The essential features of anarchism are the abolition of all constituted authority and the complete emancipation of the individual from every form of control political, social or religious'. Thus anarchists represent the extreme school of individual rights who are hostile to all forms of authority.

Thomas Hodgskin was another English Utopian anarchist who made 'the theory of an ultimate and underlying harmony', assumed by the classical economists, as the central point of his teaching. As an extreme individualist, he believed that the whole universe 'is regulated by permanent and invariable laws' and dispensed with the need for legislation or planning by a duly constituted authority.

Proudhon, a Frenchman, was probably the first to call himself an anarchist. He came in contact with radical socialists in Paris and served a brief prison term for writing seditious articles following the revolution of 1848. Basing his doctrine on the Golden Rule and the natural law of justice, he derived there from the right of everyone to the full product of his own labour. He declared property to be theft and political authority to be an enemy of justice, reason and fair deal. His specific complaint

against the state was that it had evolved out of the system of private property. He condemned property made up of accumulations from profits, interest and rent and proposed to eliminate the monopolistic and exploitative features from private property.

Max Stirner, the ablest German exponent of individualistic anarchism, was a 'young Hegelian' who maintained that the individual was the only reality and his rights entitled him to overthrow any authority whatsoever by violent means. Most of the American anarchists of the mid-nineteenth century were individualists who derived their ideas directly from older intellectual traditions and they developed their ideas in direct reference to American social questions like slavery and the labour problems arising from the rapidly developing industrialism. Henry David Thoreau urged both passive and active resistance to the American government in the struggle against slavery. He advocated civil disobedience and non-payment of taxes. More systematic anarchist doctrines were set forth by Josiah Warren, and his disciple Stephen Pearl Andrews, and later by Benjamin R. Tucker. Tucker made intelligent self-interest the foundation of his doctrine. He made a strong plea for the elimination of political authority for at all periods of history, the state had violated the principle of liberty. He believed that when coercive government disappears, crimes will disappear. Leo Tolstoy of Russia was a philosophical anarchist whose ideas were imbued with Christian ethics. The anarchist thinkers discussed so far are called individualist anarchists who were content with philosophical and literary exposition of their doctrine. They had sublime faith in the individual and invested him with property rights acquired through fair means.

NOTES

The Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakunin is regarded as the founder of an extensive movement of anarchism among proletarian group of Europe in the later nineteenth century. He founded his doctrine upon scientific basis. Human history, he wrote 'consists in the progressive negation of man's original bestiality, the evolution of his humanity'. Anarchism is the natural goal of man's moral evolution. Political authority, private property, and religion, belong to the lower stages of man's development for they are associated in one way or another, with physical desires and fears. The state perpetuates inequitable economic conditions and debase morality. 'The State makes tyrants or egoists out of the few and servants or dependents out of the many'. He advocated that the state's place is to be taken by a free society based on contract and voluntary association. The goal of anarchism is to be attained both through evolution and revolution, i.e., by education and intrigue.

Bakunin's ideas were adopted by Prince Kropotkin. He stated his ideas in terms of biology and 'human geography'. He stressed the cooperative principle in men and animals as against the competitive. He believed in a society of mutual aid. Bakunin thought that the state, private property and religious authority stood in the way of realization of the anarchistic goal. The misery of the many and the plenty for the few, he associates with the political system. Laws formulated by the state have a class bias. He advocated the replacement of the state by a web of freely functioning groups. Economically the new order will be that of complete communism. Each man is to choose his own.work and put in four to five hours of labour at some useful social service. Man, left to himself prefers work to idleness, order to disorder, social morality to conventional morality and natural religion to dogmatic religion. In all that

NOTES

he wrote he placed emphasis on man's sense of social responsibility, his feeling for human brotherhood.

Anarchists picture the vision of a new society characterized by the absence of every form of authority. They highlight the cooperative and social nature of man. They hold that human nature is essentially good but is corrupted by evil institutions. The English philosopher C.E.M Joads enumerates three sources of authority from which anarchism would emancipate the individual.

(a) It would free man as a producer from the yoke of the capitalism.

(b) It would free man as a citizen from the yoke of the State.

(c) It would free man as an individual from the authority of religious morality derived from hypothetical, metaphysical entities such as an omnipotent God.

Anarchism emphasizes the worth of individual personality finds its close ally in nineteenth century positive liberalism. In its opposition to private property it picks up the thread of socialist thought. Anarchism thus aims 'to fuse the ideals of liberalism and socialism, the two great currents of nineteenth century social reform .It taught that liberty without socialism resulted in special privilege, and that socialism without liberty led to autocracy and slavery'. Anarchists claim that only in an anarchist society would the individual be able to develop his full nature and to realize his potentialities.

