



**DELHI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY**

DELHI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY SYSTEM

CI No. R. (W)

43

Ac. No. 388668

Date of release of loan

This book should be returned on or before the date last stamped below. An overdue charge of 20np will be charged for each day the book is kept overtime.

ESSAYS
IN
POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

by
PROFESSOR
VIDYA DHAR, MAHAJAN, M.A.
(POLITICS AND HISTORY)

1943

DOABA HOUSE,
LAHORE.

Published by L. Som Dutt Puri, for Doaba House,
Mohan Lal Road, Lahore and Printed by L. Des Raj,
at the Chopra Printing Press, Mohan Lal
Road, Lahore.

FOREWORD

It is with pleasure that I respond to the request of Prof. Vidya Dhar Mahajan for a foreword to his interesting book on *'Essays in Political Philosophy.'* The book is intended to be an introduction to the study of the Socialistic Thought and Movement for students of Political Science. In the future of India, I think, this movement will play its part in the making or marring of our political destiny. Readers will judge for themselves as to the desirability or otherwise of accepting or rejecting it in our own country

The study of collectivist thought and movement is doubly important at the present time, especially for India. The old order seems to be crumbling all over the world and man is faced with the gigantic task of reconstruction. There is widespread dissatisfaction with the social order as we know it to-day. Some solution has to be found for the excesses of poverty, inequality and insecurity. The resources of the world should be preserved and utilised in such a manner as to promote the well-being of every individual and nation. Every person should receive that reward which will enable him to be at his best and at the same time render the maximum possible service to society.

Prof. Mahajan has produced a book of surpassing merit within a brief compass. Its scope is wide and necessarily his treatment is brief and limited. Nothing, however, has been omitted that has any bearing on the issues discussed. In easy and succinct form the author presents his reader with the results of his laborious study, conscientious thought and high-pitched aspiration.

It is a welcome sign of the times that Indian scholarship is now making up the lag and embarking on social and political philosophy in a spirit of constructive criticism. Prof. Mahajan's work marks a step in this direction. It bears evidence of an unusually wide range

of reading and a firm grasp of the numerous scores of collectivist thought. Political experiments like Communism and Fascism have brought into being new Ideologies of their own, which no serious student of the subject can afford to ignore. One wishes, however, that these had been more fully elaborated. The addition of a select bibliography at the end of each chapter would also be a valuable asset to the book. Perhaps, the author, may do so in a new and revised edition. The concluding chapters on the Idealistic Theory of the State and the 'End of the State', bring the interesting discussion to a close, though one wishes that the last chapter on 'The End of the State' to be a little more comprehensive.

Though Prof Mahajan's book is intended primarily as a text book for students of Political Science, it will be read with absorbing interest even by the general reader. He writes with knowledge and with discrimination. He has read widely and has a lucid and readable style ; he can be detached in his judgment, while he is enthusiastic in his appreciation—these are qualities which should ensure a cordial welcome to this volume. I would only say, in conclusion, I have enjoyed reading the volume and I have no doubt the appreciation will be shared by a wide circle of readers. One may expect even more valuable works in future from the promising young author.

'Nalanda'
Lucknow
Dec. 25th, 1942

V. S. Ram,
Professor and Head of the
Department of Political
Science,
Lucknow University.

INTRODUCTION

"The school of Us'anas declare that there is only one science, and that the science of government; for they say, it is in that science that all other sciences have their origin and end" (Kautilya Arthashastra, Book I, Chapter II).

My study and teaching of politics are inspired by the conviction that the days of greatness of a nation and the systematic study of politics by the people go side by side. My conviction is not merely a make-belief, but something based on actual facts from history. Greece was prominent in the world only in the days of Plato and Aristotle. The days of Roman hegemony witnessed the introduction of many works on politics. The same can be said of the progressive nations of the west to-day. The Germans achieved their unity and started their onward march at a time when Hegel, Kant, Nietzsche, Bernhardi and Treitschke gave their philosophy of the state to the people. It is their writings that aroused the conscience of the people and stirred them to action. Likewise, during the constitutional struggle of the Stuart period, many books on politics were written in England e.g., works of Hobbes, Locke, Milton, Coke, Harrington and Filmer.

The study of politics is so very popular among the progressive nations that thousands of books are published every year in those countries. Besides this, innumerable periodicals are issued and the problems confronting the country are discussed in their columns. There are separate chairs for the study of politics. Scholars are invited to give extension lectures to the people and thereby the message is taken to the man in the street. Speeches and dialogues between scholars of repute are broadcasted from the radio in order to educate the public in the problems of politics. Libraries, reading-rooms, study-circles and academies are started with a similar object.

While this is what is being done in other countries, it is a pity that the people in this country do not realise the importance of the study of politics in the national life. It is true that for the last five years we are holding All-India Political Science Conferences at various places and the Indian Political Science Association has a journal of its own which is issued from Allahabad under the editorship of Dr. Beni Prasad, but no one can deny that the progress that has been made is quite inadequate as compared with the political problems which face the nation at present.

The study of politics has not got its due place in the Universities, Colleges and Schools. There are hardly any books written by Indian scholars for the consumption of Indian students. But for the annual assemblage of a band of scholars at some place in India, there is hardly any activity in any province. There are no branches of the Indian Political Science Association in which the students and teachers of politics discuss the current problems.

I have written all this not with a view to criticise anybody but merely to point out the direction in which the efforts of the well-wishers of the country ought to be directed. It is a task that demands our immediate attention.

This book has been written in order to popularise the subject in which I am interested and I will regard myself well-compensated if a few of the readers take up the higher study of the subject.

My thanks are due to Principal G. D. Sondhi, Dr. J. N. Khosla, Mr. Mulk Raj Verma and a former student of mine who actually forced me to write the book.

I am grateful to Dr. V. S. Ram for his writing the Foreword.

Sir Shadi Lal Building
Turner Road,
Lahore

Vidya Dhar Mahajan.

CONTENTS

	Pages
Foreword 	i—ii
Introduction 	iii—iv
CHAPTER I. What is 'socialism' !	1—7
(1) Definition of Socialism.	
(2) Essentials of Socialism.	
CHAPTER II Exponents of Socialism	8—22
(1) Karl Marx—his life and writings—the theory of economic determinism—the theory of surplus value—Evolutionary and revolutionary methods to establish socialist order—Marx's view regarding the state and religion.	
(2) Dr. Engels. (3) Saint-Simon (4) Fourier (5) Robert Owen. (6) Prondhon. (7) Bakunin. (8) Kropotkin (9) Lassalle and (10) Louis Blanc.	
CHAPTER III. State-Socialism.	23—27
Exposition and criticism	
CHAPTER IV. Fabianism	28—31
Origin of the Fabian society—Methods of propaganda—criticism.	
CHAPTER V. Guild—Socialism	32—39
The views of Penty, Orange, Hobson and Cole—Functional democracy—Policy of "encroaching control" for workers—views of Hobson and Cole on state.	
CHAPTER VI. Syndicalism.	40—46
Its connection with the labour movement in France—Bourse and Syndicat—Pelloutier and Sorel—Syndicatist distrust of parliamentary institutions—Their methods to destroy the capitalist regime—	

CHAPTER VII	Communism.	47—55
	Pre-Marx communism—Marxian communism—Communist programme of action—establishment of dictatorship of the proletariat—Communism and democracy—Communism and religion	
CHAPTER VIII	Anarchism.	56—63
	The philosophy of Godwin, Hodgskin, Proudhon, Tucker, Schmidt, Bakunin and Prince Kropotkin Comparison between Anarchism and individualism	
CHAPTER IX	Criticism of Socialism	64—71
	Services of socialism—criticism of socialist philosophy.	
CHAPTER X.	Individualism.	72—84
	The philosophy of J. S. Mill, Herbert Spencer and Sumner—Points in favour of individualism—Criticism of individualism.	
CHAPTER XI.	The Idealist theory of the State	85—94
	Its origin—The philosophy of Kant, Hegel Treitschke, Bradley, T. H. Green, and Dr. Bosanquet—Criticism of the idealist theory.	
CHAPTER XII.	The end of the state.	95—101
	The state an end or a means—The various views regarding the end of the state.	
	Select Bibliography.	102—106

CHAPTER I.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM ?

The vagueness, elusiveness and protean changeableness of the term make it difficult both for the scholars and the followers to say as to what **Definition of socialism** exactly is meant by socialism. Socialism is like a medicine which changes according to the condition of the patient. Hence the variations in the form of socialism adopted in many countries are due to the political, economic and social environments in those countries.

A brief survey of the various definitions of socialism given by scholars will bring home the fact to the readers that it is a difficult job to attempt a comprehensive and reliable definition of socialism which will be generally acceptable. Dr. Schaffle says : " Not only those who oppose and scorn the new gospel, but also even many of those who are believers in it, have themselves no true idea, often not the most distant conception, of what it really is that they fear or detest. that they despise or extol " Prof. Ramsay Muir remarks : " Socialism is a Chameleon-like creed. It changes its colour according to its environment. For the street corner and the club room, it wears the flaming scarlet of class-war ; for the intellectuals it is red shot with tawny ; for the sentimentalists, it becomes a delicate rose-pink, and in clerical circles it assumes a virgin-white, just touched, with a faint flush of generous aspiration ". Dr. Schadwell says : " Socialism is the most complicated, many-sided and confused question that ever plagued the minds of men. " Mr. Punch referred to the difficulty of defining socialism in these words : " A scientist suggests dissipating ice-bergs with heat bomb, Personally we

think it would be cheaper to land two socialists on the things and let them discuss what socialism really means"

In 1892, *Le Figaro*, the Parisian paper, invited definitions of socialism and 600 of them were received. In 1924, a similar effort was made in England and the result was 263 definitions in all. In those definitions, socialism was defined as a science, a religion, an attitude, a principle, a body of doctrines, a theory, a system, an organisation, a form of society, a faith, a spirit, a philosophy, a movement, a name, an expression of belief, a tendency, an aspiration, a way of living, an endeavour, a demand, a process, an ideal, a conception, an awakening, an atmosphere and a programme.

"Socialism", says J W Bowen, "is light in the darkness of a depressed world". It is sunlight opposed to darkness, "it is 'men's mind developed'", it is "the navigation of social currents by the liberated soul of man," it is "mankind working on the spiritual plane," it is "spirit in action," it is "practical expression of Christ's teaching," it "implies an ever-learning ever-improving ergatocracy," it is "that form of society which will permit the establishment of the kingdom of Heaven on earth". Rev Cummings remarks: "Jesus of Nazareth defined its ideal, Karl Marx formulated its economics, Lenin endeavoured to apply its politics". According to Ramsay Macdonald, "no better definition of socialism can be given in general terms than that it aims at the organisation of the material economic forces of society and their control by the human forces." To quote Schaffle: "Let us repeat once again that the Alpha and Omega of socialism is the transformation of private and competing capitals into a united collective capital."

To me Mr. Rappoport's views in his preface to "Dictionary of Socialism" seem to be most appropriate and comprehensive in order to understand the controversy that centres round socialism. This is what he says: "If I am asked whether I am a socia-

list myself, I cannot but frankly reply: I do not know. It all depends upon what one understands by socialism

"There are many mansions in the House of Socialism. I have quoted about forty different definitions of socialism without being able to pretend that my list is exhaustive. Now, if socialism means justice equality, real democracy, love of humanity, altruism, tolerance and individual liberty, high moral ideals, peace and good-will, then I venture to say that I am a socialist. If, on the contrary, socialism stands for the crushing of individual liberty, for despotism, tyranny, oppression and destruction, then I am an opponent of socialism. If the real aim of socialism is "to alter the too great inequality of wealth existing among men," to introduce an equilibrium by taking away from those who have too much, without having worked for it, and giving it to those who have too little inspite of hard work, then I must admit that I am a socialist at heart. If, however, socialists are inspired by a spirit of plunder, intent upon picking the pockets of some who have worked hard and filling those of others who have done no work, then I am not a socialist. If socialism means the end of oppression and exploitation of man by man, "the transformation of society in the sense of justice and equality," the abolition of a regime of persecutions, massacres and fratricidal wars, in a word, if it is idealistic and means progress, then I am proud to be counted among the soldiers of the vast army of socialism. But if the aim of socialism is the introduction of class war, the destruction of the possessing classes, and establishment of dictatorships, in any shape or form, if it is materialistic atheistic and militant, ignoring the terms of right and justice, morality and ethics, then I am certainly not a socialist. If the methods of socialism are persuasion and not force, if its ethics are the basis of peace, appealing to all that is best and noblest in man with a view to introducing an era of peace, justice and equality, then I am happy to be a socialist. If, however, the ethics of socialism are the ethics of war, if

its methods consist in sending the bird of prey to hatch the egg of liberty with a view to producing the dove of peace, then I deprecate such methods. Justice, equality, a more equitable distribution of social wealth, abolition of iniquities, exploitation and misery, are ideals which I highly appreciate and cherish, but destruction, violence, and distatorships I abhor" (pp. v—vi)

Leaving aside the definitions of socialism we pass on to the discussion of its essentials. There is no doubt that the socialists differ from one another in the matter of details, but there seems to be some sort of unanimity among them on certain points. We can discuss the six things for which the socialists stand and those are .

**Essentials
of
Socialism.**

- (1) Greater emphasis on society vis-a-vis the individual,
- (2) equalisation of human conditions,
- (3) destruction of capitalism,
- (4) confiscation of landed-property,
- (5) elimination of private enterprise, and
- (6) ending of competition

Unlike the individualists who stressed too much the importance of the individual, the socialists stand for the welfare of the society as a whole. If the selfish interests of the individuals run counter to the higher interests of the community, a check ought to be put on them. The private interests of the individuals ought to be sacrificed on the altar of society as a whole. To quote Ely, socialism stands for "subordination of the individual to society." It is 'a system which aims at the good of human society as a whole.' They regard the state like an organism of which the individuals are merely the organs. Hence the great importance of the community.

The socialists attack the capitalists system under which there is too much of inequality. Under this

system, most of the wealth is concentrated in the hands of only a few persons. The result is that while the rich suffer from having too much, the poor suffer from having too little or practically nothing. The best interests of the society can be served only if there is comparatively an equality of incomes. At present, while there is too much of waste on the part of the rich, the poor suffer from the privations of hunger and starvation. The principle of equi-marginal utility which is also the principle of maximum utility demands that the too great inequalities of wealth ought to be removed and the majority of the people should be enabled to live as human-beings. Laveleye remarks: "Every socialistic doctrine aims at introducing greater equality into social conditions. Socialism is an equaliser and a leveller." "The ideal," says M. Tugan-Baranowsky, "of equality of men must be recognised as the fundamental ethical tenet of modern socialism." "If you go to the bottom of things," says Woolsey, "the strength of socialism—that which takes hold of the great mass of the party—is not argument, but the demand for equality."

Since the capitalist system is productive of very great evils the socialists stand for its abolition. "You reproach us," says Karl Marx to the bourgeoisie in the Communist Manifesto, "because we would abolish your property. Precisely so, that is our intention." M. Emile Vandervelde says: "The final end which socialism has in view is the collective appropriation of the means of production, distribution and exchange." The socialists contend that since under the capitalist regime, the rich grow richer and the poor poorer—a fact that is hardly desirable, the system ought to go. The nationalisation of factors of production will better the lot of the man in the street. Profits will accrue to society as a whole rather than to any single individual. Some socialists will recommend the downright confiscation of the property of owners, while others suggest the payment of some compensation. Ramsay MacDonald says "Socialism cannot come by confiscation." He abhors the idea of loot.

The socialists fail to find any justification for the exploitation of land by any individual for his personal and selfish purposes only. Robert Blatchford puts the whole case thus "No man has a right to call anything his own but that which he himself has made. No man makes land. The land is not created by labour, but it is the gift of God to all. The earth belongs to the people." His conclusion is that "under socialism, no citizen would be allowed to call a single inch of land his own." As land, says another socialist, "is necessary to all, to deprive men of land except on the landlord's terms, is to deprive them of life except on the landlord's terms." Rent, says Davidson, is brigandage reduced to a system. Marx and Engels repeatedly stated that ownership of small and great holdings "must necessarily be destroyed and annihilated." The socialist condemnation of landlordism is based on the bitter experiences of mankind under this system, e.g. the lot of the people under the ancient regime in France before 1789.

The extinction of private enterprise is merely a corollary of the elimination of the capitalist and the landlord. If none is to own the factors of production, naturally the state becomes the sole employer. Practical socialism, says Blatchford, is a "kind of national scheme of cooperation managed by the state. Its programme consists essentially of one demand, viz, that the land and other instruments of production shall be common property, and shall be used and governed by the people for the people." He concludes thus "Make the land and all instruments of production national property; put all farms, mines, ships, railways and ships under national control and practical socialism is accomplished." What the socialists aim at is that the profits which accrue from national enterprise should not enrich a few but the whole nation and that is possible only if private enterprise is not allowed and all work for the national cause. Tom Johnston remarks "Private enterprise means private robbery."

The socialists contend that the fruits of competition have been very bitter. It has resulted in too much of

economic waste Moreover, there is really speaking no competition between the rich industrialist and the poor factory-hand because of economic inequality. Hence the socialists demand the eradication of competition. Dr. Haden Guest says " Socialism is, to my mind, the substitution of cooperation for competition in local, national and international affairs." What is suggested is that under the socialist regime, the people, instead of competing with one another, will cooperate for the higher interests of the nation as a whole.

CHAPTER II

EXPONENTS OF SOCIALISM.

Karl Marx (May 5, 1818—March 14, 1883) has been recognised on all hands to be the father of scientific socialism. His writings influenced the working-class world to such an extent that socialism became a great political force during his life-time.

Marx belonged to a well-to-do Jewish family which got converted in 1824. His father was a lawyer and mother a Dutch Jewess. He was born at Treves in Prussia. He had a distinguished academic career at the universities of Bonn and Berlin where he studied law and philosophy. From the very start he got interested in politics. In 1842, he edited the *Rheinische Zeitung* at Cologne. In 1843, he left it and went over to France where he came into contact with the pioneers of socialism, *e g.*, Saint-Simon and Proudhon. He published his *Study of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, and also the *Holy Family* (1845) in which he outlined the materialistic conception of history.

