

Strategies for Rural Development



**S. Kanchana Ratnam
Rahul Kumar
Anshu Choudhary**



Strategies for Rural Development

.....

S. Kanchana Ratnam

Rahul Kumar

Anshu Choudhary



Strategies for Rural Development

.....

S. Kanchana Ratnam

Rahul Kumar

Anshu Choudhary

Dominant
Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd
New Delhi, INDIA



Knowledge is Our Business

STRATEGIES FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT

By S. Kanchana Ratnam, Rahul Kumar, Anshu Choudhary

This edition published by Dominant Publishers And Distributors (P) Ltd
4378/4-B, Murarilal Street, Ansari Road, Daryaganj,
New Delhi-110002.

ISBN: 978-93-82007-11-1

Edition: 2022 (Revised)

©Reserved.

This publication may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publishers.

Dominant

Publishers & Distributors Pvt Ltd

Registered Office: 4378/4-B, Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road,
Daryaganj, New Delhi - 110002.

Ph. +91-11-23281685, 41043100, Fax: +91-11-23270680

Production Office: "Dominant House", G - 316, Sector - 63, Noida,
National Capital Region - 201301.

Ph. 0120-4270027, 4273334

e-mail: dominantbooks@gmail.com
info@dominantbooks.com

w w w . d o m i n a n t b o o k s . c o m

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Introduction to Socialist Ideas' Success.....	1
— <i>Rahul Kumar, Anshu Choudhary</i>	
Chapter 2. Describe the Complex Nature of Ownership.....	9
— <i>Rahul Kumar, Anshu Choudhary</i>	
Chapter 3. Explain the Theory of Violence and Contract.....	18
— <i>Rahul Kumar, Anshu Choudhary</i>	
Chapter 4. A Brief Introduction on Socialism.....	27
— <i>Rahul Kumar, Anshu Choudhary</i>	
Chapter 5. Social Order and the Political Constitution.....	36
— <i>Rahul Kumar, Anshu Choudhary</i>	
Chapter 6. A Brief Introduction on Economic Democracy.....	46
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 7. A Contribution to the Critique of the Concept Economic Activity.....	54
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 8. Socialization of the Means of Production.....	65
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 9. Artificial Market as the Solution of the Problem of Economic Calculation.....	74
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 10. Analyse the Distribution of Income.....	83
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 11. Socialist Community under Stationary Conditions.....	91
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 12. A Brief Study on Position of the Individual under Socialism.....	102
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 13. A Brief Study on Socialism under Dynamic Conditions.....	110
— <i>Parul Tyagi, Dr. Preeti Garg</i>	
Chapter 14. Analysis on Impracticability of Socialism.....	118
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	
Chapter 15. A Study on National Socialism and World Socialism.....	125
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	
Chapter 16. A Brief Study Foreign Trade under Socialism.....	133
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	
Chapter 17. Determine the Particular Forms of Socialism.....	142
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	

Chapter 18. A Brief Introduction about Pseudo-Socialist Systems	153
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	
Chapter 19. Analysis the Nature of Society	163
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	
Chapter 20. Role of Conflict in Social Evolution	173
— <i>Swati Rajaura, Dr. Neha Yajurvedi</i>	
Chapter 21. Discussion on the Clash of Class Interests and Class War	182
— <i>Aditi Garg, Dr. Anuj Goel</i>	
Chapter 22. Establishments and Fortunes are Concentrated in Certain Areas.....	192
— <i>Aditi Garg, Dr. Anuj Goel</i>	
Chapter 23. A Brief Study on Monopoly and Its Effects	202
— <i>Aditi Garg, Dr. Anuj Goel</i>	
Chapter 24. A Brief Study on Socialism as a Moral Imperative.....	209
— <i>Aditi Garg, Dr. Anuj Goel</i>	
Chapter 25. Analysis the Relationship between Socialism and Christianity	219
— <i>Aditi Garg, Dr. Anuj Goel</i>	

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO SOCIALIST IDEAS' SUCCESS

Rahul Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-rahul.kumar@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Anshu Choudhary, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-anshu@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The effectiveness of socialist theories in the modern world is examined in this chapter along with the variables that have influenced their broad acceptance and application. In recent years, socialist beliefs have seen a comeback, opposing established capitalist institutions and promoting more just communities. This research aims to shed light on the factors contributing to socialism policies' success and the possible ramifications for future socio-economic developments by examining significant instances of socialist policies and their results. Although socialist principles have been successful in certain areas and some programs have produced fruitful results, difficulties still exist. Since socialist systems have had varying degrees of success historically, meticulous preparation is necessary before they are put into place. Economic efficiency and social welfare must be carefully balanced, and failure to do so might have unintended repercussions. Globalization and technological development have also contributed to the expansion of socialist ideology. Digital communication and social media have made it easier to disseminate information and coordinate grassroots movements internationally. Because of this interconnection, socialist activists and ideas have a greater worldwide following and more impact.

KEYWORDS:

Economy, Globalization, Socialist, Social, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Today, socialism is both the watchword and the buzzword. The modern spirit is dominated by the socialist notion. The general public supports it. It has left its mark on our period and represents the sentiments of everybody. The chapter "The Epoch of Socialism" will be written above when history eventually tells our tale. It is true that socialism has not yet produced a society that can be claimed to embody its goal. However, the policies of civilized countries have been geared towards nothing less than a progressive realization of Socialism for more than a decade. The movement's vigor and persistence have clearly increased in recent years. Some countries have attempted to enact socialism in its purest form all at once. Whatever its importance may be, Russian Bolshevism has already achieved something that, by virtue of its sheer size and scope, must rank among the most astonishing feats in all of human history. No one has yet accomplished as much elsewhere. However, with other groups of people, only the internal inconsistencies of Socialism and the reality that it cannot be fully realized have prevented socialist victory. They have also taken things as far as they can under the circumstances[1]-[3].

There is no principled opposition to socialism. In the modern day, no powerful party would publicly support private property in the means of production. For our time, the term "capitalism" embodies the whole of all evil. Even socialist opponents are influenced by socialist principles. By attempting to oppose socialism from the perspective of their unique class interests, these opponents particularly the parties that specifically identify as "bourgeois" or "peasant" indirectly concede the legitimacy of all of the key ideas of socialist

theory. Because one has fully endorsed socialism if all one can say to refute the socialist agenda is that it endangers the specific interests of one segment of mankind. If one complains that the system of economic and social organization based on private property in the means of production does not sufficiently consider the interests of the community, that it only serves the interests of one strata, and that it limits productivity; and if one demands, along with the supporters of the various "social-political" and "social-reform" movements, state interference in all fields of economic life, then one has fundamentally accepted that the system of economic and social organization that is based on private property in the means of production. Another option is to admit that you have given in to socialist notions if all you can say in opposition to it is that it cannot be realized because of human nature flaws or that moving toward socialization now would be unwise given the current state of the economy.

The nationalist agrees with socialism and limits his criticism to its internationalism. He wants to include imperialism, socialism, and the notion of waging war on other countries. He is a national socialist, not an international one, but he nevertheless supports the fundamental tenets of socialism. Thus, socialists who believe that the socialistic order of society is superior to one based on private ownership of the means of production in terms of economics and ethics are not just limited to Bolsheviks and their allies outside of Russia or to members of the numerous socialist parties. This is true even though they may attempt to reach a temporary or permanent compromise between their socialistic ideal and the specific inter- If we use this definition of socialism as our starting point, we can see that the vast majority of people currently support it. There are very few people who avow the libertarian ideals and believe that a system based on private ownership of the means of production is the only kind of economic society that is feasible.

One startling fact highlights the success of socialist ideas: we have grown accustomed to referring to Socialism as only that policy that seeks to implement the socialist program immediately and completely, while we refer to all movements working toward the same goal under other names and even label them as Socialism's enemies. This can only have happened since there aren't many genuine socialist opponents remaining. Even in England, the birthplace of liberalism and a country that has benefited much from its liberal policies, few people today are familiar with the true meaning of liberalism. Today's "Liberals" in England are essentially moderate socialists. People in Germany rarely have any idea what liberalism may be since they never actually experienced it and because of their anti-liberal policies, they have become powerless and destitute. The immense strength of Russian Bolshevism is based on the socialist idea's total triumph in recent decades. Bolshevism is powerful because the whole world accepts its ideals with sympathy, not because of the Soviet Union's artillery and machine guns. Many socialists believe that the Bolshevik project was premature and look to the future for Socialism's success. However, no socialist can avoid being moved by the rhetoric with which the Third International calls on all peoples to wage war against capitalism. The desire for Bolshevism is felt across the whole world[4], [5].

Sympathy, terror, and the respect that the brave believer always generates in the timid opportunist are mingled together among the feeble and lukewarm. However, those who are braver and more reliable are quick to welcome the beginning of a new era.

DISCUSSION

The Scientific Analysis Of Socialism

The critique of the bourgeois social order serves as the foundation of socialist theory. We are aware of the lack of success socialist authors have had in this area. We are aware of their misunderstanding of how the economy operates and their lack of comprehension of how the

many institutions that make up the social order which is founded on the division of labor and private ownership of the means of production function. It has not been difficult to demonstrate the errors socialistic thinkers made in their analysis of the economic process: opponents have been successful in demonstrating the serious flaws in their economic theories. However, asking whether the capitalist system of government is more or less flawed is hardly a conclusive response to the issue of whether socialism would be able to provide a superior replacement.

It is required to further demonstrate that the socialistic system is superior in order to show that the social order based on private ownership of the means of production has flaws and has not produced the greatest possible world. Only a small number of socialists have attempted to demonstrate this, and those who have mostly done so in a totally unscientific, some could even say frivolous, way. Socialism's science is elementary, and it is not simply the form that calls itself "Scientific" that is to fault for this. Marxism does not consider the advent of Socialism to be a natural step in the development of society. If it had merely done this, it would not have been able to have the negative impact on the scientific study of social issues that must be attributed to it. It would never have had such harmful effects if it had just said that the socialistic order of society was the finest possible form of social existence. However, it has hindered the scientific analysis of social issues via sophistry and has tainted the intellectual climate of the moment.

Marxist theory holds that one's mentality is determined by their social situation. What opinions a writer will convey depends on his social class membership. He is unable to develop beyond his class or to liberate his mind from the constraints of his class's interests.²¹ As a result, it is debatable whether there can be a generic science that applies to all men, regardless of class. It was only one more stage in Dietzgen's process of creating a unique proletarian logic. "The ideas of proletarian logic are not party ideas, but the consequences of logic pure and simple," according to the proletariat science, which is the sole source of truth.²³ Marxism therefore defends itself from any unpleasant critique. The antagonist is not sufficiently rejected to reveal his bourgeois identity. Marxism portrays all people who hold opposing views as the opportunistic servants of the bourgeoisie, undermining their accomplishments. Never did Marx or Engels attempt to argue with their opponents. They belittled, mocked, criticized, slandered, and traduced them, and their adherents are no less skilled in these techniques. They always attack the opponent personally rather than their opponent's position. Few people have been able to resist such strategies. Few people have had the guts to criticize Socialism with the same ruthless rigor that a scientist must use when considering any field of study. Only in this way can it be understood why both proponents and opponents of socialism have blindly adhered to the Marxist ban on a more in-depth examination of the economic and social realities inside the socialist society[6]–[8].

Marxism claims, on the one hand, that the socialization of the means of production is the goal of its political endeavor and that it is the conclusion to which economic development inevitably leads with the certainty of a natural law. He explained the fundamental tenet of socialist organization in this manner. The prohibition against studying the operation of a socialist society, which was supported by a number of weak justifications, was actually designed to keep the flaws in Marxist doctrines from becoming obvious in discussions about how to build a workable socialist society. The enthusiasm of the people, who looked to Socialism for relief from the evils of the earth, may have been subdued by a clear explanation of the nature of socialist society. One of Marx's most cunning tactical tactics was the effective suppression of these risky questions, which had led to the demise of all preceding socialistic doctrines. Socialism was only able to overtake conservatism as the leading

political force of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century because it was forbidden for individuals to discuss or even contemplate the nature of the socialist society.

The best way to demonstrate these claims is with a passage from Hermann Cohen, a writer who, in the years leading up to the First World War,²⁵ had a significant impact on German philosophy. "Today," claims Cohen, "no lack of understanding stops us from identifying the core of the social crisis and, therefore, even if only covertly, the requirement of social reform policy. Only the wicked, or the not enough good, will. Only the existence of such flawed natures can account for the unreasonable demand that it reveal the general public's idea of the future state in an effort to discredit party socialism. The state presupposes law, but these individuals focus more on the appearance of the state than the moral standards that govern the law. By flipping the notions in this way, one confounds socialist ethics with utopian poetry. But morality is not poetry, and the concept is true even without a picture. According to its prototype, its picture represents the reality that has yet to materialize. Today, it is possible to see the socialist ideal as a universal reality of the public consciousness, although one that is still an unrevealed secret. Its faith is only denied by the actual materialism, which is the egoism latent in ideals of blatant covetousness.

The author of these writings and thoughts was universally hailed as the best and bravest German thinker of his day, and even detractors of his school of thought acknowledged his brilliance. Just for that reason, it is important to emphasize that Cohen not only accepts the demands of Socialism without reservation or criticism and acknowledges the prohibition against attempts to examine conditions in the socialist community, but also portrays anyone who tries to embarrass "party-Socialism" with a demand for information about the issues facing socialist economies as a morally deficient being. A phenomena that may be noticed often enough in the history of thinking is the bravery of a thinker whose critique ordinarily spares nothing should stop short before a gigantic idol of his time. Even Cohen's great model, Kant, is accused of this. But luckily, there aren't many instances in the history of thinking when a philosopher has accused everyone who has a different opinion or even raises a topic that may be problematic to people in positions of authority of malice, a bad temperament, and outright covetousness.

Anyone who refused to unconditionally submit to this compulsion was prohibited and made illegal. In this manner, Socialism was able to gain momentum year after year without anybody feeling the need to do a thorough analysis of how it would function. Marxian Socialism had to admit that it had no clear notion of what it had been attempting to do for years when it took the reins of power and tried to implement its whole agenda. Therefore, it is crucial to analyze socialist community issues in order to fully comprehend the differences between liberal and socialist policies. It is impossible to comprehend the issues that have arisen since the trend towards nationalization and municipalization started without such a conversation. Up until this point, economics has looked only at the mechanism of a society based on private ownership of the means of production, which is understandable but disappointing. This leaves a void that has to be filled.

Politicians debate whether society should be established on the principle of public ownership of the means of production or on the principle of private ownership of those same means. Science is unable to make a determination about the relative merits of various kinds of social organization.

But science alone can provide the framework for understanding society by looking at how institutions affect people. The man of thought will never stop inquiring into all that is within the realm of human intellect, even if the man of action, the politician, may sometimes pay

little regard to the findings of this study. Additionally, action must ultimately be determined by cognition.

Alternative Modes of Approach to the Analysis of Socialism

There are two approaches to solving the issues that socialism presents to science. Socialism may be discussed by the cultural philosopher by attempting to rank it amid all other cultural phenomena. He delves into its intellectual origins, assesses how it relates to other facets of social life, searches for its hidden roots inside the individual's soul, and attempts to comprehend it as a phenomenon affecting a large number of people. He looks at the impact it has on philosophy, art, and literature. He makes an effort to demonstrate how it relates to the scientific and psychological sciences of the day. He examines it as a way of life, a psychological expression, and a manifestation of aesthetic and ethical values. The cultural-historical-psychological approach is thus. It is the path taken by thousands of novels and articles, and it has been done before.

Never should we prejudge a scientific approach. Success is the only yardstick by which its capacity to produce outcomes can be measured. It's feasible that the cultural-historical-psychological approach will make a significant contribution to finding solutions to the issues that Socialism has presented to science. The fact that the sociological²⁸-economical study of the issues must come before the cultural-historical-psychological is one of the main reasons why its outcomes have been so disappointing, in addition to the ineptitude and political preconceptions of those who undertook the task. For Socialism is a plan to change society's structure and economics to conform to a predetermined ideal. One must first have a good understanding of its social and economic importance in order to comprehend its repercussions on other spheres of mental and cultural life. It is dangerous to risk a cultural-historical-psychological interpretation if one is still unsure about this. Before discussing socialism's ethics, it is important to understand how it relates to other moral principles. When one just has a vague understanding of its fundamental reality, it is hard to conduct a pertinent examination of how it affects religion and public life. Without first and foremost analyzing the workings of an economic system based on shared ownership of the means of production, it is difficult to even begin to debate socialism[9]–[11].

At each of the starting locations where the cultural-historical-psychological process typically begins, this is made very evident. This approach's proponents view Socialism as the inevitable outcome of the democratic idea of equality without first deciding what democracy and equality actually entail or how they relate to one another, or whether Socialism is fundamentally or merely generally interested in the concept of equality. They claim that Socialism seeks for the utmost rationalization of material existence, a rationalization that Capitalism could never achieve, and that it is frequently described as the psyche's response to the spiritual devastation brought on by the rationality inextricably linked to Capitalism. It is unnecessary to analyze those who envelop their theoretical and cultural explanation of socialism in a tangle of mysticism and cryptic language. The sociological and economic issues with socialism are to be the primary focus of this book's study. Before we can talk about the cultural and psychological issues, we must first address them. We can only study the culture and psychology of socialism on the findings of such research. Only sociological and economic research may provide a solid basis for those expositions that are so much more appealing to the general public and which evaluate socialism in the context of human ambitions as a whole.

To better comprehend the intricacies and ramifications of socialism, researchers and academics might use a variety of diverse forms of analysis. Here are some other methods for researching socialism:

1. Historical Review:

This strategy focuses on tracing the historical evolution of socialist movements and ideologies. It entails tracking the development of socialism thinking, comprehending the significant individuals and occasions that influenced it, and investigating the ways in which socialist ideals were applied in various historical settings. Researchers may learn a lot about the difficulties and potential of socialism government by examining the successes and failures of previous socialist ventures.

2. Compare and contrast

Comparative analysis entails comparing various political and economic systems, such as capitalism and communist, to socialism. Researchers may pinpoint distinctive features of socialism and evaluate how it varies from competing ideologies by analyzing the guiding ideas, advantages, and disadvantages of various systems. This method may provide a more comprehensive view of the possible benefits and pitfalls of socialist concepts.

3. Political-Economic Viewpoint

The link between politics, society, and economics is the main emphasis of a political economy perspective's analysis of socialism. This method takes into account how socialist institutions, policies, and practices affect social structures, power dynamics, and resource distribution. This kind of study is used by researchers to examine how welfare programs, nationalization of companies, and socialist economic planning have affected the broader socio-economic environment.

4. Cultural and Sociological Analysis:

This method explores socialism's cultural and sociological aspects. Researchers look at how socialist principles and actions affect society identities, norms, and values. It entails researching how socialist beliefs influence social movements, communal vision development, and collective consciousness.

5. Regulatory Analysis:

Analyzing socialist nations' institutional structures is the main focus of this method of research. The methods of governance, institutions, and practices that support communist regimes are the subject of research. This involves analyzing the function of the state, party structures, and deliberative procedures in socialist government.

6. Moral and ethical perspectives:

The moral tenets and ideals that underpin socialist ideology are examined in an ethical study of socialism. Researchers investigate the moral grounds for pursuing shared interests, social solidarity, and income redistribution. This method clarifies the normative dimensions of socialist beliefs by participating in ethical discussions.

7. Long-term Sustainability Analysis:

This kind of study takes socialist regimes' long-term viability and flexibility into account. Researchers examine how socialist societies and economies respond to issues including

advancing technology, changing demographics, and environmental concerns. This strategy's understanding of socialism's capacity to tolerate future uncertainty is essential.

8. Global and Postcolonial Perspectives:

Examining socialist concepts from a post-colonial and global perspective requires looking at how they have been embraced, modified, and opposed in various parts of the globe. Researchers investigate how colonial history, cultural diversity, and geopolitical factors affect how socialist programs are seen and put into practice.

A thorough grasp of socialism's complex nature and ramifications may be obtained by integrating many different ways of inquiry, since each of these forms gives particular insights into the system. Understanding that socialism is a complicated and dynamic ideology is crucial since doing so may help advance academic discussion on the topic.

CONCLUSION

There are a number of variables that have connected with a wide variety of people and contributed to the popularity of socialist beliefs in the modern world. The rising dissatisfaction with the flaws of conventional capitalist systems is one of the main factors in their attraction. People are looking for alternative economic models that offer a fairer allocation of resources and a more sustainable approach to growth as income disparity and environmental degradation worsen. Furthermore, socialist ideologies have been effective in obtaining support by directly tackling important societal problems. People who feel abandoned or oppressed by contemporary institutions have taken an interest in socialist ideas that support universal healthcare, inexpensive education, and workers' rights. Significant support has been shown for the goal of creating a society that is more compassionate and inclusive. The popularity of socialist ideologies nowadays is a complex phenomenon. The perceived flaws in capitalist systems, their emphasis on solving social problems, and the impact of technology connectedness all contribute to their appeal. Supporters of socialist ideas must continue to develop and modify their strategies in order to meet the particular difficulties posed by the dynamic global environment if they are to maintain and expand on this success.

REFERENCES:

- [1] N. Tandarić, C. Watkins, and C. D. Ives, "Urban planning in socialist Croatia," *Hrvatski Geografski Glasnik*. 2019. doi: 10.21861/HGG.2019.81.02.01.
- [2] K. Rišová, "Walkability research: concept, methods and a critical review of post-socialist studies," *Geogr. Cas.*, 2020, doi: 10.31577/geogrcas.2020.72.3.11.
- [3] S. Zeković, K. Petovar, and B. M. S. Nor-Hisham, "The credibility of illegal and informal construction: Assessing legalization policies in Serbia," *Cities*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2019.102548.
- [4] S. Hirt, "Whatever happened to the (post)socialist city?," *Cities*, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2013.04.010.
- [5] N. Lykke, "Transversal Dialogues on Intersectionality, Socialist Feminism and Epistemologies of Ignorance," *NORA - Nord. J. Fem. Gen. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/08038740.2019.1708786.
- [6] D. Lane and S. Bauman, "Socialism: The Active Utopia," *Br. J. Sociol.*, 1977, doi: 10.2307/590008.

- [7] D. Boucas, "Theory, reality, and possibilities for a digital/communicative socialist society," *TripleC*, 2020, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1140.
- [8] E. Rindzevičiūtė, "Systems analysis as infrastructural knowledge: Scientific expertise and dissensus under state socialism," *Hist. Polit. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1215/00182702-7903300.
- [9] H. Joshi, "WHY NOT SOCIALISM," *Public Aff. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.2307/26910031.
- [10] G. Kallis, "Socialism Without Growth," *Capital. Nature, Social.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/10455752.2017.1386695.
- [11] L. Chelcea and O. Druță, "Zombie socialism and the rise of neoliberalism in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe," *Eurasian Geogr. Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/15387216.2016.1266273.

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIBE THE COMPLEX NATURE OF OWNERSHIP

Rahul Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-rahul.kumar@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Anshu Choudhary, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-anshu@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Human communities are based on the idea of ownership, which shapes economic structures, legal systems, and personal identities. This chapter examines the complex nature of ownership by examining its socioeconomic, psychological, and philosophical aspects. The research explores the complex interrelationship between possession, control, and entitlement by drawing on numerous theoretical stances. It also explores how cultural, historical, and technical aspects have affected how people have understood ownership across time. The research highlights the contextual and dynamic nature of ownership and clarifies the complexity around the concept. From a perspective, ownership serves as the cornerstone for both property rights and market economies. But as civilizations advance, concerns about fair distribution and resource management go up in importance. The notion of ownership is shaped by cultural and historical settings, which can impact attitudes and customs toward collective or individual ownership.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Ownership, Property, Production, Socioeconomic.

INTRODUCTION

When considered as a social concept, ownership seems to be the right to use material possessions. The person who disposes of an economic good is the owner. As a result, the ideas of ownership in law and society are distinct. Naturally, this is the case, thus it is surprising that the reality is sometimes ignored. Ownership is the possession of the things necessary for mankind to pursue their economic goals from a social and economic perspective. This possession may be referred to as the natural or original ownership since it is only a physical connection between a person and the object, unrelated to a person's social or legal standing. The distinction between what one physically possesses and what one legally should have been the only relevance of the legal idea of property. The law distinguishes possessors and owners who lack this innate possessing, as well as owners who do not yet possess but should. According to the law, "he from whom has been stolen" continues to be the owner, but the thief can never become the owner. However, from an economic perspective, only the natural having matters, and the legal should have only has value since it helps with the natural having's acquisition, upkeep, and recovery [1]–[3].

Ownership is a standard institution according to the Law. Whether it deals with durable consumption products or non-durable consumption goods, items of the first order or goods of higher orders are neither here nor there its topic. This fact demonstrates the Law's formalist approach, which is completely unrelated to any economic principles. The Law cannot entirely shield itself from any significant economic inequalities. Real estate ownership has a unique status in the law due in part to the uniqueness of land as a medium of production. These economic disparities are more vividly portrayed in relationships that are sociologically similar to ownership but legally merely associated with it, such as servitudes and,

particularly, usufruct, than in the law of property itself. However, legal equality in law often hides real disparities. Economically speaking, ownership is by no means standardized. There are significant differences between ownership of consumption products and ownership of production items, and in both instances, we must make the distinction between durable and consumable commodities. Consumption commodities, or first-order items, are used to fulfill needs right away. The importance of ownership essentially rests on the potential for consumption inasmuch as they are consumable things, or items that by nature can only be used once and lose their status as products when consumed. The owner may also give the things away or trade them, let them deteriorate unattended, or even allow them to be purposefully destroyed. He discards their usage in every instance since it cannot be split.

The complicated interaction of philosophical, legal, psychological, cultural, and socioeconomic elements that affect how people and societies see and exercise ownership over diverse resources and things gives birth to the complex character of ownership. It encompasses more than just having physical goods; in the digital era, it also includes intangible assets, intellectual property, and even virtual possessions. The intricacy of ownership is largely influenced by a few important factors:

Philosophical Perspectives

For ages, philosophers have argued about the moral and ethical ramifications of ownership. Diverse perspectives have been developed in response to issues including the origins of ownership rights, the idea of private property, and the connection between people and the resources they assert ownership over. Arguments from many philosophical traditions are at odds with one another, resulting in difficult discussions over the validity and boundaries of ownership.

Regulatory Frameworks

Legal systems have a big part to play in establishing and defending ownership rights since ownership is a legal term. The determination of ownership rights is complicated by the fact that rules differ across countries and may change over time, particularly when it comes to situations involving intellectual property, digital assets, and shared resources.

Psychological aspects

Ownership has psychological effects on people, affecting how they feel about themselves and how valuable they are. People's possessions may become an extension of who they are, affecting their emotions, actions, and thought processes. Furthermore, psychological research shows that individuals often place an excessive value on the things they own, which results in biases in how they perceive ownership.

Influences of culture

The notion of ownership may be strongly impacted by cultural norms and traditions. While some civilizations place a higher priority on communal or social ownership of resources, others place more emphasis on individual ownership. The variety of ownership patterns around the globe is influenced by cultural views on inheritance, land ownership, and personal property.

Socioeconomic variables

Economic systems, financial disparities, and social hierarchies are all directly related to ownership. Who has the capacity to hold and manage important assets depends on power imbalances that might result from disparities in wealth and access to resources [4]-[6].

Ownership of Intangibles

New types of ownership pertaining to intellectual property, digital assets, and virtual goods have emerged with the emergence of the digital era. In terms of control, transferability, and enforcement of ownership rights, owning intangible assets and digital inventions brings special difficulties.

Environmental concerns and shared resources

When it comes to shared resources like common lands or environmental assets, the idea of ownership is more difficult to understand. Ethical conundrums arise when attempting to balance individual rights with society's shared environmental obligation.

Technological progress

From blockchain-based systems that are reinventing ownership transfer to concerns about data ownership and privacy in the digital sphere, technology is still influencing ownership practices.

When it comes to consumables that may be used again, or things of enduring utility, the situation is a bit different. They could assist numerous clients in succession. Again, in this case, persons who are able to utilise the uses that the products provide for their own purposes are to be viewed as owners in the economic sense. In this sense, the owner of a room is the person using it at the moment; the owner of the Matterhorn, to the extent that it is a natural park, are those who visit there to take in the scenery; the owner of a painting is the one who enjoys seeing it. These things' uses may be divided, which means that their natural ownership can be divided as well.

DISCUSSION

Only indirectly can production items serve delight. They work in the industry that creates consumer products. Finally, the effective fusion of production commodities and labor results in consumption goods. An object is considered a production good if it has the capacity to indirectly satisfy demands in this way. Production commodities should be disposed of naturally. The possession of production items has economic value only inasmuch as it ultimately results in the possession of consumption goods. Consumable items that need to be used up can only be enjoyed once by the person who eats them. A number of persons may use consumable goods in temporal succession, but simultaneous usage will interfere with others' pleasure, even if this enjoyment is not entirely precluded by the nature of the item. While many individuals may examine a picture at once, even if the presence of others may prevent one person from getting the best angle, may interfere with their pleasure, only two people can wear a coat at once.

The possessing that results in the fulfilment of desires by consumption goods cannot be further split from the uses that result from the consumption items. Accordingly, ownership of items that will be used up fully precludes ownership by anyone else, while ownership of durable products is exclusive at least for a certain period of time and even with respect to the smallest use that results from it. Any other economically meaningful connection for consumer products than the one that people naturally have with one another is impossible. They can only be in the natural possession of one person since they are lasting items that must be used up completely and can only be owned by one person naturally. In this context, ownership is also private ownership in the sense because it denies others the benefits that rely on the ability to dispose of the items.

For this reason, it would likewise be insane to consider eliminating or even changing ownership of consumer products. An apple that is consumed while being relished and a coat that is worn out while being worn are facts that cannot in any way be changed. Consumables cannot be the joint property of several people or the common property of everyone in the natural sense. When it comes to consumables, what is often referred to as joint property must be divided prior to consumption. As soon as a commodity is consumed or utilized, shared ownership ends. The consumer's possession must be unique. Joint property can never be used as anything more than a foundation for taking things from a common stock. The portion of the total equity that each partner may utilize for himself is his to possess. None of these issues, including whether or not a formal split of the stock arrives before consumption or whether he already has legal ownership, only has legal ownership via the stock division, or never has legal ownership at all, are important commercially. The truth is that he owns his lot even without partition.

Joint ownership cannot eliminate ownership of consumer products. It can only transfer ownership in a manner that wouldn't have happened otherwise. Like all previous reforms that stop short at consumer goods, joint property is limited to enacting a new allocation of the current stock of consumer goods. When this supply is out, its job is over. It is unable to restock the empty storehouses. This can only be done by those who oversee the disposal of manufacturing materials and labor. If they do not accept what is provided, the flow of commodities intended to refill stockpiles stops. As a result, every effort to change how consumer items are distributed must, in the ultimate instance, rely on the ability to dispose of the manufacturing machinery.

Contrary to having consumption products, having producing items may be split in a natural way. The sharing of production products under circumstances of isolated production is subject to the same rules as the sharing of consumption goods. When there is no division of labor, the possession of things may only be shared if the services provided by them can also be divided. It is not possible to share possession of non-durable manufacturing items. Depending on how easily their services may be divided, durable manufacturing items can be owned. A certain amount of grain can only be held by one person at a time, yet numerous people can hold hammers at once, and a river can power more than one water wheel. There hasn't been anything unusual about having manufacturing items up to this point. However, in the event of manufacturing with division of labor, such items are had twice. In reality, there are two types of having present here: a physical (direct) and a social (indirect) having.

The social having belongs to the person who, in the absence of being able to physically or legally dispose of the commodity, may nonetheless dispose indirectly of the effects of its use, i.e., the person who can barter or purchase the commodity's products or the services it offers. The physical having belongs to the person who holds the commodity physically and uses it productively. In this way, the producer and those whose needs he creates for share inherent ownership in a society that distributes labor. The farmer who relies only on himself outside of trade society is able to claim ownership of his land, plough, and draught animals. However, the farmer whose business involves trading, whoever creates for and purchases from the market is, in a different sense, the owner of the means of production. He does not have the same level of production control as a self-sufficient peasant. The customers, for whom he works, choose the aim of his products, not him. They choose the purpose of economic activity, not the producer. The manufacturer exclusively focuses production on the objective established by the customers [7], [8].

However, additional owners of the means of production are unable to use their physical assets for production under these circumstances. Given that all production involves combining the

different means of production, some owners of these means must transfer their natural ownership to others in order for the latter to implement the combinations that make up production. Owners of money, land, and labor put these resources at the entrepreneur's disposal so that he or she may take over the immediate management of production. The customers, who are none other than the proprietors of the means of production owners of capital, land, and labor direct the entrepreneurs' conduct of production. However, based on the value of his productive contribution to the yield, each component obtains the portion of the output to which he is legally entitled.

Natural ownership of productive commodities is, therefore, fundamentally distinct from natural ownership of consumption items. It is not required to have production products physically in the same way that one must have consumption goods if one wants to use them up or utilize them in a lasting fashion in order to make them suit one's own economic interests. Although all these methods of production must be employed to deliver a cup of coffee to my table, I do not need to own a coffee plantation in Brazil, an ocean steamer, or a coffee roasting facility in order to consume coffee. It is enough for me that other people possess and use these tools of production. In a society where labor is divided, no one individual is the exclusive proprietor of the means of production, whether they are physical goods or a person's ability to work. Every manufacturing method provides services to every buyer or seller on the market.

Therefore, if we are unwilling to refer to ownership as being shared by owners of the means of production and consumers, we must consider consumers to be the true owners in the natural sense and refer to those who are regarded as owners in the legal sense as administrators of other people's property.³ But doing so would stray too far from the terms' conventional connotation. To prevent misunderstandings, it is preferable to refrain from using any new terms and to never use words that are typically understood to express one notion in a different way. Therefore, avoiding any specific terminology, let us only reiterate that the ownership of the means of production in a society where the division of labor occurs differs fundamentally from that found in societies where the division of labor does not occur, as well as from the ownership of consumption goods in any economic order. We shall hereafter refer to "ownership of the means of production" in the commonly understood meaning, i.e., to denote the immediate power of disposal, in order to prevent any misunderstandings.

Collective Control over the Production Process

Whether or not they claimed to be driven by concerns of social usefulness or social fairness, the first initiatives to reform ownership and property may be fairly defined as endeavors to seek the greatest possible equality in the distribution of wealth. Each person should have a specific minimum, but no one should have more than that.

The general idea was that everyone should have nearly the same amount. This goal was always pursued by the same techniques. Redistribution was often suggested after a proposal to confiscate all or a portion of the property. The ideal society was one in which there were solely self-sufficient agriculturists, with just a small number of craftsmen remaining. However, we don't need to worry about all of these ideas right now. In an economy where labor is divided, they are no longer feasible. You cannot distribute a railroad, a rolling mill, or a business that makes machines. We should still be at the same level of economic growth as we were then if these principles had been put into reality hundreds or millennia ago, unless, of course, humanity had regressed to a condition that was barely distinguishable from that of brutes. Everyone would be considerably less properly supplied for than he is, much less adequately than the poorest citizen of an industrial state, and the planet would only be able to

sustain a tiny fraction of the populations it now sustains. The ability of mankind to resist the re-distributors' assault is the foundation of our whole civilisation. But even in industrialized nations, the concept of redistribution remains quite popular. The theory, which incorrectly calls itself agrarian socialism, is the cornerstone of social reform movements in those nations where agriculture predominates. It served as the major source of support for the great Russian revolution, which briefly transformed its leaders all of whom were born Marxists into its idealized heroes against their will. It may succeed elsewhere and swiftly wipe out the culture that has taken millennia of work to create. Let's reiterate: not a single word of criticism is necessary in light of all of this. There is no disagreement among views on this issue. To demonstrate that a social structure that could sustain the hundreds of millions of members of the white race cannot be established on a "land and homestead communism" is scarcely required in today's world.