Anarchism dispenses with the need for any government. On the economic side, anarchism expresses itself in the belief in a universal communism, which is stated by Kropotkin as follows: 'All belongs to everyone and provided each man and woman contributes his or her share for the Production of necessary objects, they have a right to share in all that is produced by everybody'. Government in any form is not necessary to ensure that everybody's share is just. On the contrary, the chief function of government hither to has been to ensure that everybody's share is unjust. Governments have been ensuring less for the workers and more for the employers by maintaining an unfair economic system.

Anarchists find no justification for the state. For them, the state has no rational purpose to serve; no impartial role to play. The state, as it exists today, is used by the few as an instrument to protect their unjust property which rightfully belongs to the whole society. The state can never be seized and used, as some socialist suggest; for the purpose of ushering in a new socio-economic order.

They point out the inherent fallacy of representative government. The state as a nationally representative body cannot seek the will of the people on any and every question as it arises. No man can adequately represent another man, much less a group of other men. The representative seldom possesses the required knowledge to enable him to deal adequately with all the questions that arise for decision. Moreover, the common will expresses itself differently with regard to each one of the questions that the state has to settle.

Political power has a corrupting influence. The exercise of power over other men inevitably corrupts the best intentioned persons. No man and no body of men

should be entrusted with governmental authority over other men. Governments from their very nature use force, force to separate men who are naturally friends. For them, 'Government is based on egotism and fear, anarchy on fraternity'.

NOTES

Anarchists look upon the state as a superfluous institution. It is not necessary for education either as voluntary educational societies can perform better. State is not necessary for defense. Standing armies, says Kropotkin, are always beaten by invaders who have historically been repulsed only by spontaneous uprisings. State does not really guarantee security. It creates criminals through its inequitable economic system. In art, science, and in business, voluntary organizations, clubs, academies and societies do better, because they rely upon free cooperation.

As substitutes for the existing state and its government, anarchists advocate a web of free associations formed ad hoc for the carrying out of special purposes. The autonomous associations, both territorial and vocational, will perform the essential functions of society which are at present undertaken by the state. For them, 'anarchy is not the absence of order; it is the absence of force'. There will be few occasions for conflict, disharmony and competition among various groups and associations. With proper education, elimination of inequality and abolition of the state, interests will rarely conflict and occasions of disharmony will be few. Bereft of governmental grand motherliness and governmental interference people will develop freely. It is competition which breeds enmity; if we eliminate it, men's natural friendliness will grow and deepen.

Regarding the methods by which anarchistic goal, is to be achieved there is no unanimity among its authors. The philosophical anarchists believe in the methods of persuasion, discussion and propaganda. Revolutionary or communistic anarchists advocate violent and terroristic methods for realizing their vision of an emancipated society. As Levine writes: "The anarchists saw only one way of bringing about the emancipation of the working class; namely, to organize groups, and at an opportune moment to raise the people in revolt against the state and the propertied classes; then destroy the State, expropriate the capitalist class and reorganize society on communist and federalist principles. Thus, anarchism in its emphasis on violent methods of Social change, bears close resemblance to revolutionary syndicalism.

Anarchistic theory is essentially utopian in character. It has an attractive qualities in but its supporters are unable to fill in the details. The picture of an anarchist society remains an unattainable ideal. The assumptions on which the edifice of the new society is sought to be built up are unrelated to hard and complex realities.

Its assumption of human nature is one-sided. Most anarchist doctrines rest upon assumptions of the predominance of the social and cooperative, not the self-seeking and competitive, instincts of man. Anarchists ignore the irrational forces determining human behaviour.

Their view of the coercive state is grossly exaggerated. State functions through both consent and coercion. Modern states render many welfare services to individuals in the form of aid and assistance which involve no compulsion.

The substitutes which anarchists propose to take the place of the state would wholly prove inadequate to meet the needs and problems which exist in the complex

NOTES

societies of today. The anarchist belief in automatic harmony in a society of autonomous groups is utopian. State as a common agency is indispensable for maintaining social order and stability. The state in some form, whatever may be said in criticism of its mistakes, its inefficiency, its abuse of power, is and always will be an absolute necessity among civilized men. Voluntary associations would be found totally inadequate for the purpose of defence, police protection, enforcement of contracts etc.

State action does not mean a complete destruction of moral values. State cannot directly promote morality; yet it can so order external conditions as to make it possible for the individual to live the good life. The anarchist is mistaken in thinking that liberty is the greatest of all political goods. Liberty is not an end in itself. Collective life implies some restraint upon individual freedom. Liberty degenerates into tyranny of the strong without some controlling agency like the state. It remarked, whatever in human history is great or admirable has been found in governed communities, that is, it has been the result of the imposition of restrictions upon liberty. The anarchist vision of unlimited liberty defies realization.