In 1848, Marx published the *Communist Manifesto* in collaboration with Dr Engels. It is the most widely read of all socialist documents and has been translated into almost every civilised language of today. 'It contains the clearest and most compact statement of Marx's conceptions of the past struggles between economic classes, the modern bourgeois proletarian conflict, the inevitable movement of present day capitalism towards its own destruction, and the programme of action working classes must adopt in order to fit in their efforts with the actual march of events.'

The *Manifesto* is divided into four parts. The first part contains a history of social evolution in which is

pointed out that the history of society has been one of class war and society is divided into two parts exploiters and exploited. Modern governments are merely committees managing affairs in the interests of the bourgeoisie. The second part deals with the doctrines of the Communist Party and their justification : the programme and the means of its realisation. To bring about the transition from the bourgeois to the proletarian state, the Manifesto suggests the confiscation of capitalist income, progressive taxation, abolition of inheritance, centralisation of credit and means of transport in the hands of the state, nationalisation of all industries and factories and compulsory labour for all. The third part contains a criticism of the existing socialist and communist doctrines, of reactionary and bourgeois socialism, the Utopian socialism of Cabet, Fourier, Owen and others. The fourth part of the Manifesto contains a summary of the position of the Communists and their tactics in the face of opposition. It concludes with a call of action in these words "The Communists disdain to hide their views and aims. They proclaim it openly that their goal can only be reached by a violent overthrow of existing society. May the ruling classes tremble before the approaching Communist socialist revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose in such revolutions but their chains. They have a world to gain. Proletarians of all countries, unite "

In 1849, Karl Marx took refuge in England after a stormy life in France and Germany and spent the rest of his life there. It was there that he read immensely and wrote on a grand scale. But it is to be remembered that in spite of his best efforts, he could hardly make his both ends meet. He had to suffer terribly because of financial difficulties.

In 1859, he wrote his *Criticism of Political Economy*. In 1867 appeared the first volume of his famous work, *Das Kapital* which was completed later on by Dr. Engels from Karl Marx's notes.

He was a man of action and was the moving spirit in the foundation of the International in 1864. It was he

who drafted the Appeal and the States of the Association. Even after the collapse of the First International in 1872, he continued to hold the threads of the International Labour movement and exercised a tremendous influence on the development of socialism.

It has been rightly maintained that Karl Marx was not original in his ideas which were borrowed from the contemporary leaders of thought *e.g.* Hegel, Ricardo, Adam Smith etc. But his real contribution lies in the fact that he could draw conclusions from a combination of the known facts which his predecessors or contemporaries did not. He could make his philosophy serve a purpose which he had set before himself. It is interesting to note how he used the labour theory of value of Ricardo to prove the doctrine of surplus value and Hegel's philosophy of history to propound the economic interpretation of history.

The pivots or cornerstones of Marx's work are the theories of historical materialism or economic determinism and surplus value. The doctrine of economic determinism implies that the real forces that control historical development in all its phases are to be found in the limitations upon the behaviour of man created by the economic position he occupies in the society. Social changes, transformations in religious dogmas and conventional moral standards and political revolutions are brought about by the variations in the methods of production and distribution. It is difficult for the man in the street to rise above the limitations on this thought and judgment fixed by his economic position in the society. At every stage of history, the cultural and political position of my social group depends upon the nature of its function in the production of economic goods. The class that controls the factors of production controls the society. The history of humanity is the history of class-conflict. This struggle of the under-dogs against their masters has taken different forms, *e.g.*, slaves against freemen, plebians against patricians, serfs against barons, journeymen against guildsmen, the bour-

geoisie against the landed aristocracy. But whatever the form, the fact of class-war is fundamental. Marx regarded the French Revolution as a bourgeois revolution. It was an attempt of the middle class to destroy the political superiority of the nobility and the clergy and establish their own supremacy. Similarly, the next phase of the conflict was to be the attempt of the proletariat to dislodge the bourgeoisie from its present position of power. It is to be noted that Marx did not consider himself the author of the idea of class antagonism. He merely took over and extended a theory already in existence to explain the French Revolution. In a letter to Dr. Engels, Marx himself referred to Augustin Thierry as "the father of class struggle in French historical writings." But inspite of this, it cannot be denied that it was the emphasis put on by Marx that this idea of class war became prominent and popular.

Marx preached the inevitability of the destruction of capitalism in the future. His view was that capitalism constantly generated the seeds of its own destruction and he quoted facts and figures to prove his statement. Firstly, the tendency under capitalist production is towards large-scale production and monopoly. This tendency concentrates wealth in the hands of fewer and fewer persons. This results in the fall of the number of the capitalists and gain to the proletarian class. The second tendency is towards local concentration. Its result is that thousands of labourers are assembled at the industrial centres. Their common hardships strengthen in them the feelings of class-consciousness. It is easy for them to deal a blow to capitalism if and when the occasion arises. Thirdly, capitalist production demands world-markets which are possible only if the means of production are highly developed. But this fact facilitates inter-communication among the workers distributed throughout the world and thereby strengthen their solidarity. In the fourth place, capitalist system produces recurring economic crises which become all the more acute as capitalism develops. This makes the position of the capitalists insecure. Finally, the tendency

under capitalism is towards a steady increase in the misery, ignorance and dependency of the workers and this increases their hostility and discontent. "Thus the capitalist system enlarges the number of workers, brings them together into compact group, makes them class-conscious, supplies them with means of inter-communication and co-operation on a world-wide scale, reduces their purchasing power and by increasingly exploiting them arouses them to organised resistance." Marx believed that when the process of capitalism was complete and all wealth was concentrated in the hands of a few capitalists, all that the workers had to do was to destroy them and set up a dictatorship of the proletariat. This doctrine of inevitability of the overthrow of capitalism must have created confidence in the followers of Marx and strengthened the ranks of the socialist workers

Another great contribution of Marx was the idea of surplus value which has been defined by him as "congealed labour" or labour not paid for. It is a common experience that the labourer puts in more work than he is actually paid for. Slaves, serfs and wage-earners have produced and still are producing surplus labour—labour for which they receive no compensation and which goes into the pockets of the capitalists to swell their income.

"The theory of surplus value," says Prof. Sabine, "was professedly an extension of the labour theory of value already stated by Ricardo and the classical economists" (P. 70). According to Adam Smith and Ricardo, "labour produces all wealth" and the labourers have the "the right to the whole produce of labour". But what they actually received was much less than that. A labourer produces the value of his wage in about six hours, while he works for eight or ten hours. He produces value beyond the necessities of life which is called surplus value. Karl Marx pointed out as to how this surplus value was appropriated by the capitalists who made fortunes out of the wealth produced by the labourers. That was evidently unjust that system was to end under a socialist regime because

of the elimination of capitalists and wage-earners, all members of society becoming producers. The national dividend was to be distributed equally among the people, reserving a part for the maintenance of public departments and institutions of the production under the socialist regime may be taken away by those who run the public departments. Thus the surplus value may go into the pockets of the overseers and the rulers.

A question can be asked whether Marx's programme of action to bring about a socialist system was evolutionary or revolutionary. The answer is that it was both evolutionary and revolutionary. We have already noticed as to how Marx believed that the workers should trust in the gradual disintegration of the capitalist system and its final collapse. He wanted the workers to watch the prevailing tendencies in the capitalist system which by slow degrees brought about the solidarity of the working classes and the weakening of the foundations of the capitalist superstructure. This was evidently the evolutionary method.

But in the Manifesto, he definitely advocated revolutionary methods. "Communists openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a communist revolution" The Manifesto recommended to the communists of Germany to co-operate with the bourgeoisie in a revolutionary fight for the overthrow of autocracy because victory would be a "prelude to an immediately following proletarian revolution" against the bourgeoisie. He advocated revolutionary action in connection with the political movements of 1848 in France and Germany. Marx was behind the Paris Commune of 1871.

Moreover, Marx's socialism is revolutionary in the sense that he insisted on the irreconcilability of the interests of the haves and the have-nots and the inevitability of fight between the two.

On the whole it may be said that Karl Marx admitted that "the means for securing political power

might differ at different times and in different countries; the method might be direct economic action at one time and place, a revolution at another and a slow achievement of political predominance at another. His attitude was generally pragmatic."

Marx's view of the state was that he regarded it as an indispensable organisation through whose instrumentality the socialist ideal was to be realised. He did not regard it as a voluntary organisation but one which employed force and compulsion to impose its will on the people. It was an instrument of domination of one class over others. Under the capitalist regime, the state was the engine of tyranny in the hands of the rich to tyrannise over the working class. This very state-machinery was to be employed by the socialists to crush capitalism and all those associated with it.

Marx's attitude towards religion was one of denunciation. He condemned it as "the opium of the people." He held the church responsible for reconciling the people to their position of degradation. Moreover, there was no place for religion in his materialistic philosophy.

To conclude, Karl Marx was the most important social philosopher of the nineteenth century, whose writings have profoundly influenced the thought of the people in every corner of the globe.

Besides Karl Marx, there were other socialist philosophers and it seems desirable to say a few words about the more prominent of them. Dr. Engels (1820-1895) was the friend and collaborator of Marx. He came into touch with Marx in 1844 at Paris and this friendship was life-long. They both shifted to London and joined the Communist League. He took part in the revolutionary movement in Baden and the Palatinate in 1849 and in 1850 settled at Manchester as a manufacturer. He was one of the founders of the International, a member of the general council and kept up relations with the socialists all the world over. He was joint-author with

Marx of the Communist Manifesto and the editor of the second and third volumes of the Das Kapital which were published by Engels from Marx's notes after the death of the latter. He was the most faithful friend of Marx who stood by him through thick and thin.

Saint Simon (1760-1825) has been called the last gentleman and the first socialist. He entered army in 1777, went to America in 1779 and participated in the war of Independence. He went to Holland and returned to France in 1768. In his youth, he gradually conceived the idea of "founding a new social order, based on industry and science."

His view was that great and useful things could be produced only by men of passion. Men like Luther, Bacon and Descartes were all men of passion.

Believing in the perfectability of humanity, he aimed at a better organisation of society, both morally and physically. Instead of exploitation of man by man, he wanted to organise humanity on the basis of "association." He was not in favour of class war. Instead, he wanted the cooperation of labour and capital in industry to produce the best results.

Since in his day, capitalism was still in its infancy, Saint Simon did not notice the antagonism between the industrialists and the labourers. Towards the end of his life, he saw its beginnings.

Saint-Simon did not stand for equality of remuneration which was to be determined according to his occupation or capacity by the directing authority.

Although his scheme has been described as the organisation of an industrial society, he never dreamed of organising society like some factory. The state was to be the manager of the instruments of labour the governing principle being that of merit. No doubt, he criticised society and the present social order but he did not stand for a return to the past, "The poets," he

says, "have placed the golden age at the cradle of humanity, in the midst of the ignorance and vulgarity of our first ancestors. This age, however, was the iron rather than the golden age. The real golden age of humanity is not behind but before us."

It is remarkable to note that Saint-Simon, instead of appealing to the people, constantly appealed to the government and the ruling classes, and hoped that with their assistance he would be able to materialise his hopes of an ideal society

Fourier (1772-1837), the French socialist, was a merchant to start with but having lost riches, he became an agent of a provision-merchant. The enormous destruction of rice stock which he had to resort to, impressed him and he got interested in social reform. According to him, the universe was governed by certain laws which had to be discovered and applied to social life with a view to have happiness and prosperity. There can be harmony in society only if people live in units "large enough to allow all passions" to operate freely. Society should be organised into groups, each of 2,000 soul, and called phalanx. Each phalanx is to live in one building occupied with agriculture, manufacture, commerce, art, science or government. The members of each phalanx are again to be arranged in smaller groups each individual being allowed to shift from one group to another. Under such a system, work will become pleasure and exploitation of the labourers will cease. In 1824, Fourier tried to persuade Owen to put his scheme into practice. After 1831, he got a few followers. In 1832, a phalanstery was established but it failed.

Fourier did not stand for the abolition of private property or inheritance. His solution of the social question was the establishment of associations which will bring about harmony. There will be voluntary grouping of persons for the performance of certain functions.

Robert Owen (1771-1858), the British Communist, was the son of a saddler and was deeply interested in the labour problem of his day. Not only did he try to lessen their sufferings, he also drafted a plan for the reorganisation of society. He appealed in vain, to the European rulers to organise society on the lines suggested by him. He advocated legislation in the labour field and asked the industrialists to carry more for the workers. He bought the mills at New Lanark, and worked there on philanthropic and enlightened principles. Owen drifted to socialism slowly and slowly.

He suggested the creation of agricultural committees consisting of about 2000 persons. The experiment of 1825 failed.

"The name of Owen is closely connected with all the steps towards real progress, with all social reform movements in England and all legislation in the interests of the working classes." Chartism was a result of Owenism and the followers of Owen played an important role in the history of British Trade Unionism. Rightly he can be called the "father of British socialism."

Proudhon (1809-1865) is usually called the "father of Anarchism". Although he declared himself to be a socialist, he not only attacked communism, but was also severely criticised by Marx. He was a socialist in the sense that like a reformer, he wished to organise society on the principles of justice, liberty and equality. His condemnation of communism is very sweeping. "Communism," says Proudhon, "is utopian. Whenever an attempt is made to introduce communism, it results in a caricature of property. I am opposed to communism, and if I am now considered as being the least advanced of socialists, it is because I have left Utopia, whilst the socialists are still in it." He regarded communism as incompatible with family. "It is not science but the annihilation of science. It is incapable of founding a formula of distribution and of organisation. It is eclectic,

unintelligent and unintelligible. It is the religion of misery. It neither thinks, nor does it reason. It does not know how to organise, produce and distribute; it suspects labour and is afraid of justice. It borrows its ideas from the most ancient, mystic, obsolete, vague and undefinable tradition. Communism means privation, everywhere and always."

Proudhon was opposed to privilege and authority. He believed that it was unjust for a person to live on the labour of others.

"Property", declared Proudhon, "is theft." But this statement does not imply that Proudhon was opposed to private property as such. What he condemned was the unjust way in which the people had acquired it. As a matter of fact, he regarded property as essential for liberty and advocated its transmission by inheritance. He says: "Whatever has been said to the contrary, I have never been animated by any thought radically hostile either to the institution of property or to the beneficiaries of property. I have only asked for a better justification of the established right, and this with a view to consolidation and naturally also to reform."

Proudhon was a great upholder of liberty and freedom. "Government of man by man in every form," says Proudhon, "is oppression. The highest perfection of society is found in the union of order and anarchy." No wonder that he has been designated as the Father of anarchism. His philosophy was inspired by humanitarian principles to give justice to those who were oppressed under the prevalent system.

Bakunin (1814-1876), the Russian Anarchist, descended from a noble family and joined the military as an artillery officer. In 1835, he went to Moscow to study philosophy and in 1841 he left for Berlin. His association with A. Ruge turned him into a communist. On his visit to Paris in 1843, he came into contact with Proudhon. In 1847, he was expelled from Paris because of his condemnation of the Russian Government. In 1849,

he became one of the leaders of the revolt at Dresden after which he became a member of the Revolutionary Government. He was three times sentenced to death: first by the Saxon, secondly by the Austrian and finally by the Russian Government, but he was pardoned by the Tsar and transported to Siberia. He managed to escape to Japan, the U. S. A. and finally to London. Under the influence of Marx and Engels, he joined the International but soon turned against them. In 1869, he found the Social Democratic Alliance to propagate his own views. (For his philosophy, see chapter VIII).

Prince Kropotkin (1842-1921) spent the first thirty years of his life either in the Russian army or in doing work of geographical survey and the preparation of maps. He became an authority on physical geography. But it was in 1872 that he visited Switzerland and became a member of the International Workingmen's Association at Geneva. Finding its programme too conservative, he joined the Jura Federation and turned an anarchist. On his return to Russia, he took active part in the Nihilist propaganda. In 1874, he was arrested and imprisoned but he escaped in 1876 and went to England and from there to Switzerland. He visited Paris in 1877 but returned to Switzerland where he edited the revolutionary newspaper, *Le Revolte*. In 1881 he was expelled from Switzerland and went to England and then to France. He was imprisoned there in 1883 but released in 1886. After that he went to England and settled near London and devoted himself to literary work. There he developed his doctrine of "mutual aid." When the Russian revolution broke out in 1917, he went to Russia and settled near Moscow but took no part in politics. He died in 1921.

Kropotkin had a gentle and attractive personality and was respected by all who came into contact with him. He wanted the people to be free from every kind of authority. (For his philosophy, see Chapter VIII).

Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-64) was born of Jewish parents who brought up their son to be a business-man. But Lassalle studied philosophy and philology. He impressed those with whom he came into contact and Heine described him as a wonder-child. He participated in the Revolution of 1848 but his socialist activity is concentrated mainly to two years (1862-4). At this time, the Liberals were trying to win over the support of the working-classes by offering certain palliatives but Lassalle separated the working class movement by giving them a new programme and revealing to them their historic mission. He proposed the establishment of a working men's party independent of other parties, the introduction of universal suffrage, and the establishment of association of production constituted by the working class and provided with capital by the state. He became the leader of the working class. His brilliant speeches electrified the crowds whose idol he became.

Instead of hatred or opposition, he attributed a very lofty role to the state. "The aim of the state is the education and development of liberty in the human race." The state was "the union of individuals which increases a million-fold the forces of the individuals." The state is the organ of right and justice and of general welfare. While isolated individuals do not gain much, they win their victory through the state. His view of the state was purely Hegelian.

Lassalle was responsible for propounding the Iron Law of Wages. The labourers got as remuneration from the capitalists what was bare subsistence. It was this fact that made them dependent on the capitalists.

It is contended that Lassalle did not make any new contribution to political thought. He only popularised the views of the socialists like Marx, Proudhon, Louis Blanc etc. But it cannot be denied that it was the energy of his style, the vigour of his polemics, and his

eloquence and personal influence that stirred all Germany in two years and created the Democratic Socialist Party.

His tragic death was the result of a love-affair. He fell in love with a German lady who was married by her father to Von Racowitza. Lassalle challenged him to a duel in which he was mortally wounded. His death was an irreparable loss to the labour movement in Germany.

Louis Blanc (1811-1882) belonged to poor parents. After failing in law and in the teaching profession, he took up journalism and wrote articles on social questions in 1839. In these, he dissociated himself from the utopianism of Saint Simon and Fourier. While he accepted the fact of the Industrial Revolution, he was opposed to competition and advocated the establishment of "social workshops" which were to be half-cooperative societies and half trade-unions and financed by the state. Thus, private enterprise was to go and a system of collective production was to be established. His battle cry was: From each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs. Everyone had the right to demand from the government the right to work. The state must provide work for all.