The foolish passion for the equality of the distributors was long since replaced by a new social ideal, and today the watchword of Socialism is shared ownership rather than distribution. Socialism's primary goal is the abolition of private property in the means of production and the transformation of these assets into communal property. The socialistic notion no longer has anything in common with the idea of re-distribution in its strongest and purest form. It is also far removed from a vague idea of shared ownership of consumption-related assets. Its goal is to enable everyone to have a sufficient life. However, it is not so artless as to think that doing away with the social structure that separates labor can help accomplish this. True, the distaste for the market that distinguishes proponents of re-distribution still exists; yet other than doing away with the division of labor and restoring the autarky of the self-sufficient family economy, or at the very least the simpler exchange system of the self-sufficient agricultural region, socialism aims to eliminate commerce.

Such a socialistic concept could not have developed prior to the character that private property in the means of production has taken on in the society that divides labor. Before the concept of common property in the means of production may take on a concrete shape, the relationships between various producing units must first progress to the point where production for external demand becomes the norm. Before the liberal social philosophy had clarified the nature of social production, the socialist concepts could not be fully understood. Socialism may be seen as a result of the liberal ideology in one sense, but not in any other.

Whatever our opinions on its usefulness or viability, it must be acknowledged that the concept of socialism is both big and straightforward. Even its fiercest rivals won't be able to prevent a thorough investigation. In fact, one may argue that it is one of the most grandiose works of human ingenuity. The endeavor to build society on a new foundation while rejecting all established social structures, to imagine a new global scheme and predict the shape that all human affairs will take in the future this is so wonderful and so audacious that it has rightfully inspired the highest respect. Socialism must be defeated if we are to rescue the world from barbarism; but, we cannot just toss it away [9], [10].

Theories of Property Evolution

Political innovators frequently use the rhetorical devices of "Ancient and Natural," "something that has always been there and has been lost only to the misfortune of historical development," and "men must return to this state of things and revive the Golden Age" to advance their agenda. Natural law therefore defended the rights it claimed for the person as being inherent, unalienable rights that were given to him by Nature. No innovation was being discussed here; rather, it was about restoring the "eternal rights which shine above, inextinguishable and indestructible as the stars themselves." Similar to how the romantic

Utopia of shared ownership as a remnant of distant antiquity has emerged. Almost everyone has had this dream. It was the myth of Saturn's Golden Age in ancient Rome, which was lauded by Seneca and commended by Virgil, Tibullus, and Ovid. Those were the carefree, joyful times when everyone shared in Nature's abundance and none owned private property. Of course, modern socialism sees itself as above such infantile simplicity, but even so, its aspirations are not all that far from those of the Imperial Romans.

The importance of private property in the means of production in the development of civilisation has been emphasized by liberal ideology. Socialism may have been satisfied with dismissing the need to continue the institution of ownership while yet recognizing its historical value. In fact, Marxism does this by portraying the periods of primitive and capitalist production as crucial phases in the evolution of society. On the other hand, it joins forces with other socialist ideologies to strongly criticize all forms of private property that have emerged throughout history. There was a period when private property did not exist, and there will be another time when private property does not exist.

The fledgling field of Economic History had to provide a basis of evidence in order for such a stance to seem reasonable. A notion that demonstrates the common land system's age was developed. It was said that all land had formerly belonged to the tribe as a whole as a communal property. All had first utilized it collectively; it wasn't until much later, when the common ownership was still maintained, that the fields were given to individual members for private usage. However, there were always fresh distributions, first every year and eventually at longer periods. According to this viewpoint, private property was a relatively new concept. It was unclear exactly how it came about. But if one did not want to trace it back to illicit acquisition, one had to believe that it had become more or less ingrained via omission in re-distributions. Thus, it became clear that it was a mistake to give private ownership too much credit for the development of civilisation. It was suggested that the shared ownership with periodic distribution principle had guided the development of agriculture. A man merely has to be certain of receiving the fruits of his labor for him to work and plant the fields, and for this

Annual possession is sufficient. We are informed that it is untrue to attribute the beginning of land ownership to the habitation of ownerless fields. The uninhabited land was never without an owner. Man had stated that everything belonged to the State or the community everywhere, both in ancient times and in modern times, therefore possession could not have been seized either. It was easy to observe liberal social philosophy's teachings with sympathetic amusement from these heights of freshly acquired historical knowledge. The general public was persuaded that private property was simply a historical-legal concept. Since it was a somewhat undesirable byproduct of civilization and hadn't always existed, it was a practice that might be outlawed. All types of socialists, but particularly Marxists, were fervent in their efforts to spread these beliefs. They have given the works of its advocates a popularity that economic history studies had not before seen.

However, more recent studies have refuted the idea that all peoples had common ownership of agricultural land and that this was the first form of ownership ("Ureigentum"). They have shown that the Trier Gehöferschaften¹⁷ developed in the thirteenth century, possibly only in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and that the South Slav Zadruga developed as a result of the introduction of the Byzantine taxation system. They have also shown that the Hauberg co-operatives¹⁶ of the Siegen district are not found before the sixteenth century.¹⁸ The oldest agricultural history of Germany has still not been properly clarified, making it impossible to reach a consensus on the key issues. There are particular challenges in interpreting the few details provided by Caesar and Tacitus. The fact that excellent arable

land was so plentiful that the issue of land ownership was not yet economically significant should never be overlooked while attempting to grasp the circumstances of ancient Germany as portrayed by these two authors. The main characteristic of German agricultural circumstances during the time of Tacitus is "superest ager".

However, it is not essential to take into account the Economic History evidence that refutes the "Ureigentum" concept in order to understand that there is no justification for private property in the means of production under this philosophy. When evaluating private property's historical accomplishments and role in the existing and future economic structure, it makes little difference whether common property preceded private property everywhere or not. Even if it were possible to show that common property was once the foundation of land law for all countries and that all private property originated from unlawful acquisition, it would still be difficult to demonstrate how intensive farming and rational agriculture could have developed without private property. It would be much less acceptable to draw the conclusion that private property should or might be abolished from such premises.

CONCLUSION

The concept of ownership is intricate and multidimensional, extending beyond simple possession to include control and entitlement. This research has emphasized the many perspectives including philosophical, psychological, and socioeconomic ones through which ownership may be regarded. Although ownership is ingrained in human society and is essential for structuring relationships and resources, it is always evolving due to cultural, historical, and technical variables. Recognizing ownership's dynamic and situational character is necessary for comprehension. Philosophically, it calls into question the moral and ethical ramifications of owning and controlling resources. Ownership psychologically affects how people see themselves in relation to the things they possess since it is connected to identity and self-worth.

Ownership now faces additional difficulties as a result of technical improvements, notably in the digital sphere. With the emergence of virtual assets and the decentralization of ownership enabled by blockchain technology, new issues about ownership and control have emerged. Fundamentally speaking, the idea of ownership is neither constant nor universal. It is dependent on a wide range of variables and is continually reevaluated. We must participate in multidisciplinary discussion to negotiate the complexity of ownership while taking into account philosophical, psychological, socioeconomic, cultural, historical, and technical viewpoints. Only by having such a thorough knowledge will we be able to handle new issues and promote an ownership culture that is fairer and more long-lasting in a rapidly evolving environment.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Q. Chang and G. Zhu, "The effect of initiator social capital on the crowdfunding performance -moderating role of nature of ownership," in *Proceedings - 2019 International Conference on Economic Management and Model Engineering, ICEMME 2019*, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ICEMME49371.2019.00013.
- [2] W. Shuying, Z. Shuijuan, and L. Bobo, "Effect of Diversity on Top Management Team to the Bank's Innovation Ability-based on the Nature of Ownership Perspective," in *Procedia Engineering*, 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2017.01.126.
- [3] C. Migliardo and A. F. Forgione, "Ownership structure and bank performance in EU-15 countries," *Corp. Gov.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/CG-06-2017-0112.

- [4] Y. Kong, T. Famba, O. Kurauone, G. Chituku-Dzimiro, and H. Sun, "Corporate governance mechanisms, ownership and firm value: Evidence from listed Chinese firms," *Int. J. Financ. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijfs8020020.
- [5] X. Liu, J. Sun, F. Yang, and J. Wu, "How ownership structure affects bank deposits and loan efficiencies: an empirical analysis of Chinese commercial banks," *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10479-018-3106-6.
- [6] Dr. Saroj Kumar Singh, "Exploring the Consumer Co-Operative Relationship with Their Members: An Individual Psychological Perspective on Ownership," *Int. J. Indian Psychol.*, 2017, doi: 10.25215/0402.074.
- [7] A. Boateng, Y. Liu, and S. Brahma, "Politically connected boards, ownership structure and credit risk: Evidence from Chinese commercial banks," *Res. Int. Bus. Financ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ribaf.2018.07.008.
- [8] K. T. Wang and G. Shailer, "Does Ownership Identity Matter? A Meta-analysis of Research on Firm Financial Performance in Relation to Government versus Private Ownership," *Abacus*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/abac.12103.
- [9] F. U. Khan, J. Zhang, M. Usman, A. Badulescu, and M. S. Sial, "Ownership reduction in state-owned enterprises and corporate social responsibility: Perspective from secondary privatization in China," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11041008.
- [10] S. C. Kundu, A. Mor, S. Kumar, and J. Bansal, "Diversity within management levels and organizational performance: employees' perspective," *J. Adv. Manag. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/JAMR-04-2019-0054.

CHAPTER 3

EXPLAIN THE THEORY OF VIOLENCE AND CONTRACT

Rahul Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-rahul.kumar@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Anshu Choudhary, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-anshu@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The creation and upkeep of social order within human societies are seen from two divergent angles by the theories of violence and contract. According to the Theory of Violence, dominating people or groups impose their will on subordinates in order to maintain social order. The Theory of Contract, on the other hand, contends that societies develop as a result of a voluntary agreement or contract between individuals, in which citizens willingly cede some of their rights to a governing body in return for security and the development of order. In order to provide readers with a thorough knowledge of the relevance of both theories in influencing social relations and governmental structure, this essay covers the philosophical foundations, historical settings, and modern implications of each theory. Both views have influenced human history and still do now in discussions about politics, government, and social systems. The Theory of Violence serves as a sobering reminder of the dangers of power misuse and the need of defending individual liberty against repressive governments. The Theory of Contract, on the other hand, emphasizes the importance of legitimacy and consent in the use of power as well as the duty of governments to safeguard their populations' rights and welfare.

KEYWORDS:

Contract, Law, Ownership, Social, Violence.

INTRODUCTION

Two different theoretical systems that attempt to explain the emergence and preservation of social order within societies are the theory of violence and the theory of contracts. Each theory offers a distinctive viewpoint on how people unite to build structured communities and create laws to regulate their interactions.

In terms of violence theory:

The "Might makes right" idea, commonly known as the idea of Violence, holds that force and coercion are used to construct and maintain social order. This idea holds that the dominant people or groups in a community impose their will on others, often by using violence or force. In such a society, individuals who are stronger or have more power over resources may impose their own rules and standards on others [1]–[3].

The idea of the "state of nature," which contends that people lived in a perpetual state of conflict and struggle in the absence of any formal social institutions, is closely related to this notion historically.

People banded together and surrendered to the control of a ruler or governing body that was able to enforce laws and maintain order in order to escape the turmoil of this natural condition. The "social contract," a term used to describe this shift of power from the many to the few, is what brings us to the following idea.

The Theory of Violence's main ideas are as follows:

The view emphasizes the role of dominating people, ruling classes, or authoritarian governments that impose their power by coercion, force, or intimidation. They are able to create and sustain authority over the rest of the population thanks to this use of their power.

1. Nature's State:

The idea of the "state of nature," a fictitious pre-social situation where it is thought that people lived in a perpetual state of conflict and rivalry, is often linked to the Theory of Violence. The lack of any formal social institutions in this situation creates a "survival of the fittest" situation in which the strongest people or groups become dominant.

2. Social Order Origin:

This idea holds that the demand for stability and safety against the chaos and violence of the natural world leads to the development of societies and governments. In return for security and protection, people voluntarily submit to the control of a ruler or governing body capable of executing laws and upholding order.

3. Historical Illustrations:

A number of autocratic types of government, repressive regimes, and authoritarian systems throughout history that retain power by military force, terror, and repression of opposition are historical instances of the theory of violence.

4. Limitations and Criticisms:

The complexity of social structure and the many elements that contribute to the formation of societies, according to critics, are not sufficiently taken into consideration by the Theory of Violence. Furthermore, this theory does not discuss how voluntary association, agreement, and collaboration influence social systems.

5. Connection to the Social Contract Theory:

The Social Contract thesis contends that societies are created by a consensual agreement or contract between people, in opposition to the thesis of Violence. While the idea of Violence stresses the use of power and dominance, the Social Contract idea places more emphasis on the consent of the governed.

Not all cultures throughout history have been defined entirely by violence and coercion, it is crucial to remember that the Theory of Violence is a theoretical viewpoint. Human cultures are numerous, and they have shown many different types of social organization, from hierarchical to more egalitarian ones [4]–[6].

The Contract Theory:

According to the "Social Contract" idea, which is also known as the idea of Contract, societies are founded by a mutual agreement or contract between people to establish and preserve a governing system. In accordance with this notion, individuals willingly cede some of their liberties to a ruling body in return for security and the formation of law. The legitimacy of the state's power over its population is based on this contract, which may be tacit or explicit.

Philosophers of the Enlightenment such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, and Jean-Jacques Rousseau were notable proponents of the Social Contract thesis. The core notion of the social

contract was that people voluntarily join together to create a society and choose a government to look out for their interests and secure the welfare of all members. Each thinker had their own interpretation of the social contract.

The Social Contract thesis, which holds that the power of the state derives from the agreement of the governed, is the theoretical foundation for constitutionalism and democratic administration in contemporary cultures. In return for the state's protection of their rights and freedoms, citizens agree to comply by the laws and rules of the state.

Contract and Violence

Only occupation may be seen as the source of the physical possession of economic assets, which is believed to be the essence of natural ownership from an economic perspective. It is hard to imagine how ownership might have started other than with the seizure of ownerless objects since ownership is not a reality independent of the choice and action of man. Once ownership has started, it lasts as long as the thing does not disappear, or until the owner either gives up ownership freely or the object is physically removed from his possession against his will. The former occurs when the owner gives up his property freely; the latter occurs when he does it unwillingly, such as when livestock escape into the wild, or when another person violently takes it away from him.

All ownership is a result of violence and occupation. When we track the legal title back and take into account the natural components of commodities apart from the labor components they contain we inevitably come at the conclusion that this title originated in the appropriation of universally available goods. A forced expropriation from a predecessor, whose ownership we can trace to an earlier appropriation or theft, may occur before that. We may readily concede to those who reject ownership based on natural law arguments that all rights result from violence and all ownership from appropriation or robbery. But this provides not even a sliver of evidence for the need, wisdom, or morality of abolishing ownership. It is not a requirement of natural ownership that the owners' fellow men acknowledge it. In actuality, it is only allowed so long as no force can subvert it and so long as a stronger man does not grab it first. Being the product of arbitrary force, it must always be wary of a stronger force. The fight of all against all is what the natural law concept refers to as. When the genuine relationship is acknowledged as one that merits maintaining, the conflict is over. Violence gives rise to law.

The natural law concept made a mistake by seeing this significant transition from the condition of brutes to human society as a conscious process; as an activity, that is, one in which man is fully cognizant of his motivations, of his objectives, and of how to accomplish them. The social compact that gave rise to the State, the society, and the legal system was intended to have been completed in this manner. After rejecting the previous theory that social structures had their roots in divine inspiration or, at the at least, in the enlightenment that came to man as a result of divine inspiration, rationalism was left with no other explanation.⁴ People believed that the evolution of social life was entirely logical and purposeful since it produced the current circumstances; how else could this growth have occurred if not via conscious decision in realization of its rationality and purpose? Today, we can explain the situation using alternative ideas.

We discuss the inheritance of learned traits and natural selection in the battle for life, but all of this really does not get us any closer to an understanding of the ultimate mysteries than the theologian or the logical person. By claiming that they were beneficial in the battle for survival, and that those who embraced and best developed them were more armed against the hazards of life than those who were backward in this regard, we may "explain" the origins

and development of social institutions. To demonstrate how inadequate such an explanation is now, owls⁵ should be brought to Athens. It has been a very long time since we were pleased with it and suggested it as the only possible answer to all of our difficulties with being and being. It just leads us to theology or rationality. The intersection of the several disciplines is where the big philosophical questions start and where all of our knowledge concludes.

To demonstrate that Law and the State cannot be linked to contracts, in fact, does not need a great deal of knowledge. It is not essential to use the academic tools of the historical school to demonstrate that no social compact can be created historically. In terms of the information that can be gleaned from parchments and inscriptions, realistic science was unquestionably superior to the Rationalism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, but it remained far behind in terms of social understanding. Because regardless of the criticisms leveled against rationalism as a social philosophy, it has done immeasurably valuable work in illuminating the impacts of social structures. We owe it, above all, our first understanding of the role that the State and the legal system play in society.

Stable circumstances are needed for economic activity. The large and drawn-out manufacturing process is more effective the longer the time spans to which it is applied. It requires continuity, which cannot be broken without having the worst negative effects. This implies that the absence of violence and peace are necessary for economic activity. The rationalist claims that all legal systems have peace as their ultimate objective and purpose, while we contend that peace is really their outcome and purpose. The rationalist asserts that law emerged from contracts; we assert that law is a resolution that puts an end to conflict and prevents conflict. The two poles of social existence are violence and law, war and peace, but its core is economic activity.

DISCUSSION

Every act of violence targets someone else's property. Only inasmuch as it obstructs the acquisition of property is the person their life and health the target of assault. Sadistic excesses, bloody acts carried out just for the pleasure of cruelty, are rare occurrences. One does not need a whole legal system to stop them. Today, it is believed that the doctor, not the judge, should serve as their proper adversary. Therefore, it is no surprise that the law best exemplifies its role as a broker of peace when it defends property. The concept of the law as a broker of peace yes, a broker of peace at whatever cost can be seen most clearly in the two-fold system of protection according to having, in the difference between ownership and possession.

Despite the fact that there is no title, as the lawyers assert, possession is protected. Even robbers and thieves, in addition to honest and dishonest possessors, may request protection for their property. Some people think that demonstrating how ownership manifests itself in the distribution of property at a particular moment may be refuted by demonstrating how it resulted through violent robbery and arbitrary acquisition. This point of view holds that all legal rights are nothing more than established illegalities. Therefore, as it contradicts the premise of permanence and immutability

In order to achieve justice, the current legal system must be overthrown and replaced with a new one that adheres to that concept. It shouldn't be the responsibility of the State "to consider only the condition of possession in which it finds its citizens, without inquiring into the legal grounds of acquisition." Instead, "the mission of the State is to first give everyone his own, to first put him into his property, and only then to protect him in it."⁸ The social contract, which can only exist through the unanimous agreement of all individuals who in it

divest themselves of a part of their natural rights, is where one finds the origin of true Law, quite in the sense of the contract theory. In this case, one can either postulate an eternally valid idea of justice which it is the duty of the State to recognize and realize. Both explanations are grounded in the natural law conception of the "right that is born with us." The former contends that we must behave in line with it, while the latter asserts that the present legal system emerges when we divest ourselves of it in accordance with the terms of the contract. The origin of perfect justice is elucidated in several ways. One point of view claims that Providence gave it to humanity as a gift. Another claims that Man made it using reason. However, they also agree that Man's capacity to discriminate between right and wrong distinguishes him from the animal; this is his "moral nature."

These viewpoints are no longer acceptable to us since our assumptions about how to solve the situation have changed. We no longer conceive of man as a person who has harbored a sense of justice from the beginning; instead, we consider the idea that human nature varies fundamentally from the nature of all other living things to be quite unusual indeed. But even if we don't provide an explanation for how the Law came to be, we still need to make it obvious that it couldn't have happened legitimately. It is impossible for law to have created itself. Its roots are not lawful in nature. One fails to see that Law could only be anything other than sanctioned injustice if it had existed from the beginning when they argue that Law is nothing more or less than that. If it is thought to have originated just once, then what was Law at that time could not have been Law before [7]–[9]. It is impossible to claim that Law should have come into being legitimately. Whoever doing so applies a notion that is only legitimate inside the legal order to something that is outside of it.

We who only perceive the result of Law, which is to bring about peace, must understand that it could not have come about except by acknowledging the current condition of events, however they may have arisen. Any alternative course of action would have just revived and prolonged the conflict. Only when we protect a current situation from violent disruption and get the approval of the parties concerned before making any changes can there be peace. This is the true meaning of current rights protection, which forms the basis of all Law.

Law did not appear in the world already flawless and full. It has flourished for countless years and continues to develop. It may never reach its mature state, the era of unconquerable peace. The separation between private and public law that theory has passed down to us and which, in practice, they believe it cannot exist without has been attempted in vain by legal systematicians. We shouldn't be surprised by the failure of these endeavors, which has actually caused many to give up on the distinction. In actuality, the distinction is not dogmatic; the system of law is uniform and is unable to understand it. The divide dates back in time and came about as a consequence of the development and realization of the concept of law. The concept of law is first put into practice in the area of human relations where maintaining peace is most crucial for ensuring economic continuity. The upkeep of peace in a more developed domain only becomes necessary for the continued development of the civilisation that grows on this basis.

Public law serves this function. Formally, it does not vary from Private Law. But something unusual is sensed. This is so that it may eventually reach the development that Private Law was previously granted. Existing rights are not yet as well protected in public law as they are in private law.⁹ Perhaps the most obvious sign of public law's immaturity is the fact that it has trailed behind private law in the systematization process. Still, international law is more archaic. While arbitrary violence in the form of revolution is still allowed on the remaining grounds covered by public law, even when it is not actively repressed, it is still seen as an acceptable resolution in international relations. Except in cases of self-defense, when it is

allowed under rare circumstances as a kind of legal protection, violence is entirely forbidden under private law. It is not a flaw in the legal system that what is now Law was formerly unjust or, to put it more accurately, legally neutral. Anyone who attempts to ethically or legally defend the legal system may believe it to be so. But proving this point in no way shows that the ownership system should be changed or abolished. It would be foolish to try to prove that the calls for the elimination of ownership were legitimate based on this reality.

Theoretical Views on Violence and Contract

The concept of law only gains traction gradually and with great struggle. It only successfully refutes the concept of violence slowly and laboriously. Reactions occur repeatedly, forcing the history of law to restart at the beginning each time. Tacitus records the following about the ancient Germans: "Pigrum quin immo et iners videtur sudore acquirere quod possis sanguine parare." It seems foolish, no, even slothful, to get anything via labor and sweat when you may have it through the spilling of blood. In comparison to the notions that rule current economic life, this viewpoint is a far cry.

This difference in perspective goes beyond issues with ownership and encompasses our whole outlook on life. It is the opposition of a feudal and bourgeois mentality. The first expresses itself via romantic poetry, whose beauty we find appealing even if its outlook on life can only transport us temporarily and while the poem's imprint is still new.¹¹ The best brains from all eras worked together to create a wonderful system out of the second, which is developed in the liberal social philosophy. Literature from the classical period captures its magnificence. Liberalism makes mankind aware of the forces that control its advancement. The shadow that hung over history's course fades. Man starts to comprehend social life and lets it grow intentionally.

A comparable tight systematization was not accomplished by the feudal viewpoint. It was difficult to follow the theory of violence through to its logical conclusion. Make an effort to fully comprehend the idea of violence, even only in thinking, and its antisocial nature will become clear. Chaos and the fight of all against all result from it. That cannot be avoided by sophistry. Anti-liberal social theories must all inevitably be incomplete or reach the silliest conclusions. They are only picking the latch on an open door when they claim that liberalism only cares about the earthly and neglects to care about greater things in favor of the menial challenges of everyday life. Because liberalism has never claimed to be anything other than an outlook on the here and now. Only worldly action and inaction are addressed in what it teaches. The Last or Greatest Secret of Man has never been claimed to be fully revealed. The anti-liberal beliefs make all kinds of promises. They make men feel as if they may get pleasure and spiritual tranquility from outside of themselves. One thing is certain: the supply of goods would significantly decrease under their ideal social order. Opinions on the worth of the benefits provided in compensation are, at the very least, conflicting.

The final option of those who oppose the liberal ideal of society is to make an effort to topple it using the tools that it itself supplies. They try to show that it only serves and wants to serve the interests of one class; that the peace it seeks benefits just a small group and is bad to everyone else. Even the social order that has been established in the contemporary, constitutional state is founded on violence.

They assert that the so-called "pretense of rest" is really just the terms of a peace agreement made between the winner and the defeated, with the provisions only holding good as long as the power from which they originated does. Violence is the basis for all ownership and is used to maintain it. The liberal society's "free" employees are little more than the "unfree" of medieval times. The businessperson abuses them in the same way that a medieval ruler

abuses his serfs or a plantation owner abuses his slaves. It will be clear how much the grasp of liberal ideas has deteriorated if such and comparable arguments can be raised and accepted. These criticisms, however, do not make up for the lack of a well-developed ideology for the fight against liberalism.

The division of labor-based economic system was developed in accordance with the liberal philosophy of social existence. The urban settlement, which can only exist in an exchange economy, is the exchange economy's most evident manifestation. The liberal philosophy has gained the majority of its adherents in the towns, where it has become a dosed system. But as the amount and rate of prosperity increased and as a result, as city dwellers from the countryside increased in number, so did the violence-related assaults against liberalism. Immigrants quickly settle into city life and outwardly acquire town customs and beliefs, but they remain outsiders to civic thinking for a considerable amount of time. A social concept is not as simple to personalize as a new outfit. It must be earned, gained through intellect and effort.

As a result, we repeatedly observe in history that periods of strongly progressive development of the liberal school of thought, during which wealth rises as a result of the development of the division of labor, alternate with periods during which the principle of violence seeks to rule supreme and during which wealth declines as a result of the breakdown of the division of labor. Towns and town life both expanded much too quickly. It was more thorough than it was intense. Though not in terms of mental patterns, the newcomers to the towns had essentially become citizens. Civic feeling decreased as a result of their supremacy. All cultural eras infused with the liberalism of the bourgeoisie have crumbled on this rock, and our own bourgeois culture the most glorious in history seems to be doing the same. The people who seem to be citizens but are not those who are citizens in gesture but not in thought are more dangerous than barbarians attacking the walls from outside.

The concept of violence has had a powerful resurgence in recent generations. Under a new guise, modern imperialism advances the previous arguments made by proponents of the use of violence, the result of which was the World War and all of its horrifying repercussions. However, even imperialism has obviously not been able to establish a comprehensive system of its own to challenge liberal ideology. It is impossible for the theory that contends that conflict is what drives society's development to in any way lead to a theory of cooperation, despite the fact that any social theory must be a theory of cooperation. The philosophy of the battle for existence and the concept of race are two examples of scientific phrases that are often used to describe contemporary imperialism. These made it easy to come up with a ton of slogans that have worked well for propaganda but nothing else. Liberalism has long ago debunked all of the principles that modern Imperialism proclaimed as incorrect [10]–[12].

The imperialist argument that stems from a complete misunderstanding of what it means to possess the means of production in a society that divides labor is perhaps the strongest. It considers providing the country with its own coal mines, raw material sources, ships, and ports as one of its most critical missions. It is obvious that such an argument is based on the idea that natural ownership in these production tools is unequal, and that only those who physically own them may use them to their advantage. It is unaware of the fact that, in terms of the nature of ownership in the means of production, this viewpoint naturally leads to the socialist theory. Because if it is unjust that Germans cannot own their own German cotton farms, then why should it be just that no German may own his or her own coal mine or spinning mill? Can a German claim ownership of a Lorraine iron ore mine when a German citizen owns it rather than a French citizen? The imperialist and socialist have agreed to date

in their critique of bourgeois ownership. However, the socialist attempted to create a closed system of a new social order, something the imperialist was unable to achieve.

CONCLUSION

The underlying ideas that support social structure and government in human societies are seen from two different angles by the theories of violence and contracts. According to the Theory of Violence, coercion and power dynamics play a crucial part in creating social order, with dominant people or groups using force to impose their will on subordinates. This idea highlights historical instances of tyrannical rule and repressive regimes, when power is maintained by force and terror. The Theory of Contract, on the other hand, asserts that societies are created by a consensual agreement between individuals, in which people voluntarily cede some of their rights to a ruling body in return for security and the development of order. This theory emphasizes the idea of the social compact, which forms the cornerstone of constitutional government and democracy in contemporary cultures.

Although the theories of violence and contracts provide distinct perspectives on the nature of social order, they do not always conflict. Coercion and consent have often interacted dynamically in societies throughout history, changing governance frameworks as power relations changed. Understanding these ideas enables us to evaluate and critically examine various governance structures as well as the effects of political choices on people and communities. We may endeavor to create more fair and equitable institutions that respect individual liberties while maintaining collective security and well-being by realizing the potential for both violence and contract to shape society.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. Ahmed, "The Racial Contract," *Women's Philos. Rev.*, 1999, doi: 10.5840/wpr1999219.
- [2] V. Das, "Violence, gender, and subjectivity," *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 2008. doi: 10.1146/annurev.anthro.36.081406.094430.
- [3] A. de Jonge, "Corporate Social Responsibility Through a Feminist Lens: Domestic Violence and the Workplace in the 21st Century," *J. Bus. Ethics*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10551-015-3010-9.
- [4] M. Cooney, "Family honour and social time," *Sociol. Rev.*, 2014, doi: 10.1111/1467-954X.12193.
- [5] J. Thrasher and T. Handfield, "Honor and Violence: an account of Feuds, Duels, and Honor Killings," *Hum. Nat.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s12110-018-9324-4.
- [6] J. Gravel, B. Allison, J. West-Fagan, M. McBride, and G. E. Tita, "Birds of a Feather Fight Together: Status-Enhancing Violence, Social Distance and the Emergence of Homogenous Gangs," *J. Quant. Criminol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s10940-016-9331-8.
- [7] C. Raleigh, "Violence Against Civilians: A Disaggregated Analysis," *Int. Interact.*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/03050629.2012.697049.
- [8] R. Tipton, "Contracts and capabilities: Public service interpreting and third sector domestic violence services," *Translator*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13556509.2017.1280875.
- [9] L. A. Lanzona, "Agrarian Reform and Democracy: Lessons from the Philippine Experience," *Millenn. Asia*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0976399619879866.

- [10] M. L. Besançon, “Relative resources: Inequality in ethnic wars, revolutions, and genocides,” *Journal of Peace Research*. 2005. doi: 10.1177/0022343305054086.
- [11] D. A. Lake, “Rightful rules: Authority, order, and the foundations of global governance,” *Int. Stud. Q.*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2478.2010.00601.x.
- [12] S. A. Asongu, J. C. Nwachukwu, and S. M. I. Orim, “Mobile phones, institutional quality and entrepreneurship in Sub-Saharan Africa,” *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2017.08.007.

CHAPTER 4

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ON SOCIALISM

Rahul Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-rahul.kumar@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Anshu Choudhary, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-anshu@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A political and economic philosophy known as socialism promotes group ownership and management of the means of production, distribution, and exchange. By minimizing economic disparities and ensuring that all community members' fundamental needs are addressed, it aims to build a more fair and equitable society. This chapter examines the foundations of socialism as well as its historical background and social effects. It also analyses the drawbacks and objections to socialist regimes and how those issues have affected current discussions about political and economic structures. Socialism is still a topic of discussion today, with supporters calling for further economic redistribution and social safety nets while opponents stress the value of individual rights and market-driven economies. Designing sustainable and egalitarian communities still requires striking a balance between government involvement and market forces.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Socialist, Social, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Socialism aims to transfer ownership of the means of production from private individuals to the State and organized society. All material factors of production are owned by the communist state, which controls them as a result. According to the legislation established in the historical age, which is founded on private property in the means of production, this transfer need not be carried out with appropriate observance of the procedures defined for property transfers. The usual vocabulary of law is also less significant in such a transfer procedure. Ownership is the right to dispose of things, and when that right is transferred to a legal entity with a new name and detached from its previous identity, the old nomenclature becomes practically irrelevant. It is important to think on the object, not the term. Socialization is accomplished by the legal transfer of property as well as the restriction of owners' rights. The owner is ultimately left with nothing more than the empty name of ownership, and the property has transferred into the State's hands if the State gradually takes the owner's power of disposal away by expanding its influence over production; if its power to determine what direction and type of production there shall be [1]–[3].

The basic distinction between the liberal and anarchistic ideas is often missed by people. All coercive social structures are rejected by anarchism, as is coercion as a social tool. It really wants to do away with the State and the legal system because it thinks society would function better without them. Because it thinks that without coercion, men would band together for social cooperation and act as social life requires, it does not fear anarchical chaos. Anarchism as a philosophy operates on a distinct level from both liberalism and socialism. Liberal or socialist, whoever rejects the fundamental tenets of anarchism that mankind may be brought together peacefully without the use of force under a binding legal decree rejects the principles of anarchism.

All liberal and socialist ideologies that are founded on a rigid logic of ideas have built their systems with adequate consideration for force, completely rejecting anarchism. Both acknowledge that the legal system is necessary, but its scope and substance differ for each. When a legal order limits the scope of State action, liberalism does not argue the need of a legal order and does not see the State as a necessary or wicked evil. The liberal perspective on the ownership issue is characterized by its approach to it rather than by its distaste for the "person" of the State. It must logically reject anything that is in opposition to this ideal since it wants private ownership of the means of production. Socialism, on the other hand, must unavoidably attempt to widen the area subject to the State's coercive control after it has fundamentally broken with anarchism since its stated goal is to eliminate the "anarchy of production." It aims to expand governmental intervention to an area that liberalism would leave open, far from eliminating the state and coercion. The primary goal of the State in a socialist society would be to promote the general welfare, as opposed to liberalism, which only takes the interests of a certain class into account, according to socialist thinkers, particularly those who advocate socialism for ethical grounds. Now, only when a comprehensive inquiry has shown a clear image of what a social type of organization accomplishes can one assess its worth, whether it be liberal or socialistic. However, it is immediately debatable that socialism alone has the public's welfare in mind.

Liberals support private ownership of the means of production because they want a more prosperous society and not because they want to benefit the owners. More would be created under a libertarian economic system than under a socialist one. Not only would the owners profit from the excess. Liberalism contends that the wealthy have no special need to fight against the flaws of socialism. Even the poorest people are concerned because Socialism will harm them just as much. Whether or whether one accepts this, it is incorrect to attribute to liberalism a limited class interest. In actuality, the systems' goals are similar, but how they plan to achieve them varies.

The "Fundamental Rights" Of Socialist Theory

A number of ideas that were advanced as requirements of natural law served as a summary of the liberal philosophy of the State's mission. The topic of the liberation battles in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was the Rights of Man and of Citizens. The constitutional statutes that were drafted under the influence of the current political movements have them written in brass. Even proponents of liberalism may wonder whether this is the right venue for them since, in form and language, they are more like a political agenda to be pursued in legislation and administration than they are legal principles that would make good subject matter for a law of practical life. In any case, it is certainly not enough to just formally incorporate them in state and federal constitutions and basic laws; the whole state must embody their essence. The Austrian citizen has received little advantage from the state's Fundamental Law, which grants him the freedom "to express his opinion freely by word, writing, print, or pictorial representation within the legal limits." These legislative restrictions made it as difficult to express one's opinions freely as if the Fundamental Law had never been established. Although speech and the press are really free in England due to the spirit that pervades all English laws, the country does not have a Fundamental Right to the free expression of one's opinions [4]–[6].