Anarchism highlights the dangers of overgrowth of political power. It is a protest against the glorification of the state and its institutions. In all states there are social, economic and political evils, due in large measure to bad, inefficient and corrupt government, which have tended to discredit the state in the minds of the governed. Brown remarks, 'Anarchism confronts our sense of citizenship with a challenge which we should do well to take seriously, and the believer in political institutions should seek to make them more worthy of popular allegiance'.

Anarchism is first and foremost a plea for decentralization, both territorial and functional. It stresses the need for dispersal and decentralization of power. Man through membership of small and closely-knit groups and associations can become aware of his role in society and exercise his real freedom through active participation. Anarchism draws our attention to the urgent need for socio- economic reforms in the existing system. It pictures an ideal society free from inequality, injustice, oppression and exploitation. There is truth in the anarchistic view that true morality is largely self-earned. It encourages individual self-help based on cooperation with fellow-beings.

4.4.3 Fabian Socialism

Fabianism is an English version of evolutionary socialism, which was conceived in agreement with the new conditions and developments that came over England at the end of the 19th century. This English version of socialism is essentially pragmatic in outlook, flexible in approach and democratic method. It is the brain child of a group of British intellectuals and differs sharply from Marxism in that it believes in attaining socialism by slow, peaceful and flexible methods. E.M. Burns thus writes:

> Perhaps the most important variety of contemporary socialism which does not trace the paternity of its doctrines to Marx is Fabian socialism. The principal sources of Fabian socialism were British and American. They included the writings of Henry George, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill. The most dominant idea derived from these sources was the premise that most forms of unearned wealth are created by society.

NOTES

Fabianism originated in England in the last quarter of the 19th century. Increasing democratization in the political sphere and the growth of collectivist legislation in the economic sphere provided a congenial atmosphere for the evolution of a new brand of socialism suited to the needs, temperament and traditions of the English people.

> Between the years 1865 and 1885 Great Britain had entered on a period of change. The British constitution was turned into a democracy. A democratic state which was prepared to take upon itself social reform duties, a working class with economic influence and power, a nation with a growing social conscience, could not be treated from the stand point of revolution and class struggle. The fundamental socialist concepts required a new basis and new methods more in harmony with new conditions.

In the early eighties several socialist movements got under way in England. Several organizations, active in the propagation of socialist ideas were formed of which the Social Democratic Federation, the Socialist League, the Independent Labour Party, and the Fabian Society were more prominent. The Fabian Society saw the light of the day on 4 January, 1884, 'a group of intellectuals who envisaged the emergence of a socialist society in England. The society was named after Roman general Fabius who, while fighting Hannibal adopted the policy of 'wait, and hit hard at the right moment'. Its prominent members included Sidney Webb, G.B. Shaw, Graham Wall as, Sidney Olivier, A. Besant, H. Bland, W. Clark and E. R. Pease, etc. They were highly educated men and women, widely read in economics, politics and ethics. Thus the Fabian Society could boast of having on its rolls distinguished scholars, administrators and statesmen. The Fabians were primarily influenced by J. S. Mill, Henry George, and Karl Marx.

Henry George was considered as an American Social reformer. His contribution to the study of Fabianism is very much significant. George is well known for his book *Progress and Poverty* (1879). His far-reaching contribution to the study of Ricardian theory of rent is commendable. He played a very pivotal role in the field of British socialism. George's seminal ideas influenced the thought of Marx and Engels. Sydney Oliver, George Bernard Shaw, Sidney Web, H. G. Wells also have played a very significant role under the ideas of Henry George. Particularly the Fabians were attracted in terms of poverty and disparity of incomes. To him, poverty is an evil concept and was found from parochial loyalties, economic stagnation and political breakdown. Poverty can be prevented with the help of state action and intervention. The Fabian Society was established in 4 January, 1884.

Rejection of Marxian Theory of Class Struggle

Henry George rejected Marxian theory of class struggle and revolutionary method and he was influenced by his concern for social justice and a society free from all forms of exploitation. Henry had developed socialist leanings in the later part of his life. He wrote that 'The social problem of the future we considered to be, how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw materials of the globe, and an equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labour'. Henry George, the American philosopher, who wrote *Progress and Poverty* in 1879, lectured in England in 1881 and greatly influenced the English socialist thinkers. According to Lancaster, George influenced the Fabians in two ways.

NOTES

- Firstly, George's glowing picture of a society without want fired their enthusiasm for getting rid of unearned wealth.
- Secondly, George's hint led them to find, quite readily, differential values other than economic rent — in profits, salaries, and dividends, all of which were unearned to precisely the same degree as the rent appropriated by landlords.