The February Revolution of 1848 gave Louis Blanc a chance to give his ideas a practical shape. It was under his direction that the "national workshops" were started. But the government found that it was impossible to feed the ever-increasing numbers of idlers who assembled at Paris from every part of France. Ultimately, the workshops were closed after the bloody fight in the streets of Paris in which about 10 000 were either killed or wounded.

Louis Blanc later on maintained that "the national workshops were nothing more than a rabble of paupers whom it was necessary to feed from want of knowing how to employ them. As the kind of labour in these workshops was utterly unproductive and absurd, being such as the greater part of them were utterly unaccus-

tomed to, the action of the state was simply squandering the public funds; its money a premium upon idleness ; its wages alms in disguise."

Blanc escaped with great difficulty from France and made his way to London where he spent the rest of his life in literary pursuits at the British Museum.

CHAPTER III.

STATE SOCIALISM.

The Socialist demand for collectivism or State Socialism has arisen from the fact that under the capitalist regime, the profits go into the hands of the private individuals. The whole of the industrial system is surcharged with the spirit of private profit. This results in the growth of antagonism between capital and labour which can hardly be considered as conducive to the social good. It is this fact which underlies the socialist demand for the extension of the functions of the state in such a way that in the long run all the factors of production are brought under the control of the government. There will be no private ownership of any industry or any other enterprise. All persons will be employed by the state and paid by it. The state will become the sole employer. All will work for the State.

All profits will accrue to the state. Theory of surplus value will find no place. There will be a feeling in the minds of the workers that the rich or capitalists would not profit from their efforts. If they worked more, that would increase the national dividend which was to be utilized not for the comforts of the rich capitalists, but for the amelioration of the lot of those who have worked. The increased national output was bound to be used for the increase in the wages of the labourers and the lowering of the prices for the consumers.

If the government is the sole employer, how are the workers to be compensated? Will everybody be given an identical wage? No. Will everybody work according to his capacity and receive from the state according to his needs? No. According to the state-socialists, every body will be paid according to the efficiency of his work. While an efficient worker will get higher wages,

a dullard will have to be contented with less. There will be a regular gradation of officers. The work will be in the hands of an efficient civil service.

The state-socialists insist on the employment of strictly constitutional methods for the transfer of the factors of production from the hands of the private individuals into those of the state. They belong to the evolutionary school and believe in parliamentary methods. They do not advocate the sudden and revolutionary transfer of control. The machinery of the state is to be employed for the gradual transfer of the control from the private individuals. There is to be no indiscriminate whole-sale confiscation of industries managed and controlled by the capitalists. But it has been pointed out that if the state were to pay for all those private enterprisers, there would be an enormous increase of public debt. The outcome of this will be the lowering of the wages and the rise of prices two things which go counter to the intention of the state-socialists. But this does not seem to be an insurmountable difficulty. If we accept Laski's view regarding the disposal of property, there will not arise any difficulty. Their owners of property will be given bonds indicating as to how much the government owes to them. They will get money from the government accordingly. But their claims are not to be inherited by their descendants. The government is to make provision for the owners of property, their wives and children. As soon as the owners are dead, and children have come of age and are in a position to earn their livelihood, the obligations of the government will end. There will be no more claims to be met. Thus the danger of high prices and low wages can be avoided. But it will take some time before state-socialism is established.

The recent trend all the world over has been towards extension of the economic activities of the states. Every year brings an increased control of the state in various fields. Bismarck may have been the first European statesman to follow this path, but many countries are following in his footsteps to-day. Thus, the control

of the government has enormously increased in Germany, Japan, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, United State of America and Italy. Even in an individualist country like Great Britain, collectivism is making a headway. The New Deal of Roosevelt was a step in that direction. The national economy of Germany, Russia and Italy is under the control of government.

But does the extension of the state-control indicate a step towards state-socialism? No. The mere increase of the state functions does not and cannot achieve the aims for which the state-socialists stand. The implied economic dictatorship of the state may be in the interests of those who have control over the political power. The lot of the man in the street may remain as it is. Hence, state-socialism implies a system under which all the factors of production are brought under the control of government with a view to eliminate private profit and thereby better the lot of the masses. The establishment of collectivism has a distinct end and that is the improvement of the condition of the poor and thereby avoid the existing class-antagonism between labour and capital. State-socialism implies the abolition of capitalism as such.

No one can deny the benefits to be derived from a state-socialist regime. The evils of cut-throat competition will be eliminated. Since the state controls all the factors of production and one has necessarily to buy from a state-depot, there is no necessity of competitive advertisement with a view to capture markets. There will be no duplication of machinery. As there is a single post-man for a particular locality, there will be only one government depot in a specified area. There will not be many bus-services operating between two places, but only one. Thus, all the benefits of large scale production and division of labour will be secured. There will be greater efficiency and promptitude. The system will be worked purely from the standpoint of social good.

It is pointed out that the nationalisation of factors of production would remove one of the most important

sources of war. In modern times, the governments go to war because the capitalistic interests that manufacture armaments, hope to make profits in the event of war. The armament manufacturers may do all they can to bring to power a party with an aggressive programme and thereby achieve their object. Under the present conditions, while they reap the profits, the whole nation pays for it. But since under a state-socialist regime, no particular interest stands to gain from war and everyone has to pay, the tendency to war will be checked.

But it may be contended that in a way, state socialism might encourage war. Since all the people under a state-socialist regime stand to gain because of a greater and larger share in the profits of the nation's business, there will be greater enthusiasm to support the nation in its economic struggles against other countries.

State-socialism, it is argued, has certain indirect but extremely important psychic effects which must encourage the growth of internationalism. In developing the principle of national solidarity ("each for all and all for each") within the nation, it may pave the way for international solidarity.

State-socialism has been attacked on many grounds. In the first place, the system would result in cast-iron centralisation. Nationalisation would result in the concentration of all the factors of production in the hands of the government. That would mean that there would be left no room for private initiative. There would be too much of red-tapeism. There is a possibility of reduction of the out-put. Since none has a personal stake in the work, none may care for it. Human nature as it is, there does not seem to be any prospect of the people putting in more work simply because they feel that they are working for the society.

Moreover, there are great possibilities of corruption, intrigues and unfairness. The system might have worked well in case the persons who were to work the administrative machinery, were gods and above all worldly temptations. That was possible only if the philosophers

of the Republic of Plato were available. But the things as they are, there will be too much of nepotism, favouritism and jobbery. It is only the party in power and those who are associated with it, that will gain. The interests of others are bound to be prejudiced.

Since the party that comes to power will have an enormous amount of patronage, the struggle to capture power will become very acute. The contesting parties know that while the winners will have all, those who lose the race for power, will lose heavily. The losing party will have no lucrative posts.

There will come into existence cliques and bosses who will try to dominate and manipulate the things in their own interests. That would be hardly desirable.

State-socialism is deprecated also by the socialists who consider it to be a half-measure. They maintain that the object of state socialism is merely to pacify the labouring classes by means of palliatives and thus draw them away from real socialism. Real socialism is revolutionary in its tendencies in so far as it strive for a radical change of the existing social system, whilst state-socialism is conservative and evolutionary.

CHAPTER IV.

FABIANISM.

The Fabian Society was founded in England in January 1884 by a band of reformers prominent among whom were Sydney Webb, George Bernard Shaw, Sydney Olivier, Graham Wallas, Mrs. Annie Besant, Headlam and Pease. Its name was discovered for it and revealed to it by Frank Podmore who put before the socialists for adoption the technique of the Roman Fabius Cunctator in these words: "For the right movement, you must wait, as Fabius did, most patiently, when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays, but, when the time comes, you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless"

There were certain circumstances which favoured the foundation of the society in 1884. After 1878, the tide of prosperity had begun to ebb in England. Because of the competition from the Prairie products, agriculture began to decline in England. The rivalry of the U. S. A. and the German Empire had its repercussion on English industry. As a result of protectionist policy followed by other states, English commerce also suffered because many foreign markets were closed to her merchants. It was in this atmosphere that the Fabians started their propaganda.

The Fabians reject the materialistic conception of history and the doctrine of economic determinism. They do not believe in the inevitable, automatic and scientific process by which a social revolution would come of its own accord. They do not believe in the theory of class-war and forcible revolution. They stand for the progressive transforma-

tion of the society into such channels as would remove the glaring inequalities that are due to the capitalistic system of society. The Fabianists do not condemn down right capitalism or identify it with "exploitation."

They do not believe in the theory of surplus value as given by Karl Marx. They do not take "abstract labour" as the basis of value. However, they emphasise the apparent fact that labourers are perpetually exploited by landlords and capitalists and they place the elimination of the capitalists and expropriation of the landlords in the fore-front of their programme. According to the Fabianists, value is fixed by the point where "marginal effort" coincides with "marginal utility". Bernard Shaw became one of the great champions of utility theory of value

Unlike the communists who maintain that the state will "wither away" and disappear altogether, the Fabianists propose to make state the main organ for the permanent administration of the cooperative commonwealth.

The Fabians believe in evolution and not revolution, constitutional and not violent, methods. They advocate reform as opposed to destruction. Moderation is the keynote of their technique. There is a policy of persuasion and "permeation". They avoid giving shocks to society. They try to suggest that they are not socialists at all but mere social reformers. They endeavour to win over the sympathy of all persons and impress upon them the fact that socialism is nothing more than applied Christianity

Their method of attack on capitalism is one of sapping rather than that of assault, of craft rather than force, of subtlety rather than violence. "Permeation" has been their watchword. They try to create the impression that socialism and collectivism are synonymous terms and that they are aiming at a harmless and beneficent extension of state and municipal enterprise. The effective source of propaganda has been the publica-

tion of a large number of tracts by the Fabian society and tract no 5 is the most famous.

The Fabian methods have been the object of severe criticism. "The Fabian writers", says Mallock, "have been playing fast and loose with their language and their thoughts; whilst defining socialism as being in its essence one thing viz., the elimination of the capitalist, the expropriation of the landlord, the extinction of private enterprise, the eradication of competition), when looking for examples of it they mean quite another (viz., mere state and municipal enterprise, the setting up of gas works, water works, baths, laundries and the like)". E Barker says: The Fabian Society is the least open and least straightforward socialist organisation. It habitually and on principle sails under a false flag, wishing not to arouse suspicion, as to its objects Fabians rely for their success chiefly on their artfulness Arnold Forster says that the Fabians "do not come into this controversy with clean hands." Skelton designates the Fabians as "the typical opportunists of socialists." "They have laboured ingeniously to show that an unconscious socialism is already in full swing in Britain, in post office and public schools, in hawker's licences and factory inspection and income taxation, drawing the deduction that the nation as will be hanged for a sheep as for a lamb, and go consciously to the end of the socialist road" Dr Engels wrote thus to Sorge: "Their (Fabian) tactics are to fight the liberals not as decided opponents, but to drive them on to socialistic consequences: therefore to trick them, to permeate liberalism with socialism and not to oppose socialistic candidates to liberal ones, but to palm them off, to thrust upon them, under some pretext. All is rotten." The Fabians have been called "the Jesuits of Socialism".

The Fabians have been designated as the socialists of the chair. But this is inappropriate for among the Fabians were not only the professors and lawyers but also the members of other professions and trade union.

The Fabian form of socialism explains its origin, for the English believe in a policy of moderation, revision and evolution. They believe in a policy of compromise. That is why the Fabians aim at transforming the capitalist society in such a way that while its evils are removed, no revolutionary change takes place. If the state, in pursuit of a policy of nationalisation, tries to control the land, and the factories, it does not merely turn out the powers, but gives them a fair compensation for the property confiscated.

It cannot be denied that the Fabian ideas have immensely affected the labour movement and their literature has influenced the man in the street. Their ideas reached every home because of the eminent writers who were its members. Since everybody read G. B. Shaw, his philosophy was bound to mould the thoughts of the readers to some extent.

CHAPTER V

GUILD-SOCIALISM.

"Guild Socialism" says Cole, "is based on the idea of partnership between the producers and the state in the control of industry. Guild socialism recognises that the state is necessary and that a purified parliament is necessary. At the same time, Guild Socialists hold that the first need of socialism is the placing of industrial power in the hands of the workers, and that without such industrial freedom, every change in the structure of society must be a bureaucratic sham." Guild Socialists scoff at the idea of state arranging matters and they regard that as "bureaucracy masquerading as democracy." Guild Socialists maintain that "real and effective power ought to be in the hands of the workers."

The philosophy of guild socialism was propounded by the English intellectuals in the first and second decades of the 20th century as a protest against the centralising tendencies of state-socialism. Its basic principles were propounded by S. G. Hobson, A. H. Pentty and A. R. Orage and popularised by G. D. H. Cole. Pentty was of the opinion that under large-scale production, practically no scope was left for beauty and craftsmanship. The individuality of the worker disappeared because he was only one of the very many who contributed to the making of the thing which came into the hands of the consumer in its finished form. The worker was merely a cog in the machine. For this reason, he suggested the organisation of guilds on the lines of those which existed in Medieval Europe. Cole's writings, viz., 'World of Labour' (1913), 'Self-government in Industry' (1917), 'Labour in the Commonwealth' (1918), 'Chaos and Order in Industry' (1920), 'Social Theory' (1920), and

Guild Socialism Restated (1920) popularised the guild socialist philosophy. The advocates of the theory got an opportunity to give their philosophy a practical shape after 1919 when they set up the Builders' Guild for the purpose of satisfying the demand for more houses. Although it worked for some time and it got from the government contracts to build houses, the organisation soon collapsed. The National Guilds League was dissolved in 1925. Cole has repudiated most of his Guild-Socialism and others have turned their attention somewhere else.

The guild socialists attacked the capitalist system of production because the labourers did not get their due share of production. They refused to recognise the right to property as such. No one was entitled to property unless he rendered some useful social service. They protested against "the dehumanising" effects of the machine system on the workers. The labourer became merely a feeder of the machine. His work was merely a routine and repetition of the same processes.

The Guild Socialists attacked the present political structure of society. Political democracy, at its best, guarantees to ordinary men the opportunity not to govern themselves but only to choose their governors and that also only in the realm of political activity. Since members of the legislature were elected by certain localities and not by economic interests, they did not represent all the interests of the people. A man who represented a locality, could not be expected to decide the question of the relations between the consumers and the producers.

It is to remove this defect that the guild socialists¹ advocated *functional democracy*, i. e., the organisation of society on functional basis. It is contended that it is out of the question for any one person to represent any other person. All that he can do is to represent those interests which he has in common with his neighbours. Thus a professor of political science might represent the interests of others in the same field. Likewise, a

student-leader might represent the interests of other students. Representation to be real must be functional or it is no representation at all. There should be as many separately elected groups of representatives as there are distinct and essential groups of functions to be performed. Man should have as many distinct and separate votes as he has distinct social purposes or interests. Each industry and each technical and cultural service should be administered by a co-operative organisation of all those who work in industry or service. A guild is defined as "a self-governing association of mutually dependent people organised for the responsible discharge of a particular function of society." Each guild must include all workers who take part in the particular service for which the guild exists, whether that work is skilled or unskilled, manual, technical, clerical, administrative or managerial. The guild must be self-governing to the fullest extent, subject to the condition that it fulfils its obligations to the community. It is autonomous but not absolutely free.

The guild-socialists differed on the question as to whether the guilds should remain local or be organised on a national basis. A minority were against national organisation because they opposed the centralising tendencies of a national organisation. But the majority were in favour of the idea. While they contended that a considerable degree of local autonomy be provided for, they felt the necessity of coordinating the work of various local guilds. The degree of centralisation was to depend upon the nature of the industry. Coal-mining industry was to be organised on a national basis.

Each guild association was to be so organised that production could be coordinated on a national scale. Due allowance was to be made for the differences in localities and crafts. Individual initiative and self-expression were to be encouraged. While a lot of independence was to be allowed to the local guild, appeals could be taken to the national guild. According to Cole, a national "Industrial Guild Congress", repre-

senting all national guilds, was to be the final representative of the guild system on its industrial side. It would be the guild legislature and the ultimate court of appeal in purely guild questions. It was to decide disputes among the various guilds. It was to lay down the general principles of guild conduct. It would levy taxes to collect money necessary for its expenditure. It would serve as a representative of the producers in the negotiations with the representatives of the consumers.

To guard against the potential danger arising out of the control of production by the guilds, the guild-socialists provided for joint consultation of the Producers' Guilds and Consumers' Councils. The questions of costs and prices and the nature and extent of production were to be settled in the joint sittings.

The advocates of functional democracy stand for devolution of powers and functions to various guilds and associations which represent the various aspects of the complicated life of man. The reason why the guild-socialists applied the theory of functional democracy to industry was their belief that "economic power precedes political power". Those who wield economic power also control political power. Political democracy was a sham and meaningless unless democracy was established in the economic or industrial field. If the capitalistic hold over industry was allowed to exist, there could be no independence in the political field, because the great business magnates had in their hands the power to manouvre the political machinery to their own liking. Hence, guild-socialists stood for the elimination of the control of the capitalists from the field of production and giving it to the workers. They stood for the democratisation of control in the field of production.

The principle of functional democracy can be applied not only in the industrial but also in the political and social spheres. It can and should be extended to the local and national government,

While the guilds and trade-unions resemble in certain respects, they also differ in certain others. Both aim at the betterment of the lot of the workers by strengthening their organisation and safeguarding their interests. But while a trade-union is an organisation of the manual workers, a guild includes all the workers both by hand and brain, from the coolie to the manager. While the function of the trade union is to fight against the employers in order to raise the wages and shorten the number of hours of work of the labourers, a guild is concerned with the working of the industry. A trade union is created for militant purposes in the capitalist society. A guild is organised for the peaceful object of working the industrial machinery and controlling production. Under the guild socialist society, trade unions will be transformed into guilds.

The guild socialists did not believe in the revolutionary methods for the transformation of capitalist society into a guild socialist society. They advocated the support of all those governmental measures which aimed at improving the lot of the labourers. Their policy was to go on gradually improving the condition of the workers. To realise that end, they advocated the enlarging and developing of the trade union membership by making every one a member of some trade union. This would strengthen their organisation and hence their position.

They were also to follow a policy of "encroaching control," wresting bit by bit from the hands of the possessing classes the economic power which they now exercise, by a steady transference of functions and rights into the hands of the representatives of the working classes. The employees were to have what the employers had. This policy requires that the workers should have the right to choose the workshop foremen, regulate discipline in the shop, and to hire and discharge workers.