Some anti-liberal thinkers have attempted to develop fundamental economic rights in imitation of these political Fundamental Rights. They want to demonstrate the inadequacy of a social structure that does not uphold even these so-called basic rights of man, but they also want to develop a few catchy, persuasive phrases that can be used to spread their views. The concept that enshrining these fundamental rights in law may be sufficient to create a social

structure consistent with the principles they embody is often not present in the thoughts of its writers. In fact, a large majority, particularly in recent years, is persuaded that the only way to achieve their goals is via the socialization of the means of production. The development of the economic fundamental rights served solely as a criticism of social structures rather than a plan of action. When seen from this perspective, they provide us with insight into what socialists believe Socialism should accomplish.

The right to the whole product of labor, the right to existence, and the right to work are the three economic fundamental rights that Socialism often presupposes, according to Anton Menger. The cooperation of the physical and human forces of production is necessary for all forms of production; it is the deliberate union of labor, capital, and land. It is impossible to determine how much physically each of them has contributed to the final outcome.

DISCUSSION

Buyers and sellers on the market answer the question of how much of the product's value should be attributed to each individual factor on a daily and hourly basis, despite the fact that the scientific explanation of this process has only recently produced satisfactory results and that these results are still far from being conclusive. Each production element is given a weight based on its contribution to the final product when market prices are established. Each component pays a fee that includes the benefits of its cooperation. The complete result of the laborer's labor is paid to him in compensation. In view of the subjective theory of value, this specific socialist demand looks to be completely nonsensical. But it is not true to the layperson.

The way it is articulated originates from the belief that value is only derived through labor. Anyone who adopts this concept of value will see a desire for the full fruits of labor for the laborer in the call for the elimination of private ownership of the means of production. It starts out as a demand that excludes any non-labor-based revenue. However, challenges that are a result of the unworkable theories of the production of value that have established the principle of the right to the entire output of labor present themselves as soon as one attempts to build a system on this tenet. On this, all such systems have been destroyed. Finally, its writers had to admit that what they really desired was the elimination of non-labor-based income and that the only way to do this was via the socialization of the means of production. Nothing remained of the right to the full fruits of labor, which had occupied minds for decades, other than the propaganda-effective phrase calling for the abolition of "unearned" non-labor income.

There are many ways to define the right to exist. If by this one meant the right to sustenance of those without resources, unsuitable for employment, and without a relative to care for them, then the Right to Existence is a benign institution that was established in the majority of civilizations millennia ago. The way the idea has been put into effect may leave much to be desired, since it offers the needy no legal title that may be recovered because of grounds related to its benevolent care of the poor origin. The socialists do not mean this when they use the phrase "Right to Existence," nevertheless. According to their concept, "each member of society may assert that the goods and services necessary to the maintenance of his existence shall be assigned to him, in proportion to the amount of available means, prior to the satisfaction of others' less urgent needs." The desire for the most equitable distribution of consumer items is ultimately made necessary by the ambiguity of the term "maintenance of existence" and the difficulties of objectively identifying and evaluating how urgent the demands of various people are. Even more clearly is shown by the shape that the idea sometimes takes that no one should be hungry when others have more than enough. On the

negative side, it is obvious that this claim of equality can only be met when the means of production have been socialized and the proceeds of production are dispersed by the government. Another issue that the proponents of the Right to Existence have seldom addressed is whether or not it can be fulfilled in any positive way. They contend that everyone has access to a sufficient standard of living provided by nature, and that the provision of a large portion of humanity is only insufficient due to unjust social institutions. They also contend that if the wealthy were denied access to everything they are permitted to consume above and beyond what is deemed "necessary," everyone would be able to live comfortably. Socialist philosophy has only been changed as a result of criticism based on the Malthusian Law of Population. Socialists acknowledge that under non-socialist production, there is not enough created to feed everyone in plenty, but they contend that Socialism will vastly enhance labor productivity, making it feasible to construct an eden for an infinite number of people. Even otherwise covert Marx admits that in a communist society, each person's needs would serve as the benchmark for distribution [7].

But one thing is certain: only the socialized of the means of production could lead to the realization of the Right to Existence in the sense that the socialist thinkers desired. It is true that Anton Menger has stated his belief that the rights to private property and existence may coexist. In this scenario, citizen claims to necessities of the State would have to be seen as a mortgage on the national revenue, and they would have to be satisfied before favored persons got an unearned income. However, even he must concede that if the Right to Existence were fully recognized, it would consume a significant portion of unearned income and take away so much from private ownership that all property would eventually be held jointly.²⁵ Menger would not have claimed that the Right to Existence was inherently consistent with private ownership of the means of production if he had recognized that it included a right to the equitable distribution of consumption items.

The Right to Work and the Right to Existence are inextricably linked. The premise is based more on a responsibility than a right to work. The rules that provide the unemployed a form of claim to maintenance disentitle the employed to a similar benefit. He just has a claim to the assigned task. Of course, socialist authors and earlier socialist policies have a different perspective on this right. They convert it, more or less explicitly, into a claim to a job that is in line with the worker's interests and skills and that pays enough to cover his basic requirements. The idea that every man would be able to earn enough money through work in "natural" conditions that is, conditions that we are to imagine existing before and outside the social order based on private property but which are to be restored by a socialist constitution when private property has been abolished lies at the foundation of the Right to Work.

The bourgeois society owes people who were harmed by the destruction of this happy condition of things the equal of what they have lost. The right to work alone is designed to serve as this equivalent. We once again see the outdated myth that Nature will give everything that is necessary for survival, regardless of how civilization has evolved historically. But the truth is that Nature gives no rights at all, and man is compelled to engage in economic activity simply because she provides only the barest amount of means of survival and because demands are essentially limitless. Social cooperation results from this activity, which got its start when people realized how much it boosts output and raises living standards. The cornerstone of expositions on both the Right to Work and the Right to Existence is the idea borrowed from the most naive theories of natural law that an individual is worse off in society than "in the freer primitive state of Nature" and that society must first, in a sense, buy his toleration with special rights.

There is no unemployment in properly balanced production. When production is unimpeded by the interferences of authorities and trade unions, unemployment is always only a temporary phenomena that the adjustment of pay rates strives to eliminate. Unemployment is a result of economic change. The duration of individual cases of unemployment could be reduced to such an extent by means of appropriate institutions, such as the expansion of labor exchanges, which would emerge from the economic mechanism in the unhindered market that is, where the individual is free to choose and change his profession and the location of his employment that it would no longer be regarded as a serious evil. However, it is fundamentally unsound to demand that every person have the right to work in his or her chosen profession at a pay that is equal to or higher than the wage rates of other labor that is in greater demand. A method of enforcing a change in profession cannot be eliminated from the production organization. The Right to Work is completely unworkable in the form that socialists seek, and this is true across the board in societies where private ownership of the means of production predominates. Because even the socialist community would require the ability to relocate labor to the areas where it was most needed if it wanted to allow the worker the freedom to practice just his preferred profession. The three fundamental economic rights, whose number, incidentally, might be readily extended, date back to social reform efforts in the past. Their significance now is purely propagandistic, albeit being successful. They have all been replaced by socialization of the means of production.

Socialism And Collectivism

Social philosophy also reveals the conflict between realism and nominalism that has persisted in human thinking since Plato and Aristotle. The attitudes of universalism and nominalism toward the issue of the idea of species are not dissimilar from those of collectivism and individualism toward the issue of social relationships. However, in the field of social science, this contrast to which, in philosophy, one's attitude toward the concept of God has given meaning that goes well beyond the purview of scientific inquiry has the greatest relevance. The powers that are already in place and who do not want to submit may defend their rights by using the collective mindset. However, Nominalism still exerts a restless drive that seeks constant advancement. Similar to how it disintegrates outdated metaphysical speculation in philosophy, it disintegrates sociological collectivism's metaphysics here.

The teleological shape that the comparison adopts in Ethics and Politics makes the political abuse of the contrast very obvious. Here, the issue is presented differently from how it is in Pure Philosophy. The issue is whether the goal should be the person or the community. This assumes a conflict between individuals' goals and the goals of society as a whole, a conflict that can only be resolved by sacrificing one for the other. A disagreement over the order of purposes develops from a dispute over the actuality or nominality of the ideas. Collectivism now faces a fresh challenge in this situation. It is necessary to resolve the conflict between their interests since there are many social collectiva whose goals seem to clash just as much as those of the people contrast with those of the collectiva. In actuality, practical collectivism is not very concerned about this. It considers itself to be nothing more than the apologist of the ruling classes and acts, in a sense, as a scientific policeman working side by side with political police to defend those who so happen to be in positions of authority [8]–[10].

However, the tension between Individualism and Collectivism was resolved by the individualist social theory of the Enlightenment. Its primary goal was to dismantle the concepts of the dominant Collectivism in order to pave the way for succeeding social philosophy, which is why it is known as individualistic. The broken idols of collectivism have not, however, been in any way replaced by a religion of the individual. It established modern social science and demonstrated that the conflict of goals around which the argument

spun did not really exist by making the idea of the harmony of interests the cornerstone of sociological philosophy. Because only under these conditions can society exist, each person sees in this a strengthening of his or her own ego and will. Rather than being driven by an inner desire of contemporary scientific thinking, the collectivist movement today is driven by the political will of an era that yearns for Romanticism and Mysticism. Spiritual movements are uprisings of thinking against inertia, of the few against the many, and of those who are powerful in spirit alone against those who can only be expressed in the mass and the crowd and who are only noteworthy because they are many.

The opponent of all of this is collectivism, which is a tool used by people who want to eliminate thinking and the mind. Thus it produces the State, the "New Idol," and "the coldest of all cold monsters." Collectivism consciously aims to sever every link that binds sociological and scientific thought by elevating this mysterious being to the status of an idol, dressing it up in fantasy extravagance with every excellence, purifying it of all dross, and expressing a readiness to sacrifice everything on its altar. This is most readily apparent in those thinkers who worked hardest to rid scientific thought of all teleological components, whereas in the field of social cognition they not only upheld traditional ideas and teleological ways of thinking, but even blocked the path by which sociology could have won the freedom of thought already attained by natural science by attempting to justify this. For Kant's theory of cognition of nature, there is no god and no ruler of Nature, but history is what "nature executes a hidden plan to bring about a state-constitution perfect inwardly and, for this purpose, outwardly as well as the only condition in which she can develop all her abilities in humanity," according to Kant.

In Kant's words, it is particularly clear that modern collectivism has nothing to do with the old realism of concepts. Instead, having developed out of political, rather than philosophical, needs, it now occupies a unique position outside of science that cannot be challenged by arguments based on the theory of cognition. Herder vehemently opposed Kant's critical philosophy, which he saw as a "Averroic" hypostasization of the general, in the second section of *Ideen zu einer Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit* Ideas to a Philosophy of the History of Humanity. Anyone attempting to argue that education and civilization are focused on the race rather than the individual would be speaking illogically since "race and species are only general concepts, except to the extent that they exist in the individual being." Even if one gave this general concept all the human perfections culture and the highest level of enlightenment that an ideal concept would allow, one would still have said "just as little about the true history of our race" if they had given animality, stoneness, and metalness in general the most glorious, yet inherently contradictory, attributes. Kant completes the separation of philosophical concept-realism from ethical-political collectivism in his response to this. "To claim that the species of horses is horned despite the fact that not one horse has horns is utterly ludicrous. Because all individuals must agree on one attribute, the term "species" only refers to that. However, if the term "human species" refers to the entirety of a line of generations that extends into infinity and if it is assumed that this line of generations is constantly drawing closer to its destiny, which runs alongside it, then it is not contradictory to state that the human species, as a whole, meets this destiny line; in other words, there is no connection between all the generations of the human race, only the specie.

This may be clarified by mathematicians. The completion of this development is just an idea though in all intents and purposes a good idea of the goal towards which we, in accordance with the design of Providence, have to focus our efforts. This is what the philosopher would say. Here, Collectivism's teleological nature is openly acknowledged, creating an unbridgeable gap between it and the way pure cognition thinks. The understanding of

Nature's secret purposes resides beyond the realm of experience, and our own reasoning does not allow us to draw any conclusions about their existence or their contents. Our ability to monitor human behavior and the behavior of social systems does not support a theory. There is no logical link that can be drawn between experience and what we will or may believe. Because it cannot be shown, we are supposed to assume that against his will, man submits to Nature's dictates and does what is best for the race as a whole rather than for himself. This deviates from standard scientific methodology.

Collectivism cannot be justified as a need of science, it is a reality. It can only be explained by political considerations. As a result, it idealizes and elevates social connections to the status of gods instead of stopping where conceptual realism did and confirming the reality of social relationships as living, breathing entities. Gierke emphasizes that one must keep true to the "idea of the real unity of the community" since this is the only thing that enables the demand that the individual should stake strength and life for Nation and State. Gierke makes this point very clearly and unambiguously. Collectivism, in the words of Lessing, is "the cloak of tyranny."

Men would be completely incapable of cooperating in society if there actually was a conflict between the interests of the individual and the general good. Human interaction would naturally consist of a fight of all against all. No mutual toleration or peace was possible; the only thing that was possible was a brief ceasefire that only lasted as long as one or more parties were weary. The person would, at the very least theoretically, be always in rebellion against everyone, just as he is constantly at war with bacilli and rapacious animals. A "world shaper" of the Platonic "o"? cannot have intervened to create social institutions in any other manner than via the collective perspective of history, which is utterly asocial. The heroes who guide recalcitrant man to where it wants him to go are its tools in history. As a result, the individual's will is compromised. The agents of God on earth oblige everyone who just wants to live for themselves to abide by the moral code, which requires them to forego their own happiness in favor of the good of the Whole and the growth of the Whole.

Disposing of this duality is where the science of society starts. It is able to comprehend social systems without appealing to gods and heroes for help because it recognizes that the interests of various people within society are compatible and that these individuals and the community are not at odds. When we acknowledge that social unity benefits a person more than it costs him, we may do away with the Demiurge, which pushes the individual into collectivism against his choice. The growth of a closer-knit type of society may be understood even without the assumption of a "hidden plan of nature" if we realize that every step we take in this direction helps us as a whole, not just our distant great-grandchildren.

Nothing in collectivism stood in opposition to the new social idea. Its repeated charge that this theory does not understand the significance of the collectiva, particularly those of the State and Nation, merely demonstrates that it has not seen how liberal sociology's impact has altered the context of the issue. Collectivism no longer makes an effort to develop a comprehensive theory of social existence; the best thing it can come up with in opposition to its critics is a clever aphorism, nothing more. It has shown itself to be completely fruitless in both economics and broad sociology. It is not a coincidence that the German mind, which was dominated by the social theories of classical philosophy from Kant to Hegel, produced nothing significant in economics for a very long time, and that those who broke the spell first Thünen and Gossen, then the Austrians Carl Menger, Böhm-Bawerk, and Wieser were free from any influence of the collectivist philosophy of the State.

The method in which Collectivism has approached the social will issue best demonstrates how little it has been able to achieve to overcome the obstacles in the way of amplifying its philosophy. It is in no way possible to describe how the collective will of the social associations comes into existence by repeatedly referencing the Will of the State, the Will of the People, and the Convictions of the People. The collective will cannot emerge as the sum or outcome of individual wills since it is not just different from but really extremely antagonistic to the will of distinct persons in key areas. Depending on his or her political, religious, and national views, each collectivist posits a different source for the collective will. Fundamentally, it makes little difference whether one sees it as a trait of a certain class or group of people or as the supernatural abilities of a monarch or priest. Friedrich Wilhelm IV and Wilhelm II had a strong belief that God had given them particular power, and this belief undoubtedly encouraged their diligent work and the growth of their might. Many of their contemporaries had the same beliefs and were willing to give their last drop of blood for the monarch that God had entrusted to them. But just as a religion cannot be shown to be true, neither can this notion be proven to be true by science. Collective thinking is political, not intellectual. It teaches how to make value judgements.

CONCLUSION

Throughout history, socialism has played a significant and guiding role in the formation of countless societies all over the globe. Individuals trying to redress social injustices and economic inequality have found resonance with its fundamental ideals of community ownership and fairness. Even though socialist experiments have had both triumphs and failures, they have had a big effect on how money and resources are distributed across different countries. The promise of a fairer and more equal society, where everyone's fundamental needs are addressed, is still an alluring ideal. However, for any socialist system to be successfully implemented, its shortcomings, such as inefficiency, bureaucracy, and potential for power abuse, must be recognized and overcome. The key to moving towards a more socialist or capitalist society is to have a deep grasp of the dynamics and intricacies of economic systems and how they affect the welfare and freedom of individuals. Lessons from socialist beliefs and practices may help us build more inclusive and successful communities while avoiding the mistakes of the past as societies develop.

REFERENCES:

- [1] C. Fuchs, "Communicative socialism/digital socialism," *TripleC*, 2020, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1144.
- [2] H. Joshi, "WHY NOT SOCIALISM," *Public Aff. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.2307/26910031.
- [3] G. Kallis, "Socialism Without Growth," *Capital. Nature, Social.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/10455752.2017.1386695.
- [4] L. Chelcea and O. Druță, "Zombie socialism and the rise of neoliberalism in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe," *Eurasian Geogr. Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/15387216.2016.1266273.
- [5] K. W. Fogg, "Indonesian socialism of the 1950s: from ideology to rhetoric," *Third World Q.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/01436597.2020.1794805.
- [6] N. Spakowski, "Dreaming a Future for China: Visions of Socialism among Chinese Intellectuals in the Early 1930s," *Mod. China*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0097700418767609.

- [7] L. Fiuza, "A Theory of Socialism and Capitalism," *MISES Interdiscip. J. Philos. Law Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.30800/mises.2016.v4.179.
- [8] P. Heumos, "State socialism, egalitarianism, collectivism: On the social context of socialist work movements in Czechoslovak industrial and mining enterprises, 1945-1965," *Int. Labor Work. Hist.*, 2005, doi: 10.1017/S0147547905000190.
- [9] J. Pickles, "The spirit of post-socialism: Common spaces and the production of diversity," *Eur. Urban Reg. Stud.*, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0969776409356492.
- [10] A. Wildt, "Totalitarian State Capitalism: on the Structure and Historical Function of Soviet-Type Societies," *Telos*, 1979, doi: 10.3817/0979041033.

CHAPTER 5

SOCIAL ORDER AND THE POLITICAL CONSTITUTION

Rahul Kumar, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-rahul.kumar@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Anshu Choudhary, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-anshu@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In order to shed insight on how the form and operation of political systems impact and are influenced by the social order inside a society, this study examines the complex link between social order and the political constitution. In order to create societal cohesiveness, stability, and advancement, it explores the ideas of power, authority, and government. The study underlines the importance of a well-balanced and flexible political constitution in sustaining unity and safeguarding the welfare of the public via a multidisciplinary examination. In addition, it looks at how many aspects of society, including culture, the economics, and technological development, interact with the political system. Technological developments also influence how people communicate with one another, share information, and participate in politics, therefore the political system must be continuously reviewed and modified to reflect these beneficial changes. Additionally, the operation of the political system and the social order are both heavily impacted by cultural and economic variables.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Political, Social, State, Violence.

INTRODUCTION

Naturally, the realm of property was not the only one under the rule of violence. The mindset that placed its faith in power alone and sought the necessities of wellbeing not through cooperation but by constant struggle penetrated all aspects of existence. The "Law of the Stronger," which is basically the antithesis of Law, was applied to all human relationships. No peace existed; at most, there was a ceasefire. Even the tiniest relationships may lead to a society. The group of people that banded together to maintain their own peace was first rather small. The circle gradually grew through millennia, until the majority of mankind was covered by the community of international law and the union of peace, with the exception of the semi-savage peoples who lived on the lowest level of civilisation.

The concept of contract was not applied equitably across this group. It was most widely acknowledged in everything related to property. The areas where it addressed the issue of political dominance remained its weakest. It has only so far infiltrated the realm of foreign policy to establish battle laws in order to restrain the concept of violence. The most common ancient judicial method for resolving conflicts between nations, with the exception of arbitration, is still the use of force in fight. However, much as in judicial duels under the oldest of laws, this use of force is subject to specific regulations. However, it would be untrue to claim that the only thing keeping the sword in its sheath in international relations is apprehension of external violence [1]–[3].

The importance of peace has been prioritized above the financial gain from winning a war by forces that have influenced state foreign policies for millennia. Even the most powerful war lord today cannot totally escape the effect of the legal principle that states that wars must be justified. It is a serious acknowledgement of the idea of Law and Peace that those who

conduct war consistently try to demonstrate that their cause is righteous and that they fight for defense or at the very least for preventative defense. Every policy that has publicly acknowledged the need of violence has attracted a global coalition, to which it has ultimately yielded. There are two opposing strategies for controlling societies: the Policy of Violence and the Policy of Contract. These words are often used to refer to theoretical or historical conceptions of statehood and power. Let's look more closely at each policy:

The Policy of Violence:

The "Monopoly of Violence," often referred to as the "Policy of Violence," is a notion connected to the classical state model. In this strategy, the state has exclusive control over the legal use of force on its soil. In order to maintain law and order and protect its residents, the state has the exclusive power to use violence, including the use of military, police, and judicial forces. The belief that the state must be the final judge of disputes and the enforcement of laws is at the core of the violence policy.

Specifications of the Violence Policy:

1. A central authority that exerts control over the instruments of coercion and violence is where the state's power is centered.
2. **Law and Order:** Establishing and upholding law and order in society is the basic goal. To maintain order and safeguard its population, the state imposes laws via coercion.
3. **Sovereignty:** The state claims its sovereignty over its area, prohibiting people and non-state actors from using force on their own.
4. **Legitimacy:** The permission of the governed, as well as historical customs and social contracts, provide the state the right to employ force.

Criticism of the Violence Policy

The Policy of Violence may promote authoritarianism and the misuse of authority, according to critics. If the state has exclusive control over the use of force, there is a chance that dissident voices will be silenced and human rights will be violated. If not employed carefully, it may also result in an excessive militarization and conflict escalation [4]–[6].

The Policy of Contract:

The "Social Contract Theory," also known as the "Policy of Contract," is a philosophical idea that seeks to defend the legitimacy of the state via an unspoken or overt agreement between the rulers and the subject. According to this view, people freely unite to create a society and a government in order to uphold their rights, preserve social order, and advance the common good.

Specifications of the Contract Policy:

1. **Voluntary Association:** Individuals' voluntary assent to adhere by the laws and regulations of the society serves as the foundation for the legitimacy of the state's power.
2. **Protection of Rights:** Protecting fundamental human rights including life, liberty, and property is the main objective of the government.

3. **Limited Government:** The extent of the government's jurisdiction is determined by the terms of its agreement with the people and is not unlimited. People have the right to dispute or even dissolve the government if it doesn't carry out its duties.
4. **Popular Sovereignty:** The people are ultimately in charge, and the government serves as their agent to make decisions on their behalf.

Criticism of the Contract Policy:

The Policy of Contract may oversimplify the intricacies of actual cultures and historical state formations, according to critics. Furthermore, concerns are raised about the possibility of particular groups being disenfranchised by the social compact or if everyone really agrees to it.

DISCUSSION

The human mind learns about the triumph of the principle of peace over the principle of violence via the liberal social philosophy. For the first time ever, mankind accounts for its deeds in this philosophy. It rips apart the romantic nimbus that has been around the use of force. It teaches that fighting is bad for everyone involved, even the victor. The foundation of society is peacemaking, which is how society came into being. All things have their origin in peace, not in violence. Only economic activity has produced the prosperity we see around us; enjoyment comes from work, not from the use of force. War obliterates, peace creates. Because they understand the underlying value of peace, nations are inherently peaceful. They only consent to wars of self-defense; they have no appetite for wars of aggression. Princes are the ones that prefer war as a means of obtaining wealth, possessions, and power. By denying them the tools needed to start a conflict, it is the job of the countries to stop them from attaining their goal.

As opposed to Bertha Suttner and other members of that group, the liberal's passion of peace does not stem from altruistic concerns. It is devoid of the gloomy atmosphere that opposes the sobriety of international congresses with the romanticism of blood lust. Its preference for peace is not an interest that is generally consistent with all conceivable beliefs. It is liberalism's social philosophy. Whoever upholds the solidarity of the economic interests of all nations and remains unconcerned with the size of national territories and national frontiers, whoever has so far overcome collectivist notions that an expression like "Honour of the State" sounds incomprehensible to him, that man will never find a justification for aggressive wars? The progeny of liberal social philosophy is liberal pacifism. Liberalism's emphasis on property preservation and its opposition to war are two manifestations of the same fundamental idea [7], [8].

The Role of Democracy in Society

In terms of internal politics, liberalism demands the greatest possible freedom for the expression of political opinion, that the State be established in accordance with the majority's wishes, that the people's representatives pass laws, and that the government, which is a committee of those representatives, be subject to the laws. When liberalism supports a monarchy, it just makes a compromise.

The republic, or at the very least an English-style shadow-principality, continues to be its dream. The right of people to self-determination as individuals is its ultimate political ideal. It is pointless to debate whether or not to label this political aim democratic. Recent authors

have a tendency to draw comparisons between liberalism and democracy. Above all, their notions about the intellectual foundation of democratic institutions seem to be formed only from the principles of natural law. They appear to have no distinct conceptions of either.

Now, it's possible that the majority of liberal theories have worked to promote democratic institutions on the basis of justifications that line up with natural law theories in regards to the inalienable struggle for human self-determination. However, the justifications a political movement offers for its tenets are not necessarily the same as the justifications that compel them to be spoken. Acting politically is often simpler than understanding one's true motivations. The ancient liberalism understood that its system of social philosophy would ultimately lead to democratic demands. But it was not at all evident where these demands fit into the overall system. It also explains the measureless exaggeration that some pseudo-democratic demands have enjoyed at the hands of those who ultimately claimed the name of democrat for themselves alone and who, as a result, became contrasted with liberals who did not go so far. This explains the uncertainty it has always displayed in questions of ultimate principle.

The democratic form of governance is significant not because it more closely embodies than any other the inherent and inalienable rights of man or because it more fully achieves the ideals of equality and liberty. In theory, allowing others to rule over him is about as unworthy of a man as allowing others to do any type of labor for him. Again, this is not to be explained by the fact that democracy is deserving of love for its own sake. Rather, it is to be explained by the fact that the citizen of a developed community feels free and happy in a democracy, that he regards it as superior to all other forms of government, and that he is willing to make sacrifices to achieve and maintain it. The reality is that it serves purposes for which he is unable to live without.

It is often considered that choosing political leaders is democracy's most important role. In a democratic system, candidates compete for the appointment to at least the most significant public posts, and it is thought that the candidates with the best qualifications would prevail. However, it is difficult to see why democracy should definitely have a better chance of choosing leaders of the state than autocracy or aristocracy. History demonstrates that political skill has often prevailed in non-democratic regimes, disproving the claim that democracy always elects the most qualified candidates. The adversaries and supporters of democracy will never agree on this issue.

In actuality, the importance of the democratic system of government is completely distinct from all of this. Its purpose is to promote peace and prevent violent uprisings. Only a government that can rely on the support of the populace is able to sustain itself over the long term, even in non-democratic governments. All regimes are only as strong as the spirit that employs the available weapons, not the weapons themselves. The only way the ruling class, which is always a tiny minority in the face of a vast majority, is able to win and hold onto power is by bending the majority's will to their will. The ground underneath it is eroded and must sooner or later give way if there is a change or if people whose support the government relies on no longer believe they must support this specific administration. Violence alone may alter people and political structures in non-democratic governments. The upheaval sweeps away the system and the people who have lost the public's support, and a new system and new people take their place.

However, every bloody revolution costs lives and money. Devastation causes economic disruption and results in the loss of life. By ensuring agreement between the will of the state as represented via the state's organs and the will of the people, democracy aims to avert such

material loss and the attendant psychological damage. This is accomplished by making the state's organs legally subject to the prevailing popular opinion. It accomplishes everything pacifism aims to do in internal policy.

When we explore the argument that critics of the democratic principle most usually use to refute it, it becomes abundantly obvious that this is the only function of democracy that matters. The Russian conservative is absolutely correct when he notes that the vast majority of the Russian people supported Russian Tsarism and the Tsar's policies, meaning that even a democratic state structure could not have given Russia a new form of administration. Russian Democrats themselves have not harbored such illusions. The tsardom did not suffer from the lack of a democratic type of constitution as long as the majority of the Russian people, or, better yet, of that portion of the people who was politically mature and who had the potential to influence in policy as long as this majority stood behind the tsardom. But as soon as the tsarist governmental structure and popular opinion diverged, this weakness proved deadly. A political disaster was unavoidable since state will and popular will could not be changed without violence. And what is true of the Tsarist Russia is also true of the Bolshevik Russia, as well as of Prussia, Germany, and every other state. The consequences of the French Revolution were so devastating that France has never entirely recovered psychologically. The fact that England has been able to avoid upheaval since the seventeenth century has been of immense advantage to her.

Thus, it becomes clear how incorrect it is to equate or even suggest a similarity between the phrases democratic and revolutionary. Democracy aims to eradicate revolution and is not merely not revolutionary. The specific to Marxism religion of revolution, of violent overthrow at any cost, has nothing to do with democracy. Liberalism wants democracy because it understands that achieving man's economic goals requires peace and strives to do so by eradicating any factors that lead to conflict at home or abroad. Liberals see violence in war and during revolutions as a constant evil that cannot always be avoided as long as there is no democracy among men. But even when a revolution looks all but certain, liberalism works to protect the populace from violence in the hopes that it will make dictators willing to give up their privileges that stand in the way of societal progress. The great night of August 4th, 1789, when the French feudal lords voluntarily renounced their privileges, and the English Reform Act of 1832 show that these hopes were not entirely in vain. Schiller uses the Marquis de Posa to implore the king for liberty of thought. The heroic grandiosity of Marxism's professional revolutionaries, who risk thousands of lives and demolish ideals developed over decades and centuries, is not admired by liberalism. Here, the economic tenet applies: Liberalism seeks achievement at the lowest possible cost.

Democracy is the people's right to self-governance and independence. However, this does not imply that everyone must contribute equally to policymaking and administration. Only the tiniest scales allow for the realization of direct democracy. Even tiny parliaments cannot complete all of their work in plenary sessions; committees must be formed, and the actual work is carried out by specific people—the bill writers in particular—as well as the proposers, speakers, and rapporteurs. So, this serves as the conclusive evidence that people follow the leadership of a select group of men. Even democratic institutions cannot change the fact that not all men are created equal, that some are born to lead and others to follow. We cannot all be pioneers since most people don't want to or have the strength to be. We have an image of the ancient Greek city state during its decline, and this image gives rise to the notion that under the purest form of democracy, people would spend their days in council like members of a parliament. However, we ignore the fact that such communities were not democratic at all because they excluded slaves and anyone who did not have full citizenship

rights from public life. The "pure" concept of direct democracy becomes impractical in situations when everyone must cooperate. It is nothing less than pedantic natural law doctrine to advocate for the realization of democracy in this untenable form. It is only essential for law and administration to be shaped in accordance with the public majority in order to accomplish the goals that democratic institutions pursue, and indirect democracy is wholly adequate for achieving this goal. The core of democracy is not that everyone develops and implements laws, but rather that lawmakers and rulers should be subject to the will of the people in a fashion that allows for peaceful transition in the event of dispute. This refutes a lot of the justifications offered by proponents and opponents of popular rule for why democracy cannot be realized. Because leaders emerge from the people to focus only on politics, democracy is not any less democratic. Politics requires the full man, just like any other occupation in a society that divides labor; amateur politicians are useless. The democratic ideal is met so long as the professional politician depends on popular opinion and can only implement measures for which he has gained support.

Democracy does not require that the parliament be a scaled-down representation of the country's socioeconomic structure, which consists mostly of peasants and industrial laborers when they make up the majority of the population. The lawyer and journalist in the parliaments of the Latin American nations, the gentleman of leisure who plays a significant part in the English parliament, and the labor union leaders and peasants who have brought spiritual devastation to the German and Slavic parliaments are likely to better reflect the people. Parliaments and the administrations that emanate from them would not be able to reflect the will of the people if members of the upper socioeconomic classes were excluded. Because these higher levels in society, whose members were chosen based on public opinion, have an impact on people's thoughts that is entirely out of proportion to their basic numbers. If they were excluded from parliament and public administration by being deemed unfit for office by the electorate, a conflict would have developed between public opinion and that of parliamentary bodies, making it more difficult, if not impossible, for democratic institutions to function. Because the excluded cannot be repressed by the inferior components that rule parliamentary life, non-parliamentary impacts are seen in legislation and administration. Nothing hurts parliamentarism more than this, thus we must look for a solution to this much-lamented fall. Because democracy is not mob rule, parliament should consist of the greatest political brains in the country in order to carry out its duties [9], [10].

Those who saw democracy as an unrestricted exercise of the *volonté générale* have done significant harm to the idea of democracy by distorting the notion of sovereignty found in natural law. The unrestricted authority of an autocrat and an unlimited power of a democratic state really have very little in common. Perhaps even more harm has been done by the caesarmania of degenerate princelings than by the concept that drives modern demagogues and their sympathizers, the belief that the state can do anything it pleases and that nothing should oppose the desire of the sovereign people. Both stem from the idea of a state founded only on political power.

The fact that the legislator is aware that all legislation is dependent on his will and that he is free from all restrictions stems from the philosophy of law. When someone views his formal independence as a material one and thinks he is beyond the norms of social life, it is a little thought misunderstanding, but one that has significant repercussions. Conflicts that result from this misunderstanding demonstrate that liberalism is the only paradigm in which democracy serves a social purpose. Without liberalism, democracy is a hollow shape.

Social-democracy and democracy

In the decades before the Bolshevik revolution, the idea that democracy and socialism are intrinsically linked became widely accepted. Many people began to think that Socialism and Democracy were synonymous, and that neither Socialism nor Democracy could exist without the other.

This idea was primarily the result of the fusion of two lines of reasoning, both of which had their origins in the Hegelian philosophy of history. World history, in Hegel's view, is "progress in the consciousness of freedom." The following is how progress is made: "...the Orientals only knew that one is free, the Greek and Roman world, that some are free, but we know that all men are free as such, that man is free as man."⁴⁸ Without a doubt, the freedom Hegel advocated was distinct from the one that the radical politicians of his day were fighting for. Hegel intellectualized notions that were prevalent in the political ideologies of the age of enlightenment. However, the radical young Hegelians interpreted his remarks in a way that suited them. For them, the transition to democracy was unavoidable in the Hegelian meaning of the word. The historians imitate them. Gervinus views "by and large in the history of humanity," as "in the internal evolution of the states," "a regular progress from the spiritual and civil freedom of the single individual to that of the Several and the Many."

The notion of "liberty of the many" has a distinct meaning in the materialist view of history. The Many are the proletariat; since awareness is influenced by social circumstances, they must inevitably become socialists. Therefore, the development of democracy and the growth of socialism are the same. Socialism is a means to the fulfillment of democracy, while democracy itself is a means to the achievement of Socialism. This coordination of socialism and democracy is best encapsulated by the party's name, Social Democracy. The socialist workers' party adopted the intellectual legacy of the Young Europe movements by adopting the word democracy. The Social-Democratic Party's programs are filled with all the catchphrases from the pre-March 50 radicals. They enlist followers for the party who are unconcerned with, or even hostile to, the demands of socialism.

The fact that Marxist Socialism was practiced by the Germans, Russians, and people from the smaller countries who were subjects of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy and the Tsarist empire defined how it related to the need for democracy. In these more or less authoritarian nations, every opposition group had to first demand democracy in order to provide the prerequisites for the emergence of political action. This effectively eliminated democracy from debate in the eyes of the Social Democrats; it would never have been acceptable to question the democratic ideology *proforoexterno*.