Henry George was fully engaged and was committed to intensive and extensive studies and research. In 1906, the he started the Fabian Summer School to have lectures and discussions on politics and economics. The Fabian Research Department was instituted in 1912 to study the various socio-economic problems created by industrial capitalism. Henry said that 'The object of the Fabians have been to spread the socialist doctrine as they understand it, throughout the educated middle class and to persuade the national and local governments of Great Britain to put the doctrine gradually into practical operation.'

Major Tenets of Henry George

(a) Emancipation of land and industrial capital

Henry George stated that the Fabian Society had democratic socialists as its members. The basis of Fabianism was hammered out in 1887 and was restated in 1919 with slight modifications. Henry George wanted to reorganize the society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. The society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in land the prevention of appropriation of rent by individuals. The society further, works for the transfer to the community of the administration of such industrial capital as can be conveniently managed socially. Such transfer was deemed imperative as industrial capital had become a monopoly in the hands of a class of proprietors on whom the majority depended for a livelihood. Labour should be duly rewarded. The idle class living on the labour of others could be eliminated when rent and interest are not allowed to go into their pockets, but are made the rewards of labour. 'For the attainment of these ends the Henry George looks to the spread of socialist opinions and the social and political changes consequent thereon, dissemination of knowledge as to the relation between the individual and society in the economic, ethical and political aspects'.

(b) Democratic State

Unlike syndicalists and guild socialists, Henry George was confident of the fairness and effectiveness of action by the State — the democratic state. He looked upon the democratic state as the 'representative, and trustee of the people', 'their guardian, their man of business, their manager, their secretary, even their stockholder'. He suggested the following measures to make the state 'trustworthy': (a) Broadening the suffrage; (b) Securing a better trained civil service, and (c) Equalizing educational opportunities. The state, according to them, was the state civil service and it was the bounden duty of the civil service to act efficiently and in a manner responsive to public wishes.

(c) Gradual reforms along ordinary parliamentary lines

George rejected the Marxian theory of class struggle and the method of revolution and expressed firm faith in achieving a socialist society through gradual reforms along ordinary parliamentary lines. Fabian socialists advocated peaceful and tempered social changes. Land, industry and financial institutions are to pass from private ownership to the state by peaceful, gradual methods. While Marxism is revolutionary, Fabianism is evolutionary. Instead of the Marxian theory that the history of all hither to existing societies is the history of class struggle, Henry George maintained that history demonstrates the 'irresistible progress of democracy' and 'almost continuous progress of socialism'.

(d) Transition from capitalism to socialism

Henry George regards the transition from capitalism to socialism as a gradual process. He looks forward to the socialization of industry by peaceful economic and political agencies already at hand. Fabians see in the middle class a group that can be utilized in developing the technique of administration on behalf of the new social order. They also feel that an important step in the attainment of socialism is the rise of the social conscience of the community in favour of the socialist ideal.

(e) Economic basis of Fabianism

Henry George, also analyzing the economic basis of Fabianism, rejected the labour theory of value of both the classical economists and Marx and maintained that the community as a whole, and not labour alone, creates value. The aim of socialism, as Henry conceived it, is to obtain for all members of society the values which society creates, and this aim is to be achieved by gradually transferring land and industrial capital to the community, while making the state more fully representative of the community. Thus, its aim is to transfer ownership, not to the workers as a class, but to society, for general benefit.

Socialism maintained that democracy and socialism are complementary to each other, because both are based on the ideas of equality and justice. Through democratic processes, the socio-economic, cultural and political system of the society would gradually change paving the way for socialism. Socialism should be brought gradually, not through the short-circuiting path of revolutionary method. The Fabian strategy is one of permeation, 'Resolved to permeate all classes it has not preached class antagonism. Resolved gradually to permeate it has not been revolutionary, it has relied on the slow growth of opinion.'

Henry George favours decentralization of power and greater municipalisation. He writes that, 'A democratic state cannot be a social democratic state unless it has in every centre of the population a local governing body as thoroughly democratic in constitution as the Central parliament'. Under the aegis of the state local self-bodies should be allowed greater opportunities to work.

(f) Theory of land and rent

Henry George opposed the revolutionary theory of Marxism. He holds that social reforms and socialist permeation of existing political institutions can bring about the

NOTES

expected development of socialism. He paid little attention to trade unionism and other labour movements. He recognized the major tenet of Marxian philosophy which was the abolition of private property. George questioned why there was chronic poverty in spite of advancement of technology. He himself gave the answer, stating that with the advance of technology, population grows. With the growth of the population, land grows in value. The growing share of the output and development of market economy is siphoned off by the owners of land and natural resources.