The workers were to follow the system of collective contract under which the employer agreed to

pay a lump sum of money for a specific amount of work, leaving it to the workers to divide amongst themselves the work. This system would inculcate the sense of responsibility among the workers and thereby fit them for higher jobs. The gradual guildising process was to be carried on in private industries and publicly owned enterprises.

The guild socialists believed in the method of gradual and peaceful displacement and dispossession of the capitalists. They were opposed to revolution and direct action. Cole advocated the consolidation of all the forces of workers on the lines of evolutionary development.

While the guild socialists recognise the state as an indispensable institution of society, they differ as to the position and sphere of state-activity. Some suggested that the National Guild Congress should be made the final authority in all purely industrial matters and the state should remain supreme in all purely political affairs. While the former was to represent the workers, the latter was to safeguard the interests of the consumers.

While Hobson and Cole were agreed on the principle that mere generalisations would not do and a line of demarcation will have to be drawn between the sphere of function of state and those of guilds, they differed in the matter of details. According to Hobson, the state was to continue as the representative of the community as a whole. It was to remain supreme although it delegated some of its functions to other associations. The state was to own the plants and tools which it leased out to the guilds. It was to decide questions of fair-play to the general economic policy. It was to be a court of final appeal in cases of dispute amongst the guilds. It was to levy taxes on guilds. It was to finance the various guilds which supplied free the amenities of life, e. g., education. It was to decide the broad outlines of the policy of the guilds. The state was to make and enforce

the civil and criminal law. It was to give military protection and maintain an army and a navy for that purpose. The state was to control international relations.

Unlike Hobson, Cole does not make the state supreme and omnipotent. He puts it on the same footing as the other guilds. It is to possess and exercise powers proportionate to its functions. While the guilds are to regulate the conditions of production, the state is to control the means of production and regulate prices and distribution of income. The state is also to perform political functions: defence of the community, control of marriages and divorce, education of children, care of defective and dependent persons, prevention and punishment of crime. In order to meet the contingency arising out of the conflict between the state and the guilds, Cole advocates the creation of a "Democratic Supreme Court of Functional Equity," which was to act as the final court of appeal. Thus the state was not to remain supreme. This new body was to possess and exercise the supreme powers of coercion. These were his views to start with.

But later on, Cole changed his own view regarding the state. Relegating the state to an insignificant position, he advocated the delegation of all the functions to the guilds. He came to believe that the state could be allowed to wither away and ultimately disappear altogether, "either after a frontal attack or by atrophy following upon dispossession of its vital powers."

According to Cole, the various guilds were to be organised into communes. The communes which were to have separate powers and functions, were to be of three kinds: local, regional and national. They will have extensive and important powers in the matter of control of prices, the allocation of financial resources among the various industries and services, the revision of budgets of the various guilds, taxation of guilds, issue of credit and the settlement of disputes among func-

tional bodies on the question of policy. They will be the authority for the division of powers among the various functional bodies. This they will do by making "constitutional laws" which define the sphere of each body and provide for settlement of disputes. The communes will have the power to declare war and peace, control the armed forces, conduct the foreign relations, fix the boundaries of towns and regions and control personal and private-property relationships. They will possess the power of compelling individuals and functional bodies to conform to their laws and decisions.

The guild-socialists would like to put an end to or modify the employer-employee, master-servant relation in the economic field. The state is retained, although it is given less powers and functions. The guild socialists popularised the pluralist doctrine. Their fundamental demand was that the whole structure of society should be made more democratic and the workers should be emancipated from the tyranny of the capitalist regime.

CHAPTER VI.

SYNDICALISM.

The word syndicalism is derived from syndicat which is the ordinary term for labour-union or trade union in France. This origin of the word itself points out to the close relationship between syndicalism and the workers. As a matter of fact, the whole of the philosophy of socialism is based on the organisation of labourers in France.

The reason why the syndicalist movement made its appearance in all its violence in France was that till the middle of the nineteenth century, the labourers were not allowed to form their own associations and agitate for the betterment of their position. Later on, when their right to form associations and agitate for their rights was recognised by the laws of 1864, 1868 and 1884, they formed their own organizations. They created, in the first instance, not syndicats but bourses du travail or labour exchanges. One was set up in Paris in 1887 and others were founded in provincial towns. In 1893 a national federation of the bourses (Federation des bourses du Travail de France) was formed, and it became the centre of the labour movement in France. In 1895, a new organisation known as the General Federation of Labour (Confederation General du Travail) or "C. G. T." was created and it became the chief national labour organisation in France.

To distinguish between a Bourse and a Syndicat, it may be said that while a Bourse du Travail is a local organisation not of one trade but of local labour in general, intended to serve as a labour exchange and to perform such functions for labour as chambers of commerce perform for the employer. A Syndicat is in general a local organisation of a single industry and is

thus a smaller unit than the Bourse du Travail. Under the leadership of Pelloutier, the Federation des Bourses made greater progress than the C. G. T. and ultimately the two organisations got merged into one in 1902. As a result of this, the local syndicat was federated twice over, once with the other syndicats in the same locality, forming together the Bourse du Travail, and again with the syndicats of the same industry in other parts of the country. The merit of the organisation was that while the national federation of industries was to check parochialism, the local organisation was to check the trade-union spirit. Thus the workers were to learn at once the solidarity of all workers in a locality and those in the whole trade. The result was to be the solidarity of the whole working class.

The two persons who played the most important part in the development of the Syndicalist philosophy were Pelloutier and Sorel. The former believed that the working classes should not associate themselves with the rest of the nation, but scrupulously avoid participation in politics. They were to improve their lot, not through parliamentary activities, but by their own co-operative efforts, acting through labour exchanges.

If Pelloutier was a practical organiser of the movement, Sorel affected it by his philosophy. His view was that 'the whole future of socialism resides in the autonomous development of working men's syndicats'. He emphasised the importance of keeping the details of a syndicalist society in the dark. His view was that they could be learnt through a process of intuition by the working classes. He believed in the importance of the myth. He would like to hold before the workers an ideal which could be understood by the workers alone through intuition, and not reasoning. The object of creating the idea of a myth was to inspire confidence among the workers regarding the brilliance of the future without saying in so many words what that was like.

The syndicalists are not agreed on the question of the goal they aim at. Philosophers like Sorel would

allow the workers to imagine for themselves as to the future state of things. They do not believe in giving to the workers a clear prevision of the objective they have to fight for. But inspite of this, there are certain things which can be called the aims and objects of the syndicalists.

The syndicalists stand for the destruction of the state which they regard as a capitalist institution, designed to safeguard the interests of the capitalists and crush the workers if they take it into their head to revolt against the socio-political system. They came into conflict with the might of the state on many occasions and in 1907 and 1908, protesting against blood-shed which had occurred in the suppression of strikes, the committee of the C. G. T. issued statements in which it designated the goverment as "a government of assassins" and Prime Minister as "Clemenceau the murderer." Since they find the state weighted against the workers and always in alliance with the capitalists, they aim at the destruction of the state and along with it the capitalist system.

The syndicalists are anti-militarist, because troops have been employed on many occasions to break the strikes of the workers. They are opposed to wars on the ground that the workers have nothing to do with the objects for which the politicians drag their countries into wars. Since they are concerned only with the interests of the workers which they regard to be the same everywhere all the world over, they can rightly be called internationlists. They would refuse to participate in those wars which are engineered by the capitalists to serve their own end. It is this anti-militarist attitude of theirs that brought them into conflict with the state during the years preceding the last Great War.

Some writers have given an idea of the state of society under the syndicalist regime. There will be boycott for profiteers, punishment for idlers. Prisons and court houses will be abolished because there will be

no necessity for them. There will be no professional army, no military schools, no barracks or offensive armaments. In each union, there will be armed troops for protection against counter-revolutionary disturbances. Battalions of the unions are to be created for defence. The people will arm themselves to protect themselves.

The object of the syndicalists is not only to improve the lot of workers, but also to set aside the capitalist regime and thereby put the workers in charge of the whole industrial system. They do not want the workers to be employed by the employers because in that case the workers have no choice. They want the workers to control work itself. There should be no compulsion. They believe in the ideal of "free work in a free society". But that is possible only if capitalism is superseded and the workers become the masters of the industrial system. It is evident that the syndicalist philosophy is concerned only with the view-point of the producers or the workers and not the consumers.

Unlike the socialists who advocate the employment of political methods for the realisation of their goal, the syndicalists insist on the effectiveness of the industrial methods. They have a positive hatred against the parliamentary methods because many a French politician who started his political career as a socialist, ended it by employing very often the army to suppress the strikes of the workers. Millerand was a socialist but after joining the Waldeck-Rousseau ministry in 1899, he ceased to all intents and purposes, to be a socialist. But this case was not a solitary one, although it was the most dramatic. It is because of these desertions that the syndicalists have come to distrust the effectiveness of the parliamentary methods for the capture of political power. The syndicalists are emphatically opposed to participation in elections and the assumption of office under the present socio-industrial system. They want the workers to boycott the parliamentary field altogether and keep the fire of class-war burning. They

believe that playing with the parliamentary tools and association with those who run the present social, political and industrial system will blunt the edge of their hatred against the capitalists and diminish the spirit of class-consciousness which they regard to be essential for uprooting the capitalist system.

The chief industrial methods advocated by the syndicalists are the strike, the sabotage, the boycott and the label. As regards strikes, they are of two types, ordinary strikes and the general strike. Ordinary strikes are to be considered merely rehearsals. It is these strikes which are to perfect the organisation of the workers and bring about among them a sense of solidarity. It is on the occasion of strikes and the suffering involved therein that the workers come near one another and their hatred against the system increases because of oppressions and tyrannies perpetrated on them. These strikes are not to be resorted to for the purpose of securing a few concessions here and there. The only object is to strengthen the feelings of class-consciousness among them and train them for their final struggle against the existing system. When ordinary strikes had established solidarity and discipline among the workers, they were to resort to a General Strike which means the complete cessation of work by a sufficient proportion of the wage-earners to bring about the paralysis of capitalism. Sorel's view was that the General Strike was to be regarded as a myth, like the Second Coming in Christianity. But the active syndicalists do not accept this point of view. They contend that if the General Strike is to be a mere myth, their energy would flag and their enthusiasm to fight will disappear. They insist upon the belief in the possibility, nay certainty, of a General Strike.

Sabotage in its various forms has been strongly advocated by these apostles of "direct action". Some forms of sabotage are innocent while others are highly objectionable, nay, even criminal. One form of sabotage which has been adopted by shop-assistants is to tell

customers the truth about the articles they are buying. Another form adopted on the railways—especially in Italy—was to obey all the rules so literally and exactly as to throw the whole machinery out of gear. Another form is to do the work with so much care that it is better done although the output is small. The objectionable forms of sabotage include the causing of railway accidents, keeping a loophole in some essential part of the otherwise expensive machinery and thereby cause loss to the "haves", wilfully breaking apparatus or engine etc., with a view to harm the capitalists. Although these violent methods are not approved of by the man in the street, they are justified by the syndicalists on the ground that all is fair in their war against the capitalists. They regard the state and capitalism as their enemies and would not hesitate to employ any means to bring about its collapse. End justifies the means.

Whatever, says Russell, may be thought of the practicability of syndicalism, there is no doubt that the ideas which it has put into the world, have done a great deal to revive the Labour Movement and recall certain things of fundamental importance which it had been in danger of forgetting. Syndicalists consider man as producer rather than consumer. They are more concerned to procure freedom in work than to increase material well-being. They have revived the quest for liberty, which was growing somewhat dimmed under the regime of parliamentary socialism and they have reminded men that what our modern society needs is not a little tinkering here and there, not the kind of minor readjustments to which the existing holders of power may readily consent, but a fundamental reconstruction, a sweeping away of all the sources of oppression, a liberation of man's constructive energies and a wholly new way of conceiving and regulating production and economic relations. (P. 95, *Roads to Freedom*).

Syndicalism affected not only the labour movement in France, but also in other countries. In 1905, the Industrial Workers of the World or I. W. W. was

founded at Chicago. It also affected the labour movement in England. But the old revolutionary and aggressive form of syndicalism disappeared from France after the War (1919). The new syndicalists gave up their opposition to the state and joined other socialists to fight against the government in order to better the condition of workers. But they did not present any united front. They quarrelled among themselves. New syndicalism condemns violence and dictatorship.

CHAPTER VII.

COMMUNISM.

Although the term Communism was originally used as almost synonymous with socialism, it is convenient, says Dr. E. Lederer in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "to apply the term 'Communism' to those movements in particular which rest, to a greater or less degree, on Marx's and Engel's Communist Manifesto, which identify communism with the cause of the proletariat, as a party to the class war, and which, as the corollary to this train of thought, look to the communalising of means of production to bring about not merely increased total production and total consumption, and juster distribution, but also a radical reorganisation of all conditions of life whatsoever, all creative achievement, the whole spiritual contents of the age." Communism is distinct from socialism in so much as it stands not only for the socialisation of all factors of production but also of all goods of consumption. Strict communism teaches not "to each according to his work" but "to each according to his needs." It stands for a social system in which life is lived in common, the people being provided with the necessities of life according to their requirements. Communism advocates greater equality than socialism.*

Communism as a social system has existed from time immemorial. Property, in the beginning of social development, was communistic. Communism or life in

*Cf. the popular view of communism as found in the following lines of the Corn-Law Rhymer : -

What is a Communist? One that has yearnings
For equal division of unequal earnings
Idler or burglar, or both, he is willing
To fork out his penny and pocket your shilling.

common was practised by the Essenes, the Therapeutae, and the early Christian Church. Both Plato and Aristotle were in favour of communism. The republic of Plato outlines a scheme of Communistic society in which life was lived in common. Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* depicts also a communist society. Harrington's *Oceana* and Campanella's *Sonnenstaat* belong to the same category.

The difficulties in the way of presenting in a short space a correct idea of communism are great because the material is scattered not only in the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Trotsky and others but also in the practical working of the Soviet machinery of Russia and the resolutions passed by the Third International.

The Communists believe in the materialistic interpretation of history as given by Marx. They maintain that economic motive is the driving power behind all human activity. There is and has been the division of society into two parts, the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots. The relation between the two is one of hostility. The rich are the oppressors and the have-not or proletarian class is oppressed by them. There can be no reconciliation between the rich capitalists and the class-conscious proletariat. Class-war is inevitable. The two parts can never work harmoniously. A deadly struggle goes on ceaselessly.

There is not only exploitation under the capitalist system, it is also inefficient. It does not serve the purpose of society. Since the things are produced not for use but for profit, the capitalist manufacturers stop producing them when they find that they cannot make a decent profit out of the adventure. Consequently the people suffer. Competition among the individualists results in waste, and we witness very often the economic crises which are the product of the capitalist system.

Capitalism brings in its wake inequality of wealth and that results in the inequality of power, social

status and cultural opportunity. The machinery of the state is employed to support and maintain the status quo. Not only are the laws made to serve the interests of the capitalists, even the judges interpret those laws in their favour. The critics of capitalism are dubbed as enemies of the state and the society. Whatever the form of government, the wealthy manage to control it through their possession of the main organs of propaganda and education. schools, colleges, churches and the press. Democracy is not the rule of the people, but those of the bourgeoisie. Congresses and Parliaments, presidents and cabinets are all directed by the haves. While the bourgeoisie are given all kinds of freedom, there is censorship, martial law, detention and pogroms for the have-nots.

The Communists put forward their own suggestions in order to end this unsatisfactory state of affairs. They are emphatic on the point that the transition from capitalism to a socialistic society cannot be effected by constitutional means. They have no faith in the existing parliamentary institutions to do the needful. They have no trust in the officials to carry out the programme they have before them. It is true that Karl Marx pointed out the inherent inconsistencies in the capitalist system which are ultimately to lead to its degeneration and overthrow, yet the communists do not believe in sitting quiet and watching the process. "The substitution", says Lenin in "The state and the Revolution", "of a proletarian for a capitalist state is impossible without a violent revolution." It is recognised that revolutionary methods must be adopted to bring about the fall of capitalism.

The communist programme of action is explained in the Second Congress (1920) of the Third International in these words :

"The victory of Socialism over Capitalism—as the first steps to Communist—demands the accomplishment of the three following tasks by the proletariat, as the only revolutionary class.

The first task is to lay low the exploiters, and above all the bourgeoisie as their chief economic and political representatives; to defeat them completely, to crush their resistance; to render impossible any attempts on their part to re-impose the yoke of capitalism and wage-salary.

The second is to inspire and lead in the footsteps of the revolutionary advance guard of the proletariat, its Communist Party not only the whole proletariat or the great majority, but the entire mass of workers and those exploited by capital, to enlighten, organise, instruct, and discipline them during the course of the bold and mercilessly firm struggle against the exploiters, to wrench this enormous majority of the population in all the capitalist countries out of their state of dependence on the bourgeoisie, to instil in them, through practical experience, confidence in the leading role of the proletariat and its revolutionary advance-guard.

The third is to neutralise or render harmless the inevitable fluctuations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, between bourgeois democracy and Soviet Power, on the part of that rather numerous class in all advanced countries . . . "

The Communists believe that not only is the power to be snatched by workers from the capitalists in a revolutionary way, they have to employ force to keep it. They have to use the machinery of the state to break the resistance of the capitalists in order to save the Communist Society from their future onslaughts. Lenin confessed that "in any and every serious revolution, a long, obstinate, desperate resistance of the exploiters, who for many years will yet enjoy great advantages over the exploited, constitutes the rule. Never will the exploiters submit to the decision of the exploited majority without making use of their advantages in a last desperate battle in a series of battles." Marx put the same thus : "In order to break down the resistance

of the bourgeoisie, the workers invest the state with a revolutionary and temporary form" Engels says: "The party which has triumphed in the revolution is necessarily compelled to maintain its rule by means of that fear with which its arms inspire the reactionaries. If the Commune of Paris had not based itself on the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie, would it have maintained itself more than twenty four hours?"

The reason why the capitalists were to be destroyed wholesale was that there was a danger of their marshalling their force and overthrowing the Communist Society. This distrust or suspicion of theirs is amply proved by the triumph of General Franco in Spain against the Communist Republican Government and the victory of capitalism under Hitler in Germany. But that danger is eliminated in case the capitalists along with their institutions are destroyed root and branch.