However, the party was unable to totally repress the issue of how the two concepts conveyed in its double name related to one another. The solution was first broken down into two pieces. They continued to maintain the words' interdependence and even went a step farther and claimed that they were ultimately one when they talked of the impending socialist utopia. As a devoted socialist looking forward to complete redemption in the yet-to-be paradise, one could not come to any other conclusion as long as they continued to see democracy as a positive thing in and of itself. If the land of promise weren't the ideal political scenario possible, something would be wrong with it. As a result, socialist authors never stopped claiming that only in a socialist society could there be real democracy. In the capitalist republics, what was referred to as democracy was a caricature created to hide the schemes of exploitation.

However, despite the fact that it was obvious that socialism and democracy had to merge at some point, it remained unclear if they would go along the same path. People debated

whether or not to seek the achievement of Socialism via the instrumentality of democracy, and consequently, according to the viewpoints just presented, whether or not to stray from the principles of democracy in the battle. This was the well-known debate on the proletariat's rule; it was the topic of scholarly discussion in Marxist literature before the Bolshevik revolution and has since grown to be a significant political issue.

The argument originated from the dualism that pierces through the bundle of dogmas known as the Marxist system, much like all other disagreements of opinion that separate Marxists into factions. Marxism maintains that there are always at least two opposing viewpoints on every issue, and that only artificial dialectical means can bring these viewpoints together. The most typical technique is to employ a term that may have many meanings at different times, depending on the situation. With these words, which also act as political catchphrases to captivate the collective consciousness, a cult that has fetishistic overtones is perpetuated. Word fetishism is fundamentally the Marxist dialectic. Every tenet of the religion is reflected in a word fetish that unites contradictory concepts and demands via its double or even multiple meanings. The opposing groups finally come to blows over the meaning of these words, which are as purposefully vague as those of the Delphic Pythia, and each side cites sections from Marx and Engels' works that they believe to be authoritative in support of their position.

The term "revolution" is one of them. Marxism defines the term "industrial revolution" as the progressive transition from the pre-capitalist mode of production to the capitalist one. The distinction between the phrases "evolution" and "revolution" is essentially nonexistent in this context since "revolution" has the same meaning as "development." Thus, the Marxist has the freedom to despise "putschism" (also known as "insurrectionism") to describe the revolutionary spirit as he pleases. Many passages from Marx and Engels were cited by the revisionists, and they had a point. However, Marx uses the phrase in a way that conjures up barricades and brawls when he refers to the workers' movement as a revolutionary movement and asserts that the working class is the only genuine revolutionary class. So, when syndicalism invokes Marx, it is also correct.

Marxism uses the term "State" in a way that is similarly ambiguous. Marxism holds that the State serves only as a tool for the exploitation of certain classes. The proletariat eliminates class strife and the State by gaining political power. "There will be nothing left to repress and nothing that would necessitate a special repressive power, a state, as soon as there is no longer any social class to be kept in suppression, as soon as class domination and the struggle for individual existence based on the prior anarchy of production are removed, along with the conflicts and excesses which arise from them. The seizure of control of the means of production in the name of society, which is the State's first true act of acting as the representative of the whole society, also happens to be its last autonomous act as a state. One area of state power's engagement in social matters becomes redundant after another, until finally it finally falls asleep on its own. Even if this statement's understanding of the fundamentals of political organization is unclear or poorly thought out, it is so unambiguously favorable in its assessment of proletarian rule that it seems to leave no room for dispute.

It becomes much less encouraging, however, when we consider Marx's claim that there must be a period of revolutionary transformation between capitalist and communist societies, along with a corresponding "political period of transition whose state can be no other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." We obviously arrive at a very different conclusion regarding Marxism's attitude toward democracy if we assume, like Lenin, that this period is to last until that "higher phase of communist society" is reached, in which "the

enslaving subordination of individuals under the division of labor has vanished, and with it the contrast of mental and physical work," in which "work will have become not only a means to life, but itself the first necessity of life." Without a certain, democracy will never be tolerated in the communist world for many years to come.

Marxism completely ignores the significance of liberal ideas, albeit sometimes mentioning the historical successes of liberalism. When it comes to dealing with liberal demands for freedom of conscience and speech, for the principled recognition of every opposition party, and for the equality of all parties, it is at a loss. Marxism asserts all fundamental liberal liberties everywhere it is not in power because only they can provide it the freedom that its propaganda so desperately demands. However, when it comes to power itself, it will never be able to comprehend their spirit or provide them to their rivals. In this way, it is similar to churches and other organizations founded on the use of force. When waging war, these groups also take use of democratic liberty, but once in power, they deny their opponents those same rights. Therefore, it is obvious that Socialism's democracy exposes its falsehood. "The party of the communists," claims Bukharin, "demands no form of freedoms for the bourgeois enemies of the people. Quite the opposite. And with astonishing cynicism, he brags that the communists, before they had power, supported freedom of speech simply because it would have been "ridiculous" to seek freedom from the capitalists in any other manner than by demanding freedom in general for everyone.

Liberalism wants democracy immediately everywhere and everywhere because it thinks that the role it must play in society does not allow for procrastination. The peaceful growth of the state is impossible without democracy. As liberalism claims the infallibility of its teaching, the desire for democracy is not the product of a strategy of accommodation or of caving in to relativism in matters of global philosophy. Instead, it is a result of the liberal view that control over the mind alone is the only path to power and that the only tools that can help achieve this control are spiritual ones. Liberalism nevertheless supports democracy even if it may anticipate only negative effects from democracy for an indeterminate period of time. Liberalism holds that it cannot exist against the will of the majority, and that any benefits that might result from a liberal regime that is artificially maintained and in opposition to popular sentiment would be insignificant in comparison to the commotions that would result from disobeying the will of the people. The Bolshevik revolution has forced the Social Democrats to prematurely remove their mask and show the brutality that their philosophy entails. Otherwise, they would have undoubtedly continued to flirt with the catchphrase democracy.

CONCLUSION

The complex interactions that make up a civilization show how closely social order and political structure are related. The successful operation of the political constitution depends on a stable and peaceful social order, while the political constitution is crucial in maintaining and controlling social order. The allocation and use of authority within the political system has a direct bearing on the development and cohesiveness of society. To ensure the welfare and prosperity of the population, a political constitution must be functional and flexible enough to respond to the changing demands and ambitions of the people. More inclusive and fair governance may result from recognizing these factors and developing regulations that take them into consideration. In order to improve the symbiotic link between social order and the political constitution, it is crucial that politicians, academics, and people work together on a constant basis. We can pave the way to a more equitable and successful future for everybody by developing a culture that values openness, diversity, and democratic ideals. In order to create a strong and cohesive society, it is crucial to acknowledge and embrace how intertwined the social and political spheres are.

REFERENCES:

- [1] T. Macdonald and K. Macdonald, "Towards a 'pluralist' world order: creative agency and legitimacy in global institutions," *Eur. J. Int. Relations*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1354066119873134.
- [2] O. Ansaldi and M. Pardo-Vergara, "What Constitution? On Chile's Constitutional Awakening," *Law Crit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10978-020-09260-0.
- [3] M. Goldoni and M. A. Wilkinson, "The material constitution," *Rev. Estud. Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.18042/cepc/rep.187.01.
- [4] L. Danner, "The apolitical social contract: Contemporary democratic politics beyond depoliticized social contract," *Kriter.*, 2017, doi: 10.1590/0100-512X2017n13606ld.
- [5] D. Tröhler, "La historia del currículum como camino real a la investigación educativa internacional. Historia, perspectivas, beneficios y dificultades," *Profesorado*, 2017, doi: 10.30827/profesorado.v21i1.10360.
- [6] A. Sajó, "The constitution of illiberal democracy as a theory about society," *Polish Sociol. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.26412/psr208.01.
- [7] L. Rauch, "Law, Legislation and Liberty," *Philos. Stud.*, 1978, doi: 10.5840/philstudies19782620.
- [8] B. P. Lamichhane, "Models of Constitution Making with Reference to Nepal," *J. Polit. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.3126/jps.v20i0.31793.
- [9] J. McLean, "The unwritten political constitution and its enemies," *Int. J. Const. Law*, 2016, doi: 10.1093/icon/mow002.
- [10] G. Gee and G. C. N. Webber, "What is a political constitution?," *Oxf. J. Leg. Stud.*, 2010, doi: 10.1093/ojls/gqq013.

CHAPTER 6

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ON ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

By providing people and communities a bigger voice in economic choices and the allocation of resources, the idea of economic democracy aims to strengthen people and communities. It goes beyond the conventional concept of market-based capitalism with the goal of establishing a more just and inclusive economic system. This chapter examines the tenets and practices of economic democracy, stressing both its advantages and disadvantages in promoting a more equitable and environmentally friendly society. The research provides insight into the applicability and implementation of economic democracy in diverse circumstances by examining case studies and theoretical frameworks. However, putting economic democracy into practice is not without difficulties. The need for public education and awareness, bureaucratic difficulties, and resistance from established interests are key obstacles to be overcome. Decentralization and coordination must be balanced properly in order to prevent inefficiency or anarchy in economic systems. Economic democracy demands additional investigation, testing, and active participation from all stakeholders as an essential step toward a more equal and prosperous future.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Economic, Socialism, Society.

INTRODUCTION

The justification for socialism included in the term "self-government by industry" is one of the most significant ones. Similar to how the King's absolutism in politics was overthrown by the people's right to participate in decision-making and subsequently by its exclusive right to decide, the absolutism of producers and business owners has to be overthrown by customers and employees. As long as everyone must bow to the owners' despotism, democracy is not complete. The worst aspect of capitalism is not the disparity in wealth; rather, what is even more intolerable is the influence that the capitalists have on their fellow people. Personal freedom cannot exist as long as this situation persists. The People must assume control over the management of economic affairs, just as they have done with state administration. This argument has two errors. Both the essence and purpose of political democracy and the social order based on private ownership of the means of production are misunderstood in this statement.

We've previously shown that the core of democracy is not to be found in elections, national council deliberations and decisions, or any committees that these councils select. These are only the technical means through which political democracy operates. Its primary goal is to promote peace [1]–[3]. By guaranteeing that the nation's leaders and administrators are chosen by popular vote, democratic institutions ensure that the will of the people is carried out in political issues. Thus, any risks to social progress that may arise from a conflict between the wishes of the rulers and the general populace have been removed. The functioning of institutions that enable a peaceful transition of administration helps to prevent civil war. No unique institutions, like those that political democracy has built for itself, are

necessary in an economic system based on private ownership of the means of production to attain similar success. Free competition serves the purpose.

All production must flex to the demands of the public. It loses profitability the instant it doesn't meet customer expectations. As a result, free competition forces producers to yield to customer needs and, in emergency situations, to transfer their control of the means of production to those who are better equipped to manage production rather than those who are unwilling or unable to meet market demands. The customer is king of production. From this vantage point, the capitalist society is a democracy, with its representatives having an immediate and revocable mandate and each cent representing a ballot paper. Consumer democracy is what it is. The producers cannot effectively direct the course of production on their own. This is true for both business owners and employees, who must eventually heed customer demands. And it is implausible to think otherwise. People generate commodities so that they might be consumed, not only for the purpose of producing. In a division of labor-based economy, a man's role as a producer is just that of the community's agent, and as such, he must submit. He can only control as a customer.

Thus, the entrepreneur is only a production manager. Of sure, he has authority over the employee. But he is not allowed to use it at will. He must employ it in line with the demands of that producing activity that satisfies the needs of the customers. The judgments made by the business owner may seem arbitrary and capricious to the individual wage worker whose view is constrained by the limited horizon of daily labor. When anything is seen too closely, its real form becomes meaningless. The worker will undoubtedly see the business owner's disposal of the products as being arbitrary and baseless if it hurts his short-term interest. He won't be aware that the business owner operates inside the confines of a tight legal code. True, the business owner is allowed to follow his whims to the letter, to arbitrarily fire employees, to steadfastly adhere to archaic procedures, to purposefully choose inappropriate means of production, and to allow himself to be influenced by factors that contradict with customer expectations. But whenever and whenever he does this, he must pay a price, and if he does not control himself in time, the loss of his possessions will force him into a position where he is unable to do any more harm. No special techniques are required to manage his conduct. More firmly and precisely than any government or other institution of society could, the market controls him [4], [5].

Every effort to replace this consumer regulation with a producer rule is ridiculous. It would go against the basic foundation of the creative process. The most significant example for contemporary circumstances the syndicalist economy was previously covered in more depth. What applies to it also applies to any producer's policy. Consumers must always come first in all economies. If we picture these syndicalist institutions being expanded into the political sphere, the folly of these attempts to establish "economic democracy" via the construction of these institutions becomes clear.

Would it be democratic, for instance, if judges had to determine which laws should be in effect and how they should be applied? Or what if troops had to choose who to put their weapons at their disposal and how to use them? No, if the state wants to avoid turning into an arbitrary despotic regime, judges and soldiers must follow the law. The most overt misunderstanding of democracy's nature is the term "industrial self-government," which is a catchphrase. The highest authority of society, not the workers in various fields of production, determines what must be done in each individual economic zone in the socialist community. If this were not the case, then instead of socialism, we would have syndicalism, and there can be no compromise between the two.

DISCUSSION

The Consumer As The Deciding Factor In Production

Some claim that business owners drive production in a path that is counter to customer interests in order to protect their own interests. They have no qualms about "creating or intensifying the public's need for things which provide for merely sensual gratification but inflict harm on health or spiritual welfare." For instance, it is said that the hostility "of the vested interests of alcohol capitalism to all attempts to combat it" makes the struggle against alcoholism, the biggest threat to national health and welfare, more difficult. If economic concerns had no influence in spreading the habit, smoking would not be "so widespread and so greatly on the rise among the young." In today's world, "luxury articles, baubles and tinsel of all kinds, trashy and obscene publications" are "forced upon the public because the producers profit by them or hope to do so." It is well known that the schemes of "armament-capital" are to blame for the massive arming of the Powers and thereafter, indirectly, for war itself.

When looking for investments, businesspeople and investors gravitate toward the sectors of the economy where they expect to make the most money. In order to get a broad picture of demand, they strive to understand what customers will desire in the future. Consumers regularly find themselves in the situation of being able to fulfill needs that were previously unmet since capitalism is always producing new riches for everybody and expanding the satisfying of wants. Therefore, it becomes the specific responsibility of the capitalist entrepreneur to identify those previously unmet desires that may now be met. When individuals claim that capitalism develops needs in order to fulfill them, they have this in mind.

The nature of the goods that consumers seek is unimportant to businesspeople and capitalists. They are only the customer's subservient slaves, and it is not their place to dictate what the consumer may enjoy. If he requests them, they offer him poison and deadly weapons. But nothing could be more false than to believe that goods with a negative or destructive aim attract more customers than those with a positive one. The products with the greatest level of demand also provide the largest profits. Therefore, the profit-seeker begins manufacturing those commodities where supply and demand are most out of balance. Naturally, it is in his best interest to ensure that the demand for his goods rises once he has committed his wealth. He works to increase sales. But over time, he will be unable to stop a shift in demand. He also won't benefit much from rising product demand since new businesses are starting to focus on his sector, which tends to lower his earnings to ordinary levels. Men manufacture beer, distill spirits, and cultivate grapes because there is a need for alcoholic beverages; mankind does not use alcohol despite the existence of breweries, distilleries, and vineyards. "Alcohol-capital" hasn't invented drinking habits or drinking tunes, either. If there had been a market for spiritual rather than spirituous material, the capitalists who hold shares in brewers and distilleries would have chosen stakes in publishing companies for devotional publications. Warfare did not initiate "armament capital"; rather, "armament capital" initiated conflict. Instead of Krupp and Schneider, imperialist intellectuals and politicians incited the countries to war.

Let a guy refrain from alcohol and tobacco if he believes they are detrimental. If he wants, let him make an effort to persuade his peers to adopt his own abstinence philosophy. What is clear is that he cannot compel individuals to give up drink and tobacco against their will in a capitalist society where the fundamental tenet is that of human autonomy and responsibility. If he regrets not being able to force his will on others, he may at least comfort himself by

remembering that he is not subject to their orders. Some socialists criticize the capitalism social structure largely due to the wide range of products it produces. Instead of creating homogeneous items that might be distributed on a broad scale, individuals create hundreds of thousands of different varieties of each commodity, which drives up the cost of manufacturing significantly. Socialism would integrate production and increase national output by giving the comrades access to just uniform items. Simultaneously, Socialism would dismantle individual family homes and build communal kitchens and hotel-style residences in their stead. This, too, would boost societal wealth by eliminating the waste of labor force in small kitchens that serve a limited number of customers. These concepts have been covered in considerable length in a number of socialist literature, particularly those of Walter Rathenau [6]–[8].

Under capitalism, each customer must choose between the more affordable uniformity of mass production and the more expensive, particularly made goods that cater to the tastes of the individual or a small group. Unmistakably, production and consumption have a propensity to become more uniform over time via standardization. The materials utilized in the production process itself are standardizing more and more on a regular basis. The astute businessperson quickly realizes the benefit of employing the standard type over products made using a specific method due to its reduced purchase cost, replaceability, and adaptability to different productive processes. Due to the widespread socialization of many businesses, the push to standardize the tools of production is now hindered. No emphasis is placed on the benefit of utilizing standard types since they cannot be sensibly controlled. Army administrations, municipal construction departments, State railroads, and other comparable organizations resent the adoption of widely used typefaces with bureaucratic obstinacy. It is not necessary to modify Socialism in order to synchronize the production of machinery, manufacturing equipment, and semi-finished goods. Contrarily, capitalism moves through this process more swiftly on its own.

With items for use and consumption, it is different. One cannot objectively disprove a man's decision to satisfy his unique, personal tastes over utilizing the uniform goods produced in huge quantities if he feels that his pleasure outweighs the additional expense. Who can blame my buddy for preferring to dress, live, and eat whatever he pleases and not follow social norms? Because he wants to live his life the way he wants to and not the way I or others would if we were in his shoes, he is happy when his desires are granted. It is his assessment that matters, not mine or anybody else's. I may be able to convince him that the conclusions he draws to form his values are incorrect. I may, for instance, show him that his meal choices don't have as much nutritious value as he thought they did. However, if his values are based on subjective thoughts and sentiments rather than unsupportable theories regarding the relationship between cause and effect, my arguments will not be able to convince him otherwise.

If he chooses a separate household despite the benefits of hotel living and shared kitchens because he values having a "own home" and "own hearth" more than reasons in favor of unitary organization, then nothing further has to be stated. There are no grounds to counter his decision to equip his home in accordance with his own preferences rather than the general taste that influences the furniture maker. I may undoubtedly label him foolish from the perspective of my values if he continues to drink while understanding the negative consequences of alcohol because he is willing to pay even a high price for the pleasure it provides him, but ultimately, that is up to his choice and valuation. If I ban alcohol use as a dictator or a member of a despotically controlling majority, I do not increase the productivity of social production. Without prohibition, many who criticize alcohol wouldn't have

consumed it. For everyone else, the inability to enjoy something they value more than whatever they might get from giving it up results in a decline in happiness.

When applied to the goals of economic activity, the comparison of productivity and profitability. One may refer to a method or an action as being more practical, or more capable of producing a larger yield, when discussing means to a certain objective. However, we lack any useful objective criteria when we try to determine which measures directly boost an individual's wellbeing more. In this case, man's subjective volition is what counts. The physiological effects of water, milk, or wine do not determine a man's taste for such beverages; rather, it depends on how he values those effects. I can't claim a guy is behaving unreasonably if he drinks wine instead of water. I can only say that if I were in his position, I may not do it. But it is not my concern to interfere with his search of pleasure.

The amount of satisfactions is not enhanced but decreased if the socialist society provides the comrades with commodities that they themselves desire to enjoy rather than those that the rules believe they should. Certainly, this infringement of personal autonomy cannot be referred to as "economic democracy." Since men under capitalism provide for themselves but under socialism they are taken care of, this is a crucial distinction between capitalist and socialist production. The socialist seeks to feed, shelter, and hide the nakedness of mankind. However, males want to live, dress, and generally pursue pleasure in their own way.

Socialism As Expression of the Majority

It is by no means insignificant how many people in our day choose socialism since the majority already does. We must socialize because the majority of people desire socialism and no longer accept the capitalist system of government. One hears this all the time. But many who oppose socialism do not find it to be a strong argument. We will undoubtedly get socialism if the majority wants it. Nobody has shown this point more forcefully than liberal thinkers than how the majority always rules, even when it is wrong. The minority must bear the repercussions of the majority's error and cannot protest. Has it not contributed to the mistake by failing to educate the majority?

However, when addressing what will be, the claim that the vast majority of people fiercely want socialism would only be true if socialism were a goal in and of itself. But in no way is this the case. Socialism is a means to a goal and not an end in and of itself, like all other systems of social organization. Both individuals who support and oppose socialism want pleasure and well-being, and the only reason why they identify as socialists is because they think that socialism is the best path to achieving these goals. They would become liberal if they believed that the liberal order of society was better equipped to meet their desires. The weakest defense against a socialist is thus the claim that one must support socialism since the majority wants it. The greatest law for the people's representatives, who must carry out its directives, is the people's will. But people who want to control mind shouldn't submit to it.

Only he is a pioneer who stands out and makes an effort to persuade his fellow people to adopt his points of view, even when they are different from the prevalent ones. This claim that one should submit to the masses is nothing more than a demand that those who continue to criticize Socialism with reasoned arguments give up reason itself. The fact that such a claim can be made merely serves to highlight how far intellectual life has already been assimilated into society. Such justifications haven't been utilized in early history's most gloomy periods. People who disagreed with the majority's preconceptions were never taught that their beliefs were incorrect just because the majority had a different viewpoint. The fact that everyone wants socialism won't help us if it's essentially impossible to implement [9]–[11].

The Impossibility Of Socialism And The Morality Of Capitalism

It is a common claim made in expositions of ethical socialism that it assumes mankind have been morally cleansed. We won't be able to move the socialist order of society from the realm of ideas to actuality as long as we don't succeed in morally uplifting the masses. The obstacles to socialism are wholly, or mostly, caused by men's moral failings. Some authors express uncertainty that this challenge will ever be solved, while others are happy to state that Socialism will not be possible in the near or far future. We were able to demonstrate why the socialist economy is unworkable, which isn't because people are inherently unethical but rather because the issues a socialist system would have to resolve offer insurmountable intellectual challenges. Socialism is unworkable because of intellectual, not moral, limitations. Because a socialist economy was unable to determine value, socialism was unable to realize its goals. Even angels, if they had just human reason, would not be able to create a socialist society.

If a socialist society could make economic decisions, it could be established without affecting the moral nature of humanity. Different ethical norms from those of a society based on private ownership of the means of production would rule in a socialist society. Different temporary sacrifices would be required of the person by society. But if there was any way to do objective calculations inside the communist society, it wouldn't be any harder to impose the socialist moral code than it is to enforce the capitalist one. A socialist society would be able to compute each individual member's part of the social product and set their compensation in accordance with their respective productive contributions. In such a situation, the socialist order would have no need to worry that a comrade wouldn't put out the greatest amount of effort since there would be no inducement to make the toil of labor more enjoyable. Socialism will have to create a completely different sort of human being for its Utopia than the species that now inhabits the planet, one for whom labor is not toil and agony but joy and pleasure. This is because this condition is absent. The utopian socialist is forced to demand things of mankind that are at odds with nature since such a calculation is impossible. Although this human type's inadequacy which would lead to the collapse of socialism might first seem to be of a moral nature, upon closer inspection, it becomes clear that it is an intellectual one.

The alleged ethical flaws with capitalism

Sacrificing the less important for the more essential is what it means to conduct decently. When we give up little things to get greater ones, like quitting drinking to prevent its negative physiological repercussions, we make temporary sacrifices. Men put up with the hardship of labor so they won't go hungry. The temporary sacrifices made in the name of social cooperation, which is the main way to meet human needs and sustain life in general, are referred to as moral behavior. Social ethics underpin all morality. If it were argued that rational behavior that is solely focused on one's own good should also be considered ethical and that we had to deal with individual ethics and duties to oneself, we could not argue against it; in fact, this mode of expression emphasizes perhaps more effectively than ours the fact that, in the end, social ethics and personal hygiene are founded on the same logic. By enabling social cooperation, one may act ethically by sacrificing the less important for the more significant.

The primary flaw in the majority of anti-utilitarian ethical theories is their misunderstanding of the significance of the momentary sacrifices that obligation requires. They create the ridiculous idea that sacrifice and renunciation are ethically good in and of themselves because they fail to understand the reason for doing so. They elevate the qualities that led to them

selflessness, sacrifice, and the love of compassion to the status of unquestionable moral principles. It's quite close to saying that any action that causes pain to the performer is moral, which is why the suffering that first comes with the sacrifice is characterized as moral since it causes agony.

We may understand why many attitudes and behaviors that are socially neutral or even detrimental end up being referred to be moral by the finding of this misconception. Unavoidably, utilitarian concepts will always recur in reasoning of this kind. If we fail to distinguish between true and false compassion and refuse to applaud a doctor who refuses to perform a life-saving procedure on the grounds that doing so will spare the patient pain, we reintroduce the teleological consideration of purpose that we had hoped to avoid. If we value selflessness, then human wellbeing cannot be disregarded as a goal. Thus, a negative utilitarianism develops: we are to see as moral whatever which helps others rather than the actor. There has been established an ethical standard that is incompatible with the reality of our day. So, after denouncing the "self-interest"-based society, the moralist goes on to create a society where people are to be what his ideal demands. He starts off by misinterpreting the world and its rules. He then wants to create a world that corresponds to his incorrect notions, which he refers to as creating a moral ideal. Man is not wicked just because he want to survive, or to have pleasure and avoid suffering. Self-sacrifice, abnegation, and renunciation are not virtues in and of themselves. It is entirely arbitrary to denounce the moral norms that capitalism demands of social behavior and to replace them with ones that may be established under socialism.

CONCLUSION

A compelling vision for a society that is more fair and inclusive is economic democracy. This concept provides a method to enhance social equality and sustainability by decentralizing economic power and include stakeholders in decision-making processes. The research shows that the development of strong institutions that support group decision-making and guarantee openness and accountability are crucial for the success of economic democracy. Reduced income inequality, better resource allocation, stronger social cohesiveness, and more general well-being are some of the major advantages of economic democracy. Additionally, it encourages a feeling of accountability and ownership among residents, which may increase productivity and creativity. A convincing alternative to the dominant economic paradigms is economic democracy, which places an emphasis on shared wealth and sustainable development. In order to create economic democracy, policymakers, corporations, and civil society groups should work together to investigate and test diverse strategies, then adapt them to the particular needs of their own communities.

REFERENCES:

- [1] A. Cumbers, R. McMaster, S. Cabaço, and M. J. White, "Reconfiguring Economic Democracy: Generating New Forms of Collective Agency, Individual Economic Freedom and Public Participation," *Work. Employ. Soc.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0950017019875935.
- [2] A. Cumbers, "Economic democracy," in *Keywords in Radical Geography: Antipode at 50*, 2019. doi: 10.1002/9781119558071.ch18.
- [3] B. Akbulut and F. Adaman, "The Ecological Economics of Economic Democracy," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106750.

- [4] R. G. Holcombe, "South Korea's economic future: Industrial policy, or economic democracy?," *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.*, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.jebo.2011.07.021.
- [5] N. Johannisova and S. Wolf, "Economic democracy: A path for the future?," *Futures*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.futures.2012.03.017.
- [6] S. S. Braun, "Pope Francis and Economic Democracy: Understanding Pope Francis's Radical (yet) Practical Approach to Political Economy," *Theol. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0040563920907077.
- [7] D. Treisman, "Economic Development and Democracy: Predispositions and Triggers," *Annual Review of Political Science*. 2020. doi: 10.1146/annurev-polisci-050718-043546.
- [8] G. M. Mikkelsen, "Environmental Values, Human Nature, and Economic Democracy," *Hum. Ecol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10745-016-9877-y.
- [9] R. Gunderson, "Work time reduction and economic democracy as climate change mitigation strategies: or why the climate needs a renewed labor movement," *J. Environ. Stud. Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s13412-018-0507-4.
- [10] W. H. Simon, "Economic Democracy and Enterprise Form in Finance*," *Polit. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0032329219880372.
- [11] N. Baklouti and Y. Boujelbene, "An econometric study of the role of the political stability on the relationship between democracy and economic growth," *Panoeconomicus*, 2020, doi: 10.2298/PAN170308015B.

CHAPTER 7

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE CRITIQUE OF THE CONCEPT ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Modern economies are based on the idea of economic activity, which has an impact on the creation, consumption, and distribution of products and services. This chapter examines the core components of economic activity, its forces, and its social repercussions. We strive to shed insight on the intricacies and interdependencies that define economic systems by analysing diverse economic models and ideas. The study explores important theoretical stances and practical applications, emphasizing the role of economic activity in promoting development, growth, and stability. While economic activity offers chances for wealth and advancement, it also brings with it difficulties like income disparity, resource depletion, and environmental destruction. To create sustainable and fair economic systems, policymakers and stakeholders must carefully evaluate these ramifications. One standard must be used to evaluate not just the fulfillment of wants, desires, and impulses that may be accomplished by contact with the outside world, but also the fulfillment of ideal demands.

KEYWORDS:

Economic Models, Economic, Money, Production.

INTRODUCTION

The history of economics began with discussions on the monetary value of products and services. Its earliest roots may be traced back to queries concerning coinage, which evolved into studies of price changes. The issues around money, money pricing, and everything involving financial calculations make up the difficulties from which the field of economics was born. The economic investigations that are apparent in books on family administration and the organization of production particularly agricultural production did not progress in this direction. They just served as the foundation for several technological and natural science departments. And this wasn't by chance. The only way the human mind could learn to comprehend and trace the rules governing its conduct was via the rationality inherent in economic calculation based on the use of money. Previous generations of economists did not pause to consider what exactly the terms "economic" and "economic activity" meant. They had enough to do with the substantial duties that the specific issues they were then focused on offered. The methods didn't matter to them. They didn't start debating economics' methodology, ultimate goals, and position within the larger body of knowledge until it was much too late. And then there was the issue of defining the subject matter of economic activity, which appeared to be an insurmountable barrier [1]–[3].

All theoretical investigations those conducted by classical and contemporary economists alike begin with the economic premise. However, as was inevitably realized quickly, this does not provide a foundation for precisely defining the field of economics. The economic principle is not a particular concept of such conduct that is the focus of economic investigation, but rather a general principle of rational activity. All rational, conduct that may be the topic of a

science, is guided by the economic principle. For the purpose of differentiating the "economic" from the "non-economic," it seemed to be completely useless as far as the conventional economic issues were concerned. On the other hand, it was also difficult to categorize rational activities according to the immediate goal they served and to limit the scope of economics to just those behaviors that served to provide humanity with goods from the outside world. The fact that providing material things serves numerous additional goals in addition to those that are often referred to be economic is a resounding argument against such a technique.

Such a split of rational action's motivations implies a dual view of action activity driven by economic motivations on the one hand, and action driven by non-economic motivations on the other which is completely incompatible with the essential unit of will and action. A rational action theory must consider rational action to be unitary.

Logic-based action

Reason-based action, which can only be comprehended by reason, has a single goal: to provide the actor the most joy. Its goals are the pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of suffering. Of course, we do not mean "pleasure" and "pain" in the traditional sense by these phrases when we say this. According to the vocabulary of the contemporary economist, pleasure is to be regarded as including all that which men deem pleasant, everything that they want, and all that they work for. Therefore, there can no longer be a comparison between the "noble" ethics of responsibility and the impolite hedonistic ethics. Regardless of whether an activity is motivated by moral or dishonorable, noble or ignoble, selfless or egocentric goals, all human objectives are included in the current definition of pleasure, happiness, usefulness, satisfaction, and things like.

Men often only take action when they are not entirely happy. If people were to continually experience perfect enjoyment, they would lack motivation, ambition, and initiative. There is no activity in the lotus-eaters' homeland. Only needs or discontent lead to action. It is a conscious effort toward a goal. Its ultimate goal is to eliminate a state that is seen to be deficient to satisfy a need, to find contentment, to promote happiness because this is the only way to really succeed. Men might utilize nature's resources carelessly if they had access to all of them in sufficient quantities to satisfy their needs completely via action. They would just have to think about their own abilities and the limited amount of time available. Because they would still only have a finite amount of power and life left after meeting their whole demands. They would still need to save money on labor and time. But they would not care about material economics. However, since there are only so many resources available, they must also be utilized to meet the most pressing demands first, using the fewest amount of supplies for each fulfillment [4]. As a result, the domains of economic and logical activity coincide. Economics underlies all sane behavior. Economic activity is always reasonable behavior. All logical activity is, first and foremost, personal action. Thinking is a unique thing. Just the particular causes. Only the person takes action. In a later section of our discussion, it will be shown how society develops as a result of individual behavior.

DISCUSSION

The Capitalist Economy

Political buzzwords, "capitalism" and "capitalistic production" are used often. Socialism created them, not to advance knowledge, but to complain, criticize, and condemn. They no longer need to be said in order to paint a picture of the ruthless exploitation of wage slaves by the avaricious elite. They are seldom ever used except to signify that the body politic is ill.

They are so cryptic and unclear from a scientific standpoint that they are completely useless. Only this: Their users agree that they represent the features of the contemporary economic system. However, it is seldom clear exactly what makes up these traits. Since their usage is wholly harmful, the idea to completely exclude them from economic discourse and hand them over to the matadors of public agitation merits careful examination.

However, if we want to find a specific use for them, we need start with the concept of capital calculations. Furthermore, as we are primarily interested in the examination of real economic events and not in economic theory, where the word "capital" is often used in a sense that is specifically stretched for certain objectives, we must first determine what meaning the term has in actual business operations. There, we discover that it is solely utilized for economic calculations. It helps to unite all of the original attributes of a company, whether they were represented in money or just in terms of money. Its calculations are intended to help us determine how much the value of this property has changed over company operations. Economic calculation is the source of the idea of capital. Accountancy, the main tool of business logic, is where it belongs. A crucial component of the idea of capital is calculation in terms of money [5]–[7].

The word "capitalism" takes on a unique relevance for characterizing economic activity when it is used to describe an economic system in which capital calculations dominate output. Thus, the terms "capitalism" and "capitalistic methods of production" are by no means inaccurate, and phrases like "the capitalistic spirit" and "the anti-capitalistic disposition" take on a narrowly defined meaning. Individualism, which is often utilized in this sense, is less suited to serve as the antithesis of Socialism than capitalism. The tacit assumption made by those who compare individualism and socialism is that there is a conflict between the interests of the individual and those of society, and that individualism serves the interests of specific individuals while socialism has the welfare of the general public as its goal. And since this is one of the most serious social fallacies, we must be very cautious when using any kind of language that can enable it to subtly seep in.

According to Passow, when the word "capitalism" is used appropriately, the relationship it is meant to imply is often connected with the growth and dissemination of big businesses. We may acknowledge this, even if it is rather challenging to do so given that "Grosskapital" and "Grosskapitalist" are terms that are often used before "Kleinkapitalisten." However, if we keep in mind that the expansion of massive businesses and endeavors was only made feasible by capital calculations, our proposed definitions are not in the least bit invalidated.

The Limited Definition Of "Economic"

Just like the previous contrast between ideal and material goods, economists sometimes differentiate between "economic" or "purely economic" activity and "non-economic" behavior. For willingness and action are one. All of them come to clash with one another, and it is this conflict that places them on a scale.