In this context, many English economists had criticized the philosophy and ideas of Henry George. T.E. Cliff Leslie, Alfrad Marshall has vehemently criticized his basic ideas on economy. George Bernard Shaw attempted to adopt Henry George's view of land rent and is considered as a huge and mounting subtraction from the income of workers. George said that a tax is levied upon the production of a thing that must constantly be produced by human labour. This labour will make supply more difficult, raise prices, and the man who pays the tax is constantly able to push the tax upon the consumer. Land has no role to constantly supply in order to meet the demand. Its price is always a monopoly value and the tax falls upon the land value which does not fall upon all land but only upon valuable land and that its proportion to its value.

4.4.4 Guild Socialism and Syndicalism

In its origins, guild socialism was a purely English theory. It was set forth by English intellectuals in the first and second decades of the twentieth century. It is a socialist system and movement aiming at industrial self-government and functional democracy. It is the intellectual child of English Fabianism and French Syndicalism. It is 'a kind of anaemic version of French syndicalism'. Some describe it as a half-way house between syndicalism and collectivism. It does not agree with syndicalism in wanting to abolish the state by direct action; nor does it want the state to control all of industry, as does collectivism. But like the syndicalists, the guild socialists were the most ardent advocates of workers' control in industry. Unlike collectivists (State socialists) they advocate withdrawal of state control from the economic sphere. Guild socialists aim at the achievement of socialism with the guild as its foundation. They want to extend the democratic principle to any and every form of social action and in especial, to industrial and economic full as much as to political affairs. The object of guild socialism is to make work more interesting and the whole economic structure of society more democratic. The fundamental demand of guild socialism is that the whole structure of society should be made democratic.

It was not until 1909 that the guild-socialist theory assumed a more practical form. The Trade Unions played a prominent part in the great labour unrest during the years 1909-12. Writers like AR. Orage and S.G. Hobson put forward the proposal in the columns of the *New Age* that the guild idea should be adapted to modern conditions on the basis of the existing Trade Union Organization. They made vigorous attacks upon modern capitalism, criticized also the centralized collectivism of contemporary socialism, and gradually reshaped the original Orage-Penty proposals, for a restoration of medieval guilds, into an elaborate scheme for national guilds, properly adjusted to modern political and economic conditions. Their articles were

later published in the book *National Guilds, An Enquiry into the Wage System and the Way out*. Penty, Orage and Hobson were members of the Fabian Society and the Independent Labour Party, until they became disillusioned with these organizations, upholding centralized political socialism.

NOTES

Main Tenets of Guild Socialism

Guild socialism offers an indictment of present society, based on industrialism. They protest against the contemporary capitalist method of exploitation in which the surplus value is pocketed by the capitalist. In return for the minimum wage, the workers surrender all control over the organization of production. They advocate the abolition of the present system which produces slave mentality in the workers. They argue wages, profits, rents, and interest should be apportioned upon a fundamentally different principle. They criticize the acquisitive nature of the mode economic system which separates ownership from service to munity. Right to property exists for its owner's sake, unrelated to any full social function. They protest against the dehumanizing consequences of the machine system. They attempt to devise a system that develop workers not merely skill but also pride in their work. Again, they criticize the contemporary political democracy based on the principle of territorial representation.

The goals at which the National Guilds League aims are described the abolition of the Wage-system, and the establishment by the workers Self-Government in industry, through a democratic system of Nation - Guilds, working in conjunction with other democratic functional organizations in the community. The general principles on which this statement of aims is founded may be reduced to the following three:

- The principle of Functional Democracy
- The principle that industry should be administered by the common action of workers both of hand and brain who carry on the industry
- The principle that power and responsibility in society should be related and proportional to the importance of the functions which individuals perform in the service of the community.

They advocate the setting up of guilds or cooperative associations in the economic sphere. Each industry and each technical and cultural service would be managed and controlled by guild which is defined by Drage as 'a self-governing association of mutually dependent people organized for-the responsible discharge of a particular function of society'. The guild is a Trade Union modified in two ways: it will be inclusive of all workers in an industry the unskilled workers as well as the clerical, technical and managerial workers - and its chief function would be not to protect the interests of its members, nor merely to secure better conditions of work, but to carry on and control the industry. While trade union is organized for militant purposes in a hostile society, the Guild will be organized for peaceful purposes in a friendly society. With regard to prices of commodities, where the interests of the consumers are involved, the Consumers' Councils in collaboration with the guilds will make the decisions.

NOTES

State can exercise power only in a limited field such as defence, justice, education, taxation and international relations. In general the National Guilds League adopts a hostile attitude to the state. There is a tendency to relegate the State to the role of an association of consumers, represented on a number of bodies elected on a national basis for the purpose of negotiating with the big producing Guilds, but according to Hobson, the state continues to be the representative of the community at large. He ascribes a superior position to the state. As supreme authority the state should settle disputes between guilds in the capacity of a court of final appeal; when the guild congress proves unable to settle them.