It is clear that during that transitional period of change from Capitalist to Communist Society, there is to be the dictatorship of the proletariat. The labourers who capture power, are to use the machinery of the state which was formerly employed by the bourgeoisie to oppress the working classes, to destroy the bourgeoisie in turn. When this work of destruction is completed and the classes and privileges are eliminated, a society of equal and free people is established. Each is to be free to do what he pleases. There is to be no iniquity or oppression. It is at that time that the state is to disappear. According to the Communists, the state serves no useful purpose except that of domination of one class by another. Since in the Communist Society there are no classes who have divergent interests to struggle for, the *raison d'être* of the state disappears completely. It "withers away". To quote Engels: "The machine of the state is put into the museum of antiquities, alongside of the spinning wheel and the bronze axe." The same writer remarks: "Since the state is only a temporary institution which is to be

made use of in the revolution in order forcibly to suppress the opponents, it is perfectly absurd to talk about a free, popular state: so long as the proletariat needs the state, it needs it not in the interests of freedom, but in order to suppress its opponents, and when it becomes possible to speak of freedom, the state as such ceases to exist."

It seems desirable to discuss the Communist attitude towards democracy. It has been pointed out how the workers have to usurp the power of the state by force and set up a dictatorship of the proletariat. The Communists declare that they do not bother about principles of democracy. The main problem is to crush the bourgeoisie. It is the labourers alone who have to direct the state-machinery in such a way as to break the resistance of those whom they have dislodged from power. Evidently, the bourgeoisie are to be excluded from participation in the administrative machinery. The Constitution of Soviet Russia excludes the monks, clergymen, private merchants and traders, the members of the former reigning family, former members of the police, gendarmerie, and secret service of the Tsar, and all kinds of profiteers from the list of voters. The political rights are given to all citizens of either sex, 18 years of age, who acquired "the means of living through labour that is productive and useful to society," or "soldiers of the army a navy of the Soviets" or are "citizens of the two preceding categories who have lost their capacity to work." In short, the electorate consists of the "toiling and exploited masses."

The Communists profess no faith in the democratic principles and institutions. They refuse to believe that capitalist institutions can be adapted to serve their purpose. They must have new institutions to realise their end. The essential institutions of the Communist dictatorship in Russia are the Soviets and the Communist Party. The local Soviets are the unions of the workers of a locality. They select delegates to the next higher soviet. Thus are created the country, provincial and national congresses of Soviets of the workers. It is to be remem-

bered that the representatives are delegates and not deputies. They are elected for short periods merely to carry out the mandate of the body that selects them. There exists the unlimited right of recall. It is the workers who are the ultimate sovereign. Authority goes from bottom to top. There are no checks and balances to restrain the expression of the will of the proletariat.

The democratic procedure, no doubt, is followed but it is not to be forgotten that all the classes in society are not given representation. It is only the workers who have franchise. All the means of propaganda are in the hands of Communist Party and elections are managed to serve their purpose. Thus, all the resources are employed to create an opinion in favour of the Communist system. The Communist Party 'includes in its ranks only the most class-conscious and devoted; and only in careful selection does it widen its ranks.' Since the Council of People's Commissar (Cabinet of the Russian State) is chosen by the Central Executive Committee which is chosen by the All-Russian Congress of Soviets which in turn is chosen by Soviets which are under the control of the Communist Party which in itself is not constituted on any democratic principles, the position of democracy in Communism is clear. The distatorship of the proletariat implies not only a denial of political rights to non-workers and the rule by the most fanatical of the workers, but also a very autocratic and coercive exercise of government authority. Bukharin remarks: "The party of the proletariat must be inexorably set on the attainment of its object. Its task is not to bargain with the bourgeoisie but to overthrow them and break their resistance." They believe not in the democratic method of counting heads but breaking the heads of those who differ from them. They believe in their mission and in order to realise that, they are prepared to go to any length to crush their opponents.

Although the Communists are mainly concerned with the economic aspect of the life of individuals,

it is not out of place to discuss their attitude towards religion. It is true that law in Russia does not prescribe atheism as a qualification for political rights and the profession or belief in no religion is banned. But on the whole, the communist authorities are aggressively hostile to religion. Both direct and indirect means are employed to exterminate religion from the country. The religious associations are not allowed to work freely. They are denied access to the agencies of propaganda. Religious instruction is prohibited in schools, the circulation of religious books is restricted; the religious societies are not allowed to engage in civic and philanthropic activities, and the government encourages the anti-religious propaganda in the press, magazines, public lectures and moving pictures. The Communists do not believe in any religion. They regard it as an obstacle in the way of the realisation of their object. The Communist Party is pledged to atheism and the constitution disfranchises all priests and monks.

In the history of Russia we find an explanation of this anti-religious attitude of the communists. The Church in Russia was governed by the Holy Synod which was controlled by the Tsar. Thus was the machinery of the church employed to support the tyranny of the Tsar. The church was an ally of the oppressive state. When the state was overthrown in 1917, its ally could not be spared. Moreover, the church always opposed the progress of the masses. It tried to keep them in ignorance. It was opposed to any kind of reform in the country. Pobiedonostsev, the Chief Procurator of the Holy Synod, was the right-hand man of Nicholas II in all his oppressive and tyrannical actions. When in 1905, the Tsar was forced to grant the freedom of conscience and opinion, the bishops denounced the concessions. The Church preached that the authority of the state was derived from God and disobedience to state was disobedience to God. It was but natural that the church should become the target at the hands of the progressive Russians who had their revenge after 1917.

Marx had also described religion as the "opium for the people," because it preached contentment with one's earthly lot and submission to the political authority. Such an institution was bound to be condemned by the Communists as they believe in creating a militant spirit among the masses to overthrow the status quo.

It is clear how the Communists, sick of the iniquities of the capitalist system, stand for its overthrow by revolutionary methods and want to set up, in the long run, a classless and stateless society, after passing through the transitional period of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

CHAPTER VIII

ANARCHISM.

If the state-socialists went to one extreme in placing all the factors of production under the control of the government, the anarchists go to the other by advocating the elimination of all control and the establishment of a social system in which authority is conspicuous by its absence. The anarchist philosophy is the outcome of the anti-authoritarian movement against the all-absorbing power of the state. It can best be studied by discussing the views of its various exponents.

William Godwin has often been called the first modern anarchist. He was the first to associate opposition to political authority with an attack on private property. He was of the opinion that ordinarily men acted reasonably and justly unless unfair economic conditions made them act otherwise. The state upheld these economic inequalities. His philosophy was not strictly anarchist and he did not adopt the term "anarchism".

According to Hodgskin, "all law-making, except gradually and quietly to repeal all existing laws, is errant humbug." When all laws are repealed, men would come to have their natural rights.

Proudhon was probably the first to call himself an anarchist. According to him, "property is theft". His complaint against the state was that it had evolved out of the system of private property and its institution was being exploited to defend the interests of owners of private property. He drew up a plan for a "Bank of the People" to issue "labour notes" which would represent units of labour, measured solely by duration, and would be loaned, without interest, to any one offering his

capacity and promise to work as security. His view was that in the long run, his banking plan would eliminate all private capital because it will not be able to earn any interest. Moreover, this would encourage and facilitate voluntary cooperation so much that there will be no scope for any coercive authority or organisation.

Warren was of the opinion that necessity for protection from the state arose because our forefathers committed the "error" of creating the institutions of private property and government. He preached to the labourers to cut themselves completely from political affairs and be devoted to voluntary cooperative efforts. In that case, profits and poverty would be gradually eliminated from society and the necessity for state would disappear.

According to Tucker, political authority should be eliminated from society, for the experience of the world is that the state has always and invariably violated the principle of liberty and put restraint on individuals. Tucker advocated the replacement of the state by associations which the individuals were to join of their own free will and leave them whenever they pleased, without any let or hinderance. There may be competing associations for the same purpose, e g., defence.

Schmidt held the view that the state was unnatural as it repressed the individual in the supposed interests of the community. "The state has never any object but to limit the individual, to tame him, to subordinate him, to subject him to something general" "I am the mortal enemy of the state." He went to the extent of advocating the use of force to destroy the state.

But the two persons who stand foremost in the ranks of the anarchists are Bakunin and Prince Kropotkin. These high-born and cultivated writers tried to present the orderly, evolutionary and scientific aspects of the anarchist creed. Both of them were Russians and descended from the nobility. Both were trained for military life and served as officers in the army. It is

their personal experiences that created hatred in their mind against the state. Both of them had to spend many years of their lives in prison and in exile. Bakunin spent his days of banishment in Switzerland and Kropotkin in France and England.

According to Bakunin, the history of the evolution of man shows that he has progressed from a life of animal impulse to that in which reason predominates. The necessity of state has lessened with the progress of man. Bakunin repudiated the existence and justification of all political institutions. The state is merely a machinery in the hands of the moneyed classes who use it to defend their interests against the onslaughts of the poor masses, whatever the form of government. The workers are bound to be exploited by the property-owners. The state exercises a demoralising influence not only on the governed but also the rulers. The reason is that the state employs force and compulsion rather than persuasion and enlightenment in its actions. Political action degrades the moral and intellectual level of the subjects. The state makes tyrants or egoists out of the few servants or dependents out of the many.

Private property creates physical and moral evils of all kinds. Its effect on labourers is that they become economically dependent and socially and spiritually unprogressive and remain ignorant otherwise. The love of ostentation and luxury that comes from property, spoils the rich.

Religion is an evil because it has had been used by the rich for the purpose of sanctifying those social and political institutions which are in their interests. It is better to replace religion by science and knowledge.

Bakunin held that both the systems of evolution and revolution will be used in the realisation of the goal of anarchism. The "current of events and facts" automatically drifted to the anarchist goal. The task of the anarchists was merely to hinder hinderances from the

channel of that current. The revolution might involve violence, forcible dissolution of churches, army, courts, police, legislative assemblies and administrative officers and the invalidation of all titles to property

Bakunin was cautious in painting a picture of the anarchist society which was to be set up after the destruction of the state. However, in that society, everybody, irrespective of race, colour, nationality or belief, was to be permitted to work and enjoy the fruits of his labour on equal terms. There will be free associations and no use of force or laws. Necessary associations will develop from below. The society will own the land and instruments of production. It was to give them to those who could use them most productively. Everybody was entitled to those things which were the necessities of life on the condition that he made some personal contribution to the sum total of national production. "There will be a free union of individuals into communes, of communes into provinces, of provinces into nations and finally of nations into the United States of Europe, and later of the whole world."

According to Kropotkin, there has been an evolution in individual and human society. In certain cases, evolution was normal and steady, in others it was abrupt. In society, there was slow and steady progress from lower to higher forms of organisation. But there were three impediments in the way of human progress, *viz.*, state, private property and religion. There exists no justification for the state, whether historical or natural. It is opposed to the very nature of man which possesses the instinct of co-operation. For centuries, men lived without any political organisation, their relations being regulated by habits and usages. The state is of relatively late origin. The necessity of the state arose when the economically better-placed wanted to suppress and exploit the have-nots. The laws of the state are either superfluous or harmful. If they were not superfluous, they will be adhered to even without the sanction of the state. If they were not harmful, they will be obeyed

even without the fear of the might and the force of the state.

If history is to be our guide, it proves that the state has failed to accomplish anything that is useful and noble. On the other hand, it has added to the sufferings of man. Historical experience has demonstrated the utter incompetence and ineffectiveness of the state to do anything that we regard as necessary. It can be maintained that the hired armies of the state do not stand comparison with the nation-in-arms. The hirelings of the state do not and cannot be expected to possess the same spirit of sacrifice and enthusiasm which are the privilege of a citizen-army. Standing armies have been defeated by the spontaneous uprisings of the people.

The state does not guarantee any security to the citizens from within. State-action creates more trouble than it actually removes. Prisons are more effective in spreading vice than in checking it. The machinery of the state is yoked to sustain the system which is productive of great evils because of the economic injustice prevailing in the capitalist society.

Similarly, the intervention of the state is superfluous in the field of art, science and business. The growth of educational institutions, literary clubs and other societies—all worked by individuals without any direction from the state—, show that after all the state is something without which we can afford to live. The enormous growth of business concerns under the aegis of private individuals points to a similar conclusion. All work can be done by voluntary associations working on their own initiative.

Kropotkin could find no justification for the institution of private property. When all the progress that mankind has made was the outcome of collective efforts, no individual could claim that it was his work. Hence all wealth was social wealth and no individual could claim it exclusively for himself. Private property was

an offence against justice, for under it a majority enjoyed the major portion of the utilities created by the combined efforts of men and women of the present and past generations. Under the institution of private property, there was want and misery, millions were unemployed, the growth of the children was checked and debts of the farmers multiplied. It encouraged idleness, and ostentation and prodigality among the rich. It incited war and enabled the wealthy to control and debase the press which would otherwise have been the vehicle of free expression.

Like Bakunin, Kropotkin decried religion both on scientific and religious grounds. Religion was the opium of the masses. Its organisation was used to reconcile the people to the injustices that prevailed in the society due to economic iniquities.

Kropotkin's picture of the anarchist society runs on the lines of Bakunin. Free associations will prevail in society. Individuals of the same profession will join hands and group themselves into associations. There were to be separate associations to build houses, construct roads, make tools, conduct schools, etc. Disputes among the groups or associations are to be settled by voluntarily established courts of arbitration. There will be complete economic independence. There will be no distinction between goods for consumption and production. The nature of the contract on whose basis the associations are to be formed is explained thus: "We are ready to guarantee to you the use of our houses, stores, means of transportation, schools, museums, etc., on the condition that from your twentieth to your forty-fifth or fiftieth year, you apply four or five hours a day to some work recognised as necessary for life. Choose yourself when it pleases you, the group you wish to join, or organise a new group, provided that it undertakes to do some necessary service. For the rest of your time, associate yourself with whom you like. In return we guarantee to you all that our groups produce." The distribution is to be on the basis of need but only to those who put in work.

Kropotkin was convinced that under the anarchist society, production will increase to such an extent that all will be able to live in comfort. The quality of the things will improve. There will be less of economic waste and hence more things could be produced.

His minute observation of the things about him convinced him that events were moving towards the goal he had put forward. There was a mushroom growth of associations in every aspect of life, *e.g.*, life-boat and hospital associations, the Red Cross Societies for socialistic study, etc. The number of things done without the intervention of the state was very large. Besides the evolutionary method, he advocated even the use of force to establish the anarchist order. Private property was to be plundered, land-owners were to be turned out by the peasants and the factory owners by the rank and file working in the factories.

Kropotkin maintained that anarchism did not imply confusion or chaos. No doubt, there was to be hostility to the state but not to order. Anarchy "is not the absence of order, it is the absence of force." "Government means compulsion exclusion, distraction, separation; while anarchy is freedom, union and love. Government is based on egotism and fear, anarchy on fraternity." (Lowes Dickinson : Modern Symposium).

Kropotkin's view was that there was no inborn instinct in man to violate the useful customs of the society. If he is constrained to do that, it is because of the environments which will disappear in the anarchist society. It is not work but overwork, unhealthy work and unfairly remunerated work that is repulsive to man.

A comparison of anarchism and individualism might lead one to the conclusion that these two philosophical systems have very much in common. There is no doubt that both the systems regard the political power as an evil and would like to liberate man from its control. Both the system emphasise the importance of man and

regard the extension of state-functions with disfavour. But the fundamental difference between the two is that while the individualists regard the state as a necessary evil which has to be tolerated because of human shortcomings, the anarchists want to abolish the state altogether. There is no place for the state and its laws. The state is regarded as the mortal enemy of man. While the individualists regard the state as useful for protection of society from foreign invasion, maintenance of law and order within the country and the making and enforcement of laws the anarchists regard the state as completely superfluous.

Moreover, while the anarchists stand for the abolition of private property and capitalism, individualism definitely encouraged the growth and development of capitalism through the factory system. The individualists regarded private property as sacred which was not to be attacked from any quarter.

While the anarchists condemn religion and positively stand for its abolition, the individualists ignored it altogether. They did not bother about religious matters.

In a way, the difference between anarchism and individualism might be regarded as one of degree and not of kind, but there are other considerations which make the difference fundamental.

CHAPTER IX.

CRITICISM OF SOCIALISM.

In order to have a correct idea of socialism, it is desirable to discuss its merits before entering upon its demerits. The first important point to note is that the socialists depict, vividly and effectively, the evils of the existing system and thereby focus the attention of the people in order to remedy them. The socialists have presented a full picture of the sufferings and privations to which the poor are subjected under the capitalist regime and thereby aroused the conscience of the people. Laveleye rightly remarks: "Socialism has rendered a real service by calling attention to the evils and iniquities of the existing social order, and by awakening in the heart of all good men the desire to apply a remedy."

Socialism has emphasised the importance of environments in determining the character and destiny of individuals and nations. The socialists do not attribute the present-day sufferings of the poor to the idea of predestination or the will of God, but to the capitalist regime under which we live. They hold the circumstances responsible for ills of society—circumstances over which the individuals have no control.

Socialism makes a passionate appeal to the communal conscience by denouncing exploitation. It excites sympathy for the poor and weak; it demands justice for the oppressed, it asserts the responsibility of the community for the lost and the forlorn; it makes a powerful appeal for social service and for public assistance.

The philosophy of socialism gave a zest to the spirit of reform. The exposing of the evils of the society under the capitalist regime created in the hearts of the reformers the desire to work for the eradication of the evils from the social body-politic. It helped the cause

of reform by attacking privileges and monopolies, cruelty and tyranny

Another effect of socialism was that it emphasised the importance of the state and attributed to it a role in the society that was denied under the individualist philosophy which restricted to the minimum the scope of the state. The old idea of the state as the rival and antagonist of the individual gave place to that of the state as the great benefactor of mankind. Grönlund in "The Cooperative Commonwealth" puts the socialist case thus: "The state is not some power outside the people, but the social organism itself, and as an organism it is destined to grow until it embraces all social activities."

Another great merit of the socialist propaganda has been that the lot of the working classes has changed for the better. "In uniting working men for the purposes of class-war, socialism has achieved something of permanent spiritual value. It has raised a mass of men whom it found in a state of brutalising servitude, to the human level of antagonists in a battle, has aroused in them a sense of their dignity and autonomy; and has advanced their differentiation as a class from within. The present position of the working man, as a man and not a mere machine or commodity, is largely due to socialism, which thus appears as the greatest movement of human emancipation since the French Revolution. If we remember the mean and inhuman harshness displayed by early nineteenth century liberals towards the urgent social problems of their time, we cannot deny that socialism, for all the defects of its ideology, has been an immense advance on the earlier individualism, and from the point of view of history, has been justified in attempting to submerge it beneath its own social flood."