We are forced to make a decision in life between the "ideal" and the "material." Making the former subject to a single set of values is thus just as important as making the latter. We put both options to one test when deciding between food and honor, faith and riches, and love and money.

Therefore, it is improper to define "economic" activity as a distinct field of human activity that can be clearly distinguished from other activity sectors. Rational behavior is economic activity. Additionally, because no one can ever be completely satisfied, the realms of economic activity and rational conduct overlap. It entails valuing goals first, followed by

valuing the methods by which these goals will be achieved. Because of this, the presence of aims is a prerequisite for any economic action. Economy is dominated by ends, which are what give it significance.

Since the economic principle governs all human conduct, it is important to be very cautious when defining "purely economic" and other types of action under its purview. For many scientific reasons, such a divide is unavoidable. It highlights one end in particular and sets it out from the others. The achievement of the biggest feasible product measured in money is this aim, and at this point we need not debate whether it is ultimate or not. Assigning it a specifically defined sphere of operation is therefore impossible. It is true that each person has a clearly defined sphere, but the size of this sphere fluctuates depending on the person's perspective as a whole. For the guy who values honor, it is one thing. For him, selling his pal for riches is yet another. The difference is only warranted by the uniqueness of the techniques used, not the nature of the aim or the strangeness of the means. Only the application of precise computation sets "purely economic" apart from other activities.

The world of "purely economic" analysis is nothing more or less than the world of financial analysis. We have a tendency to give this form of action a specific amount of attention since it allows us to compare methods in a particular area of action with minute accuracy down to the slightest detail. It is easy to forget that such a difference solely pertains to the method of cognition and action and in no way, shape, or form, affects the ultimate goal of action, which is unitary. It is not the fault of the analytical tool used that all efforts to show the "economic" as a distinct department of the rational and within it to find still another clearly defined department, the "purely economic," have failed. There is no question that this issue has received a great deal of analytical nuance, and the fact that it still hasn't been resolved shows that there isn't a good solution available. The realm of the "economic" is obviously the same as the realm of reason, and the realm of the "purely economic" is nothing more than the realm in which it is feasible to calculate money.

The pursuit of the greatest pleasure is the only goal a person may recognise in the final instance. No matter how "material" or "immaterial" (moral) a person's needs and desires are, they are all included in this statement. If we didn't worry about misconceptions caused by the debate between hedonism and eudaemonism, we might use the term "happiness" in lieu of "satisfaction." It's hard to define satisfaction. There is a tendency to forget that the physiological makeup of humans and the unity of outlook and emotion resulting from tradition create a far-reaching similarity of views regarding wants and the means to satisfy them because modern social philosophy has emphasized this in such stark contrast to earlier theories. Society is only possible because of these shared viewpoints. Men are able to coexist because they have similar objectives. The fact that certain objectives are being pursued by a small percentage of people is of secondary relevance when compared to the reality that the majority of ends and those that are most important are shared by the vast majority of humanity.

Because every rational behavior is motivated by economic considerations, the conventional distinction between economic and non-economic reasons is discredited. On the one hand, the goal of economic activity resides beyond the purview of economics. However, there is a strong case for distinguishing between "purely economic" activities and all other types of activity, defined as those that may be valued in terms of money. Since, as we've previously shown, there are only intermediate goals beyond the realm of monetary calculation that can be evaluated immediately, it becomes imperative to turn to these judgements after this realm is gone. The difference we have been examining has its origin in the realization of this requirement.

It is wrong to assume that a nation's desire to wage war, for instance, is irrational just because its motivations aren't often seen as "economic" as is the case, for instance, with wars of religion. War cannot be considered irrational if the country chooses to go to war in full knowledge of all the facts because it believes that the desired outcome is more essential than the cost in lives, and that war is the best way to achieve it. Determining whether or not this notion will ever be true is not essential at this time. In order to choose between war and peace, one must specifically look at this. And the difference we've been talking about has really been created in order to provide clarity to such an evaluation.

Economic Analysis

Insofar as it is reasonable, all human action seems to be an exchange of one condition for another. Men allocate financial resources, personal time, and labor in a way that, under the circumstances, guarantees the greatest degree of pleasure, and they forego gratifying less important wants in favor of gratifying more pressing ones. The execution of trading actions is the core of economic activity [8]–[10].

Every guy who makes value judgements while choosing between two wants that can only be supplied by one of them during economic activity.⁵ Such assessments are made on the satisfactions themselves first and foremost; only from these do they reflect back on the items. In general, everybody with their senses can instantly assess things that are fit for ingestion. He should also have minimal trouble generating an opinion on the relative importance of the production elements to him under fairly straightforward circumstances. However, when situations are even somewhat complex and the relationship between objects is difficult to identify, we need to do more complex calculations in order to assess such instruments. Man who lives alone may choose between expanding his hunting and farming with ease. The manufacturing procedures he has to consider are just a few steps long. It is simple to understand their request for spending and the item they can afford as a whole. But deciding whether to employ a waterfall or increase coal mining in order to better use the energy found in coal is a very other problem. Here, the manufacturing procedures are so many and drawn out, and the requirements for the undertaking's success are so numerous, that we can never be satisfied with hazy concepts. We must carefully compute in order to determine if a project is sound.

However, calculation needs units. Additionally, there cannot exist a unit for the arbitrary use-value of goods. No unit of value is provided by marginal utility. Although it is always higher or smaller than one, the value of two units of a particular commodity is not twice as great as that of one. Value judgments organise and grade rather than measure. Even an isolated guy cannot make a choice based on more or less precise calculations in situations where the answer is not immediately apparent if he simply uses subjective evaluation. He must assume commodity substitution relations in order to simplify his computations. Typically, he won't be able to condense everything into a single unit.

However, if he is successful in limiting all components of the calculation to products that he can assess right away, such as consumables and the inefficiency of labor, he will be able to base his choice on this data. It is evident that only extremely straightforward situations make even this conceivable. It would be completely out of the question for industrial procedures that are difficult and drawn out. The unit of measurement in an exchange economy is the objective exchange value of the goods. There are three advantages to this. First, we are able to use the value of every trade participant as the foundation for our calculations.

The subjective assessment of one person cannot be easily compared to the subjective assessments of other people. It only takes on its meaning as an exchange value when the

subjective judgments of everyone involved in buying and selling interact. Second, calculations of this kind provide a check on the proper use of the production tools. They make it possible for people who want to estimate the cost of intricate manufacturing processes to determine right away if they are operating more efficiently than competitors. If they are unable to complete the process profitably at the current market price, others are more likely to be able to use the instrumental products to their advantage. Finally, we may convert quantities to a single unit by using computations based on exchange values. Additionally, because the market's haggling creates relationships of substitution between commodities, any commodity is suitable for this use. Money is the commodity of choice in a money economy.

There are limitations to money computations. Money is neither a measure of worth nor a benchmark for pricing. Value is not quantified by money. Prices are not either measured in money or expressed as sums of money. Additionally, while some who refer to money as a "standard of deferred payments" incorrectly think that this is the case, money is not a commodity with a fixed value. Both on the "money side" and the "goods side," the relationship between money and goods is always in flux. These variations are often not too erratic. They don't significantly affect the economic calculation since it only considers relatively short time periods, during which "sound money" at least does not significantly alter its buying power, even in a state of constant change of all economic circumstances. Most often, the flaws in money calculations result from the fact that they employ exchange values rather than arbitrary use values, despite the fact that money is a common medium of exchange. Because of this, all components of value that are not exchangeable escape these calculations. When determining, for instance, whether a hydraulic power plant would be viable, it is impossible to factor in the harm that would be done to the waterfalls' aesthetic value without also accounting for the decline in value brought on by a decline in tourist traffic. But while considering whether to carry out the endeavor, we must unquestionably take such factors into account.

These kinds of considerations are often referred to as "non-economic." And we may use the phrase since arguing about language is pointless. However, not all of these factors should be deemed illogical. Even if because they are not traded on the market they do not involve exchange relations, the attractiveness of a location or a structure, the health of a race, or the honor of individuals or nations are just as valid reasons for rational behavior as those that are typically referred to as economic, so long as people value them highly. It results from the sheer nature of these computations that they cannot be included in financial calculations. However, this has little impact on how valuable money estimates are in typical economic situations. Because all of these moral virtues are first-class commodities. Even if they fall outside the realm of monetary calculations, we can value them directly and may thus easily take them into consideration. The fact that they escape these calculations does not make it any more challenging to remember them. If we are aware of the exact price to be paid for honor, health, and beauty,

Nothing, even pride, needs to stop us from giving children the attention they deserve. Having to choose between the ideal and the tangible may hurt sensitive individuals. A money economy is not to blame for it, however. It is just how things are. Because we are forced to make this decision even in cases when we can evaluate things without using monetary calculations. True sensitive natures won't find it painful since both solitary man and communist communities would have to do it. When forced to choose between honor and food, they will always know what to do. If eating is not possible for the sake of honor, eating may at least be avoided. Only those who secretly know they couldn't live without the stuff would see the requirement of choice as a profanation because they dread the anguish of

decision. Only for the sake of economic calculation are money calculations relevant. They are utilized in this instance so that the disposal of goods may adhere to the standard of economy and only in the amounts that they trade for money under certain circumstances are commodities taken into consideration in these computations. Every enlargement of the realm of financial computation is deceptive. It is inaccurate when used as a gauge for previous commodity prices in historical study. When used to assess a nation's capital or national income, it is deceptive. When it is used to assess the worth of non-exchangeable items, such as when individuals try to calculate the loss from emigration or conflict, it is deceptive. Even when they are attempted by the most skilled economists, all of them are amateurish endeavors.

But within these bounds and in real life, they are seldom exceeded money calculation fulfills all of our legitimate requests. It offers direction among the overwhelming array of economic opportunities. It allows us to apply value judgements that are only directly applicable to consumption products, or at most, to production goods of the lowest level, to all things of higher orders. Without it, every manufacturing would involve protracted and convoluted actions that would be in the dark.

If one wants to calculate value in terms of money, two things are required. First, exchangeable products must include both items of higher orders and goods that are ready for consumption. A system of trading connections could not form if this were not the case. It is true that the factors a lone man must take into account while "exchanging" labor and flour for bread inside his own home are the same as those that would direct his behavior if he were to swap bread for clothing on the open market. Therefore, it is quite legitimate to see all economic activity as trade, including that of a solitary individual. The ability to assess the relative value of any of an endless number of higher-order goods, however, does not belong to any one individual, not even the greatest genius ever to exist. No one could distinguish between the many different manufacturing processes in such a way that he could determine their relative worth without using any further computations. Without a certain mental division of labor, which is necessary for both economics and methodical production, civilizations founded on the division of labor are unable to function. Second, a universal means of trade, such as money, must be in use. And this must act as a middleman in the equitable exchange of producing items with the others. If not, it would be difficult to find a common denominator for all trading relationships.

It is only conceivable to do away with money computations in relatively straightforward situations. A parent may be able to assess changes in production processes in a small, closed home where he can keep an eye on everything without resorting to money calculating. Because manufacturing can continue under these conditions with very little money. There aren't many indirect manufacturing techniques used. Production often focuses on consumer items or higher-order commodities that aren't too far distant from them. The division of labor is still in its infancy. From start to finish, a worker carries out the manufacturing of a good. This has all changed in a modern world. It is untenable to claim that because of the experience of prehistoric cultures, contemporary society can do without money.

It is feasible to see the whole manufacturing process from beginning to finish in the straightforward surroundings of a closed family. One can assess if a certain technique produces more consumable items than another. However, this is no longer conceivable due to the enormously more intricate circumstances of our modern day. It's true that a communist society would understand that 1000 liters of wine are superior than 800 liters. It might choose whether or not 1000 liters of wine or 500 liters of oil should be favored. There would be no calculation involved in such a choice. Some man's will would make the decision. But once

such a choice is made, the true work of economic management, the adaptation of means to aims, starts. Additionally, this adaptation is only achievable via economic reasoning. The human mind would be completely lost in the confusing maze of alternate materials and procedures without such aid. We would be completely lost if we had to choose between several procedures or manufacturing hubs.⁸

It is a fantasy to think that a communist society could replace monetary calculations with equivalents in kind. Calculations in kind can never account for anything other than consumption commodities in a culture where commerce is not practiced. When it comes to higher-order items, they utterly fall apart. Once society stops allowing for the free price of items used in production, rational production is impossible. A step away from rational economic activity is every step that takes us away from private ownership of the means of production and the use of money.

It was feasible to ignore all of this since, for the most part, society is founded on free trade and the use of money, and socialism as we know it from firsthand experience only exists in these socialistic oases. To a certain degree, we may even agree with the socialist claim that nationalized and municipalized businesses operating in a capitalist economy are not socialist—a claim that is otherwise implausible and is solely made for propagandistic ends. Because of the support that such concerns get from the surrounding system of free pricing, the fundamental characteristic of economic life under socialism is not apparent in them. Technical advancements may still be made in government and municipal projects since it is easy to see how they affect related commercial projects both domestically and overseas. In such situations, you may still ascertain the benefits of restructuring because they live in a society where private ownership of the means of production and the use of money is still the norm. They can still maintain accounts and do computations, which would be impossible in a strictly communist system for identical reasons.

It is difficult to conduct economic activity without calculating. Economic calculation is not conceivable under socialism, hence there cannot be economic activity in the traditional meaning of the term. Reasonable conduct may nonetheless prevail in trivial situations. However, speaking about rational manufacturing would no longer be conceivable for the most part. Production could not be intentionally economical without rationality requirements. The heritage of thousands of years of economic independence may have prevented the art of economic management from completely disintegrating for a while. Men would continue to adopt the outdated procedures since custom had elevated them beyond reasonable consideration. However, in the meanwhile, shifting circumstances would render them unreasonable. Changes brought forth by the widespread loss of economic ideas would make them uneconomical. True, manufacturing wouldn't be "anarchic" anymore. The supply chain would operate under the direction of a supreme authority. The illogical order of a machine would rule supreme in place of the economics of "anarchical" manufacturing. The wheels would turn, but nothing would happen.

Let's attempt to picture what a socialist community might be like. There will be tens of thousands of workplaces where work is being done. Only a small percentage of them will result in usable products. The majority will manufacture semi-finished commodities and capital items. These institutions will be interconnected in some way. Before a product is suitable for consumption, it must travel through many of these facilities. However, the economic administration won't have a clear sense of direction amid the constant pressure of all these operations. It will be unable to determine if a certain task is really required or whether labor and resources are being thrown away in order to do it. How would it determine which of two processes was superior? It may, at most, compare the number of final products.

But it could hardly ever match the costs associated with their creation. It would be well aware of what it wanted to generate, or at least it would think it was. Therefore, it should start working on getting the required outcomes with the least amount of money spent. But in order to achieve this, it would need to have mathematical capabilities.

And these computations must be value-based. This is so evident that it doesn't need to be further demonstrated: they couldn't be just "technical," they couldn't be computations of the objective use-value of commodities and services. The scale of values is the result of each individual member of society acting in a system where the means of production are privately owned. Everyone contributes to its establishment in two ways: first as a consumer, then as a producer. He sets the price of commodities that are ready for consumption in his capacity as a consumer. As a producer, he directs manufactured commodities to applications where they will create the most. All products of higher orders are rated in this manner as well suitable to them given the manufacturing circumstances in place and the social needs. These two processes interact to guarantee that the economic principle is upheld in both production and consumption. And thus, the precisely graded pricing structure that allows everyone to formulate their demands along economic lines, emerges.

All of this must unavoidably be absent under socialism. It's possible that the economic administration is aware of which items are required most urgently. But this just solves part of the issue. It cannot resolve the other half, which is the value of the means of production. It can determine the entire worth of these instruments. That makes sense given the satisfactions they provide and their worth. It may also determine the worth of individual production tools if it analyzes the loss that would result from their withdrawal. But unlike a system of economic freedom and money prices, it is unable to reduce them to a single price denominator.

It is not required for Socialism to completely abolish money. It is feasible to imagine systems that allow the exchange of consumer products for money. Money, however, was unable to be used in economic calculations since the costs of the different production inputs, including labor, could not be stated in monetary terms. Imagine, for example, that the socialist commonwealth was considering building a new railroad. Would a brand-new railroad line be beneficial? If so, which of the numerous potential paths ought to it follow? We might utilize financial calculations under a system of private ownership to make these decisions. The new line would make it more affordable to carry certain goods, and on this premise, we might calculate whether the decrease in transport costs would be sufficient to outweigh the costs associated with constructing and maintaining the line. Only in monetary terms could such a computation be done. By comparing several categories of consumption and savings in kind, we were unable to do this. It is impossible to subject the quantities of different types of skilled and unskilled labor, iron, coal, different types of building materials, machinery, and other items required for the construction and maintenance of railways to economic calculation if they cannot be combined into a single unit.

Only when all the items we must consider can be converted into money can we create systematic economic strategies. Yes, financial computations are imprecise. It's true that they have serious shortcomings. However, we don't have anything better to replace them with. And they are sufficient for practical purposes in a solid financial environment. Economic calculation becomes utterly impossible if we give up on them. The socialist community would not, however, be completely at a loss. It would provide a decision in favor of or against the suggested activity and issue a directive. However, such a choice would, at best, be based on hazy assessments. It couldn't be relied on precise value computations. Unnecessary computations might be done away with in a stagnant society. There, economic activity

essentially repeats itself. Therefore, if we assume that the socialist system of production was based on the most recent iteration of the system of economic freedom it replaced and that further modifications were not to occur, we would have may in fact envision a sensible and practical socialism. But just conceptually. There can never be a stagnant economic system. The steady state is a theoretical presumption that has no analogue in reality since things are always changing. Nevertheless, it is required to help in speculation. In addition, maintaining such a link to the final stage of the exchange economy would be impossible given that the shift to socialism and its equalization of incomes would inevitably affect the whole "set" of consumption and production. Then there is the socialist society, which is forced to navigate the vast expanse of conceivable economic permutations without the aid of economic calculation. Therefore, every economic shift would include actions whose worth could neither be foreseen in advance nor determined after they had already occurred. Everything would be a blind leap of faith. Socialism is the rejection of the free market.

CONCLUSION

The socio-economic environment of the contemporary world is significantly shaped by economic activity. The wheels of production, consumption, and distribution are propelled by it, enabling society to fulfill their wants and goals. We have learned a great deal about the complex systems that control economic behavior and decision-making by examining numerous economic models. We now understand how markets work, how resources are distributed, and how policies affect development and stability thanks to the study of economic activity. For governments, firms, and people who want to make wise decisions, adjust to changing conditions, and promote long-term growth, understanding economic activity is essential. Economic activity research will be essential for tackling current global concerns and building a more equitable and sustainable future as economies continue to change.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. Achten and C. Lessmann, "Spatial inequality, geography and economic activity," *World Dev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2020.105114.
- [2] L. Dong, S. Chen, Y. Cheng, Z. Wu, C. Li, and H. Wu, "Measuring economic activity in China with mobile big data," *EPJ Data Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1140/epjds/s13688-017-0125-5.
- [3] S. Jabeen *et al.*, "Impacts of rural women's traditional economic activities on household economy: Changing economic contributions through empowered women in rural Pakistan," *Sustain.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12072731.
- [4] A. M. Herrera, M. B. Karaki, and S. K. Rangaraju, "Oil price shocks and U.S. economic activity," *Energy Policy*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2019.02.011.
- [5] A. Kaltenbrunner and J. P. Paineira, "Subordinated Financial Integration and Financialisation in Emerging Capitalist Economies: The Brazilian Experience," *New Polit. Econ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/13563467.2017.1349089.
- [6] P. Worsley, I. Wallerstein, and A. G. Frank, "The Capitalist World-Economy," *Br. J. Sociol.*, 1980, doi: 10.2307/589700.
- [7] J. Lust, "The rise of a capitalist subsistence economy in Peru," *Third World Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/01436597.2018.1529540.

- [8] A. Hassel, B. Palier, and S. Avlijaš, “The pursuit of growth. Growth regimes, growth strategies and welfare reforms in advanced capitalist economies,” *Stato e Mercat.*, 2020, doi: 10.1425/97509.
- [9] C. Podhisita, “Household dynamics, the capitalist economy, and agricultural change in rural Thailand,” *Southeast Asian Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.20495/seas.6.2_247.
- [10] Rahmat Gunawijaya, “Kebutuhan Manusia Dalam Pandang Ekonomi Kapitalis Dan Ekonomi Islam,” *J. Al-Mashlahah*, 2020.

CHAPTER 8

SOCIALIZATION OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A key idea in Marxist theory is the "socialization of the means of production," which emphasizes the shift from individual ownership and control of the means of production to communal ownership and management by the working class. The historical progression and theoretical underpinnings of the socialization of the means of production are explored in this essay along with its ramifications for society structure and economic planning. In-depth examination of several socialization mechanisms, including state ownership, cooperatives, and worker self-management, is done in this research. Their effects on wealth distribution, employment dynamics, and overall economic efficiency are examined. This study offers light on the possible advantages and difficulties of adopting socialization in various socio-political circumstances by looking at case studies and theoretical frameworks. In the end, it aims to provide a thorough knowledge of the socialization of the means of production and its importance for promoting a fairer and equal society. One of socialization's major benefits is its ability to reduce wealth inequality by more fairly allocating the rewards of production to the working class. Socialization strives to establish a system where the rewards of work are distributed among those who actively participate to the production process by doing away with private ownership and profit-driven objectives.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Labour, Production, Society, Socialist.

INTRODUCTION

All the tools of production belong to the community under socialism. They are only disposed of and put to use in manufacturing by the community. The community determines how to utilize the goods once it generates them and receives them as a benefit. Modern socialists, especially those who adhere to the Marxist school of thought, place a strong emphasis on referring to the socialist community as Society and, as a result, refer to the transfer of the means of production to the community's control as the "Socialization of the means of production." The phrase is OK in and of itself, but the context in which it is used specifically serves to hide one of Socialism's most significant faults. The adjective "social," which goes with the noun "society," has three distinct meanings. It entails both the tangible notion of a union of the persons themselves and the abstract idea of societal interrelationships. Between these two very distinct meanings, a third has been added in everyday speech: terms like "human society" and "civil society" are seen to personify the abstract society [1]–[3].

Marx now uses the phrase in all these contexts. As long as he made the difference very apparent, it wouldn't matter. But he acts in the exact opposite way. When it seems to be in his best interest, he switches them out for a conjurer's talent. He uses the term "social" in an abstract sense when he discusses how capitalism has a social component to its production. He refers to the personified society of humanity when he talks about the society that suffers during crises. However, he refers to a real social union when he talks about the society that

would expropriate the expropriators and socialize the means of production. And anytime he has to show the improbable, all meanings are switched in his argument's linkages. All of this is done in order to avoid using the phrase "State" or its equivalent, since the Marxist does not want to alienate the supporters of freedom and democracy right away with the use of this word. A plan that would give the government full control and direction overall output has little chance of being accepted in these circles. As a result, the Marxist must constantly search for a phraseology that obscures the core of the ideology and successfully hides the unbridgeable chasm that separates democracy from socialism. The fact that folks who lived in the decades just before World War I did not see this as a ruse does not speak much for their vision of the world.

The contemporary theory of the state interprets the term "State" to mean an authoritative body, a coercion instrument distinguished not by its purposes but by its structure. However, Marxism has unilaterally narrowed the definition of "state," excluding the socialist state. Only those nations and organizational structures that the socialist authors despise are referred to be states. The word is angrily rejected by the future organization to which they aspire as being dishonorable and demeaning. The name of it is "Society." In this approach, the Marxian social democracy could simultaneously consider overthrowing the current state apparatus, vehemently oppose all anarchist groups, and follow a course of action that resulted in an all-powerful state.

No longer does it matter in the slightest what name the socialist community's repressive system is given. If we use the word "State," we have a phrase that is commonly understood and that conjures the notion it is meant to suggest, with the exception of the fairly uncritical Marxian literature. However, there is no harm if we choose to avoid using this phrase because it causes conflicting emotions in many individuals and instead use the word "community." Terminology selection is just a matter of taste and has no bearing on reality. The issue of how this socialist State or society is organized is crucial. The English language offers a more nuanced difference when discussing the actual manifestation of the State's intent by allowing us to use the word "government" rather than "state." Nothing is better prepared to prevent the mysticism that Marxian usages have most actively encouraged in this regard. Because the Marxists casually discuss expressing society's will while offering no indication of how 'society' may go about acting and willing. However, the community can only take action via the institutions it has established.

Now, it follows that the instrument of control must be unitary from the socialistic community's fundamental inception. A socialist society is only allowed to have one ultimate organ of control, which unifies all governmental and economic duties. Of course, this organ may be broken up into several parts, and there can be inferior offices to which specific orders are given. However, the unified expression of the common will, which is the primary goal of the socialization of the means of production and of production, entails that all offices charged with overseeing various matters must be subservient to a single office. In order to settle any differences from the common goal and unite the executive goal, this office must have the highest authority. In the analysis of our specific issue, its composition and the degree to which the general will is able to do so via it are of secondary relevance. It makes no difference whether this organ is a direct or indirect democracy established by all people or an absolute prince. It doesn't matter how this organ formulates and communicates its desire. For our purposes, we must regard this to be completed, so we do not need to waste time debating whether or not it can be done or if socialism is already doomed because it cannot be done.

We must assume at the start of our investigation that there are no international contacts in the socialist society. It encompasses all people and all of creation. If we consider it to be

restricted, meaning that it just includes a portion of the planet and its inhabitants, we must presume that it has no economic ties to the regions and populations outside of its borders. We will talk about the issue of the isolated socialist society. When we have thoroughly generalized our analysis of the issue, we shall address the ramifications of the concurrent presence of many socialistic societies [4]–[6].

Economic Analysis in the Socialist Sector

According to the theory of economic calculation, economic calculation would not be feasible in a socialist society. In any significant project, the various works or divisions have a degree of financial independence. They may calculate labor and material costs, and each group has the freedom to balance its own budget and compile the financial results of its activities at any moment. By doing so, it is able to determine how well each individual branch has been run and use that information to decide whether to reorganize, restrict, or grow current branches or start new ones. Of course, it is impossible to prevent certain errors in these computations. They result in part from the challenge of distributing overhead expenses. The need to calculate from incompletely defined data also leads to other errors. For instance, when assessing the profitability of a particular operation, the depreciation of the equipment used is calculated by assuming a certain working life for the machine. However, all of these inaccuracies may be kept to a small range that won't affect the calculation's overall outcome. Whatever uncertainty is still there is ascribed to the unpredictability of future events, which is unavoidable in each conceivable situation.

DISCUSSION

The question of why various production sectors in a socialist society shouldn't maintain separate accounts in the same way then seems only obvious. However, it is not feasible. Only when market prices for all types of products and services are established and provide a basis for calculating are separate accounts for a single branch of one and the same company viable. Without a market, there is no pricing system, and without a price system, no economic calculation is possible. Some people may believe that it is conceivable to authorize trade between the various groupings of businesses in order to develop a system of exchange relations (prices) and so provide a foundation for economic calculation in the socialist society. Individual branches of industry could thus be established within the framework of a unitary economic system that does not recognize private property in the means of production, subject, of course, to the supreme economic authority, but able to transfer goods and services to one another for a consideration reckoned in a common medium of exchange. When people nowadays talk of total socialization and the like, this is basically how they see the productive structure of socialistic industry. But once again, the crucial point is missed. Only when the means of production are privately owned can exchange relations for productive items be formed. Only when both syndicates control the means of production in the industry can a price be set for coal delivered by the Coal Syndicate to the Iron Syndicate. However, it would be syndicalism rather than socialism.

The issue is, of course, quite straightforward for socialist authors who subscribe to the labor theory of value. Engels asserts that once society has seized control of the means of production and put them to use for direct social production, all labor regardless of how differently it may be put to use suddenly transforms into direct social labor. Any product's intrinsic social labor requirements may be determined directly from experience, without the need for any complicated methods of investigation. A steam engine, a hectolitre of wheat from the most recent harvest, or one hundred square meters of fabric of a given grade may all be calculated simply by society. Of course, society will have to determine how much labor is involved in

producing each consumable item. It will need to base its plans on an analysis of the production resources it has at its disposal, which naturally includes the labor force. The ultimate decision will be made based on the usefulness of the various consumer goods compared to one another and the labor required for their manufacturing. Without the help of the much-heralded value, the people will determine everything fairly easy.

Reiterating the key objections to the labor theory of value is beyond the scope of this discussion. They are only interesting to us at this stage inasmuch as they allow us to assess whether or not labor may serve as the foundation for economic calculation in a socialist society. At first glance, it would seem that calculations based on labor take into consideration both circumstances resulting from the human factor and the natural conditions of production. The law of diminishing returns is taken into account by the Marxian idea of the socially required labor time inasmuch as it derives from various natural circumstances of production. The average socially required time for producing a unit likewise grows when demand for an item rises and less advantageous natural circumstances must be utilized. The amount of social labor that is required decreases when more advantageous circumstances of production are found.¹⁶ But this is insufficient. Natural circumstances are only taken into consideration in the computation of changes in marginal labor costs to the extent that they affect labor costs. The "labour" calculation fails after that. For instance, it completely disregards the use of raw materials as a component in manufacturing. Assume that it takes ten hours of socially necessary labor to produce the two commodities P and Q. Each unit of P and Q must be produced, and each unit of A requires one hour of socially necessary labor [7].

Production of P requires two units of A and eight hours of labor, while production of Q requires one unit of A and nine hours of labor. P and Q are equal in a computation based on labor hours, but in a calculation based on value, P must be worth more than Q. The earlier estimate is incorrect. Only the latter is consistent with the goal and core of economic analysis. It is true that this surplus, or the material substratum, by which the value of P exceeds that of Q, "is furnished by nature without the help of man," but if it is only present in such proportions as to constitute an economic element, it must also be considered in some way when making economic calculations. The labor calculation theory's disregard for variations in labor quality is its second drawback. Marx believed that since all labor involves the "productive expenditure of human brain, muscles, nerves, hands, etc.," it is economically identical. "Skilled labor is just simple labor increased by a factor of two, so that a little amount of skilled labor equals a lot more simple labor.

Experience indicates that this transformation of complex into simple occurs often. Despite the fact that an item may have been produced by highly skilled labor, its value still simply reflects a little amount of basic labor. This argument was a masterpiece of stunning naivete, as Böhm-Bawerk correctly noted. When critiquing it, it's easy to leave open the question of whether it's possible to find a single physiological indicator for all human labor, both physical and "mental." For it is undeniable that there are disparities in competence and skill among men themselves, which have an impact on the quality of the commodities and services produced. The issue of whether it is possible to assimilate various types of work to a common denominator without the value of the goods by the consumer is ultimately what determines if employing labor as a foundation for economic calculation can be solved. Marx's logic, which he uses to support this claim, is obviously invalid. Indeed, experience demonstrates that commodities are exchanged whether or whether they are the results of skilled or manual labor. However, if it could be shown that labor is the source of trade value, then this would simply demonstrate that a certain amount of basic labor is equivalent to a specific amount of skilled labor. In fact, this is precisely what Marx set out to disprove in the first place, thus it is

not simply unverified. The fact that pay rates have emerged as a replacement relation between simple and skilled labor in exchange a point to which Marx does not here allude is in no way evidence of this uniformity. This process of equating is the outcome of the market's operation, not its premise. Instead of using monetary values, calculations based on labor costs would have to create a wholly arbitrary connection to convert skilled labor into basic labor, rendering them worthless as a tool for the economic organization of resources [8], [9].

For a very long time, it was believed that the labour theory of value gave the need for socializing the means of production the required ethical foundation. Now that we realize it was a mistake. It is clear that, on the one hand, the political demands for the introduction of the socialistic method of production neither need nor receive support from the labor theory of value and, on the other hand, that those who hold different views on the nature and cause of value can also have socialistic tendencies. Although the majority of socialists have adopted this view, and even Marx with his allegedly non-ethical standpoint could not shake it off. However, from a different angle, the labor theory of value continues to be a fundamental tenet for proponents of the socialist mode of production. Because socialistic production in a society based on labor division appears feasible only if there is an objective, identifiable unit of value that would permit economic calculations in a community devoid of trade and money, and labor seems to be the only item that might fulfill this function.

Recent Socialist Doctrines And The Problems Of Economic Calculation

The core issue with socialism is the difficulty with economic calculation. It only serves to highlight the terrible implications of the Marxian ban on scientific examination of the nature and operation of a socialist economy that individuals were able to write and discuss Socialism for decades without addressing this issue. To demonstrate that economic calculations would be difficult in a communist society is to demonstrate the impracticability of socialism. All of the arguments put forward in favor of socialism over the last 100 years, all of the speeches and publications, all of the blood that has been shed by socialists, cannot make socialism viable. Even if the people may fervently wish for it and many revolutions and battles may be waged in its favor, it will never come to pass. Every effort to implement it will result in syndicalism or disorder in some other way, which will rapidly break down the society built on the division of labor into little autarkous groupings. The socialist parties have obviously been very inconvenienced by the revelation of this reality, and socialists of all stripes have poured forth efforts to counter my arguments and develop an economic calculation system for Socialism. They haven't had any luck. There is not a single new argument that they have presented that I have not previously considered. Nothing has been able to disprove the argument that economic calculation is impossible under socialism.

The Russian Bolsheviks' effort to translate Socialism from a party platform into everyday life has not run into the issue of economic calculation under Socialism since the Soviet Republics live in a world where money values are established for all types of production. These costs serve as the foundation for the computations used by the Soviet Republics' leaders to arrive at their conclusions. They wouldn't be able to act with any purpose or strategy without the assistance of these rates. They can only compute, maintain accounts, and organize their plans to the extent that they make reference to this pricing system. Their situation is the same as that of state and municipal socialism in other nations: they are not yet facing the issue of socialist economic calculation. State and municipal businesses use market-based pricing for production equipment and consumer items when calculating costs. Therefore, it would be hasty to draw the conclusion that socialist economic calculation is conceivable just because municipal and state firms exist.

We are aware that only with the assistance of their non-socialist surroundings are socialist companies in certain production branches really feasible. Because the taxes that capitalist corporations pay offset their losses, the state and municipality are able to operate their own businesses. In a similar way, Russia, which if left to its own devices would have imploded long ago, has received financial backing from capitalist nations. However, the mental support that the capitalist economy provides to communist firms is much more significant than this tangible support. Socialism would not be possible without the market pricing that capitalism provides to Socialism as a foundation for calculation even within certain industries of production or within specific nations.

The fate of the socialist idea cannot be changed by socialist writers continuing to publish books about capitalism's demise and the arrival of the socialist millennium. They may paint the evils of capitalism in vivid colors and contrast them with an alluring image of the benefits of a socialist society. Socialism's ambition to transform the globe risked wiping off civilisation. It couldn't ever create a prosperous socialist community.

Contemporary socialist doctrines

1. Economic Socialism:

A modern socialist philosophy known as "market socialism" aims to fuse socialist values with capitalist mechanics. It promotes community ownership of the means of production while letting market forces influence how commodities and services are distributed. Decentralizing economic decision-making, according to market socialists, may boost efficiency and provide greater incentives for creativity and output.

2. Social Democracy:

Democratic socialism, a political philosophy that aims to change capitalism institutions by enacting socialist ideas within a democratic framework, has grown in acceptance in recent years. To achieve more economic equality and social justice, proponents of democratic socialism urge for enlarging the welfare state, enacting progressive taxes, and advancing workers' rights.

3. Ecosocialism:

A subset of socialism known as ecosocialism places a strong emphasis on fusing environmental and ecological issues with socialist ideals. It promotes environmentally friendly and sustainable economic activities while criticizing conventional capitalist forms of production for their negative effects on the environment.