They believe in the evolutionary methods of achieving socialism. The present trade unions will be the guilds of tomorrow and become instruments of transformation. The present trade unions have to perfect and strengthen themselves and pursue the method of 'encroaching control' which is 'wresting bit by bit from the hands of the possessing classes the economic power, by a steady transference of functions and rights from their nominees to representatives of the working class'. In this respect they differ from syndicalists who advocate direct action and general strike.

Syndicalism

Syndicalism is a form of revolutionary socialism which is essentially a French school of thought of the French labour movement. It is both a body of social doctrine or theory of social organization, and a plan of action.

Syndicalism, loosely defined, holds that the workers alone must control the conditions under which they work and live; the social changes they need can be achieved only by their own efforts, by direct action in their own associations, and through means suited to their peculiar needs. Syndicalism places positive emphasis on the trade and industrial union movement as the basis of the new industrial structure and on the producer rather than the consumer.

The exponents of syndicalism were both the active leaders of the trade Union movement and a group of brilliant intellectuals. While activists like Fernard Pelloutier, Emile Pouget and others formulated the main tenets of syndicalism, Georges Sorel, Hubert Lagardelle and Edouard Berth with their intellectual brilliance provided its philosophical foundation. Sorel, the philosopher par excellence of syndicalism, attempted to work out a synthesis between the proletarianism of Marx, the anti-political associationism of Proudhon and the intuitionism of Bergson. Socialism, according to Sorel, required organization of the proletariat and not of the economic system. He was in favour of establishing an industrial self-government of the working class.

According to syndicalism, workers should organize a general strike and paralyze the state. From the French revolutionary tradition, syndicalists acquired their methods of violence and their emphasis on the role of militant elite in the process of social transformation. Syndicalists called themselves a 'new school' of socialism. This variety of socialism is marked by certain distinct features and tenets.

Syndicalism is uncompromisingly opposed to the State and looks upon it as a bourgeois and middle class institution. Irrespective of its form, the state is an instrument

of capitalist exploitation. All states are instruments of class rule. The territorial, military state reflects the ideals of property-owners and serves their interests. Workers cannot emancipate themselves unless they destroy the power of the state. Reforms and concessions conceded by the state are mere palliatives. The state, the syndicalists argued, is theoretically wrong because it embodies an impossible ideal of social unity. Society is essentially pluralistic, and no political constitution can make it otherwise.

Syndicalists not only dislike the middle-class state but also distrust middle-class socialism which is a product of clever middle-class intellectuals out of touch with the needs of the working class. Syndicalism claims to be the only school of socialism which is the product of the workers them- selves. It keeps alive among workers an intense class consciousness and forbids any rapprochement between the workers and the bourgeois. It is distrustful of the-middle class leadership and its primary objective is to put the workers in power. Since the workers as producers create value, they should be the controllers of society.

Syndicalists are deadly opponents of wars which they consider as the outcome of the conflicting interests of the capitalists. The workers must keep out of wars and unnecessary bloodshed and bend their energy for their own upliftment. The police and the defence forces uphold the interests of the ruling capitalist class by breaking strikes of workers and by fighting wars with other nations. The oppressed working class have no country of their own; they have no need for patriotism as such national spirit is as assiduously created by the ruling class to mollify proletarian radicalism.

Syndicalism is a form of revolutionary socialism. Syndicalists are distrustful of political methods as a means of achieving their desired society. They do not believe in peaceful, constitutional methods. They advocate violent and revolutionary methods which they would call 'direct action'. Strike, sabotage and boycott are their chief forms for achieving direct action.

Syndicalists differ from Marxists in believing that the time is not far off when the working class would rise in revolt against the capitalist class. Marx, they believe, was unduly optimistic in prophesying that capitalists would fight the workers and thereby bring about own destruction.

What the capitalists would do is to make comprises and bargains for their survival. In these circumstances the workers must carryon perpetual offence against the employers through strikes, sabotage, destruction of machinery, boycott, label, spoiling work through 'go-slow' methods.

Syndicalists are ardent believers in direct action. It is the only means of educating the workers and preparing them for the final struggle. The general strike is the chief weapon.

The general strike is the final and mighty weapon which would paralyse the state and make the workers the masters of society. The general strike is not necessarily a striker of all workers. What is required is a strike on the part of a sufficient proportion of the workers in key industries to secure the paralysis of the capitalist system. Syndicalists rely on a conscious, militant minority who would inspire

NOTES

and provide leadership to the otherwise passive majority. The syndicalists' stress on elitism is akin to Lenin's. In Sorel's language, the general strike is to be a 'myth' to the workers. A myth being an idea which fills men with ardour and belief in a better future.