While the merits of socialism cannot be questioned or denied, it suffers from certain obvious defects. The socialists distort and misrepresent the facts. Their economic interpretation of history is evidently a misrepresentation. While none will deny the importance of

the economic factor, few will concede that economic motive is the only motive force behind all human activity. To the same category belong the socialist contention that value is due to labour only, that the capitalists are the enemies of the labourers, that the rich and the poor have irreconcilable interests and they must always be in the opposite camps etc. The socialists can be accused of falsification of history and misrepresentation of actuality. They are clever people who omit those facts which go against them and emphasise those which serve their interests.

The socialist description of human nature is erroneous. They stand for the elimination of private enterprise and private property but the acquisitive instinct of man requires them. Similarly, competition is in the very blood of every individual. The demand for equality may be a good ideal but it is difficult to say how it can be realised and how far it is desirable. The socialists would subordinate the individual to the state and thereby restrict his liberty. But this is opposed to human nature.

The economic theories propounded by the socialists are misleading. They twisted the facts in the way that best suited their interests. Their conclusions are based on half-truths. They reproduce misleading quotations to create a fictitious air of authority and impartiality. For examples, they do not attach any importance to the free gifts of nature and regard labour only as productive of wealth and value. But this is evidently wrong, for nature is also a great source of wealth.

Under the socialist regime, there is no incentive to work and produce. When the people cannot compete with one another and keep the private property created by their efforts to themselves, they will lose all incentive to work. After all, one very important reason as to why we work is that we want to provide for our families. But since such a thing is out of the question, few would put in their best. It is difficult to believe with the socialist that the people will work hard under

the feeling of doing good to the whole society. The benefactors of society could be honoured by society and the inventions named after their inventors. But the mere recognition of their worth may not be enough for the individuals to put in their best efforts. Socialism, it is contended, will result in a "slackening of energy, a cessation of enterprise, a falling off invention, a stagnation of industry, fatal alike to progress and to productivity."

While the socialists contend that all should work for society in order to avoid exploitation, they have failed to offer an equitable plan for the distribution of the national dividend among the workers. Some stand for the equality of payment. But this will not serve the purpose because when the sluggard and the active are to be paid the same wages, there will be no incentive to work hard. Justice demands that those who work harder must get their share proportionately. The second suggestion is: From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs. But the difficulty is that it may not be possible to assess the working capacity of every worker and even if it is found out he may refuse to put in that much of work. What punishment is to be given to the worker? "Socialised industry," says Brailsford, "will succeed only if the public opinion of the workshop and trade union condemns and ostracises a man who does less than his best." Moreover, the system of giving everybody according to his needs, will encourage idleness. A third method of remuneration that is suggested is that the worker should be paid according to his merit. "Service," says Ramsay Macdonald, "is the only claim the socialist recognises to possession." But what will become of equality when each is paid according to his merit. The plain fact is that the socialists hold divergent views on the question of distribution of wealth. Ramsay-Macdonald's view is that the question of payment "cannot be settled now, and, therefore, cannot be discussed profitably except as a speculative exercise." The question, says he, should be left to experience.

The socialist attitude is not conducive to the growth of trade and commerce. They assert that "business is blackmail." They decry competition for new markets, expenditure on advertisement, window-dressing, commercial travelling etc. What they stand for is a self-sufficing community in which the people put in their efforts to produce what is necessary for their sustenance. They condemn all the modern methods of exchange.

Liberty will be restricted under the socialist regime. The individual will be too much under the state. Since the state had to ensure that no one did anything on his own account, or saved anything, or sold anything, or lent anything, or invested anything, or discovered anything, it will have to employ a large army of spies. Moreover, it will not be left to the individuals to do what they pleased. The state will have a say in this matter. "The whole mass of living beings would be devoted to work under the state (or trade union) agents." There will be too much of uniformity and monotony. Socialism, it is contended, will bring about "the most sterilizing despotism that the world has ever seen." Professor Leacock says: "Under socialism freedom is gone. There is nothing but the rule of the elected boss. The worker is commanded to his task and obey he must. There is nothing like it among us at the present day except within the melancholy precincts of the penitentiary. There and there only the socialist system is in operation." Under the socialist regime, there will be no freedom of the press. Since all the newspapers will be owned by the Government, nothing that goes against the socialist system will be allowed to appear. There will be no freedom of expression.

Socialism is a menace to family life. Although it is not directly concerned with the problems of marriage, some socialist writers have scoffed at the ties of family-life and advocated a social order in which family ties do not exist. Harry Quelch says: "I am in favour of

free love. I want to abolish marriage... ..We want no marriage bond. We want no bonds at all. We do want free love." But this will lead to unbridled lust. "Marriage," says G. Deville, "is a regulation of property, a business contract rather than a union of persons, and its utility grows out of the economic structure of a society which is based on individual appropriation ...When property is transformed, marriage will lose its reason for existence, and boys and girls may then freely, and without fear of censure, listen to the desires and promptings of their nature." Others also contend that since the institution of family leads to capitalism, it must be destroyed.

The socialists condemn religion because they regard it as the ally of the capitalists and a reactionary force. Karl Marx denounced religion as "the opium of the people." It is religion that sanctifies the institution of private property, and with the abolition of private property, it also must go. The Anarchists also stand for its destruction. The Communists in Russia carried out in actual practice the programme of elimination of religion from the country.

Socialism can be attacked also on ethical grounds. The ethical standard of the socialist is very low. It is "utilitarian, opportunist, materialistic, devoid of appeal to any eternal law of truth and right." When the socialists always go on preaching the gospel of hatred and envy, it is difficult to perceive as to how they can reconstruct a harmonious society in which the people co-operate with one another. Surely socialism is no alchemy to effect this sudden transformation.

Socialism has undesirable effects on society. It encourages class-hatred and makes heroes out of the factory-hands by designating them as "the Industrial workers of the World." Antagonism between the rich and the poor, the employer and the employees cannot be conducive to human progress and welfare. Socialism, it is contended, injects into the body-politics "a poison which inflames every wound, and turns every

trivial scratch into a malignant ulcer." All social progress will be hampered because of too much government control.

The effects of socialism in the political field leave much to be desired. The nationalisation of factors of production will bring all the power into the hands of the workers. They will no doubt be servants while they work for the state. But they will also be masters as voters. "They are both masters and servants; they clamour perpetually for an increase of their pay, and in point of fact vote themselves an increase" The position of the minority is indeed perilous. The ignorant and illiterate workers are too much liable to fall victims to the propaganda of the demagogues and fiery orators from their own class and that will be a danger to democracy itself.

Socialist propaganda is the enemy of industrial peace and prosperity. The teachings of class-war, sabotage, strikes and revolution against the prevailing social system cannot but dislocate the economic system. A nation cannot and need not think in terms of property when the workers regard the industrialists as blood-suckers and they do not hesitate to inflict any injury on them that lies in their power.

While the socialists are strongest in condemnation and destruction, they hopelessly fail when they endeavour to put forward constructive suggestions for the refashioning of social order. Their philosophy is negative rather than positive. Their greatest weakness is their inability to replan the society after the holocaust which they contemplate. The syndicalists take refuge in the philosophy of intuition while depicting the socialist order after the capture of power by the workers.

Socialism has universally failed in practice. Not only did the utopian experiments made by the Saint Simonians, the Owenites, the Fourierists, and the Icarians fail, the socialist record of achievements is no better in recent times. Although power fell into the

hands of the socialists after the collapse of Imperial Germany in 1918, they failed to make any use of it. Either they did not care or they found themselves unfit to rise to the occasion and direct the machinery of the state on the socialist lines. The same was the case in Austria, Sweden, Czechoslovakia and Denmark. The only success achieved by them is that in Soviét Russia, but for that also a very high price had to be paid.

CHATER X.

INDIVIDUALISM.

The philosophy of individualism advocates the non-interference of the state into the lives of the individuals. It is asserted that the greatest good of the greatest number can be realised only if the people are allowed to manage their own affairs according to the internal dictates of their own conscience. The greatest service that the state can render is to make itself superfluous. The very existence of the state is a sign of the imperfection of the individuals and it should strive to improve them in such a way that after some time, no necessity for its existence is felt.

The individualists regard the state as an evil, although a necessary one. Since it is an evil, it is desirable to have as little of it as possible. It is considered best to leave to every individual the largest amount of liberty. According to them, the larger the number of the functions performed by the state, the lesser is the liberty of the individuals. They refuse to believe that the functions of the state can in any way increase individual liberty.

Their conception of the state functions is a negative one. They minimise the scope of its activities. They consider the state to be merely a policeman. As the function of a policeman is merely to regulate, so should the state do. It should not add anything in a positive way. The functions of the state are limited to the protection of the country from foreign invasion with the help of an army kept for that purpose, to maintain law and order with in the state with the help of the police, to set up a system of laws and enforce them through courts, to enforce contracts etc. The function of the state may be described as the hindering of the hindering of liberty.

Individualism came into prominence in the latter half of the 18th century as a result of the reaction against the evils of over-government in Europe. Evidently, the restrictions imposed by the state in every aspect of the industrial life, were not conducive to inventions and improvements and hence came the demand for the restriction of state-control in the industrial field. The physiocrats advocated the limitation of state-functions in the economic field. In the same way, Adam-Smith in his "Wealth of Nations" denounced the laws restricting the free interchange of labour and products as harmful and pernicious. Similarly, the doctrine of natural liberty was propounded by Cairnes, Ricardo, Malthus, De Tocqueville, Taine, Kant, Fichte, Humboldt, Herbert Spencer, J. S. Mill, Bruce Smith, Donisthorpe, Sumner and others.

Humboldt's view was that the state should "abstain from all solicitude for the positive welfare of the citizens and ought not to proceed a step farther than is necessary for their natural security and protection, against foreign enemies."

J. S. Mill made the following classic statement on individual liberty in his famous essay
 J. S. Mill. "On Liberty": "The sole end for which mankind are warranted individually or collectively in interfering with the liberty of action of any of their number is self-protection. The only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not sufficient warrant . . . The only part of the conduct of any one for which he is amenable to society is that which concerns others. In the part which merely concerns himself, his independence is, of right, absolute. Over himself, over his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign "

Mill divided the actions of individuals into two parts: self-regarding and others-regarding actions. While the individual was to be free in doing those

things which affected him alone, his independence was to be restricted in those cases in which his actions had a direct or indirect bearing on others. Although it is difficult to divide human actions into water-tight compartments as suggested by Mill, the principle was to be followed in a general way.

Mill maintained that everybody should be allowed to hold any opinion he pleases. It may be that an opinion which the state or social convention seeks to suppress or discredit may turn out to be true and even if it may come out to be partially or wholly false, society will suffer from its suppression. The reason is that governments, majorities and social aristocrats are not infallible. Majorities and authorities of the past have held opinions which we consider to be wrong. Socrates and Christ were condemned both by the government and the public opinion for holding opinions contrary to the prevailing ideas. There is reason to believe that some cranks of today may hold opinions which may be considered as correct by the future generations. Moreover, the opinion to be suppressed by the government may contain portions of truth and error and that distinction can be made only by trial and discussion. Finally, even if the opinion turns out to be wholly erroneous, it is desirable to allow its expression because its discussion in itself helps to make the truth clear. "The beliefs which we have most warrant for have no safeguard to rest on but a standing invitation to the whole world to prove them unfounded." We serve the creed by throwing it open to criticism by others.

Spencer's individualism was the outcome of his belief in natural rights, natural economic laws and the non-conformist's hostility to authority. He shared the view that human history is an orderly, continuous and beneficent change, naturally operating towards more enlightened ways of living and more perfect equilibrium of social forces. Hence natural laws demanded that the government should allow nature to function freely without any artificial hinderance.

Spencer applied the law of organic evolution through natural selection to human society and came to the conclusion that the state should allow nature to do its work. Its only function is to assist nature, i.e., to allow every individual to fight out the struggle for existence according to his conduct and nature. The state has only two sorts of duties. While its primary function is defence against external attack, its secondary function consists in preventing encroachments reciprocally among the individuals within the state. In other words, the duty of the state in the domestic field is to preserve justice which is described by him in these words: "Every man is free to do that which he wills, provided he infringes not upon the equal freedom of any other man."

He was opposed to all organised charity public or private, all state-help to education or industry, and all government operation or regulation of industry. Compulsory and public education, poor relief and social legislation seemed to serve no useful purpose. Their only effect was to prolong the existence of those who ought to be eliminated. It was no business of the state to come to the assistance of the lame, dumb, poor, the old and the destitute. The state should not work the mint and post offices and erect light-houses or life-saving stations because none of these fall under the category of justice which alone is the function of the state.

His view regarding the state is put in these words: "Be it or be it not true, the man is shapen in iniquity and conceived in sin, it is unquestionably true that government is begotten of aggression and by aggression." In a perfect society there is no *raison d'être* for the state. He says: "Have we not shown that government is essentially immoral? Does it not exist because crime exists and must government not cease when crime ceases, for very lack of objects on which to perform its functions?" It was a mistake to regard the state as an eternal institution. Its existence was merely incidental.

In "Social Statics" (1866), he maintained that the individual had the right to ignore the state, "drop connection" with it, refuse its protection, throw off its burdens and adopt a condition of voluntary outlawry. Past experience indicated that happiness came not from state action but by leaving the individual alone. The sphere of the state should be "negatively regulative". The only right of the individual is equal freedom with everybody else, and the only duty of the state is to protect that right against violence and fraud.

On the question of provision of educational facilities by the state, he observed that "taking away a man's property to educate his own or other people's children is not needful for the maintenance of his rights and hence is wrong." He went to the extent of maintaining that it is a "violation of the moral law for the state" to interpose between quacks and those who patronise them.

In an essay entitled "The Sins of the Legislators," he condemned the legislation passed in the past. The laws of the state were a record of "unhappy guesses." Since most of the laws passed were repealed or amended later on, it follows that they should not have been passed.

Sumner's individualist philosophy was influenced by the writings of Darwin, Huxley and Sumner. Spencer. He was opposed to the policy of protection and government intervention in the industrial sphere in the U. S. A. "Let it be understood," he wrote, "that we cannot go outside of this alternative: liberty, inequality, survival of the fittest, non-liberty, equality and survival of the unfittest. The former carries society forward and favours all its best members, the latter carries society downwards and favours all its worst members." Again, "The truth is that the social order is fixed by laws of nature precisely analogous to those of the physical order. The most that man can do is by ignorance and self-conceit to mar the operation of social laws." Hence,

he maintained that the state should not interfere in the social field. He advocated the policy of leaving nature alone. Competition "is a law of nature. Nature submits to him who most energetically and resolutely assails her. She grants her rewards to the fittest, therefore, without regard to other considerations of any kind." To attack capital, he maintained, was to attack "the foundations of civilisation." He concluded by saying: "All experience is against state regulation."

After a brief reference to the views of those who were prominent amongst the individualists, we pass on to the systematic discussion of the grounds on which individualism is defended and attacked. It is contended that considerations of justice and morality demand that the state should not interfere with the free expression of the will of the individuals. An individual can develop his faculties in the best manner only if there is no diversion of them by any external factor. The only function, according to Kant, of the state is the hindering of hinderances to liberty of action of individuals. Government action tends to destroy the sense of self-reliance, weakens his responsibility as a free agent, and blunts his character. Humboldt says: "The true end of man, or that which is prescribed by the immutable dictates of reason is the highest and most harmonious development of his powers to a complete and consistent whole." Mill asserted that too much of the meddling of the government "starves the development of some portion of the bodily or mental faculties when it deprives one from doing what one is inclined to do or from acting according to one's judgment of what is desirable." The highest civilisation has developed under an individualist society. Spencer complained of the monotony and uniformity of an over-governed or collectivist state. "Everybody is like everybody else." Government control is "essentially despotic." It "unavoidably cramps" by lessening the liberty of action, "galls by its inefficiency and restrictions" and vexes by the army of officials who needlessly poke their nose into

the affairs of individuals. "A people," says Mill, "among whom there is no habit of spontaneous action for a collective interest, who look habitually to their government to command and prompt them in matters of joint concern who expect to have everything done for them except that can be made an affair of mere habit and routine—have their faculties only half developed, their education is defective in one of its most important branches "

The biological argument implies that nature should be given a free hand to work in its own way. According to the law of nature, the undesirable elements of society will be weeded out. It is only the efficient and fit who manage to survive unassisted and it is they who will live in the individualist society. Spencer maintained that the rich, who were generally more educated and wise, multiplied themselves less quickly than the poor who were, on the whole, less intelligent and ignorant. In an individualist society, although more children will be born among the poor, as a result of Malthus' law of population, most of them will starve to death because of the lack of necessities of life. While on the other hand, all the children of the rich can afford to live. The result will be that a balance could be maintained between the rich and the poor and the rule of the wise rich will be established. But in case the state came to the assistance of the poor, there was a possibility of all of them surviving. The result is that the poor will outnumber the rich who are also intelligent and wise. Thus, the rule of the unwise and ignorant people will be established and the intelligent rich will be tyrannised. (For further details see Spencer and Sumner).

According to the economic argument, every individual is actuated by feelings of self-interest. Since everybody tries to get the maximum, the society will also get the maximum. The manufacturers sell in the dearest market and the consumer will try to buy from the cheapest shop. As a result of the working of these competing forces, society comes to have a

reasonable price and maximum advantage. This will develop internal and international trade and commerce. Inventions will multiply. Production will increase manifold. Competition will raise the level of efficiency and things of a superior type will be manufactured. It cannot be denied that the philosophy of *Laissez-faire* or "let alone" played an important part in the industrial development of England during the latter half of the 18th and the first half of the 19th century. Britain's lead in the industrial field was due to the lack of state-intervention and the free scope for the individuals to experiment in their own way.

The argument of experience is that the historical examples of state-regulation and control pointed out to their uselessness, futility and ineffectiveness. Most of the legislation was mischievous and ridiculous, e. g., prohibition of wearing of certain kinds of cloth and dress, export and import and manufacture of commodities of a particular pattern, the prescription of width and thickness of cloth and the length of the yarn, laws regulating wages of labour, and fixing the prices of food, clothing and other necessities of life. Buckle opined that he was surprised at the progress of the obstacles created by state-action. Evidently better results would have been secured by a policy of *laissez-faire*.