Problems of Economic Calculation:

One of the main arguments against socialist economic systems is the issue with economic calculation. Since the beginning of time, economics has placed a high priority on the effective allocation of resources. At the core of economic theory is the idea of economic calculation, which entails figuring out the best way to distribute resources in order to satisfy society's shifting needs and desires. The allocation of resources is made sure to optimize welfare, productivity, and general society well-being by proper economic calculation. However, this apparently simple undertaking has consistently proved to be a difficult one throughout history. Prices play a key role in conventional market economies in indicating relative scarcity and demand for commodities and services. Buyers and sellers trade goods and resources via the pricing system, enabling a decentralized method of resource distribution.

The supply and demand-driven pricing mechanism is often seen as a highly effective means to allocate resources and organize economic activity.

However, as economies develop and increase in size and complexity, a number of underlying issues with economic calculation have come to the fore. These issues are brought on by knowledge gaps, information asymmetry, and the difficulties of processing massive volumes of data in real time. Decision-makers as a consequence, whether they be consumers or organizations, often deal with ambiguity and are unable to make completely informed decisions. Market inefficiencies, ineffective resource allocation, and even systemic breakdowns may result from this. These economic calculation issues were more severe in the 20th century in centrally planned economies, as the government made an effort to regulate and coordinate all economic operations. Numerous inefficiencies and resource misallocation occurred as a consequence of centralized authorities' incapacity to acquire, analyze, and react to market information effectively [10]–[12].

The challenges of economic calculation may now be addressed because to technological advancements, notably in the fields of computers and artificial intelligence. The idea of an artificial market, which uses algorithms and computer models to imitate economic processes, has gained popularity as a possible remedy. The artificial market aspires to give a more precise and dynamic knowledge of economic processes by incorporating real-time data and feedback mechanisms.

This explores the complex calculations issues that have existed in conventional economic systems. It looks at the historical background of these difficulties and the effects they have had on different economies. investigates the development of the artificial market as a potential solution to these issues. The artificial market offers a fresh approach to obtaining more efficient, transparent, and successful resource allocation by using cutting-edge technology.

1. Not enough price signals

Prices are crucial signals that transmit information about resource scarcity, customer preferences, and production costs in a market-based capitalist economy. Prices based on supply and demand are absent or greatly skewed under a socialist economy when the means of production are held collectively. It is challenging for planners to properly allocate resources and coordinate output due to the absence of reliable pricing signals.

2. Challenges of Centralized Planning:

Centralized planning is often used in socialist economies to decide how to allocate resources and produce goods. For central planners, the complexity of contemporary economies with their many interrelated commodities and services presents enormous difficulties. Central planning authority may get overwhelmed by the amount of data needed to make the best choices, which might result in inefficiencies, bottlenecks, and surpluses or shortages of products and services.

3. Issues with incentives:

The prospect of private ownership, profits, and competition in capitalist economies provide people and businesses great incentives to innovate, work hard, and be productive. Socialism, under which the means of production are collectively held, may find it difficult to provide comparable incentives for initiative and entrepreneurship. Reduced innovation, decreased productivity, and a general slowdown in economic development might result from this.

4. Consumer Sovereignty Absence:

Customers have the capacity to influence what products and services are produced in market-based economies via their purchase choices. In socialist regimes, however, central planners or group decision-making may take precedence over consumer preferences, resulting in a mismatch between supply and demand and a less effective distribution of resources.

Despite these objections, proponents of socialist ideologies contend that developments in technology and information systems may be able to somewhat alleviate some of the issues with economic calculation. Additionally, a number of hybrid economic models try to balance market forces and community ownership by including aspects of both capitalism and socialism. The feasibility and acceptability of socialist economic systems, as well as their capacity to handle issues with economic calculation, are still hotly contested issues in economic and political discourse.

CONCLUSION

A cornerstone of Marxist theory, the socialization of the means of production calls for a drastic break from capitalism institutions and the adoption of a more cooperative and equitable economic system. Socialization has been attempted in many different ways throughout history, from worker cooperatives to governmental control of important businesses. Each strategy had its advantages and disadvantages, demonstrating the difficulties of putting such a revolutionary idea into practice. Socialization also has the capacity to alter labor relations by providing employees a bigger say in decision-making and encouraging a feeling of empowerment and ownership over their job. Increased productivity and work satisfaction may follow from this. The execution of socialization, however, also confronts several difficulties. The effective distribution of resources in the absence of market processes is one of the main issues. Centralized planning and ineffective bureaucracies, according to critics, may stifle innovation and economic progress. Furthermore, a major institutional, cultural, and political hurdle must be overcome in order to go from a capitalism to a socialization-based economy. The socialization of the means of production is still a hotly contested idea. While it provides possible answers to the problems of wealth inequality and labor exploitation, its practical application requires careful consideration of contextual elements and the creation of workable models that strike a balance between economic efficiency and social fairness. The debate over the socialization of the means of production will surely continue to be a crucial and developing issue as nations struggle with issues of economic structure and social fairness.

REFERENCES:

- [1] D. E. Leidner, E. Gonzalez, and H. Koch, "An affordance perspective of enterprise social media and organizational socialization," *J. Strateg. Inf. Syst.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jsis.2018.03.003.
- [2] M. J. Carter, "Gender socialization and identity theory," *Soc. Sci.*, 2014, doi: 10.3390/socsci3020242.
- [3] S. Batistič, "Looking beyond - socialization tactics: The role of human resource systems in the socialization process," *Hum. Resour. Manag. Rev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2017.06.004.
- [4] J. A. Martinez-Escudero, S. Villarejo, O. F. Garcia, and F. Garcia, "Parental socialization and its impact across the lifespan," *Behav. Sci. (Basel)*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/BS10060101.

- [5] B. E. Ashforth, D. M. Sluss, and A. M. Saks, "Socialization tactics, proactive behavior, and newcomer learning: Integrating socialization models," *J. Vocat. Behav.*, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.jvb.2007.02.001.
- [6] G. Biesta, "Risking Ourselves in Education: Qualification, Socialization, and Subjectification Revisited," *Educ. Theory*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/edth.12411.
- [7] J. J. Lee and S. C. Yang, "Professional socialisation of nursing students in a collectivist culture: A qualitative study," *BMC Med. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1186/s12909-019-1690-z.
- [8] U. Sirsch, M. Zupančič, M. Poredoš, K. Levec, and M. Friedlmeier, "Does Parental Financial Socialization for Emerging Adults Matter? The Case of Austrian and Slovene First-Year University Students," *Emerg. Adulthood*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2167696819882178.
- [9] Y. Kondakçı and Ç. Haser, "Socialization at the university: A qualitative investigation on the role of contextual dynamics in the socialization of academics," *Res. Educ. Adm. Leadersh.*, 2019, doi: 10.30828/real/2019.2.3.
- [10] P. L. Bylund and G. P. Manish, "Private Property and Economic Calculation: A Reply to Andy Denis," *Rev. Polit. Econ.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/09538259.2017.1352193.
- [11] A. Denis, "Economic Calculation: Private Property or Several Control?," *Rev. Polit. Econ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/09538259.2015.1083189.
- [12] M. Auteri and R. E. Wagner, "The organizational architecture of nonprofit governance: Economic calculation within an ecology of enterprises," *Public Organ. Rev.*, 2007, doi: 10.1007/s11115-006-0027-7.

CHAPTER 9

ARTIFICIAL MARKET AS THE SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM OF ECONOMIC CALCULATION

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The idea of an artificial market has come to light as a possible remedy for the age-old issue of economic calculation. Due to knowledge asymmetry and the enormous amount of data that has to be processed, effective resource allocation in complex economies has historically been difficult. The idea behind the artificial market is to imitate and improve economic processes using computer models like artificial intelligence and machine learning techniques. The artificial market seeks to improve resource allocation efficiency, transparency, and accuracy by using real-time data and feedback systems. The main ideas of the artificial market are examined in this essay along with any possible repercussions for economic theory and practice. The issue of economic calculation is compellingly solved by the artificial market. The potential advantages of technology are becoming more and more attainable. In order to improve this idea and show that it works in practical situations, further investigation and testing are absolutely necessary. The artificial market has the potential to bring in a new age of economic efficiency, openness, and prosperity if it is effectively implemented.

KEYWORDS:

Artificial, Economic, Market, Production, Socialist.

INTRODUCTION

We shall examine the main features of the artificial market and any possible repercussions for economic theory and practice in the sections that follow. We want to contribute to the current discussion about the future of economic calculation and the possible improvement of economic systems by throwing light on this novel idea. Some of the younger socialists think that by creating a fictitious market for the means of production, the socialist movement can resolve the issue of economic calculation. They hold that it was a mistake for the older socialists to believe that the essence of the socialist ideal could be found in the suppression of the market and the price system. They admit that it was a mistake on the part of the older socialists to have sought to realize Socialism through the suspension of the market and the abolition of pricing for goods of higher orders. And they assert that both the socialist and capitalist communities must establish a market where all commodities and services may be valued in order to prevent it from deteriorating into a senseless anarchy in which the whole of our civilization would vanish. They believe that with such arrangements, the communist community will be able to calculate just as effortlessly as the businessmen of capitalism [1]–[3].

Unfortunately, the proponents of such proposals fail to understand or perhaps refuse to understand that it is impossible to separate the market and its functions in relation to price formation from the operation of a society based on private property in the means of production, in which landlords, capitalists, and entrepreneurs are free to use their property however they see fit, subject to the laws of such a society. For the relentless pursuit by

businesspeople and capitalists to maximize their profits by meeting the demands of customers is the driving force behind the whole process that results in market pricing for the inputs into production. The effective operation of the whole system cannot be envisioned without the striving for profit by the business owners including the shareholders, for rent by the landlords, for interest by the financiers, and for pay by the workers. Production is only directed into those channels where customer needs are best met while incurring the lowest cost when there is a chance of profit. The mechanism of the market loses its mainspring if the possibility of profit vanishes since this is the only thing that propels and sustains it. As a result, the market serves as the center of the capitalist societal order and is at the core of capitalism. It is consequently only conceivable under capitalism; under socialism, it cannot be "artificially" duplicated.

However, proponents of the artificial market believe that an artificial market may be formed by telling the managers of the various industrial units to behave as if they were business owners in a capitalistic state. They contend that even in a capitalist system, joint stock Company managers serve the interests of the shareholders rather than their own enterprises. Therefore, they may behave precisely the same as they did before, with the same caution and commitment to duty, under Socialism. The main difference would be that under socialism, the community would benefit from the manager's labors rather than the shareholders. In this approach, they believe it would be feasible to create a decentralized, as opposed to a centralized, Socialism, in opposition to all socialists who have written on the issue so far, notably the Marxians.

It is first vital to understand that these controllers of certain industrial units would need to be chosen in order to fully evaluate such suggestions. Under capitalism, the shareholders select the joint stock company management directly or indirectly. The shareholders are putting their own property, or a portion of their own property, at risk when they provide the management the authority to create using the company's i.e., the shareholders' stock. The speculation because it is unavoidably one could be profitable and successful, but it might also go wrong and result in the loss of all or part of the invested funds. The core of a joint stock company firm is investing one's own money in a venture whose results are unpredictable and in people whose future prowess is still up for debate, regardless of what one may know about their history [4]–[6].

Now, it is a total error to believe that the issue of economic calculation in a socialist society is limited to issues that pertain to the day-to-day operations of joint stock company management. It is obvious that such a belief can only result from a focus that is solely on the concept of a stationary economic system—a conception that, while undoubtedly helpful for the resolution of many theoretical issues, has no counterpart in reality and, when viewed exclusively, can even be positively deceptive. It is evident that the issue of economic calculation does not actually arise under stationary settings. When we conceive of a stationary society, we see an economy in which all the production factors have already been put to work in order to meet as many consumer demands as possible within the existing circumstances. In other words, there is no longer a problem for economic calculation to answer under stationary circumstances.

By supposition, the crucial task of economic calculation has already been accomplished. An instrument for computation is not required. We may remark that the issue with economic computation is one of economic dynamics rather than economic statics, to use a common but not quite accurate word.

DISCUSSION

A challenge that occurs in an economy that is always undergoing change and that faces brand-new issues that need to be resolved on a daily basis is the problem of economic calculation. Now, in order to address these issues, it is crucially important to reallocate capital away from certain lines of production, undertakings, and concerns in order to use it in other lines of production, undertakings, and worries. This is not a matter for joint stock company managers; rather, it is primarily a matter for capitalists those who buy and sell stocks and shares, make loans and recover them, deposit money in banks and then withdraw it again, and speculate on a variety of commodities. The manager of a joint stock company, who, according to the socialist writers we are considering, is to be conceived as nothing more than the dependable and conscientious servant of the company, must be expected to take for granted the conditions of the money market, stock exchanges, and wholesale markets as a result of these operations of speculative capitalists. Speculative investors are the ones who provide the data to which he must alter his operations and which, in turn, directs his trading activities. The belief that producers' purchases and sales of goods are the only factors affecting the market for factors of production is therefore a fundamental flaw in all of these socialistic constructions that use the "artificial market" and artificial competition as a solution to the problem of economic calculation. Without damaging the mechanism itself, it is impossible to remove from such markets the impact of the capitalists' supply of capital and the entrepreneurs' demand for capital [7], [8].

The socialist is inclined to suggest, in response to this problem, that the socialist state, which is the owner of all capital and all means of production, should simply direct money to the ventures which provide the biggest return. He would argue that the projects with the largest profit margins should get the available funds. However, under this scenario, the more cautious and pessimistic managers would walk away empty-handed while the more enthusiastic and less cautious ones would obtain funding to expand their ventures. In capitalism, the capitalist chooses who to entrust with his own money. The opinions of joint stock company managers on the prospects of their ventures and the expectations of project developers regarding the viability of their proposals are in no manner deciding factors. The capital and money markets' mechanisms make decisions. This is, in fact, its primary duty: to benefit the economy as a whole, assess the viability of other opportunities, and refrain from following proposals made by managers of specific concerns who are constrained by the restricted scope of their own ventures. To fully comprehend this, it is important to realize that the investor does not just put his money into businesses that provide high interest rates or big profits; rather, he tries to strike a balance between his desire for profit and his estimation of the danger of loss. He has to be proactive. If he does not, he incurs losses that result in the transfer of his control over the elements of production to others who are more equipped to balance the risks and potential rewards of economic speculation.

Now, if the socialist state is to continue to be socialist, it must cede control of the capital necessary for the creation of wholly new ventures as well as the shrinkage of others and the expansion of already existing ventures. It is barely possible that socialists of any political persuasion would seriously suggest that this role be given to a group of individuals who would "simply" have the business of doing what capitalists and speculators do in a capitalist environment, with the only difference being that the community should own the results of their foresight instead of them. Such suggestions may be made in relation to joint stock company management. No socialist would contest that the function that capitalists and speculators carry out under capitalism, namely directing the use of capital goods in the direction that best meets consumer demands, is only carried out because these individuals are

motivated to protect their property and to make profits that either increase it or at the very least enable them to live without depleting their capital. As a result, the socialist society has no choice but to give the State, or more specifically, the individuals who act in that capacity as the State's ruling body, the power to dispose of capital. And that represents the market's elimination, which is precisely what socialism aims to achieve. After all, the market's direction of economic activity implies the organization of production and a distribution of the product in accordance with the disposition of the spending power of individual members of society as it manifests itself on the market.

By arguing that market forces do not provide morally acceptable solutions, socialists who seek to downplay the importance of the economic calculation problem in the socialist society are just demonstrating their ignorance of the true nature of the issue. It is not a matter of whether or not cannons or cloths, homes or churches, pleasures or survival will be created. It is quite simple to determine what sort and how many units of consumer items should be produced in any socioeconomic system, including Socialism. That has never been refuted. Once this choice has been taken, however, the issue of determining how the currently available manufacturing methods may be employed to create the commodities in question most efficiently remains. It is essential that economic analysis be done in order to address this issue. And only monetary prices created in the market for producing items in a society supported by private property in the means of production can be used to calculate economic values. That is to say, there must be monetary wages and interest rates, as well as monetary pricing for land, raw materials, and semi-manufactures. So, the choice still remains between Socialism and a Market Economy.

Productivity and Profitability

The socialist community's economic activity is governed by the same external factors that apply to any other kind of economic system, including those based on private property in the means of production. It acknowledges a hierarchy of objectives and must thus work to accomplish the more important before the less important, according to the economic principle, which is applicable to all economic systems. This is what economic activity is all about. It goes without saying that the socialist society would use both labor and physical production tools in its production processes. These tangible tools of production are referred to as capital, per a fairly common practice. In contrast to non-capitalistic production, which uses hand-to-mouth means to reach its destination, capitalist production deploys clever diversionary strategies. If we use this word, we must acknowledge that the socialist society will create in a capitalist manner since it must need capital to operate.

Socialism would not, at least not at first, eradicate capital, which is defined as the intermediate products that emerge at the various levels of production via indirect techniques. It would just be converted from private to public ownership. However, if, as we have previously suggested, we want to understand by capitalistic production that economic system in which money-calculation is used, so that we can summarize under the term capital a set of goods devoted to production and evaluated in terms of money, and can attempt to estimate the results of economic activity by the variations in the value of capital, then it is clear that socialist methods of production cannot be referred to as capitalistic. We may differentiate between socialistic and capitalist modes of production as well as between capitalism and socialism in a quite different way than the Marxists.

According to socialists, the hallmark of the capitalistic mode of production is that the producer strives for financial gain. Socialism's production will be for the fulfillment of necessities, while capitalism's production is done for profit. It is true that capitalistic

manufacturing seeks to maximize profit. The socialist community must likewise strive for a profit, which is a result that is worth more than the expenditures incurred. If economic activity is rationally directed, that is, if it meets more urgent wants before less urgent needs, it has already generated profits since the cost, or the value of the most significant unmet demand, is less than the outcome accomplished. Profits in the capitalist economy are only possible when production satisfies a relatively pressing need. Anyone who produces without considering the relationship between supply and demand will fall short of his objectives. Producing for profit simply refers to doing so in order to meet consumer demand; in this sense, it might be compared to a lone guy producing just for his own need.

However, he also works for profit in the sense described before. There is no distinction between manufacturing done for profit and production done for necessity. Contrasting productivity and profitability, or the "social" and "private" economic points of view, is a typical practice. This is also true when comparing output for profit with production for necessities. If an economic activity generates more revenue than it spends, it is considered to be profitable within the capitalist system. When the output outweighs the cost, from the perspective of a fictitious socialist society, an economic activity is considered to be productive. Now, productivity and profitability don't always match up. Some lucrative economic activities are not productive, and vice versa, some profitable activities are not productive. This fact alone may be used to criticize the capitalistic social structure for those who are naively prejudiced in favor of socialism, which includes the majority of economists. They believe that everything a socialist community would do is undeniably just and rational, and that anything else that may occur in a capitalist society is an abuse that must be permitted. However, a closer look at the situations when profitability and productivity are allegedly at odds will reveal that this assessment is entirely subjective and that the scientific garb that it is given is a fraud [9]–[11].

There is seldom a difference between profitability and productivity in situations where it is often considered that there is. For instance, earnings from speculating are a good illustration of this. In the capitalist system, speculation serves a purpose that must be fulfilled in any economic system, regardless of how it is structured: it allows for the adjustment of supply and demand through time and place. The source of speculation's profit is increased value, which may arise from any kind of economic structure. When a speculator buys goods that are available on the market in relatively big quantities at a low price and then sells them for a higher price after demand has grown once again, his earnings reflect an increase in value from a business and economic perspective. We do not dispute the fact that under a socialist system the society, not the individual, would get this much resented and derided profit. However, it is not the relevance of the issue that interests us. The fact that there is no actual difference between profitability and productivity in this situation is what worries us. It is impossible to see how any economic system could remove the economic function that speculation provides. If it is removed, as socialists desire, then another organization must step in to carry out its duties: the community itself must turn into a trader. There cannot be economic activity that extends beyond the present without speculation.

It is sometimes intended to identify a difference between profitability and productivity by focusing on a single process and analyzing it separately. Some characteristics unique to the structure of the capitalistic organization of industry, such as selling expenditures, advertising costs, and the like, may be regarded as being unproductive. This is not lawful. The end consequence of the whole process, not just the individual steps, must be taken into account. Without weighing their contribution to the end outcome, we cannot properly analyze the component costs.

Net and Gross Product

The investigation of the link between gross product and net product led to the most comprehensive effort to compare productivity and profitability. It is obvious that every businessperson in the capitalism system strives to produce the highest net product. However, it is argued that the goal of economic activity should really be to generate the biggest gross product rather than the highest net product. But this idea is false since it is founded on naive valuational assumptions. However, it is a highly common misconception if measured by the extent to which it is still accepted today. It is implied when individuals suggest that a certain production line should be supported because it employs a big number of people or when a specific manufacturing improvement is opposed because it would deny people a livelihood.

If the proponents of these viewpoints were rational, they would have to concede that the gross product principle applies to both labor and the physical tools of production. The business owner continues manufacturing until it can no longer produce a net good. Let's suppose that labor is not needed for manufacturing beyond this stage, just material tools. Does the entrepreneur's decision to increase output in order to produce a higher gross product serve the interests of society? If society controlled production, would it act in that way? Both inquiries need a resounding "no." The fact that increased manufacturing is not profitable indicates that the means of production may be used for a more pressing need in the economy. However, if they are used on the unprofitable route, they will be absent from areas that more urgently need them. Both capitalism and socialism are applicable to this. Even a socialist society, if it operated sanely, wouldn't continuously promote certain forms of production while neglecting others. Even a socialist society would stop producing a certain line of goods when doing so would not cover the cost, i.e., when doing so would entail not being able to meet a more pressing need somewhere else.

But the same is true for the growing use of labor in the same manner that it is true for the increased use of material instruments. Labor is being kept from some other line of production where it might provide a more useful service if it is committed to one line of production to the extent that it only raises the gross product while the net product decreases. Again, the sole consequence of disregarding the concept of net product is that more important needs go unmet while less urgent ones are supplied. The reduction in net product highlights this truth more than any other in the capitalist system's workings. It would be the responsibility of the economic administration in a socialist society to ensure that such inappropriate uses of economic activity did not take place. There is therefore no difference between profitability and productivity in this case. Even from a socialist perspective, the goal of economic activity must be the highest possible net product rather than the highest possible gross output. However, individuals still maintain the opposite, sometimes about productivity in general, sometimes regarding labor alone, and sometimes regarding agricultural output. It is negatively argued that capitalism activity is only focused on achieving the highest net product, and state action is required to correct the claimed misuse.

This conversation has a long history. According to Adam Smith, various modes of production should be rated as more or less productive depending on the quantity of labor they mobilize. Ricardo harshly reprimanded him for this, pointing out that increasing the net product rather than the gross product was the only way to improve peoples' welfare. Ricardo was brutally assaulted as a result. Even J. B. Say misinterpreted him and said that he showed complete disdain for the wellbeing of so many people. A ruler who could manufacture net product by pushing a button would, in Ricardo's opinion, render the country obsolete, according to Sismondi, who enjoyed responding to economic arguments with emotive proclamations. Sismondi was followed on this point by Bernhardi. Proudhon even went so far as to use the

phrase to sum up the difference between capitalism and socialism: whereas society must strive for the highest gross output, the goal of the entrepreneur is the highest net product. However, Marx fills two chapters of the first book of *Das Kapital* with a sentimental exposition that paints the transition from intensive to extensive agricultural methods in the harshest terms as a system "where sheep eat up men," in the words of Sir Thomas More. In the course of this discussion, Marx also manages to confuse the significant expropriations accomplished by the political power of the nobility, which characterized European agriculture.

Since then, socialists' contentious publications and speeches often include declarations about this plan. The goal of achieving the highest gross output is productive from a society point of view, but it is also advantageous from an individual point of view, according to German agricultural economist Freiherr von der Goltz. According to him, a high gross product always implies a high net product, and in that regard, the interests of people whose primary goal is to attain a high net product are the same as those of the State, which wants a high gross product.³⁶ But he lacks any evidence to support this. The position taken up by adherents of the romantic school of economic thought, particularly the German etatists, that the agriculturist has the status of a civil servant and is therefore required to work in the public interest, is much more logical than these attempts to overcome the apparent contrast between social and private interests by ignoring obvious facts of agricultural accountancy.

Since this is claimed to need the highest gross product conceivable, it follows that the farmer must dedicate himself to achieving this goal while being unaffected by commercial spirit, ideas, or interests and regardless of any potential drawbacks. All of these authors assume that the highest gross output serves the needs of the community. However, they make no special effort to support it. When they do attempt to debate, they only do so from the perspective of Nationalpolitik or Machtpolitik power politics. The State is interested in a robust agricultural population for a variety of reasons, including the agricultural population's conservatism, the fact that agriculture provides the greatest number of troops, the need to make provisions for the feeding of the populace during times of war, and others.

In contrast, Landry has made an effort to use economic arguments to support the gross product concept. He will only acknowledge the social benefits of attempting to produce the highest net output inasmuch as those benefits result from the use of physical production tools. When labor application is concerned, he has quite a different perspective. The use of labor also has no cost from an economic perspective, thus social welfare is not affected. Pay cuts that lower the gross domestic product are detrimental.³⁸ By presuming that the labor force so discharged could not find work elsewhere, he comes to this conclusion. But this is just incorrect. As long as labor is not a "free good," society's demand for labor can never be met. The fired employees find new jobs where they must do tasks that are more vital economically. If Landry is correct, it would have been preferable if all labor-saving technology had never been invented, and the attitude of those employees who oppose any technological advancements that reduce labor costs and who destroy such technology would be justifiable. There is no justification for making a difference between labor and the use of tangible tools.

Due to the fact that additional material instruments are needed in another line to meet more urgent demands, increasing output in the same line is not economical given the cost of the material instruments and the cost of their products. But the same applies to labor. Workers who are involved in expanding the gross output in an unprofitable way are kept out of other production lines where they are more urgently needed. The fact that their wages are too high prevents an increase in production with a higher gross product from being profitable because

labor's marginal productivity is higher overall than in the specific line of production in question, where it is applied outside the bounds set by the net product principle. There is absolutely no distinction between social and private objectives in this situation; an entrepreneur in a capitalist organization would behave exactly the same as one in a socialist organization.

Of course, there are a ton of different justifications that can be offered to demonstrate how following the net product principle could be detrimental. They are the well-known justifications put out to defend any protectionist policy and are shared by every nationalist-militarist thought. Because a country's political and military status rests on its population, it must have a large population. It must strive for economic self-sufficiency, or at the very least, it must produce all of its own food. In the end, Landry must rely on these justifications to back up his thesis. It would be inappropriate to address such ideas in relation to the isolated communist community.

But if the claims we've been debating are false, the socialist society will have to use net product, not gross output, as its guiding economic principle. If it is practicable to plow more productive land elsewhere, the socialist community will likewise convert arable land to grassland, just like the capitalist society does. The socialist community's leaders will behave no differently from the Duchess of Sutherland, that "economically instructed person," as Marx once mockingly referred to her, and notwithstanding Sir Thomas More, "sheep will eat up men" even in Utopia. Every manufacturing line is subject to the net product concept. No exception is made in agriculture. The German agricultural pioneer Thae'r's maxim that an agriculturalist's goal should be a high net yield "even from the standpoint of the public welfare" is still applicable today.

CONCLUSION

A possible solution to the age-old issue of economic calculation is the artificial market. This idea has the ability to fundamentally alter how resources are allocated in complex economies by using the capabilities of computer models like artificial intelligence and machine learning. Real-time data and feedback loop integration enables dynamic modifications, improving the precision and effectiveness of economic decision-making processes. The artificial market's capacity to collect and analyze enormous volumes of data, which enables a more thorough knowledge of market dynamics and trends, is one of its key advantages. This encourages people and institutions to make more informed decisions, which improves resource allocation. Nevertheless, despite its promise, creating a fake market is not without difficulty. It is crucial to ensure the confidentiality and integrity of the data and algorithms since any tampering or biases might have unfavorable effects. Additionally, stakeholders and existing institutions may be resistant to the shift from conventional economic systems to an artificial market, demanding careful planning and slow implementation.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Ø. Ulleberg and R. Hancke, "Techno-economic calculations of small-scale hydrogen supply systems for zero emission transport in Norway," *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.05.170.
- [2] M. C. da Silva, "Value and economic calculation in the early middle ages," *Tempo (Brazil)*, 2020, doi: 10.1590/tem-1980-542x2019v260108.
- [3] P. L. Bylund and G. P. Manish, "Private Property and Economic Calculation: A Reply to Andy Denis," *Rev. Polit. Econ.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/09538259.2017.1352193.

- [4] A. Denis, "Economic Calculation: Private Property or Several Control?," *Rev. Polit. Econ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/09538259.2015.1083189.
- [5] M. Auteri and R. E. Wagner, "The organizational architecture of nonprofit governance: Economic calculation within an ecology of enterprises," *Public Organ. Rev.*, 2007, doi: 10.1007/s11115-006-0027-7.
- [6] I. M. Kirzner, "The economic calculation debate: Lessons for Austrians," *Rev. Austrian Econ.*, 1988, doi: 10.1007/bf01539296.
- [7] T. C. Lopes and R. G. de Almeida, "What would have been Keynes' position in the socialist economic calculation debate and why it matters," *Int. J. Plur. Econ. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1504/ijpee.2019.10026546.
- [8] M. Glavan, R. Cvejić, V. Zupanc, M. Knapič, and M. Pintar, "Agricultural production and flood control dry detention reservoirs: Example from Lower Savinja Valley, Slovenia," *Environ. Sci. Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.envsci.2020.09.012.
- [9] W. Ma, A. Renwick, and X. Zhou, "Short communication: The relationship between farm debt and dairy productivity and profitability in New Zealand," *J. Dairy Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.3168/jds.2019-17506.
- [10] K. P. Narwal and S. Pathneja, "Effect of bank-specific and governance-specific variables on the productivity and profitability of banks," *Int. J. Product. Perform. Manag.*, 2016, doi: 10.1108/IJPPM-09-2015-0130.
- [11] V. D. Ha, "The interactive and causal relationship between productivity and profitability of Vietnam's formal microfinance institutions," *Asian Econ. Financ. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.18488/journal.aefr.2019.910.1160.1170.

CHAPTER 10

ANALYSE THE DISTRIBUTION OF INCOME

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Any economy must carefully consider how money is distributed since it has a direct bearing on equality, economic stability, and social well-being. The trends and elements affecting income distribution in a particular society are examined in this chapter. It explores the numerous methods for evaluating the distribution of income, including the decile analysis and Lorenz curve. The report also examines the factors that contribute to economic disparity, such as government policy, globalization, education, and technological improvements. Additionally, it investigates how income inequality affects social cohesiveness, health outcomes, and economic progress. The report makes suggestions for policy actions to decrease inequality and encourage more inclusive economic development. It does this by using both qualitative and quantitative data to give a thorough examination of income distribution. Additionally, targeted social welfare programs and progressive taxation policies may assist close the income gap and redistribute wealth.

KEYWORDS:

Distribution, Economic, Income, Society.

INTRODUCTION

The Distribution Process under Socialism and Liberalism

The consideration of the issue of income should logically follow any inquiry of the daily operations of the socialist society. Distribution cannot occur without production, hence obviously the former should be considered before the latter. However, the distribution issue is one of socialism's most salient characteristics, making it imperative to address it as soon as feasible. Because at its core, socialism is essentially a doctrine of "just" distribution, and the socialist movement is merely an effort to realize this ideal. Every socialist program begins with the issue of distribution and always returns to it. The distribution issue is the economic issue for socialism [1]–[3].

Furthermore, socialism is unique in that it has a distribution difficulty. Only in a socialist economy does it occur. It's true that in a private property-based economy, we often refer to distribution, and the word "Distribution" in economic theory refers to how income is distributed as well as how the prices of production elements are set. It would be absurd to use any other phrase instead of this since it is customary and well-established. However, it is deceptive and fails to convey the characteristics of the idea it is intended to express. In a capitalist system, earnings are produced as a consequence of market exchanges that are inextricably related to production. We don't create things first, then disseminate them. Since profits occur during and are in fact generated from the manufacturing process, they are, for the most part, already known when goods are given for use and consumption. Before the final product is available for consumption, workers, landowners, capitalists, and many of the entrepreneurs who contributed to production have already gotten their part. Only the money that some businesses get from the manufacturing process is determined by the prices that are

acquired for the finished product on the market. Through the entrepreneurs' expectations, these prices have already had an impact on the income of other groups. The idea of distribution is merely metaphorical since under the capitalistic order of society the accumulation of individual earnings to generate a total social income is simply a theoretical conception. This phrase has been used in place of the straightforward and more appropriate word "formation of income" because the Physiocrats and the English classical school, the forerunners of scientific economics, took a long time to break free from the statistic viewpoint of mercantilism.

Although their main accomplishment was precisely this analysis of how income is formed as a result of market transactions, they adopted the practice of grouping the chapters addressing various forms of income under the heading "distribution" thankfully without affecting the content of their teachings. Only in the socialist society are consumable products distributed in the full meaning of the term. If we use the phrase "distribution" in the context of thinking about capitalistic society in any meaning other than a strictly symbolic one, then a parallel is being drawn between how income is determined in a socialism and in a capitalist society. Any examination of the workings of capitalism must avoid considering any real method of income distribution.

Social Dividend

Socialism's core tenet is that only products that are ready for consumption should be distributed. Higher-order goods must not be dispersed; they remain the community's property to be used in future production. Contrarily, goods of the first order are always meant to be shared; they really represent the net social dividend. It is common to suggest that the society would preserve a portion of the consumers' products for public use since while examining the socialist society we cannot entirely get rid of conceptions which are exclusively relevant to the capitalist order. We are really considering the portion of consumption that is often referred to as public spending in a capitalist country. When the private property concept is strictly followed, this public expense only includes the cost of maintaining the machinery that ensures the uninterrupted flow of events. The only responsibility of a strictly liberal state is to protect people's lives and property against foreign and internal enemies.

It serves as a producer of security, or a "night watchman's state," as Lassalle mockingly put it. Securing the socialist order and the orderly development of socialistic production will be the equivalent responsibility in a socialist society. We could care less whether the system of coercion and violence that accomplishes this goal is still referred to as the state or goes by a different name, or whether it is legally given a different status from the other duties expected of the socialist community. We merely need to be aware that any expenses made to this aim will be included as general production costs in the socialist society. Insofar as they include the utilization of labor in order to distribute the social dividend, they must be calculated such that the employed employees get their fair share.

However, additional expenses are included in public spending. The majority of governments and municipalities provide their residents some services in kind, sometimes for free and sometimes for a fee that only partially offsets the cost. This often occurs with single services that are produced by durable goods. As a result, anybody wishing to utilize parks, art galleries, public libraries, or houses of religion may do so. In a same vein, everyone has access to highways and streets. In addition, there is direct distribution of consumer items, such as when providing food and medication to the ill and educational materials to students. Personal service is also provided while providing medical care. All of this does not constitute socialism, nor does it constitute production based on shared ownership of the means of

production. Distribution does take place here, but before anything can be provided, the residents' taxes must first be collected. In the context of an otherwise liberal social order, this distribution can only be characterized as socialist inasmuch as it deals with goods produced by the government or local governments. We need not pause to consider the extent to which socialist critics of capitalist society's views have influenced this area of state and municipal activity, or the unique characteristics of some particularly long-lasting consumer goods that provide practically endless service. For us, the only thing that matters is that a distribution in the truest meaning of the term occurs in the case of this public spending, even in an otherwise capitalistic society [4]–[6].