Sabotage is a policy of injuring an employer's property or enterprise through sluggish, bungling, wasteful, or positively damaging acts: done either while the worker remains on the job or in connection with strikes. It may take the non-violent form of slow work for long hours, poor work for low pay, revealing the secrets of the employer etc. The boycott of goods produced by non-union labour and the placing of the Union label produced by syndicates themselves are some of the other methods advocated by the syndicalists. All of this is in preparation for the general strike which may fail today, but 'today's failure is a preparation for tomorrow's success'.

The syndicalist plan of action is direct, vigorous, and well defined, but the structure of society which it seeks to achieve is extremely vague and nebulous. Syndicalism is primarily a creed of opposition; its thrust is negative. As Coker aptly put it, syndicalism offered a policy primarily of revolution, not of administration. Under syndicalism, the syndicate is to be the basis of industrial organisation. Syndicalists picture the future society as a free and flexible federation of autonomous and distributive associations based on collective ownership and carrying on the activities in accordance with the needs of the community. Workers assume control of production and private capital is to be replaced by collective capital. Thus syndicalists share the collectivist concept of property, the communistic principle of distribution according to needs and the anarchist goal of statelessness. All means of production, distribution and exchange will belong to the community and should be controlled and managed by the syndicates of workers. National services like highways, railways and post offices are to be placed in the hands of the National Federation of Workers. Prisons and Courts are to be abolished, and punishment is to take the form of social boycott.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

6. What was the primary concern in Robert Owen's theories?
7. For Peter Kropotkin, what is the essential feature of an anarchist regime?
8. What do you understand by Syndicalism?

4.5 SUMMARY

- Mao Zedong, also known as Mao Tse-tung, was the father of the People's Republic of China.
- As a political theorist, politician and revolutionary, Mao not only moulded the destiny of the People's Republic of China, he also became one of the most important Marxists political theorists of the twentieth century and gave the Asiatic version of Marxism to the world.

NOTES

- The political theory espoused by Mao Zedong is known as Maoism. The followers of Mao's political theory, known as Maoists, consider Maoism as an anti-Revisionist form of Marxism-Leninism. Maoism was developed during the 1950s and 1960s and was widely applied as the guiding ideology of the Communist Party of China.
- The model for Mao's theory of revolution was the Chinese Communist insurgency against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government in the late 1920s and 1930s, which resulted in Communist Party of China becoming a powerful fighting force strengthened on the backs of the immense support that the CPC enjoyed among the rural peasantry.
- Mao jotted down his thoughts on revolution in his two most famous essays, both written in 1937, called '*On Contradiction'* and '*On Practice'*. The essays, part of his famous '*Red Book*', are concerned with the practical strategies of a revolutionary movement and emphasize the importance of practical, grass-roots knowledge, which can only be obtained through experience.
- One of the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is the belief that the urban proletariat or the working class is the main source of revolution. This is because Marxism believes that a true socialist society can only emerge after capitalism has been firmly established. Thus, in Marxism-Leninism, the rural countryside, consisting of landless peasants, is largely ignored. On the other hand, Mao, perhaps because of his own upbringing as a peasant, believed that the peasantry could be shaped into a revolutionary force under the knowledge, leadership and guiding principles of a Communist party.
- Unlike the other forms of Marxism-Leninism where large-scale industrial development is seen as a positive force, Maoism prioritised rural development. For Mao, such a strategy was the most logical taking into account the fact that in a developing country like China the majority of the population were not the industrial urban proletariat, but rather the rural peasantry.
- Today, in the People's Republic of China, Mao's theories have largely been repudiated. This is because of the disastrous consequence of the two major initiatives of Mao after seizing power – The Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. Both of these initiatives resulted in the deaths of millions of people.
- Antonio Gramsci was the famous Italian Marxist philosopher of the 20th century.
- Gramsci made the distinction between the state and civil society which must be maintained in order to prevent authoritarianism.
- Gramsci's conception of hegemony always revolves around the maintenance of the fundamental groups and also around the mechanism by which the subaltern groups accepts the leadership of another group.
- The idea of power described as hegemony was also influenced by many debates about the civil society.