The individualists condemn the incompetence and inefficiency of state-action. Mill said that the great majority of things were worse done when done by the government than when done by individuals. The reason was that the people understood their own business and cared for it better than any government could. (cf. the promptitude observed in the disposal of orders from the customers in a private shop and a government depot). The state was not a creative organ, but an organ which acts only by means of a complicated apparatus, composed of numerous wheels and system of wheels subordinated one to another. It is an organ of criticism, generalisation, and of co-ordination and consequently, the state could not be the first agent.

If the individualists sang songs regarding the beneficial effects of their philosophy, the critics have gone to the other extreme in condemning it and pointing out to the inadequacy and fallacies of such a system.

Criticism of Individualism. It is contended that the state is not an evil, although a necessary one. Our experience shows that the advancement of mankind and the existence and development of state have gone hand in hand. The state instead of being an evil, is a positive good. The traffic and police regulations enforced by the state are not an evil but certainly add to human comforts and progress. The same can be said about the pure-food laws, quarantine laws, regulations regarding free and compulsory education, construction and maintenance of railways, and roads. By no stretch of imagination can these actions of the state be called evil. It is true that sometimes the action of the government might have been unjust and tyrannical and vexatious, but on the whole, the machinery of the state had a wholesome effect.

Spencer maintained that the state existed because crime existed and the state would disappear with the outlawry of crime from the world. But this statement is not borne out by facts. It is found that with the progress of civilisation, necessity of the state is increasing. The number of regulations issued by the government from year to year is increasing at a tremendous speed. In order to cope with the needs of the complicated society of today, not only the number of laws but also their volume is increasing everyday. To quote an example, when there were no roads, there was no necessity of state-intervention in the form of traffic-regulations but those have become necessary today. It follows that instead of diminishing, the sphere of the state-actions will increase. Instead of the state becoming superfluous and useless, its necessity will become paramount.

The individualist view that the actions of the state and the liberty of the individuals varied in the inverse

ratio, is false. There is no hostility between man and state. On the other hand, state action has definitely added to individual liberty rather than taken away from it. Similarly, the education of the people by the state will make them more free. It can be maintained that a well planned-out policy of state-intervention will have the effect of removing hinderances from the path of individuals, and discipline and train them. It is wrong to assert that all restraint is an evil. License is hardly the thing to be desired. It is absurd to regard the state actions and the liberty of individuals as the debit and credit sides of an account book. Both the entries may have to be made on the credit side.

The individualists while praising the individual, ignored or minimised the importance of society of which he is merely a member and without which he can neither live nor make any progress. The idea of a self-centred and self-contained individual, "enjoying the desolated freedom of the wild ass," cannot be accepted. The fact is that 'apart from his surroundings and relationships, the individual is a mere abstraction, a logical ghost, a metaphorical spectre, mere negation.' Man is a bundle of relations. He is the "concise formula for the total of actions and attributes. Out of relation to other things, he is literally nothing." Prof. Ritchie maintained that even thoughts of an individual could not be completely "self-regarding" and hence the bifurcation of individual actions as proposed by Mill, could not be accepted. Every action of an individual was social in the sense that ultimately that had its effect on others, directly or indirectly. The man in the street is not a Robinson Crusoe.

As regards the individualist contention that the work done by the state was less efficient than that done by individuals, it can be maintained that there is not much truth in this allegation. Huxley rightly puts the real state of affairs thus: "The state lives in a glass-house; we see what it tries to do, and all its failures, partial or total, are made the most of. But private enterprise is sheltered under good opaque bricks and mortar. The public rarely knows what it tries to do and only hears of

its failures when they are gross and patent to all the world." Pembroke said, "What would private enterprise look if its mistakes and failures were collected and pilloried in a similar manner?" It can be maintained that there is nothing inherently wrong or good either in the individual or state-action. All depends upon the nature of the work. In certain cases the machinery of the state can be employed with profit, while certain other things can and should be left to private and individual enterprise.

It was contended by the individualists that man was the best judge of his own interests and left to himself, he will do only that which will be to his greatest advantage. While this is true to some extent, it is not so absolutely. In certain cases, society may guide him better and protect him better than he can do so personally and individually. It may be that he may not understand his best interests because of his ignorance or the complicated nature of the situation to be faced. Sidgwick confessed that "as the appliances of life become more elaborate and complicated through the progress of invention, it is only according to the general law of division of labour to suppose that an average man's ability to judge of the adaptation of means to ends, even as regards the satisfaction of his everyday needs, is likely to become continually less. It is for this reason that in our times, the governments place restrictions on the construction of buildings, use of water for drinking purposes may be prohibited from certain sources, the people may be forced to get themselves inoculated to check certain diseases, the construction of brick-kilns near the city may not be allowed.

In applying the biological analogy, the upholders of individualism failed to consider the essential difference between mankind and lower forms of life. While the latter are at the mercy of their environment and are transformed by it, man transforms his environments and thus can remove the great waste that the process of nature selection necessitates. Moreover, since the survival of the "fittest" means only the fittest under given circumstances and not necessarily the survival of

the best, man, by improving those circumstances, can make the fittest a far more desirable product. Hence the collectivist activity, instead of being an interference with a beneficent law, may remove the waste of competition, hasten progress, and make possible a higher type of individual and society

The biological argument was taken to extremes by Spencer. It was maintained that everybody ought to exert himself single-handed and if he survives, he proves his fitness to live. It was not the duty of the state to come to the rescue of the orphans, the poor and the aged. Every one of them must be left alone to exert himself. But it was found that the practical application of such a philosophy involved great hardships for the victims. Kind-hearted people came to condemn it as a cruel philosophy which preached selfishness in all its nakedness and which threw to the winds all humanitarian principles. The people were prepared to abandon such a philosophy that preached to them to keep on looking while the orphans and the poor were shrieking and the aged were crying for help. That was against the very human nature. After all, man is not the "economic" man of the economists who is actuated purely by economic considerations.

The individualists maintained that the state was not justified in interfering between the employers and the employees, the industrialists and the factory-hands. It was contended that under the individualist regime, the employers and the employees were both free to strike the bargain. The employers should be free to offer any wage they please and the workers should have the option to do the work or not for that wage. It was contended that no force was used by the employers to compel the workers to work at a particular remuneration and hence the state had no right to step in to force the employers not to lower the wages below a certain level. The critics hold that the so-called freedom in the economic field does not actually exist. The workers as a rule live from hand to mouth and have no reserves to fall back upon. Even if he is offered wages below the reasonable

limit, he has to accept it because the alternative is starvation of his family. This fact puts the industrialist in a position of vantage. While the employer can afford to close down the mills for months and still live in luxury out of his accumulated stock, the worker must work if he has not to die. Hence arises the necessity of intervention of state in order to bring to senses the employer and secure justice for the employees.

Critics also point out to the harmful and destructive effects of individualist, competitive society. There is cut-throat competition among the buyers and sellers and consequently the waste of money in advertisement and counter advertisement. There may be three or four bus-services between the places although one could have been adequate. There is unnecessary waste of money in the freight of goods from Lahore to Calcutta by one company and from Calcutta to Lahore by another company dealing in the same commodity. In a nutshell, there will be too much of conomic waste.

Individualism or Laissez-faire was a doctrine of production and left distribution entirely out of account. The result was that inspite of the tremendous increase of national wealth, the misery of the underdog and the weaklings increased. Although the industrialist magnates made fortunes, the people as a whole suffered because no effort was made to solve adequately the problem of distribution of the national dividend among the factors of production. While the factory-hands worked from early in the morning to late at night, they were hardly given a living wage. There was too much misery among them. Their lot can better be imagined than described.

We may conclude by saying that while the individualists rendered a great service by emphasising the necessity of development of individuality and expression of free will of the individuals, they went to extremes in making man selfish, unsocial, and calculating. While it is true that man must have freedom in certain respects, it is wrong to maintain that he can be completely segregated from the rest of his stock.

CHAPTER XI

THE IDEALIST THEORY OF THE STATE.

The idealist theory of the state is variously known as the absolute, metaphysical or philosophical theory. The various names are due to the nature of the philosophy propounded by its exponents. The philosophers in question have given us an ideal picture of the state. Their reasoning is abstract. They attribute absolute powers to the state.

Although Dr Bosanquet maintained that the German Idealists owed much to the philosophy of Rousseau, it is generally accepted that the origin of the idealist theory lies in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle who depicted the state as self-sufficient and something under which alone could a man realise his highest self. Plato maintained in the Republic that a good virtuous state was a necessity in order to make the people so. All the efforts of the state were to be directed to make the people honest, moral and just. According to Aristotle, "the state comes into being for the sake of mere life. it continues to exist for the sake of the good life." Man, says Aristotle, is a political animal which in other words means that he can live and flourish only under the benign guidance and protection of the state.

As the Greek writers emphasised the part played by the state in the betterment of the individuals similarly the Idealists deified the state which was described as omnipotent, infallible, omniscient, absolute, just and the guardian of morality. The state was described not as a means but an end in itself. It was the sacred duty of the individuals to obey the orders of the government. Resistance was both wicked and iniquitous. The state is a mystical, super-personal entity above the nation. It possesses a will, rights, interests, and even standards

of morality of its own separate from those of individuals who constitute the state. It is the source of all civilisation and progress.

It seems desirable to state the views of the important writers of the Idealist School. Kant is usually given the title of "father" of the idealist theory, although some give this credit to Hegel. His philosophy on this point is given in "Metaphysical First Principles of the Theory of Law." His view was that the state is omnipotent, infallible, divine in essence and its authority comes from God. It was a sacred duty to obey the state although the occupant of power at any time may be a usurper. Since the state was a divine and holy idea, no inquiry was to be made about its origin. Since Kant had a great horror of war because of his experience of the French Revolution, he attached great importance to the established authority. The function of the individual was to obey blindly and implicitly the orders of the government and not to question their legality or the legitimacy of the power from which they emanated. According to him, if a constitution was defective, changes were to be made "only by the sovereign itself, through reform, not by the people, through revolution."

The idealist theory reached its climax under Hegel. His abstract and subtle reasoning is not within the comprehension of the man in the street. In spite of this, it had a tremendous influence on his disciples who popularised his views. Prof. Hobhouse held Hegel responsible for the last war. Referring to Hegel's "Philosophy of the State" he said, "In the bombing of London I had just witnessed the visible and tangible outcome of a false and wicked doctrine, the foundations of which lay, as I believe, in the book before me."

According to Hegel, the state is "the reality of the ethical spirit," "the manifest self-conscious, substantial will of man, thinking and knowing itself and suiting its performance to its knowledge, or to the proportion of its knowledge." The state is "perfected rationality" and

"absolute fixed end in itself" The state, whether good or bad, is the march of God on earth. It is God itself. To obey the state, is to obey God. Its orders have a divine sanction. State is "the divine idea as it exists on earth" "It is the divine will as the present spirit unfolding itself to the actual shape and organisation of the world" The state is "objective reason or spirit." It is only under a state that man raises his outward self to the level of his inward self of thought. The state is man in his fullness and perfection of development. The state has a separate entity. It possesses a separate will and personality of its own. It represents the "general will," in which all wills are included. It can never act unrepresentatively as it embodies the general will. Man is most free when he obeys the state. It follows that a person should consider himself free even when he is arrested by the police. The individual can have no real rights which conflict with the state, as his real rights are only in the state. This leaves no margin for the revolt of an individual or a group against the state.

The state contains within itself and represents the morality of all its citizens. It is the "realisation of the moral idea." There can be no checks on state on moral grounds. It can act irrespectively of moral considerations. International law and moral principles are not binding on the state.

According to Hegel's way of thinking, the state is the temple, the monarch is the idol, and the people the worshippers.

The personality of the state, says Hegel, manifests itself through a person, i.e., the monarch. Hence obedience to the monarch becomes necessary.

It is remarkable to note that although Hegel declared that whatever attributes he employed for the state did not exist at all in actual practice, his disciples attributed them to the actual state existing in their midst.

The Idealist theory was popularised by the disciples of Hegel who went ahead of their teacher. The promi-

ment among them were Nietzsche, Treitschke and Bernhardi. All of them glorified and apotheosized the state. According to Treitschke, 'the state is power,' and our duty is to "fall down and worship it." The state must be self-assertive, aggressive and militaristic. It was due to the state that civilisation had progressed. Man, without the state, was helpless.

Besides the school of German Idealists, there were three important exponents of the theory from England viz., Bradley, Green and Bosanquet. Although they followed in essentials the German Idealists they differed from them in the matter of details. That was due to the environments and tradition in England.

Bradley in "Ethical Studies," propounds the view that the duty of man is to perform only that function which is assigned to him by the state. His station in life is fixed for him by the state. Just as the performance of their specific duties by the various organs is necessary for the smooth working of an organism, similarly the successful working of the state demands the performance of his duties by every individual.

Although T H Green emphasised the importance and majesty of the state as is evident from his statement that we should think twice before disobeying the state and that state is necessary for individual rights, he put two checks on the state. Those were internal and external checks. The individual could not be sacrificed on the altar of the state. It has been rightly said that he was "a Kantian rather than a Hegelian." His philosophy is given in "Principles of Political Obligation."

Bosanquet whom Hobhouse considers as "the most modern and most faithful exponent" of Hegel, expressed his views in "The Philosophical Theory of the State." According to him, the state is not "merely the political fabric, but is the entire hierarchy of institutions by which life is determined, including, e.g. the family,

trade-union, the church, the university. It is the structure which gives life and meaning to them all." "It is the operative criticism of institutions." A perfect conception of the end of the state would mean "a complete idea of the realisation of all human capacity"

The state is force. It is inherent in the state and is exercised not only for the "restraint of disorderly persons but in the form of instruction and authoritative suggestion to the ordinary law-abiding citizen." It forms a kind of automatism which underlies our more conscious and intelligent behaviour. The force of the state is a "dangerous drug" which has to be administered "as a counter-poison to tendencies which would otherwise give to chance the logical will."

Since the individuals were selfish and always clamoured for their personal interests, it was desirable to obey the state which alone could and did rise above the partial and short-sighted interests of the individuals

Bosanquet identified state with society. "We have," says he, "hitherto spoken of the state and society as almost convertible terms." Again, "By the state then we mean society as a unit recognised as rightly exercising control over its members through absolute physical power"

The lofty position to which he raised the state in the world-society is evident from the following statement: "The state is the guardian of the whole moral world, and not a factor within an organised moral world." The state could act independently of any control whether internal or external. It was a unit in itself, having as it were no connection with the rest of the world.

Criticism. As was to be expected, the Idealist theory has been subjected to severe criticism. The realists contend that its philosophy is purely abstract and metaphysical. It is wrong to say that "what is real is rational, and what is rational is real". The "realisation of freedom" is not the completion of an exercise in

logic. The Russian State before 1917 was real but not rational. The idealist state "may be laid up in heaven but it is not established on earth."

Neither the state can be nor it should be omnipotent. There are internal checks on its power. It acts through law which has a limited jurisdiction because it can regulate and control only the external actions of man. Moreover, my only duty is not obedience to the state. The state is merely an association like many others and consequently my allegiance to it is proportionate to its contribution to my life. Since that contribution is partial, my allegiance is also partial. Hence, the state cannot be allowed to exercise absolute powers with any justification.

It is wrong to contend that the state is infallible. After all, the state acts through a machinery of human beings who are liable to make mistakes. One fails to understand how an ordinary man becomes infallible as soon as he enters the government service. The acceptance of such a view will lead to the worst form of tyranny.

The idealists make the state an end in itself and the people become the means for its glorification. The sacrifice of the lives of thousands of people is justified in case that can make a state great. Such a view ignores the importance of man for whose welfare the state ought to exist. It is like putting the cart before the horse. After all, the state is merely a machinery for the betterment of the lot of individuals. It is wrong to speak of the personality of the state separate from the individuals who constitute the state, or the separate interests or will of the state. There can be no will of society or mind of society. These are merely the figments of imagination.

The idealist identification of state and society is also erroneous. "It is true that the state is at present necessary to society, but it is only one of its conditions. The bony skeleton is necessary to the human body and in a sense holds it together, but it is hardly that which constitutes the life of the body, still less

that which makes the life of the body desirable and beautiful." Moreover, "much of the organisation of life is more extensive than any organised state, and many social divisions cut across state divisions *e.g.* the Church is a cosmopolitan and not a national organisation. Similarly, economic organisations may be world-wide, *e.g.*, the Socialist International." The state may be the organisation that supports the entire fabric of society but that does not imply that it is to be identified with society.

The idealist conception of individuality is wrong. My individuality is a separate entity in itself. It cannot be merged into the that of the state.

Likewise, the idealist view of liberty is ridiculous. It does not stand to reason as to how a person is actually free when he is being taken to the prison by the police although the orders were issued by the government. I am free only when I obey myself. How can I be free when I have to submit to an order of the government which my conscience does not approve of? How can true liberty be in complete subordination to the dictates of the government?

The Idealists try to explain this paradox by a theory of two "wills", *viz.*, the "real will" and the so-called will. It is contended that the "real will" of man is identical with that of the state. When a man obeys the state, he obeys his real will. If he finds himself in conflict with the state, he has not the right to defy its authority because it is not his real will but the so-called will that is opposing the state. This is evidently wrong. This is merely to take away from the individual all right of opposing the will of the state even when that is oppressive and tyrannical.

The idealists contend that the people have no right of revolution against the state. To rise against the state is to rise against yourself. According to their way of thinking the attack of an individual on the state is like the revolt of the hand against the body. If is like com-

mitting suicide and not murder. Such a view is untenable.

The metaphysical theory errs in confusing the political with moral obligations. Hobson regards it as the central fallacy. Law is concerned only with the external actions of man, while morality is internal and hence cannot be dealt with by the crude hands of law. An individual must have the right to challenge an order of the government in case his inner conscience does not approve of it, just as Sir Thomas More refused to recognise the spiritual headship of Henry VIII although he recognised him as the political head. Many will have to share the fate of More if the moral and political obligations were identified. There will be no safeguard for the conscientious objectors and the quakers who regard war as an evil and would not fight on any account. To make them fight against the dictates of their inner conscience, is the very negation of morality and liberty.