Furthermore, the socialist neighborhood won't physically distribute all consumer products. Every new book will probably not be given to every citizen; instead, the books will likely be placed in public reading rooms for everyone to use. The same will be done with its educational institutions, public parks, playgrounds, and gathering places. The cost associated with all of these arrangements is not subtracted from the social dividend; rather, it is included in the social dividend. This aspect of the social dividend has one peculiarity: special distributional rules can be applied to it in accordance with the unique nature of the services involved, disregarding the rules governing the distribution of durable goods and some consumable consumer goods. The methods used to make scientific and artistic publications and collections accessible to the public differ significantly from those used to distribute first-order items.

DISCUSSION

The Principles Of Distribution

The absence of a link between production and distribution is a defining characteristic of the socialist community. The size of the share allocated to each citizen for their usage is entirely unrelated to the worth of the service he provides. Because it is a fundamental aspect of socialistic production methods that the proportions of the various factors of production in the final product cannot be determined, basing distribution on the imputation of value would be fundamentally impossible. Additionally, it would be impossible to test the relationships between effort and outcome mathematically.

Therefore, it would not be possible to base even a portion of distribution on an economic calculation of the contributions of the various factors, such as by first giving the worker the full product of his labor, which under a capitalist system he would receive in the form of wages, and then using a special distribution method in the case of the shares that are attributed to the material factors of production and to the work of the entrepreneur. Socialists often don't have a firm understanding of this reality. The Marxian concept, however, that the categories of wages, profit, and rent would be unimaginable under Socialism, is permeated by a nagging distrust of them. Socialistic distribution might theoretically be based on four distinct principles: equal distribution per person, distribution based on community duty, distribution based on needs, and distribution based on merit. There are several ways to mix these ideas.

The tenet of equitable distribution originates from the traditional natural law theory of everyone's equality. If strictly followed, it would be ludicrous. No discrimination between adults and children, the ill and the healthy, the diligent and the lazy, or between good and evil would be allowed. It could only be used in conjunction with the other three distributional principles. At the very least, the principle of distribution according to needs would need to be taken into consideration, allowing shares to be graded according to age, sex, health, and special occupational needs; the principle of distribution according to services rendered would

also need to be taken into consideration, allowing distinctions to be made between diligent and less diligent workers, as well as between good and bad workers; and finally, some consideration of merit would need to be made, allowing for the distribution of shares to be based on merit rather than need. However, these modifications to the equal distribution principle do not eliminate the challenges associated with socialistic distribution. In actuality, there is no way to get over these challenges.

We have previously shown the challenges posed by the application of the concept of distribution in accordance with the value of supplied services. The value of the economic subject's contribution to the overall production process is reflected in the money he earns under the capitalist system. Services are compensated in accordance with their worth. Socialism wants to change this system and replace it with one in which the shares given to the entrepreneurs and the material factors of production are distributed in such a way that no property owner or entrepreneur has a position that is fundamentally different from that of the rest of the community. However, doing so necessitates a total decoupling of distribution from economic imputation of value. It has nothing to do with how valuable a person's community work is. It could only be connected externally to the service provided if the individual's service was used as the foundation for distribution based on some external criterion. The amount of hours worked would seem to be the most apparent criteria. However, the value of any service performed for the social dividend is not determined by the amount of time spent working. First of all, the value of the service varies depending on how it is used in the overall economic system.

Whether the service is utilized in the appropriate location that is, where it is most urgently needed or not will affect the outcomes. However, under the socialist organization, it is not the worker who is held ultimately accountable for this; rather, it is the people who give him the tasks. Second, the cost of the service varies depending on the caliber of the task and the specific skills of the worker; it also fluctuates depending on his fervor and vigor. Finding moral justifications for equal compensation for employees with varying talents is not difficult. Contrary to popular belief, talent and brilliance are not a person's fault; rather, they are blessings from God. However, this does not address the issue of whether it is practical or efficient to pay all hours of labor the same amount.

According to needs is the third distributional concept. The simplistic communist's old catchphrase is "each according to his needs." It is sometimes supported by citing the fact that all of the Early Christians' possessions were held in common. Others believe it to be realistic since it is meant to serve as the foundation for distribution within the family. Without a sure, it could be universalized if the mother's attitude in which she willingly endures hunger rather than seeing her children suffer could. The proponents of the needs-based distribution concept ignore this. They also miss out on a lot more. They fail to see that as long as any kind of economic activity is required, only a portion of our demands can be met, and a portion must go unmet. As long as it is not specified to what degree each person is permitted to meet his requirements, the concept of "to each according to his needs" remains meaningless. Since everyone must give up having all of their demands completely met, the formula is illusory.⁴⁴ It might be used, but only under certain circumstances. Without making this concern the norm, the ill and suffering may be given particular medication, care, and attendance, as well as greater attention and customized treatment for their unique requirements.

In a similar vein, it is completely impossible to base distribution on an individual's merit. Who will make a merits decision? The opinions of those in authority on the virtues or faults of their contemporaries are often quite bizarre. And God's voice is not the same as the voice of the people. Who would the populace now choose as the ideal representative of their

generation? It is not improbable that a movie star or possibly a prizefighter would be selected. Shakespeare would certainly be considered the greatest Englishman by the English today. Would his time period have done the same? And if a second Shakespeare were to live among them now, how would they see him?

Furthermore, why should people who lack the extraordinary talents and geniuses that Nature has bestowed upon them be punished? Distribution based on an individual's qualities would leave the individual helpless against the persecution of the majority and throw open the door to whimsy. There would be circumstances that would make existence intolerable. Regarding the economics of the issue, it makes no difference whether concept or mix of individuals is used as the foundation for distribution. Regardless of the guiding principle chosen, the truth remains that each person will get a share from the community. The citizen will get a package of claims that may be traded for a certain number of various items within a set length of time. He will be able to afford his daily food, stable housing, sporadic joys, and sometimes new clothes this way. The effectiveness of the community's efforts will determine how much or how little of his demands are satisfied in this manner [7]–[9].

The Distribution Process

It is not required that each person eat the whole portion that is assigned to him. As long as the commodity allows it, he may save some aside for future use, give some away, or let some go to waste. He may, however, trade some. The person who drinks beer will gladly give up his fair share of non-alcoholic beverage to get more beer. If the abstainer can get other goods in exchange, he will be willing to give up his claim to spirits. The lowbrow would happily trade tickets to art galleries for more sociable delights, while the aesthete will forego a trip to the movies for more chances to hear excellent music. Everyone will be prepared to trade, but only consumer products will be traded. The products of the producers will be very commercial.

Such trade need not be limited to direct barter; it may also occur indirectly as long as it stays within a few strict parameters. It will be favorable for people dealing in the socialist community for the same reasons that have led to indirect trade in other forms of society. It follows that there will be a chance to utilize money as a broad form of trade even in this situation. Fundamentally, money's function in a socialist economy will be the same as it is in a free one: that of an all-purpose trade facilitator. But this role's importance will be quite different. The importance of the function of money will be uncomparably less in a society based on communal ownership of the means of production than in one based on private property in the means of production. Because trading under the socialist commonwealth is limited to consumer products solely, it has a considerably narrower meaning. Since producers' items are not exchanged, there can be no money pricing for them. In a socialist society, money no longer serves the accounting role that it does in a free economic system. Value estimates in terms of money will not be feasible.

However, the trade relations that occur in this kind of traffic cannot be ignored by the central management of production and distribution. Clearly, it would have to take them into consideration when determining how to distribute the social dividend if it were to make certain goods interchangeable. Therefore, if throughout the exchange procedure it was determined that one cigar equaled five cigarettes, the administration could not arbitrarily decide that one cigar equaled three cigarettes, in order to be able to offer one person just cigars and another person only cigarettes. The exchange relationships already in place could not be disregarded if the tobacco allowance had not been distributed equally, with some people receiving only cigars and others only cigarettes, either on their own terms or by

government decree. Otherwise, all recipients of cigarettes would be treated unjustly in comparison to those of cigars since the cigar recipient could trade it for five smokes while the recipient of cigarettes would only be able to exchange it for three cigarettes.

The government would be forced to adjust the substitution ratios of the different goods as a result of changes in the exchange relationships in this traffic among the inhabitants. Every such alteration would show that the relationships between residents' demands and satisfaction had changed, that certain goods were now more and others were now less desired. The economic management would probably make an effort to alter output to accommodate this shift. It would try to create more of the more popular product and less of the less popular one. However, it would be unable to accomplish one thing: it would be unable to allow individual residents to unilaterally exchange their tobacco tickets for cigars or cigarettes. If people were given the freedom to choose whatever cigars or cigarettes they wanted, they may purchase more than had been made, or, on the other side, there might not be any demand, leaving cigars or cigarettes in the distribution facilities.

This issue seems to have a straightforward answer according to the labour theory of value. A citizen is given a token for every hour of labor in exchange for which he is entitled to the hour's worth of labor's output, less a deduction for community obligations such as supporting the handicapped and funding cultural activities. Every person who has worked an hour will be entitled to purchase things on which an hour of labor has been invested, with this deduction serving to pay the cost sustained by the community as a whole. Anyone may take products and services intended for consumers from the supply centers and use them for his or her personal use as long as they are willing to pay by contributing to the community some of the time that was spent to make them.

But because labor is neither uniform or homogenous, such a distributional theory would not hold true. The various types of labor have qualitative characteristics that, when combined with changes in the supply and demand of the produced goods, result in varied values. As a general rule, more photos cannot be produced without lowering the quality of the job. In a socialist community, it would be impossible to draw any correlation between the value of work done for the community and the share of the yield of communal production given for the work. A worker who has provided an hour of simple labor cannot be granted the right to consume the product of an hour of work of a higher quality. It would be extremely arbitrary to get paid for labour. Since, as we have shown, such imputation is impossible in a socialistic society, it would not be able to employ the techniques of assessing value used in a free economic society based on private ownership of the means of production.

Economic reality would undoubtedly place a limit on society's ability to reward laborers arbitrarily; over the long term, wages can never, under any circumstances, surpass societal revenue.

However, the community is allowed to take action up to this point. It may choose to pay all labor equally, regardless of quality, or it can simply opt to pay differently for different hours of work depending on the caliber of the job produced. However, it must retain the right to choose the specific manner in which the items are distributed in both circumstances. The community would never let the person who had performed an hour of labor to eat the result of an hour's labor, even if we set aside inequalities in the quality of labor and its outcome and accept the feasibility of doing so. Aside from labor, all economic items have material costs. A product for which more raw materials are needed cannot be produced in the same way as a product for which fewer raw materials are needed [10].

The Costs Of Distribution

Socialistic critiques of capitalism often focus on how expensive the so-called "distribution apparatus of distribution" is. They cover all expenses associated with national and political institutions, including those related to war and military operations. They also cover the costs associated with free competition to society. The costs incurred by firms in their efforts to maintain their independence as opposed to joining cartels or combining into larger units that would allow for specialization and, in turn, the lowering of production costs, are all deducted from the capitalist system's distributive process. These expenses include all advertising costs as well as the activities of those involved in the competitive struggle, such as agents, commercial travelers, etc. The skeptics argue that by eliminating this waste, the socialist society would save a tremendous amount of money.

The belief, peculiar to many anarchists and Marxian socialists, that state compulsion would be unnecessary in a society not based on private property in the means of production gives rise to the expectation that the socialist community will save that expenditure that can properly be referred to as state expenditure. They claim that "obedience to the simple fundamental rules governing any form of social life will very soon become of necessity a habit" in the socialist community, but they also imply that "evasion of regulation and control enforced by the whole people will undoubtedly be enormously difficult" and "swift and severe punishment" will result because "the armed workers" would not be "sentimental intellectuals" or "let themselves be mocked." All of this is essentially word play. Control, Weapons, and Punishment do not these constitute "a special repressive authority," or, in Engels' own words, a "State"? The expenses associated with the coercion are the same whether it is carried out by armed employees who are prohibited from working while carrying weapons or by the workers' sons wearing police uniforms.

The State, however, uses compulsion on those outside of its own population as well. Only a state that encompasses the whole of the universe would need no external compulsion, and even then only because there wouldn't be any other nations, people, or territories. Liberalism aspires to organize the whole planet into some kind of state due to its inherent opposition to conflict. If this is possible, it is impossible to do it without a coercive device. Even if all national militaries were disbanded, there would still need to be a global police force to maintain peace in the globe. Socialism won't be able to function without a coercive machinery, whether it unifies all states into a single entity or maintains their independence.

The communist system of compulsion will also cost money. We are unable to predict whether this will cost more or less than what the capitalist state apparatus would inevitably incur. We just need to observe that the amount involved will result in a decrease in the social dividend. Little needs to be said about the distribution wastes that capitalism produces. There are no distribution costs in a capitalist society since there is no distribution in the traditional meaning of the term. Trading costs and other comparable expenditures cannot be referred to as distribution costs since they are not associated with distribution, which is a unique operation in and of itself, and because the impacts of the services provided for these reasons reach much beyond the simple delivery of commodities. Competition is not limited to distribution since it is just a small portion of what it offers. It benefits both the manufacturing process and the overall goal of any production organization, which is to guarantee high output. Therefore, comparing these expenses to those imposed by the distribution and management system in a communist society is insufficient. It doesn't matter much whether socialist production techniques spare the jobs of business travelers, brokers, and advertisements if they result in lower productivity we'll talk more about this later.

CONCLUSION

Any economy's income distribution is a complex and important component. This essay emphasizes the substantial effects income disparity has on society and the economy. High levels of economic disparity may cause social unrest, a loss of social cohesiveness, and negative health effects in those who are less fortunate. Furthermore, these differences impede the development and expansion of the economy as a whole. The report finds a number of important factors that contribute to income disparity, such as the fast improvements in technology that disproportionately favor skilled employees, the effects of globalization on salaries and employment possibilities, and how education affects income levels. When it comes to determining how money is distributed and reducing severe inequality, governmental policies, taxation structures, and social welfare programs are essential factors. Policymakers must give priority to inclusive economic policies that concentrate on delivering high-quality education and skill-development opportunities for all facets of society if they want to create a more equitable income distribution. Addressing economic disparity requires a multifaceted strategy that incorporates collaboration between the public sector, private sector, and civil society. Societies may strive toward a more fair and sustainable future with a balanced distribution of wealth by supporting an environment that encourages equal opportunities and equitable access to resources.

REFERENCES:

- [1] A. Mountford and H. Rapoport, "The brain drain and the world distribution of income," *J. Dev. Econ.*, 2011, doi: 10.1016/j.jdeveco.2009.11.005.
- [2] C. Arndt *et al.*, "Covid-19 lockdowns, income distribution, and food security: An analysis for South Africa," *Glob. Food Sec.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.gfs.2020.100410.
- [3] P. Ibrahim, M. Ali, M. Muridan, and A. I. Mohd Jazid, "Revisiting Zakat Distribution on Income Inequality and Welfare: The Malaysia Experience," *al-Uqud J. Islam. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.26740/al-uqud.v4n1.p146-161.
- [4] X. Cirera and E. Masset, "Income distribution trends and future food demand," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2010. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2010.0164.
- [5] J. Behringer and T. Van Treeck, "Income distribution and growth models: A sectoral balances approach," *Polit. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0032329219861237.
- [6] Y. Bilan, H. Mishchuk, N. Samoliuk, and H. Yurchyk, "Impact of Income Distribution on Social and Economic Well-Being of the State," *Sustain.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12010429.
- [7] A. H. Meltzer and S. F. Richard, "A positive theory of economic growth and the distribution of income," *Res. Econ.*, 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.rie.2015.04.001.
- [8] M. Nirei and S. Aoki, "Pareto distribution of income in neoclassical growth models," *Rev. Econ. Dyn.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.red.2015.11.002.
- [9] X. Sala-I-Martin, "The world distribution of income: Falling poverty and . . . convergence, period," *Q. J. Econ.*, 2006, doi: 10.1162/qjec.2006.121.2.351.
- [10] S. Hong, H. Han, and C. S. Kim, "World distribution of income for 1970–2010: dramatic reduction in world income inequality during the 2000s," *Empir. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s00181-019-01657-w.

CHAPTER 11

SOCIALIST COMMUNITY UNDER STATIONARY CONDITIONS

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A theoretical framework for comprehending and studying the dynamics of a socialist society working in an equilibrium state is represented by the idea of a socialist community under stationary circumstances. This study examines the socioeconomic effects and possible drawbacks of such a system, taking into account social welfare, economic planning, and resource allocation. This research offers insight on the viability and sustainability of socialist ideals in a society characterised by resource scarcity and environmental concerns by looking at how stability and development interact within a stationary framework. However, good leadership, democratic decision-making, and a shared commitment to common objectives are crucial for a socialist society to be viable in stagnant circumstances. The system might experience inefficiency, stagnation, and the danger of entrenchment without these essential components. Policymakers and supporters may more effectively design and put into practice sustainable socialist policies that give priority to social welfare, economic stability, and environmental preservation by being aware of the possible drawbacks and advantages of such a model.

KEYWORDS:

Labor, Society, Socialist Community.

INTRODUCTION

It is not an effort to depict reality, but rather a theoretical convenience, to assume stagnant economic circumstances. If we want to comprehend the rules of economic change, we cannot ignore this way of thinking. We must first consider a situation in which movement is not present in order to investigate movement. The stationary condition is the equilibrium point to which we believe all economic activity is moving and which would be reached if other causes did not in the interim produce another equilibrium point. There is no need to consider changing the quantity or the distribution of the units that make up the production components in the idealized equilibrium state since they are all used in the most efficient manner.

Even if a socialist economic order that is alive, that is, evolving, is hard to envision since economic activity without economic calculation appears unfathomable, a socialist economic order that is stable is fairly simple to assume. We merely need to refrain from pondering how this fixed situation is established. If we follow this procedure, it is simple to look at a socialist community's statistics. The stagnant state has always been the exclusive focus of all socialist doctrines and utopias [1]–[3].

The Disabilities and Satisfactions of Labor

The socialist movement is portrayed by socialist authors as a utopian society. The fancies of Fourier are the most extreme in this regard. In Fourier's imagined scenario of the future, all dangerous animals would have vanished and been replaced with creatures that will aid man in his labors or even do those tasks for him. Fishing will be handled by an anti-beaver, sailing ships will be moved calmly by an anti-whale, and river boats will be towed by an anti-

hippopotamus. The lion will be replaced by an anti-lion, a horse of amazing speed, on the back of which the rider will sit as comfortably as in a well-sprung carriage. "Living in a world with such servants will be a pleasure." Even after property had been abolished, Godwin believed that people may be everlasting. According to Kautsky, in a socialist society "a new type of man will arise... a superman... an exalted man." Even more specific information is provided by Trotsky: "Man will grow incomparably stronger, smarter, and finer. His voice was more melodic, his motions were more rhythmic, and his physique was more harmonic. The typical person will attain the stature of an Aristotle, Goethe, or Marx. There will be new peaks above these others. Additionally, authors of this caliber are often republished, translated into other languages, and the focus of in-depth historical theses.

Other socialist authors are more cautious in their claims, but they start from basically the same premises. The vague notion that the natural factors of production are such that they do not need to be economized is tacitly present in Marxian theory. Such a result is unavoidably drawn from a system that views labor as the sole cost component, denies the rule of declining returns, ignores the Malthusian law of population, and gets lost in esoteric illusions about the unbounded potential for productivity growth. We don't need to go further into these issues. It is necessary to understand that even in a communist society, natural resources for production would be few and would need to be conserved.

Labor would be the second aspect that would need to be reduced. Even if we disregard variations in quality, it is still clear that there is a finite quantity of labor that can be performed by each person. Even if work were purely enjoyable, it would still need to be done economically since human life is finite in duration and human energy is not limitless. Even the guy who enjoys an unrestricted lifestyle free from financial worries must allocate his time, that is, select between several options for how to use it. Therefore, it follows that economic factors must rule human behavior in the world as we know it. Since the first-order goods provided by nature are in little supply despite the fact that human demands are limitless, the only way that products of higher order may enhance the fulfillment of needs with a given labor productivity is to increase labor. In addition to the fact that the amount of labor cannot be raised beyond a certain point, a rise in labor also results in an increase in disutility.

According to Fourier and his school, unfavorable social structures are to blame for the inutility of labor. They believe that they are the only ones to blame for the fact that the terms "labor" and "toil" are interchangeable in common use. Work is not inherently unpleasant. On the other hand, guys must all be active. Boredom from inactivity is unpleasant. If work is to be made appealing, it must be done in hygienic, clean surroundings, and the pleasure of work must be stimulated by a joyful sense of unity among the employees and cheery rivalry among them.

The continual nature of labor is what most repulses people. Even pleasures lose their luster after a while. Work will become a joy and stop causing aversion if employees are free to switch jobs whenever they like [4]–[6].

Even while socialists from all schools accept this argument, its flaws are easily shown. Man has the need to act. He wouldn't always be satisfied to lounge about on the grass and soak up the sun, even if he didn't have a need to go to work. Even young animals and youngsters whose needs are met by their parents kick, dance, leap, and run in order to use muscles that have not yet been appropriated by labor. A physical and psychological necessity is to be moving. Therefore, productive work generally results in pleasure. But only up to a certain extent; beyond that, it becomes labor.

DISCUSSION

Why is labor still done when the disutility it causes outweighs the immediate enjoyment it provides? Because indirect labor satisfaction which is the satisfaction provided by the labor's product comes into play in addition to direct labor pleasure. As long as the pleasure received from the work's outcome balances out the resentment it causes, labor will continue. Only when continuing with labor would result in greater disutility than utility would it be stopped. Although Fourier's attempts to rid labor of its unappealing qualities were founded on accurate observations, he vastly overestimated the significance of his case. It is obvious that the quantity of work that provides direct labor pleasure only meets a tiny portion of the demands that men deem essential, thus they are willing to put up with the pain of doing unpleasant job. However, it is incorrect to believe that allowing people to switch jobs often will result in any meaningful improvement. First of all, the man would have less ability because of less experience in each of his different vocations, which would lower the value of the output of labor. Additionally, every switchover would waste time and require labor to move things around. Second, only a very small portion of the excess of direct labor pleasure over labor disutility is attributable to being tired of the specific task at hand. Therefore, the ability to experience immediate fulfillment from a different kind of work is less than it would have been if the first task had not been completed.

It is obvious that the majority of the inefficiency is brought on by the organism's overall tiredness and a desire to be freed from any additional restrictions. A guy who has spent hours at a desk would rather spend an hour cutting wood than another hour there. But it wasn't only the necessity for change that made his employment disagreeable; it was also how long it took. Only through increasing productivity will it be possible to shorten the workday without compromising the quality of the final output. Everyone can verify that the common belief that there are two types of work labor that only exhausts the body and labor that only exhausts the mind is untrue. All labor has an impact on the whole body. We delude ourselves on this issue because when we look at other occupations, all we notice is the immediate gratification of our work. Because he would want a little leisure while driving, the clerk envies the coachman. However, his jealousy would only last as long as the pleasure outweighed the agony. Like such activities, sport activities include riding, driving, fishing, hunting, and mountain climbing. However, in the economic sense, sport is not labor. Men are forced to put up with the irksomeness of labor because of the harsh reality that they cannot survive on the little quantity of work that provides direct labor pleasure, not because of poor labor organization.

It goes without saying that changes in the working environment might result in a product with increased or less irksomeness for the same product. But without increasing costs, it would be difficult to enhance these circumstances more than capitalism already does. It has long been understood that labor is less unpleasant when done in a group, and when it is feasible to allow employees to collaborate without lowering production, it is done. Of certainly, some people have remarkable natures that are above average. The great creative genius who immortalizes himself in works and actions does not discriminate between pleasure and suffering while working. For such guys, creativity is both their greatest source of delight and their deepest source of suffering. They create for the purpose of creating, not for the end product, therefore what they do has no intrinsic worth to them. Since they give up nothing more precious to them than their labor while they work, the product doesn't cost them anything. And the only cost to society for their goods is what they might have created with other labor. This cost is negligible in light of the value of the service. True genius is a gift from God.

Now, everyone is acquainted with the lives of great men. As a result, the social reformer is prone to taking what he has heard about them for granted. People are often inclined to think

that the genius' style of life is the norm for an everyday socialist society resident. But not everyone has the talent of Sophocles or Shakespeare, and turning a lathe is hardly the same as creating the Napoleonic Empire or penning Goethe's songs. Therefore, it is simple to see the nature of the delusions held by Marxists on the pleasures and labor of the citizens of the socialist community. Marxism follows the guidelines outlined by the Utopians in this instance, as well as in everything else it has to say about the socialist society. Engels sees Socialism as a system of production "in which productive labor will not be a means for enslaving but for liberating mankind, which will give every individual the opportunity to develop and to exercise all his capabilities, bodily and mental, in all dire circumstances," specifically referencing Fourier's and Owen's ideas of restoring to work "the attractiveness lost through division of labor" by arranging for each form of work to be performed for a short period of time only.⁵⁴ Marx also describes "a higher phase of communist society" in which "labor has become not only a means of life but the first need of life itself after having done away with the slavish subjection of the individual under the division of labor."⁵⁵ Max Adler affirms that no one would "at the very least" be given any employment that "must hurt him" in the socialist society. The only thing that sets these remarks apart from those of Fourier and his school is that no effort is made to provide a foundation for support for them [7]–[9].

But in addition to changing careers, Fourier and his school also used competition to make labor more appealing. The best achievements from mankind would be possible if they were motivated by a mood of joyful competition or noble emulation. They view competition everywhere else as harmful, yet here they acknowledge its benefits. It will be enough to split the employees into groups if they don't perform well. Immediately, passionate rivalry will break out between the groups, doubling each person's energy and igniting a desire for work in everyone. Competition naturally leads to better achievement, although this observation is just a surface level one. In and of itself, competition is not a human emotion. Men compete, but they do so with an aim in mind rather than for the joy of the competition itself. The battle is fought for the reward that awaits the winner, not for the fight's own sake. But what rewards would encourage people to imitate the workers in a communist society? Experience has shown us that honorific titles and awards are not given too much weight.

Since the concept of distribution would be independent of individual performance and the rise per head via the increased effort of a single worker would be so little that it would not count, material things to improve the fulfillment of demands could not be offered as awards. The sheer enjoyment of a job well done would not be sufficient; we look for additional incentives precisely because we cannot trust this one. Furthermore, labor would still be annoying even if it were true. It wouldn't become appealing in and of itself that way. As we've seen, the Fourier school views making labor enjoyable rather than a chore as the key to solving society's problems. However, the methods it offers to do this are sadly not very workable. Fourier would have been deserving of the celestial honors lavished upon him by his followers if he had really been able to demonstrate how to make labor appealing.⁵⁹ However, his highly praised beliefs are nothing more than the fancies of a man who was unable to see the world objectively. Even in a communist society, working will make people experience pain rather than pleasure.

Joy of Labor

One of the key pillars of the socialist school of thinking crumbles if this is acknowledged. Therefore, it is understandable why socialists persist in arguing that work is intrinsically satisfying, that there is an innate drive in humans to work, and that only the unfavorable conditions that exist in capitalist society, where work is performed, could limit this natural joy of labor and turn it into toil. They diligently compile quotes from employees who

describe how enjoyable their employment is in contemporary factories as evidence for their claim. They pose provocative questions to the employees, and when they get the desired responses, they are really happy. However, because to their preoccupation, they fail to perceive that there is a conflict that has to be resolved between the acts and responses of individuals they cross-examine. Why is a person compensated if their labor itself provides satisfaction? Why doesn't he pay his employer back for the joy the job brings him by letting him work? Nowhere else are individuals compensated for the joys they get, and the fact that rewards are provided for pleasures should at the very least cause pause for thought. By definition, work cannot directly provide satisfaction. We define labor as any action that does not directly provide pleasure feelings but is carried out exclusively in order to produce indirectly pleasurable feelings strong enough to balance out the main pain feelings. Three very distinct sensations are responsible for the so-called "joy of labor," which is often cited as evidence in favor of the idea that labor awakens sentiments of pleasure rather than pain.

First, there is the pleasure that may be had from perverting labour. The pleasures that follow are unquestionably not pleasures of work but pleasures derived from certain accompanying circumstances when the public official abuses his office, frequently while performing his function in a manner which is formally quite correct, in order to satisfy the instincts of power, to give free rein to sadistic impulses, or to pander to erotic lusts and in this one need not always think merely of things condemned by law or morals. Other types of employment likewise need similar considerations. Numerous times, the psychoanalytic literature has emphasized how much factors of this kind affect career choice. Insofar as these joys offset the suffering of labor, they are reflected in pay rates as well, with a tendency for pay rates in jobs where there is a greater supply of labor to be lower. The employee makes less money than he would have otherwise in order to pay for the "pleasure".

People refer to the "joy of labor" as well as the satisfaction of getting something done. But rather than enjoying the task itself, this is enjoying not having to do any work. When something difficult, unpleasant, or painful is eliminated, there is a specific form of pleasure that can be seen to exist everywhere. This pleasure is the satisfaction of "I've done it." The Middle Ages are lauded by socialist romanticism and romantic socialists as a period when the pleasure of labor was unlimited. Although we lack trustworthy information regarding the "joy of labor" from medieval craftsmen, peasants, and their helpers, we may assume that their delight came from finishing their task and starting the hours of leisure and rest. The observations left to us by medieval monks who copied manuscripts while immersed in the meditative serenity of their monasteries are unquestionably more real and trustworthy than the claims made by modern romantics. Many beautiful manuscripts finish with the words *Laustibi sit Christe, quoniam liber explicit iste*. not because the labor has itself been enjoyable [10]–[12].

But we must not overlook the third and most significant element of labor's joy the pleasure experienced by the worker when his or her job goes so well that it enables him or her to support himself and/or his family. This sense of fulfillment from work is undoubtedly founded in what we have dubbed the indirect enjoyment of work. The worker is happy because he recognizes the foundation of his life and social standing in his capacity to work and in his talent. He is ecstatic because he has gained a position that is superior to others'. He is happy because he believes that his capacity to work will ensure his financial prosperity in the future. He feels pleased because he can do something that is considered "good," which society appreciates and subsequently rewards in the job market. This emotion, which is sometimes inflated to the absurd assumption that one is necessary, is the best self-respect booster. However, it provides the healthy man the willpower to accept the reality that he can

only gratify his desires via labor and suffering. He makes the most of a terrible situation, as they say. The first of the three sources of what we can refer to as the "joy of labor" will surely exist in the socialist society as a result of the distortion of the actual purposes of work. It will logically be limited to a small circle in a capitalist society. The thrill of labor from the other two sources will likely cease entirely. The individual will always feel as if he has been given an excessive amount of work if the link between the produce of labor and the income of the laborer is severed, as it must be in a socialist society. The over-heated, neurasthenic aversion of labor that we now see in almost all government offices and public firms will start to grow. Everyone believes that he is overworked in situations like these, where income is based on following strict timetables, and that he is simply given too much work and disagreeable tasks, and that his accomplishments go unappreciated and unrecognized. These emotions give rise to a sour dislike of labor that stifles even the satisfaction of finishing it. The "joy of labor" cannot be relied upon by the socialist society.

The Productivity of Labor

The earlier "distributivism" beliefs were founded on the idea that everyone might enjoy a comfortable life, if not wealth, with an equitable distribution of resources. This appeared so evident that no effort was made to demonstrate it. At first, socialism adopted this presumption in its totality and anticipated that a fair distribution of the social income would result in comfort for everyone. The argument that capitalism restricts labor productivity and that socialism would remove these restrictions and multiply production to ensure that everyone leads a comfortable life did not emerge until the criticisms of their opponents brought their attention to the fact that an equal distribution of the income obtained by the entire economic society would hardly improve the conditions of the masses at all. Socialist writers started to spread fantastic claims about the rise in productivity that could be anticipated under Socialism without giving it any thought that they had not been able to refute the liberal school's claim that productivity under Socialism would sink so low that want and poverty would be prevalent.

By switching from capitalist to socialist production processes, Kautsky suggests two strategies to boost output. One is the consolidation of all production into the finest companies and the closure of the ineffective ones. There is no denying that this is a way to increase productivity, but it is a one that works best in an exchange-economy system. All inferior productive efforts and concerns are mercilessly eliminated through competition. The fact that it does so consistently causes complaints from those engaged, and as a result, the weaker enterprises seek State subsidies, special treatment in public contracts, and general restrictions on the freedom of competition in whatever manner they can. Kautsky is compelled to acknowledge that trusts established by private industry fully use these methods in order to increase output, and he candidly views them as the precursors of the social revolution. Whether the socialist State would feel the same need to implement comparable productivity gains is more than debatable. Would it not maintain a losing venture rather than risk offending the community by ending it? Without much fuss, the private business owner shuts down ventures that are no longer profitable, forcing the employee to relocate and, in some cases, change careers.

Undoubtedly, this causes the affected individuals some initial suffering, but it benefits society as a whole since it allows for more efficient and effective market provisioning. What about the Socialist State? Instead, wouldn't it be restricted for political reasons to prevent local unrest? The desire to prevent the damage to specific areas that would arise from the deletion of unnecessary branch offices, workshops, and power plants frustrates all changes of this sort

on the majority of state railroads. When a garrison was wanted to be removed from a certain location for military purposes, even the army administration ran into legislative resistance.

According to Kautsky's own admission, his second strategy for increasing production "economies of every description" is already operational under current law. He specifically calls out material economies, transportation costs, advertising, and PR expenses. Experience has shown that public services and enterprises are handled with less economy and greater waste of labor and material of all kinds than anything else when it comes to material and transportation economies. On the other side, private business inherently encourages the owner to operate as efficiently as possible for his personal benefit. Of course, the socialist state would forego all advertising expenditures as well as all travel and agency fees for business. However, it is quite likely that it would employ a lot more people to work for the distribution system. We have learned how complicated and costly the social distribution system can be through experience in war. Were the prices of meat, sugar, wheat, bread, and other cards truly cheaper than those of advertising? Has the cost of the massive staff needed to manage a rationing system been less than that of paying for commercial travelers and agents?

Small shops would disappear under socialism. Distributive centers, which would not be less expensive, must be established in their place. Co-operative shops don't employ fewer people than retail establishments set up along contemporary lines, and many of them, due to high costs, would be unable to compete with the latter if they weren't given tax exemption advantages. In general, it must be argued that it is unacceptable to single out certain expenses in a capitalist society and then instantly draw the conclusion that the latter's output would be higher than the former since such expenses would vanish in the former. The entire costs and total yields of the two systems must be compared. The electromobile's lack of a fuel need is not evidence that it is less expensive to operate than a vehicle with a gasoline engine. When Kautsky claims that "by the application of these two methods a proletarian regime could raise production to such a high level that it would be possible to significantly increase wages while at the same time reducing the hours of labor," the flaw in his logic is clear. Here, he makes a claim without providing any supporting evidence.

And it doesn't get any better with the additional justifications that are often offered to support the claimed superior productivity of a socialist society. People are regrettably misinformed about the amount of idlers under capitalism when they claim, for instance, that under Socialism everyone who can work would be required to do so.

The Stimulus to Labour

The citizen of the socialist commonwealth has a responsibility to contribute to the community to the best of his abilities; in exchange, he is entitled to a portion of the social dividend from the community. Unjustifiably failing to execute his responsibility will result in the typical forms of governmental coercion being used to force him to submit. It is unimaginable that anybody could resist the economic administration's influence on individual residents on a long-term basis. The requirement that residents show up on time and stay at their jobs for the required amount of hours is insufficient. While they are there, they must be working hard.