NOTES

- In the writings of Antonio Gramsci, hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion.
- As a non-coercive form of class rule, hegemony is typically understood as a cultural or ideological process that operates through the dissemination of bourgeois values and beliefs throughout the society.
- Utopian socialism is a concept that is used to describe the initial currents of modern socialist thought. It differs from the later socialist thought as it is based on idealism instead of materialism.
- The Utopian socialist Robert Owen's most prominent contribution to socialist thought was the belief that the social behavior of human beings is not rigid or complete and that human beings have the liberty to settle themselves into any kind of society that they liked.
- Anarchism is an extreme theory regarding the necessity and the function of the state. The theory is hostile to the 'coercisive state' and wants to see it abolished.
- Anarchism asserts that political authority, in any of its forms is unnecessary and undesirable.
- Fabianism is an English version of evolutionary socialism, which was conceived in agreement with the new conditions and developments that came over England at the end of the 19th century.
- This English version of socialism is essentially pragmatic in outlook, flexible in approach and democratic method.
- Guild socialism is a socialist system and movement aiming at industrial self-government and functional democracy.
- Syndicalism, loosely defined, holds that the workers alone must control the conditions under which they work and live; the social changes they need can be achieved only by their own efforts, by direct action in their own associations, and through means suited to their peculiar needs.

4.6 KEY TERMS

- **Political Society:** Gramsci described the term political society as the arena of the political institutions and legal constitutional control.
- **Hegemony:** Hegemony is in its simplest sense the ascendency or domination of one element of a system over others. In Marxist theory the term is used in a more technical and specific sense. According to Antonio Gramsci the term hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion.
- **Ideological hegemony:** Gramsci in his book Prison Notebooks emphasised the degree to which capitalism was maintained not merely by economic

domination, but also by political and cultural factors, and he called this ideological hegemony

- **Cultural Revolution:** The Cultural Revolution was a social-political movement that took place in the People's Republic of China from 1966 through 1976. Started by Mao Zedong, the stated goal of the Cultural Revolution was the enforcement of communism in the country by removing capitalist, traditional and cultural elements from Chinese society, and to imposing Maoist orthodoxy within the Party.
- **Red Book:** Also known as '*Quotations from Chairman Mao*' is a book containing selected statements and writings of the father of the People's Republic of China, Mao Zedong.
- **Fabianism:** It is a type of socialism that is to be established by gradual reforms within the law.

4.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The model for Mao's theory of revolution was the Chinese Communist insurgency against Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist government in the late 1920s and 1930s, which resulted in Communist Party of China becoming a powerful fighting force strengthened on the backs of the colossal support that the CPC enjoyed among the rural peasantry.
2. One difference between Maoism and Marxist-Leninism is that Mao, perhaps because of his own upbringing as a peasant, believed that the peasantry could be shaped into a revolutionary force under the knowledge, leadership and guiding principles of a communist party. Marxists traditionally ignored the rural peasantry.
3. According to Gramsci, the institutions of civil society like the family, school and church familiarize the citizens with the rules of behaviour and teach them to show natural respect to the authority of the ruling classes.
4. In the writings of Antonio Gramsci, hegemony refers to the ability of a dominant class to exercise power by winning the consent of those it subjugates as an alternative to the use of coercion.
5. Gramsci identified two different forms of political control such as:
   - The domination which referred the direct physical coercion by the police and the armed forces.
   - The hegemony which referred to both ideological control and more crucially consent.
6. In Robert Owen's writings, the primary concern was with agricultural rather than industrial production, with the household rather than the factory.
7. For Kropotkin, the essential feature of the anarchistic regime is that there will be no compulsion, no law, and no government exercising force.

NOTES

8. Syndicalism, loosely defined, holds that the workers alone must control the conditions under which they work and live; the social changes they need can be achieved only by their own efforts, by direct action in their own associations, and through means suited to their peculiar needs.

4.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on the Cultural Revolution in China.
2. Write a short note on Utopian Socialism.
3. What are the sources of authority from which anarchism claims to emancipate the individual?
4. How does Fabian Socialism reject the Marxist theory of class struggle?
5. Differentiate between guild socialism and syndicalism.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss the basic principles of Maoism.
2. Antonio Gramsci sought to distinguish civil society from political society in the context of his analysis of capitalist society. Discuss.
3. How is Gramsci's theory of hegemony tied to his view of the capitalist state?
4. Discuss the Anarchist view of the state.
5. Examine the major tenets of Henry George's philosophy.

4.9 FURTHER READING

Thomas, Peter D. 2009. The Gramscian Moment: Philosophy, Hegemony and Marxism. Leiden: Brill Books.

Strauss, Leo and Joseph Cropsey. 1987. *A History of Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vaughan, Edwin C. and Zhang Chunhou. 2002. *Mao Zedong As Poet and Revolutionary Leader: Social and Historical Perspectives*. Maryland: Lexington Books.

Mcclelland, J.S. 1998. *A History of Western Political Thought*. London: Routledge.

Coleman, Janet. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

Jha, Shefali. 2010. *Western Political Thought: From Plato to Marx*. New Delhi: Pearson Education India.