Bosanquet held the view that standards of morality did not apply to the actions of the state. Those were above all moral considerations. The state could not commit theft or murder. But history of the world is a proof positive that the machinery through which the state expresses itself, i.e., the government, does certain things which definitely contravene all tenets of morality and hence ought to be judged accordingly. Otherwise, life will not be worth living.

The idealist conception of the state does not leave any scope for a world-order or an international law. The idealist do not recognise any power or organisation to which an individual can owe allegiance. His own state is the centre of his existence. There exists nothing beyond its frontiers. The state is self-sufficient. Dr. Bosanquet remarks: "The state is the guardian of the whole moral world, and not a factor within an organised moral world." Such a view of the state will have to be given up if we regard the world as one great unit in which the various states are merely the parts of one great whole.

The idealist conception of unity of the state is a fiction. The state cannot be regarded as an organism. If the individuals constitute a state, the state does not become an individual thereby. Just as a grove of trees is not a tree, a flock of sheep is not a sheep, similarly the state which is an assemblage of individuals, does not become an individual on that account. The unity of the state is conceptual and not a fact. Moreover, the state can enjoy the backing of the people only if it meets the expectations of the individuals and not otherwise. But that is not so in many countries, e.g., India. Hegel stood for an aristocratic state in which only the nobility was to run the machinery of the government. Since all other classes were excluded from participation in the state, there was no possibility of realising unity under such circumstances. The unity of the state is breaking down as the conflict between the various sections of society in the state is gaining momentum because of the socialistic propaganda and the operation of capitalist tendencies.

Last but not least, the Idealists made the capital blunder in deifying the state. It is absurd to assert that the orders of the government, whatever their nature, have a divine sanction and to oppose them is morally wrong. The state by no stretch of imagination can be regarded as the march of God on earth.

The state in actual practice is government and the persons who run its machinery, cannot be expected to be impartial. It has always been weighted on the side of those who control it at any time. The state was biased against the slaves in the Greek and Roman period, in favour of the landed aristocracy in the middle ages and against the proletariat in the modern individualist and capitalist society. Prof. Hobhouse remarks: "The government law, or other political institutions are far from being the most successful of the experiments of mankind. They call aloud for criticism and to deify them is to establish false gods, gods who at the present time figure as veritable Molochs before whom our sons are made to pass in millions through the fire."

"When we think of the actual inconsistencies of traditional social morality, the blindness and crudity of law, the elements of class-selfishness and oppression that have coloured it, mechanical dullness of state institutions even at their best, the massive misery that has lain at the foundation of all historic civilisation, we cannot deify the state "

The great contribution of the Idealist theory lies in its emphasis on the significance of the state. But it is not to be forgotten that it was a product of the times. It is the political exigencies of Germany during the 19th century that justified the complete subordination of the individual to the state. But it was a philosophy of abnormal times and in normal times both the state and the individual must have their legitimate place in society. Prof. Hobhouse sums up thus: "The state is a great organisation. Its well-being is something of larger and more permanent import than that of any single citizen. Its scope is vast. Its service calls for the extreme of loyalty and self-sacrifice. All this is true. Yet when the state is set up as an entity superior and indifferent to component individuals it becomes a false god and its worship the abomination of desolation, as seen at Ypres or on the Somme."

CHAPTER XII

THE END OF THE STATE.

The significance of the problem of the end of the state lies in the fact that it is the motive-force behind the machinery of the government. It is only when it has been satisfactorily settled as to for what purpose does the state exist that we can know the direction in which its machinery has to be directed in order to realise it. This problem always remains fresh for the simple reason that with the variations in the environments prevailing at any time in any country, the goal towards which the government should aim at must change. The end of the state in a politically and economically backward country before the Christian era cannot be the same as that of a highly industrialised society after the socialist preachings of Marx.

Even the question as to whether the state is an end in itself or a means to an end, was not settled for centuries. The Greeks held the view that the state was an end in itself. Their conclusion was the outcome of their identification of the state with society. The same was the opinion of the Hegelians whose philosophy was immensely affected by the writings of the Greeks. It is only due to the growth of individualism and the emphasis that is being laid on individuality, that the view of regarding the state a means and not an end, is gaining ground and being generally accepted. It is held that the state is merely a means and man is the end for which the machinery of the state should be directed. But Prof. Willoughby says that whether the state is a means or an end, depends upon the particular point of view from which we look at it. If the state is considered as something distinct from the body of persons who constitute the state or who live under it, it becomes an end in it-

self. Prof. Bluntschli put the problem in his own characteristic way. A picture, says he, may be an end or a means. It may be the end of a life of artistic aspirations or it may be a means of getting food. So the individuals may gain from the state and for them it may be only a means, but at the same time, it may be viewed as an end itself.

Bluntschli has pointed out three false ends of the state. One view is that the state has for its real aim the rule of the supreme power especially of princes over their subjects. According to the second view, the end of the state is to carry out the divine will. In such a case, the state becomes a theocracy. The third view is that the end of the state is the service of some object external to the people and the country. An example of this is the papal claim to territory which will give the Roman Church an independent temporal status.

But besides these three, there were other mistaken views regarding the end of the state. The individualists of the nineteenth century held that order or security was the end of the state and its only function was to act as a policeman. They contended that society was governed by laws analogous to those of nature and as nature did its work uninterrupted from any quarter, men and women in society should be allowed to direct their destinies without any check from any side. It was argued that the only purpose for which the state existed was to remove hinderances in the way of the natural working of the social forces. Hence the state was merely to protect individuals from external invasions and internal disturbances. But it can be contended that maintenance of order and security alone cannot be the end of the state. These are too negative to serve the needs of the modern progressive society. The state must play a positive role in it. Order in itself cannot be the end, otherwise there is plenty of it in a managerie.

Likewise, progress cannot be regarded as an end of the state. It is merely a process towards an end. Utility has also been put forward as the end of the state.

According to this view, every action of the state ought to stand the test of usefulness. Addition of utility to the lives of individuals is welcome, but usefulness is merely a means to an end. Utility view confuses means and ends.

Another school of thought regards justice as the end of the state. No body will deny the desirability of equal-handed justice being given to the man in the street. But this alone is a narrow view of the end of the state. Moreover, interpretations of justice vary from person to person, and time to time. As one man's meat is another man's poison, similarly what is justice from the point of view of a rich man may be the very negation of it from that of a poor man. Complete justice involves complete knowledge which belongs only to God. Hence the difficulty of the realisation of this ideal in actual practice.

Likewise, liberty, equality, fraternity, monarchy, democracy have been put forward as ends of the state. But they all seem to confuse the idea of end.

According to Bluntschli, the proper and direct end of the state is the development of national capacities, the perfecting of national life and finally its completion, provided of course that the process of moral and political development shall not be opposed to destiny of humanity.

The view of Holtzendorff is that the state has a triple end. The first is power. The state must have so much of power that it can preserve its existence. The second is individual liberty. The individual must be protected from the interference of others. The third end of the state is the general welfare. While regarding this view as inadequate and incomplete, Professor Burgess points out that the end of the state should be three-fold, viz., the good of the individual, the good of association, and the furthering of the world progress or civilisation.

Another school puts forward the suggestion that the end of the state is social control for the satisfaction of wills. The individual will is considered the fundamental

unit in politics and the ultimate purpose of the state is to satisfy as many wills as possible. The state exists to keep a balance between wills. Dr. Catlin refers to the importance of wills in these words: "The fact about individuals which is relevant to discussion of politics is not then musical taste or the charm of their character, but that they have wills, and may be counted on to endeavour to carry out what they may happen to will." Against this view, it may be argued that such a view is more suited to the exhaustive study of processes of politics than to an elucidation of end of government. The primary consideration should not be the mere satisfaction of the human wills, but to realise the greatest satisfaction under the circumstances. Moreover, wills do not act in a vacuum. They must act in accordance with some purpose, whether or not they succeed in realising it. At best, the satisfaction of wills is a partial end of the state.

Moral progress has been suggested as the end of the state. The activities of the state should be so adjusted and directed that human-beings living under it, become more and more moral. The Greeks believed that moral progress was possible only under a state and the problem before Plato in the Republic was as to how to make people moral. According to Hegel, the state includes within itself the morality of which man is capable and individual could attain this development only by complete submission to the state. Kant was of the opinion that the state could help individuals to be moral by removing all those obstacles which hindered their moral growth. T. H. Green also held that the state should do only those things which helped individuals to become moral. The state was to regulate the external life of man or his environments, and the man was to become moral by adjusting his actions according to the dictates of his conscience. While it is conceded that the attainment of moral progress is a good enough ideal, it cannot be said that it is an adequate end of the state. Hocking remarks; "Those who like Kant, Green and Bosanquet, limit the state to external conditions of public welfare or especial-

ly the external conditions of right fail to make it appear how external conditions can promote right at all, if the inner is so sharply separated from the outer as the Kantian analysis insists, no external change can either hinder or help the moral will."

The utilitarians regard the greatest happiness of the greatest number as the end of the state. According to Bentham and the Mills, the end of all legislation and state-activity should be the realisation of the greatest happiness of the largest number. But the problem becomes complicated if the greatest number were to become thieves. Moreover, happiness consists of many things and each individual has his or her own conception of happiness. It is difficult to say for certain as to what the happiness of the largest number implies. The greatest difficulty of the utilitarian philosophy lies in the fact that it is difficult to find as to how the greatest good of the greatest number can be realised or wherein it actually lies. Happiness being subjective, there is no barometer to measure it. It is a good ideal to aim at the happiness of the people, but it is difficult to say as to how far the legislators will be able to achieve it in actual practice in the atmosphere of fight for power and domination. Moreover, the average voter is too ignorant to know enough about the world, about himself and the permanent conditions of life he desires, or the changes that will take place in his wants or about the governmental means or choices presented to him, or to judge at a given moment as to what will give him the greatest happiness. Bentham may legislate for the nations of the world, but all are not Benthams. In spite of its shortcomings, utilitarianism cannot be passed over as a puerile solution of the end of the state. It is a deniable criterion for the actions of the state.

Maintenance of rights has been suggested as the end of the state. Professor Laski says: "It is clear, in such a view, that the citizens have a claim upon the state. It must observe its rights. It must

give those conditions without which he cannot be that best self that he may." Development of the personality, says he, is impossible unless certain rights are guaranteed. The record of past history shows that in the absence of these rights, life was incomplete. The individuals lacked means essential for the development of their best selves. It is true that the contents of these rights change with time and place, but their necessity cannot be denied. The state must guarantee these rights to individuals or groups of individuals. Hocking puts the matter thus: "It is right, or absolute right, that an individual shall develop the powers that are in him. He may be said to have natural rights to become what he is capable of becoming." Rights may be moral or legal. The legal rights must try to approach the goal fixed by the moral rights or the natural rights.

Another view makes the protection of interests as the end of the state. This is the view of the sociological jurists. Pound is one of them. According to him, the end of law and hence of the state is the definition and classification of interests and improvement in the administration of justice. Law should formulate and protect the social interests which include general security, security of social institutions, use and conservation of natural resources, general progress, (cultural, economic and political), the welfare of individuals and equitable adjustment of individual interests. Ihering puts the same in these words: "The final end, then, of the state as of right and law is the safeguarding and the conservation of the vital elements of society. Law exists because of society."

Last but not least, the development of individual personality has been put forward as the end of the state. The state is a means to serve the individual and it should aim at the development of his self. Hocking says: "The state is a territorial body of people united under a sovereign power for the purpose of making a better breed of men and rendering more rational the inner play of social forces." The state exists and

should exist for the best realisation of the self. It is true that the very life in the state makes the individual more rational. By its very existence, the state performs a service. It is permanent and therefore it creates an atmosphere in which human purpose can be realised without undue interference. The individual is not required to devote his energies to preserving himself against the disorders of anarchy. But the state can and should go further and try to provide the individual with those opportunities which will enable him to realise the very best in him. In this way, the state can make history by bettering the individuals.

We may conclude the discussion regarding the end of the state with the famous statement of Aristotle: "The state comes into being for the sake of mere life: it continues to exist for the sake of the good life." The state should try to make the individual better, for his betterment is its end.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY.

- 1 Rappoport, Dictionary of Socialism.
2. Spargo, J., Socialism.
3. Spargo, J., Karl Marx : his life and work.
4. Postgate, R W., Karl Marx, London. 1933.
- 5 Beer M., The life and teaching of Karl Marx,
London and Manchester, 1921.
6. Korsch, Karl. Karl Marx, London, 1938.
7. Kautsky, Karl, Economic doctrines of Karl Marx,
London, 1925.
8. Salter, F R., Karl Marx, and modern civilisa-
tion. 1921.
9. Cole, G D. H., What Marx really meant, London,
1934
10. Laski, H J., Karl Marx : an essay, London,
1922.
11. The correspondence of Marx and Engels (1846-
1895).
Martin Lawrence Ltd., London, 1934.
- 12 Hook, Sidney, Towards the understanding of Karl
Marx, London, 1933
13. Karl Marx, Selected Essays, (translated by
H J. Stenning) Leonard Parsons,
London
14. Markham, S. F., A History of Socialism London,
1930.
15. Laidler, H. W., History of Socialist thought.
16. Pease, E. R., History of the Fabian Society,
London, 1925.
17. Kirkup, T., History of socialism, 1913.
18. Coker, F. W., Recent political thought, New
York and London, 1934.
19. Hearnshaw. F. A survey of socialism, London,
J. C., 1928.

20. Kirkup, Thomas, A Primer of socialism, London, 1926 (fourth edition).
21. Galsier, J. B., The meaning of socialism, Westminster, 1925.
22. Gordon, A., The Common-sense of socialism, London, 1924.
23. Fabian essays in socialism, edited by Shaw, The Fabian Society, London, 1920.
24. Bax, E. Belford, Essays in Socialism, London, 1907
25. Bax, F. B., Ethics Socialism, London. 1902.
26. Bax, E. B., The Religion of Socialism, London, 1902.
27. Rae, John, Contemporary Socialism, New York, 1886.
28. Price, G. M and Thurbur, R. B., Socialism in the Test-tube, 1921.
29. Hillquit, M., Socialism in theory and practice, New York, 1909.
30. Hamilton, M.A , The Principles of Socialism, London.
31. Schaffle, A. Dr., The Quintessence of Socialism. (English translation under the supervision of Dr. D. B. Bosanquet). London, 1902.
32. Humphrey, P. W., The modern case for Socialism, London, 1928.
33. Russell, Bertrand, Roads to freedom, 1918.
34. " " Proposed roads to freedom, 1919.
35. Leacock, S., The unsolved riddle of social justice. 1919.
36. Mallock, W.H.. Social reform, London, 1914.
37. Shadwell, A. Dr , Typhoeus or the future of Socialism, London, 1926.
38. Shadwell, A. Dr. The Breakdown of Socialism, London 1926.
39. Wilson, H. A. The failure of modern Socialism, London.
40. Brailsford, H. W. Socialism for to-day, London, 1927.

41. Bliss, W. D. P., Handbook of Socialism,
42. Skelton, O., Socialism - a critical analysis, 1911.
43. Mackay, Tho- A plea for liberty : an argument
mased. against socialism and socialistic
legislation, 1891.
44. Seligman, E. R. The economic interpretation of
A., history, New York, 1924.
45. Shaw, G B., The intelligent woman's guide to
Socialism and Capitalism, London,
1929.
46. Laski, H. J. Communism 1927.
47. Zenker, E. V., Anarchism : a criticism and history
of the anarchist theory, 1897.
48. Field, G. C. Guild-Socialism, 1920.
49. Spargo, John. Syndicalism, industrial unionism
and Socialism, 1913.
50. Macdonald, J. Sydicalism - a critical examination,
R., 1912.
51. Marriott, J. A. Syndicalism economic and politi-
cal, London, 1920.
52. Russell, Bertand, The practice and theory of Bol-
shevism, London, 1920.
53. Carpenter, Niles, Guild-Socialism, Appleton Com-
Dr. pany, New York, 1922.
54. Brameld, T. B. A philosophic approach to Com-
H. munistism, Chicago, 1933.
55. Beanlieu, P. I. Collectivism (translated and ab-
ridged by Sir Arthur Clay),
London, 1928.
56. Hurd, A , State-socialism in practice, London,
1925
57. Barker, J E., British Socialism, London, 1908.
58. Arnold-Forster, English Socialism of To-day,
H O., M. P., London, 1908.
59. Eastman, Max, Lenin and the science of revolu-
Marx, tion, 1926.
60. Kropotkin, P. A. The Conquest of bread, London,
1906.
61. Kropotkin, P. Anarchist Communism : its basis
A., and principles, 1905.

62. Tolstoi, Count Leo The kingdom of God within you, 1893.
63. Dawson, W. H. Bismarck and state-socialism, London, 1891.
64. Cole, G. D. H., Self-Government in Industry, 1918.
65. Cole, G. D. H., World of Labour, 1913.
66. Maccunn, John, Six radical thinkers, 1907.
67. Donisthorpe, Individualism, 1894.
68. Von Humboldt, Sphere and duties of Government, 1791.
69. M'Kechnie, W. S. The state and the individual, 1896.
70. Montague, F. C. Limits of individual liberty, 1855.
71. Ritchie, Principles of state-interference.
72. Burgess, J. W. The Reconciliation of Government with liberty, 1915.
73. Mill, J. S., On liberty, 1863.
74. Bain, Alexander, Dr. John Stuart Mill: a Criticism, London, 1882.
75. Keynes, J. M., The end of laissez-faire, 1926.
76. Lord, A. R., Principles of Politics, 1926.
77. Ritchie, D. G., Studies in political and social ethics, 1929.
78. Hobhouse, L.T., The metaphysical theory of the state, 1918.
79. Bosanquet, B., The philosophical theory of the State.
80. Wilde, Norman, The ethical basis of the state, Princeton University Press, 1924.
81. Green, T. H., Lectures on the principles of political obligation.
82. Muirhead, J.H., The service of the state: four lectures on the political teaching of T. H. Green, London, 1908.
83. Barker, E., Political Thought in England. (1848 to 1914), London, 1932.
84. Laski, H. J., The state in theory and practice, London, 1836.

85. Krabbe, H., The modern idea of the state
(translated by G. H. Sabine and
W. S. Shepard), London and
New York, 1930.
86. Wilson, F. G., Elements of modern Politics, New
York and London, 1936.
87. Sabine, G. H., A History of Political Theory,
1939.
88. Dunning, W.A., A history of political theories,
(from Rousseau to Spencer),
New York, 1933.