The worth of the laborer's produce is given to him under the capitalist system. The static or natural pay rate tends to a point where the employee gets the value of the labor product, or all that can be attributed to his job.⁶⁴ Therefore, the worker is worried that he should be as productive as possible. Work done only for piece rates is not covered by this. The marginal productivity of the specific kind of work in question affects the level of time rates as well. Long-term wage levels are unaffected by the conventional technical method of salary

payment. Time rates are no exception to the rule that the pay rate will eventually stabilize at its previous level. Even yet, since there is no correlation between the worker's productivity and his pay, labor done for time payments affords us the chance to see how work is conducted when the worker feels like he isn't working for himself. Under time pay, the more skilled employee is not encouraged to go above and beyond what is required of all employees. Time wages are an incentive for minimal activity, whereas piece pay is for maximum activity. These societal repercussions of the concept of paying by time are significantly mitigated under capitalism by the gradation of time compensation for various types of labour. Because the compensation rises as the minimum requirements climb, the worker has an incentive to locate a job where the minimal labor necessary is as great as he can complete.

The time pay only starts to negatively impact output when we budge from the idea of grading time wages in accordance with the amount of labor necessary. This is especially obvious when it comes to work with the government and local governments. Here, over the past few decades, not only has the minimum expected of each worker consistently decreased, but every incentive for better work such as differential treatment of different grades and quick promotion of diligent and capable employees to better-paying positions has also been eliminated. The outcome of this strategy has unequivocally supported the idea that a worker will only exert his greatest effort when he understands that there is something to gain from it.

The typical relationship between labor done and compensation cannot exist under socialism. Due to the difficulties of estimating the productive contributions of the various components of production, all efforts to calculate the results of an individual's labor and, therefore, the pay rate, must fail. The socialist movement may be able to tie distribution to certain outside factors of the labor done. Any such distinction, however, would be arbitrary. Let's assume that the minimal standards for each production branch have been established. Let's assume that this is accomplished in accordance with Rodbertus' suggestion of a "normal working day." For each business, it is specified how long a worker of average strength and effort can keep working and how much work a person of average skill and industry can do during that period.⁶⁵ We won't give a damn about the technical challenges involved in determining whether or not this minimum has been met in any given actual scenario. However, it is clear that any such broad conclusion can only be completely arbitrary. No one could ever force the employees of the various businesses to concur on this issue. Everyone would argue that he had been given too many tasks, and they would work to get them scaled down. Average worker quality, average talent, average strength, average effort, and average industry are all ill-defined concepts that are difficult to pinpoint. Now it is obvious that only a portion of the workers let's say half will attain the minimal performance computed for the worker of average quality, skill, and strength. Less will be done by the others. How can the authorities tell whether a performance below the minimum is the result of incapacity or laziness? Either some basic criteria must be specified, or the administration must be permitted to make decisions at its discretion. The quantity of work completed would undoubtedly continue to decrease as a consequence.

Everyone who actively participates in the economic world is concerned under capitalism that labor should be compensated the full output. Employers that fire employees who are worth their wages hurt themselves. The financial outcomes of the department under his supervision, as well as indirectly himself, are negatively impacted by the foreman who fires a good employee while keeping a poor one. To constrain the judgments of individuals who must evaluate the job accomplished in this situation, explicit criteria are not required. Such standards would need to be created under a socialist system because otherwise the authority

granted to those in control may be abused at will. As a result, the employee would lose interest in doing the task itself. In order to escape penalty, he would only be concerned with doing what is required by the formal requirements.

The experience of a thousand years of slave labor may be used to discover what type of outcomes will be attained by employees who are not very engaged in the end result of their labor. New examples are provided by officials and staff from state and local entities. By arguing that these workers had no interest in the outcome of their labor because they did not share in the distribution, one could attempt to weaken the persuasiveness of the first example. In the socialist community, everyone would realize that he was working for himself and that would motivate him to the highest level of activity. However, this is just the issue. The worker has greater labor disutility to overcome if he puts more effort into his task. But despite his greater effort, he will only get a tiny portion of the benefits. He won't be motivated to use his abilities any more than is necessary by the idea of earning a two billionth of the benefits of his additional effort.

Socialist authors often avoid these uncomfortable topics by being silent or by making a few insignificant comments. They provide little more than a few moralizing platitudes. The new man of Socialism will be free from petty self-interest; he will be morally immensely superior to the man of the terrifying age of private property, and he will dedicate all of his resources to advancing the benefit of society out of a deep understanding of the coherence of things and a high sense of obligation. But a deeper look reveals that these arguments only give rise to two feasible options: compelled service under a system of rewards and punishments or free adherence to the moral law with no coercion other than that of the individual conscience. Both will fall short of their goals. Even though it is publicly praised on all occasions and declared in all schools and churches, the former offers insufficient motivation to continue overcoming the inutility of labor, while the latter can only result in a formal performance of duty and never in performance involving the full use of one's powers. John Stuart Mill is the author who has written the most on this issue. The foundation for all arguments that follow is his. His ideas may be found across the relevant literature and in regular political discourse; they have even evolved into catchphrases. Even if he is completely unfamiliar with the author, everyone is familiar with them. They have served as one of the key pillars of the socialist notion for decades and have done more to increase its acceptance than the hate-motivated and sometimes incoherent arguments of communist agitators.

According to Mill, one of the key arguments against the viability of the socialist system is that everyone would be always preoccupied with avoiding doing their fair part of labor. However, individuals who make this argument tend to overlook just how much of the same problem exists in the current social order, wherein nine out of ten transactions are made. The argument makes the assumption that the only people who can provide honest and effective labor are those who stand to earn personally from their own efforts. However, only a tiny portion of all labor under the current system is able to achieve this. The most common types of compensation are hourly rates or fixed salary. People who do labor have less personal stake in its success than do socialist community members since, in contrast to them, they do not work for an organization where they are partners.

The majority of the time, they are not directly controlled by individuals whose interests are entwined with the success of the organization. Work that requires technical, managerial, and supervisory expertise may be done by time-based personnel. It is possible to argue that labor would be more productive under a system where the worker owned all or a significant portion of the results of their additional effort, but this motivation is specifically absent in the current setup. Even if communistic labor could be less active than that of a peasant owner or a

worker working for himself, it would likely be more active than that of a hired laborer, who has no personal stake in the outcome. The reason for Mill's error is plain to understand. The last economist from the classical school, he did not live to witness how the subjective theory of value transformed economics and was unaware of the relationship between pay rates and labor productivity. Because his pay relies on the quality of the task he does, he does not understand the worker's motivation to give his all. Without the illumination of contemporary economic theory, he can only see the outside of things and not the core of them. The person earning a time-based income probably has little interest in accomplishing anything more than what would keep him employed. But if he is able to do more, if his knowledge, strength, and ability allow it, he looks for a job where more is needed and where he can earn more money. He may not do this out of laziness, but the system is not to blame for that. The system does all it can to encourage everyone to exercise the highest diligence because it guarantees that everyone will reap the rewards of their labor. The key distinction between Socialism and Capitalism is that Socialism cannot do this.

CONCLUSION

The study of a stationary socialist society has provided important insights into the advantages and disadvantages of this socioeconomic paradigm. The results imply that although a stationary state provides certain difficulties for a socialist society, it also offers special chances for resource allocation and sustained growth. It takes careful economic planning, ongoing adaptation to changing demands, and active efforts to reduce waste and environmental damage to maintain stability in such a system. Two major findings may be derived from this research.

First off, compared to capitalist systems, a socialist society may promote more equality and social welfare since resources are divided among the people more equitably. Second, since eternal growth is not possible in a stagnant state, it is important to strike a careful balance between maintaining social harmony and fostering innovation and advancement. A useful theoretical lens for comprehending socialist ideals in the context of resource depletion and environmental problems is provided by the idea of a socialist society under fixed circumstances.

REFERENCES:

- [1] O. Nagornaia, "Promoting the socialist community: efforts and effects of the socialist camp's cultural diplomacy," *Quaestio Ross.*, 2020, doi: 10.15826/QR.2020.5.547.
- [2] L. Škamlová, A. Wilkaniec, M. Szczepańska, V. Bačík, and P. Hencelová, "The development process and effects from the management of community gardens in two post-socialist cities: Bratislava and Poznań," *Urban For. Urban Green.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ufug.2019.126572.
- [3] L. Byrne, "Constructing a socialist community: The Victorian socialist party, ritual, pedagogy, and the subaltern counterpublic," *Labour Hist.*, 2015, doi: 10.5263/labourhistory.108.0103.
- [4] W. C. Ho and P. Ng, "Public amnesia and multiple modernities in Shanghai: Narrating the postsocialist future in a former socialist 'model community,'" *J. Contemp. Ethnogr.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0891241607309622.
- [5] H. D. Dickinson, "Price Formation in a Socialist Community," *Econ. J.*, 1933, doi: 10.2307/2224464.

- [6] H. Dai, "Community in a diverse society: Using three Western approaches to understand community organization in post-socialist urban China," *Int. Soc. Work*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/0020872807083916.
- [7] J. Spafford, "Community As Socialist Value," *Public Aff. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.2307/26910030.
- [8] L. Sklair, "World revolution or socialism, community by community, in the anthropocene?," *J. World-Systems Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.5195/jwsr.2019.956.
- [9] Y. Moskvich, "Business sustainability strategy in a cooperative kibbutz industry," *Sustain.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12219172.
- [10] Z. Kovács and G. Hegedus, "Gated communities as new forms of segregation in post-socialist Budapest," *Cities*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.cities.2013.08.004.
- [11] G. Kligman, "On the social construction of 'otherness' identifying 'the Roma' in post-socialist communities," *Rev. Sociol.*, 2001, doi: 10.1556/revsoc.7.2001.2.4.
- [12] S. Balčaitė and D. Krupickaitė, "Perspectives of gated communities' socio-spatial integration: The case of post-socialist Lithuania," *BELGEO*, 2018, doi: 10.4000/BELGEO.23832.

CHAPTER 12

A BRIEF STUDY ON POSITION OF THE INDIVIDUAL UNDER SOCIALISM

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The role of the individual under socialism has generated a great deal of discussion and investigation throughout history. Socialism is an economic and political philosophy that seeks to establish an equitable, cooperative society with a focus on community ownership. This essay explores the complex interaction between the individual and the socialist system, assessing how well individual liberties, rights, and obligations are protected within such a framework. This research clarifies the complexity and nuanced aspects of the individual's position and agency under socialism by examining important theoretical viewpoints and historical case studies. As a result, the position of the person under socialism is complex and dependent on a number of variables, such as the exact socialist model used, the level of governmental control, and the values upheld by the populace. Keeping the communal good and individual agency in harmony is still a difficult but essential job as socialism develops and changes in many circumstances. In order to build a system that empowers people while creating a fair and equitable society for everyone, policymakers and supporters must be aware of both the potential advantages and disadvantages of socialism.

KEYWORDS:

Community, Freedom, Socialism, Society.

INTRODUCTION

The Socialist Community is a powerful authoritarian group where commands are given and followed. The phrases "planned economy" and "abolition of the anarchy of production" imply this. It is easiest to comprehend the inner workings of a socialist society if we contrast them with those of an army. In fact, a lot of socialists prefer to refer to the "army of labor." Everything under Socialism is based on the directives of the highest authority, much as in an army. Every person has a position to which they are assigned. Until someone is transferred to another, everyone must stay in their current position. Men then become tools for government activity. They only progress when given a promotion. Only when they are deteriorated do they sink. To explain such circumstances would be pointless. Every person living in a bureaucratic state is aware of them. It goes without saying that all appointments in a situation like this should be based on personal ability. The person who is most qualified for each post should keep it, always on the condition that he is not needed for other, more important tasks. This is the core tenet of all authoritarian institutions that are rigorously organized, including both the Chinese Mandarinate and contemporary bureaucracy [1]-[3].

The selection of the ultimate authority is the first issue that emerges when putting this theory into practice. There are two approaches to solving this issue: the democratic and the oligarchical-monarchical, but there can only be one approach: the charismatic approach. The grace that the divinely ordained supreme rulers are gifted with determines their selection. They are superior to normal mortals due to their superhuman abilities and abilities. In addition to opposing the established authorities, doing so would mean disobeying the Deity's

laws. Such is the foundation of theocracies, which are clerical aristocracies in realms of "the Lord's anointed." However, it also serves as the cornerstone of Russia's Bolshevik regime. The Bolsheviks describe themselves as the embodiment of humanity, the instruments of necessity, and the completion of the grand plan of things after being called upon by history to carry out their majestic job. The worst of all crimes is to resist them. However, they are free to use any tactic while dealing with their opponents. It is the traditional aristocratic-theocratic notion reimagined.

The other strategy for resolving the issue is democracy. The majority controls everything in a democratic society. A ruler or rulers selected by a majority vote sit at its helm. But this has a charismatic foundation just like any other. Only in this instance is grace considered to be given to everyone equally. Everyone has it by birth. God speaks via the voice of the people. City of the Sun by Tommaso Campanella is a good example of this. The National Assembly's choice for Regent is a priest by the name of "Hoh," which signifies "metaphysics." Democracy is only valued in authoritarian ideologies as a way to establish the absolute, not for its social benefits.

According to the charismatic idea, the ultimate power imparts its own grace to those it appoints as officials. Ordinary people are raised above the crowd by a position of authority. They are more significant than others. Their standing is particularly elevated while they are on duty. There can be no uncertainty about their ability or suitability for the position. Man is made at the office. All of these ideas are completely formal, save from their polemical significance. They don't provide any information regarding how these appointments truly operate. They don't care where they came from. They don't ask whether the dynasties and aristocracies in question came to power via chance or battle. They don't explain how the party system works or how it selects a democracy's leaders. They provide little information on the real procedures for choosing officials.

However, as only an all-knowing king could function without them, specific provisions must be made for their appointment. Since the highest power is limited in what it can accomplish, subordinate authorities must at least be given the ability to nominate to lower posts. Regulating this authority is necessary to keep it from turning into a simple license. In this approach, hiring decisions wind up being made based less on actual aptitude and more on formalities like filling out paperwork, passing exams, attending particular institutions, and working in lower-level positions for a certain period of time. There can only be one view on the drawbacks of such procedures. Even though the tests include material related to the job at hand, the effective operation of business involves attributes completely different from those required for passing exams.

A guy who has worked in a lower position for a while is not always qualified for a higher one. It is untrue that learning to obey comes before learning to command. Age is not a replacement for individual ability. In a nutshell, the system is flawed. Its only defense is that there isn't anything better available to take its place.

Recent efforts have been undertaken to enlist the assistance of experimental psychology and physiology, and many of these efforts promise outcomes that are of the utmost significance to Socialism. There is little question that something similar to a medical examination for military duty would need to be used on a greater scale and with more sophisticated procedures under Socialism. Both individuals who tried labor for which they were not adequately developed and those who pretended to have physical defects to avoid tough and unpleasant job would need to be scrutinized. However, even the most enthusiastic supporters of these techniques could hardly claim that they could do more than place a very loose

restraint on the most egregious abuses of officialdom. They are not at all suited to any task that requires more than just physical stamina and a decent development of certain senses [4]–[6].

Journalism, science, and the arts and literature

A socialist society is an official society. This fact shapes the type of life that prevails there and the way that its people think. Everywhere in Europe has seen the emergence of this sort of person over the last ten years. These individuals always demand promotions, always have a "chief" on whom they rely, and never grasp how production and their own consumption are related since they are paid a set wage. However, it is particularly at home in Germany. It is the foundation of modern psychology. The right to choose one's employment is unknown under socialism. Everyone is required to follow instructions and go to the destination specified. Anything else is absurd. We'll talk more about this later and in another context about how it will impact labor productivity. We must now talk about how literature, science, and the press fit into these circumstances. The artists, scientists, and authors who were recognized as such by the selectors designated for this purpose were excused from the general duty to labor and paid a set pay under Bolshevism in Russia and Hungary. All those who were not acknowledged continued to be bound by the universal duty to labor and got no assistance for alternative endeavors. The media was become national.

DISCUSSION

This is the most straightforward answer to the issue, and it is also the only one that perfectly fits within the socialist society's overall framework. The officialdom is extended to the spiritual realm. Powerful people forbid those who displease them from creating art, sculpting, or conducting an orchestra. They neither publish nor perform their works. Additionally, the situation is not significantly changed if the decision is not made based only on the economic administration's discretion but rather on the recommendation of an expert council. On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that expert councils, which are always made up of the elderly and the established, are even less qualified than laypeople to support the development of fresh talent with different perspectives and maybe better mastery than their own. Even if the whole country were asked to vote, the growth of independent spirits challenging established methods and beliefs would not be made possible. Such tactics will only help the epigone race.

Only novels that are pleasing to the republic are to be printed in Cabet's *Icaria* the selected or favored works. The Republic will investigate pre-socialist writings. Revisions must be made to those that are just partly beneficial. Those that are deemed to be harmful or worthless must be burned. Cabet considered the argument that doing this would amount to replicating Omar's destruction of the Alexandrian Library to be completely unpersuasive. "We carry out what oppressors carry out against society. While brigands or zealots start flames to burn innocent heretics at the stake, we build fires to destroy wicked texts. This viewpoint makes it hard to find a solution to the tolerance issue. Except for pure opportunists, everyone is persuaded that their ideas are correct. However, if this conviction alone served as a basis for intolerance, then everyone would have the right to force and punish anybody who has other beliefs. The demand for tolerance can only be made by the weak in these circumstances. Power leads to the manifestation of intolerance. There must always be conflict and animosity amongst guys in such a situation. Cooperation that is peaceful is not an option. Liberalism preaches tolerance for all viewpoints because it wants peace.

The options available to artists and scientists under capitalism are many. If they are wealthy, they are free to pursue their own interests. They may look for wealthy clients. They are

capable of holding public office. They might try to make a living by selling their artistic creations. There are risks associated with each of these options, but the latter two in particular. It's possible that the person who instills new ideals in humanity or who has the capacity to do so experiences deprivation and poverty. However, there is no reliable technique to stop this. The innovative spirit is unavoidably inventive. It has to go ahead. It must obliterate the outdated and install the new. It could not possibly be freed from this weight. If so, it would stop being a pioneer. You cannot organize progress. It is simple to make sure that a genius who has finished his labor is crowned with laurel, that his mortal remains be interred in a place of honor, and that memorials are built in his honor. But if he is to fulfill his destiny, there is no way to make the path he must travel easier. Nothing society can do will help development. It has accomplished all that can be expected of it if it does not surround the jail in which it imprisons the person with absolutely impassable walls and shackles. Soon, genius will figure out how to liberate itself [7]–[9].

All intellectual advancement must be prevented by the nationalization of intellectual life, which must be undertaken under socialism. This is because new forms of art have grown popular in Russia, making it feasible to delude oneself about them. However, these technologies' creators were already at work when the Soviet Union took over. They joined with it in the expectation that the new authority would acknowledge them as they had not previously received any acknowledgment. The big concern is whether they will be able to retain their current position against subsequent innovators. Only physical labor is valued by society in Bebel's utopia. Science and the arts are reserved for free time. According to Bebel, the civilization of the future "will possess scientists and artists of all kinds in countless numbers." These people will spend their free time studying and practicing their arts, depending on their various preferences. Bebel therefore succumbs to the philistine animosity of the manual laborer against everyone who is not a woodcutter or a waterdrawer. He views all mental activity as simple dilettante behavior, as seen by the fact that he combines it with "social intercourse." Nevertheless, we must consider whether the mind would be able to generate the freedom that it need to live under these circumstances.

Naturally, any creative or scientific endeavor that takes a lot of time, effort, expense, or travel would be completely out of the question. But we'll presume that when the day's job is done, it's able to dedicate oneself to writing or to music. We will further assume that such activities won't be impeded by the economic administration's malicious interference by, for example, banishing unpopular authors to remote regions so that, perhaps with the help of devoted friends, an author or a composer is able to save enough to pay the fee demanded by the state printing works for the publication of a small edition. By doing this, he could even be able to publish a small independent monthly or perhaps secure a theatrical production.⁸¹ The economic administration, however, may at any point stifle it due to the intense rivalry of the publicly subsidized arts. Because the price of printing could not be determined, the economic administration would be allowed to choose the commercial terms under which publishing may occur. A socialist society would have the capacity to stifle intellectual freedom, which has never been exercised by a censor, an emperor, or a pope.

Personal Freedom

It is typical to refer to the individual's situation under socialism as being one of "unfreedom," and that the socialist society would be a "prison state." This statement includes a value judgment, and as such, it is beyond the purview of scientific inquiry. Science is unable to determine if freedom is desirable, bad, or just a question of indifference. It can only enquire as to what and where freedom consists.

A sociological idea is freedom. Applying it to situations outside of society is pointless, as is seen from the widespread uncertainty surrounding the well-known free-will debate. Man's life is dependent on factors in nature that he cannot control. He must submit himself to these circumstances since they are what he lives and dies under and are not within his control. They have the last say in all he does. When he tosses a stone, it travels along a path determined by nature. He may also influence how his body functions by eating and drinking. By assuming that all natural occurrences adhere to immutable rules, we try to illustrate how the course of events is dependent upon clear and lasting functional relationships. Man is entirely constrained by these rules; they rule over his daily activities. Only within these confines are his will and his deeds possible. There is no freedom in nature or against it.

The unchangeable principles of nature still govern social life since it is a component of nature. These laws affect both the course of activity and its outcomes. If we identify the notion of freedom with the root of action in the will and how it manifests in societies, it is not because we believe that such action occurs independently of natural rules; rather, the meaning of this concept of freedom is quite different. Here, the issue of internal independence is not at issue. Our main area of interest is the issue of outward freedom. The former is an issue with where willingness comes from, whereas the latter is with how action is worked out. Every guy is reliant on the behavior of other men. Their activities have a wide range of effects on him. He must sense a one-sided dependency on them and will claim that he is not free if he must watch as they treat him as if he had no free choice and if he is unable to stop them from disregarding his wants. He must adjust himself to their compulsion if he is weaker.

This one-sided reliance becomes reciprocal under the social relationships that develop through cooperation in shared activity. Each person must conform to the wishes of his or her fellows insofar as they behave as members of society. In this sense, no one is more dependent on others than others are on him. What we mean by exterior freedom is this. In the context of social need, it is a tendency of people that involves, on the one hand, limiting one's freedom in respect to others and, on the other, limiting the freedom of others in relation to him. This should be made explicit using an example. In a capitalist system, the employer seems to have considerable influence over the employee. It is up to him to decide whether to hire a guy, how to work with him, how much to pay him, and whether to fire him. However, his freedom and the other's matching unfreedom are merely visible. A social process includes how the employer treats the employee. If he doesn't treat the employee in a way that reflects the value society places on their work, then he will be held responsible for the repercussions. He may treat the employee poorly, but he will have to bear the price of his irrational actions. The employee is consequently reliant on him to this degree. However, this dependency is not any higher than how much each of us depends on the other. Because even in a place where the law is upheld, anybody who is ready to take responsibility for their actions is allowed to attack us physically or shatter our windows.

Of fact, strictly speaking, this perspective cannot allow for completely random social activity. Even the autocrat of the East, who seems to have complete control over what happens to the adversary he captures, must think about the consequences of his actions. However, there are variances in degree between how the expenses of arbitrary action are connected to the benefits they provide. No laws can protect us against attacks by guys who are so hostile that they are prepared to take responsibility for their actions. But if the rules are strict enough to guarantee that, on average, our serenity is not disturbed, we feel, at least to a certain degree, independent of the bad intentions of others. Because people have learned to control their anger by thinking about the consequences of their actions, it has been possible to lessen the severity of punishments without eroding their deterrent power throughout history. This is not

due to an improvement in morals or to legislative decadence. The threat of a brief jail sentence now offers more protection against crimes against people than the gallows did in the past.

When we can fully compute action using accurate money calculation, there is no room for the arbitrary. We miss the fact that the most effective way for society to control arbitrary behavior is precisely this linking up of action with financial profit considerations if we allow ourselves to be carried away by the current laments over the stony-heartedness of a money-based age. This kind of system makes everyone involved in producing for needs other than their own the consumer on the one hand, the employer, the capitalist, the landowner, and the worker on the other dependent on social cooperation. Nobody can question whether the debtor is reliant on the creditor or the creditor is dependent on the debtor unless they completely fail to appreciate this reciprocity of connection. Each is really reliant on the other, and this is true of relationships between buyers and sellers as well as employers and employees. It is common to gripe that money now controls everything and that personal concerns are no longer allowed in business. What is really being complained about here, however, is the fact that in the field of work that we refer to as strictly economic, whims and favors are outlawed and only those factors are taken into account that are necessary for societal cohesion.

This independence from the arbitrary authority of his colleagues, therefore, is freedom in man's exterior existence. Such liberties are not inherent rights. Under the basic circumstances, it did not exist. It emerged throughout the course of social evolution, and mature capitalism is responsible for its successful fulfillment. In pre-capitalist times, a "gracious lord" oversaw the man, whose favor he had to win. Such a connection is not acknowledged by capitalism. Society is no longer split between tyrannical rulers and deprived serfs. All relationships are tangible, impersonal, calculable, and replaceable. Through capitalistic financial calculations, freedom emerges from the realm of fantasies and becomes a reality. Men start to want freedom in other contexts once they get it in strictly economic interactions. Therefore, efforts to remove from the State all arbitrary behavior and all dependency on others go hand in hand with the growth of capitalism. The goal of the liberal movement is to achieve legal acknowledgment of people's subjective rights and to limit authorities' arbitrary behavior to the smallest feasible area. It calls for rights rather than grace. It also acknowledges right away that the only way to fulfill this need is by firmly restricting the State's authority over individuals. It holds that freedom means independence from the State [10], [11].

Because the State the coercive equipment used by the people who make up the government is only impervious to freedom when its activities must adhere to specific, unambiguous, universal standards or when they follow the rules controlling all activity done for profit. When it operates judicially, the former is true because the judge is constrained by rules that provide him or her some leeway to use personal judgment. The latter is true when, under a capitalist system, the State acts as an entrepreneur who operates under the same rules and adheres to the same moral standards as other businesses who want to make a profit. Beyond this, it cannot be restricted enough to prevent arbitrary conduct either by legislation or in any other manner. The person is then unable to challenge the authorities' judgment. He is unable to predict how his acts will be seen by the people that rely on him, hence he is unable to predict the effects of his actions. The antithesis of freedom is this.

It is conventional to see the issue of external freedom as one of an individual's greater or lesser dependency on society.⁸² However, political freedom does not include all freedom. It is not enough for a man to be free if he can act in a way that doesn't damage others without interference from the state or the oppressive force of tradition. He must also be able to take

action without worrying about unanticipated social repercussions. This freedom can only be guaranteed by capitalism, which expressly refers all reciprocal relationships to the impersonal, cold exchange principle *du ut des*.

Socialists often make the claim that only the possessor is free under capitalism in an effort to counter the case for freedom. The fact that the proletariat must labor to survive makes him a slave. A more primitive understanding of freedom cannot be conceived. It is in the nature of things that man must labor since his urge to consume exceeds that of the wild animals. That the owner has sufficient means to survive following this norm is a benefit of society's existence that benefits no one—not even the impoverished. The presence of society also benefits those who lack material possessions since cooperation increases the output of labor. Only through raising this productivity might socialism reduce an individual's reliance on the environment. If it is unable to achieve that, if it instead reduces production, it will reduce freedom.

CONCLUSION

The status of the person in a socialist society is characterized by a fine line between the interests of the whole and the rights of the individual. While socialism aims to promote more equality in society by addressing economic inequalities and providing all individuals with basic amenities, it also struggles to protect individual liberties and encourage self-reliance. Socialist concepts have historically been applied in a variety of ways, leading to a range of effects on people. The degree of government involvement in people's lives is one of the main points of contention. Excessive centralization of authority has in certain communist governments resulted in restrictions on individual liberties, which have stifled innovation and entrepreneurship. On the other hand, certain socialist models have been effective in upholding personal freedoms and rights while fostering a sense of community and shared accountability. Furthermore, socialism redefines the idea of ownership. There is a reduction in private ownership of the means of production, and social ownership takes precedence. This change challenges ideas of personal property rights and economic gain, but it may also foster a sense of community and prevent exploitation.

REFERENCES:

- [1] H. Marcuse, "State and Individual Under National Socialism," in *Technology, War and Fascism*, 2020. doi: 10.4324/9780203208311-7.
- [2] T. Kovačič and P. Dolan, "Conceptualising Coping and Resilience in the Context of Socio-Political and Economic Change: Generational Perspectives From Slovenia," *Child Care Pract.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13575279.2020.1758036.
- [3] M. Cernea, "Individual motivation and labor turnover under socialism," *Stud. Comp. Int. Dev.*, 1973, doi: 10.1007/BF02800434.
- [4] M. Śliwa and B. Taylor, "'Everything comes down to money?': Migration and working life trajectories in a (post-)socialist context," *Manag. Organ. Hist.*, 2011, doi: 10.1177/1744935911406103.
- [5] P. S. Y. Ho, S. Jackson, S. Cao, and C. Kwok, "Sex With Chinese Characteristics: Sexuality Research in/on 21st-Century China," *J. Sex Res.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/00224499.2018.1437593.
- [6] T. Tuvikene, W. Sgibnev, D. Zupan, D. Jovanović, and C. S. Neugebauer, "Post-socialist infrastructuring," *Area*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/area.12590.

- [7] C. Fuchs, “Communicative socialism/digital socialism,” *TripleC*, 2020, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1144.
- [8] G. Kallis, “Socialism Without Growth,” *Capital. Nature, Social.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/10455752.2017.1386695.
- [9] L. Chelcea and O. Druță, “Zombie socialism and the rise of neoliberalism in post-socialist Central and Eastern Europe,” *Eurasian Geogr. Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/15387216.2016.1266273.
- [10] L. Fiuza, “A Theory of Socialism and Capitalism,” *MISES Interdiscip. J. Philos. Law Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.30800/mises.2016.v4.179.
- [11] N. Spakowski, “Dreaming a Future for China: Visions of Socialism among Chinese Intellectuals in the Early 1930s,” *Mod. China*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0097700418767609.

CHAPTER 13

A BRIEF STUDY ON SOCIALISM UNDER DYNAMIC CONDITIONS

Parul Tyagi, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-parul.tyagi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Preeti Garg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-preeti.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

An academic investigation of the development and adaptation of socialist ideology in response to dynamic socioeconomic situations is Socialism under Dynamic situations. This study looks at how socialist ideals have changed over time to meet the difficulties provided by globalization, advancing technology, environmental concerns, and evolving social standards. This research offers light on the techniques and measures used by socialist governments and movements to stay relevant and successful in the face of changing circumstances via an examination of historical and current case studies. Socialism under Dynamic Conditions explains how the concept of socialism is still relevant and flexible in a society that is always evolving. Socialist groups and governments may continue to meet the demands and ambitions of the people they serve by embracing innovation, realizing global interconnection, and supporting social and environmental development. However, problems still exist, and more study is required to comprehend how socialism may successfully adapt to future dynamic situations and promote just and sustainable communities.

KEYWORDS:

Capital, Economic, Socialist, Society.

INTRODUCTION

The Characteristics of Dynamic Forces

A theoretical speculator may make use of the concept of a stationary state. There is never a steady state in reality since the circumstances in which economic activity occurs are always changing beyond what humans can control. Six major classifications may be used to categorize the forces sustaining the economic system's ongoing evolution. The alterations in exterior Nature happen first. Both changes resulting from operations carried out within these conditions, such as the exhaustion of the soil, or consumption of standing timber or mineral deposits, as well as changes in the climate and other specifically natural conditions that occur independently of human actions must be classified under this heading. Following changes in population size and quality are adjustments in capital goods' size and quality, adjustments in production methods, adjustments in labor organization, and lastly adjustments in demand [1]–[3].

The first of these drivers of change is the most vitally significant. Let's suppose for the sake of argument that a socialist society could be able to control population growth and commodity demand in such a way as to prevent these forces from endangering the stability of the economy. If that were the case, we could prevent other sources of change. However, the socialist society would never be able to change the inherent laws of how economies operate. Nature doesn't change to accommodate humans. Man must change to fit the natural world. Even the socialist society will have to take changes in the natural world into account, as well as the effects of alterations in the elements. It will need to consider the reality that the natural

resources and capabilities at its disposal are finite. Its quiet operation will be disturbed by outside disturbances. It won't be able to stand still any longer than capitalism can.

Population Variations

There is plenty in the world, according to the naïve communist, to make everyone happy and pleased. The lack of products is merely a consequence of a twisted social structure that, on the one hand, restricts the expansion of creative capacities and, on the other, allows too much to go to the wealthy and too little to the poor due to uneven distribution. These illusions were dispelled by the Malthusian Law of Population and the Law of Diminishing Returns. *Ceteris Paribus*, after a certain threshold is reached, wealth does not rise proportionally with population growth since productivity per person decreases. It is important to distinguish between the factual issue of whether production has ever reached this position and the general principle question.

Given this information, socialists have developed a variety of viewpoints. Some people have just rejected it. Malthus was viciously criticized during the entire nineteenth century, more so than almost any other author. The criticism of "parson" Malthus is rampant in the works of Marx, Engels, Dühring, and many others. But they don't contradict him. We may now consider the Law of Population to be settled. The Law of Diminishing Returns is no longer debated; hence it is not essential to deal with writers that either disregard or refute the idea.

Other socialists think it is easy to disprove these arguments by emphasizing the productivity boost that would result from socializing the means of production. It is unnecessary to debate whether or not such an increase would really occur at this time since, even if it were assumed that it would, this would not change the fact that, at every given moment, there is a certain population level beyond which any growth in population must lead to a decrease in productivity per person. It must be demonstrated that every child born into the world beyond the current optimum will also bring with it such a great increase in productivity that production per head will not be diminished by its coming if it is desired to refute the effectiveness of the Laws of Population and Diminishing Returns under Socialism [4]–[6].

A third set of author's content themselves with the observation that population growth is slowing as civilization and rational living expand, as affluence and the desire for a better quality of living rise. This, however, ignores the fact that the birth rate declines not because of improved living standards but rather due to "moral restraint," and that the incentive for an individual to abstain from having children vanishes once having a family is possible without incurring financial burdens because the children are supported by society. Fundamentally speaking, this is the same fallacy that caught Godwin when he believed there was "a principle in human society" that maintained the population perpetually within the boundaries established by the means of sustenance. Malthus exemplified the characteristics of this enigmatic "principle."

It is impossible to imagine a communist society without forceful population control. A socialist society must be able to prohibit population growth that exceeds or falls below certain, predetermined thresholds. It must make an effort to keep the population at that level that provides for the highest possible productivity per person. It must see both under- and overpopulation as bad, just like any other social structure. It will be forced to control the issue itself because it lacks the motivations that, in a society where private ownership of the means of production prevails, balance the number of births with the constraints of the means of sustenance. It is not necessary to detail how it will do this in this section. Whether its policies would further ethnological or eugenic notions is also irrelevant to our goal. But it is certain that, even if a socialist society could promote "free love," it could never promote free

conception. Only when unwanted births may be averted can it be argued that every person's right to exist already exists. There will be people in the socialist society, just as in any other, for whom "at the great banquet of Nature no place has been laid" and to whom the command must be issued to retire as quickly as possible. No outrage that Malthus's statements may cause may change this reality.

DISCUSSION

Demands Have Changed

Changes in demand cannot be permitted to run amok due to the rules that the socialist society is compelled to follow in the distribution of consumer products. Each individual citizen might be permitted to demand what he pleased within the parameters of the total consumption-units given to him if economic calculation and, along with it, even a rough estimation of the costs of production, were available. Each would then choose what was pleasing to him. It is true that it is feasible for certain goods to be overpriced due to the production directors' evil purpose. The people who suffered would have little defense against the government other than political agitation. Either they may be forced to absorb an excessive amount of overhead expenses or they might be rendered more expensive by uneconomic techniques of manufacturing. They would not be able to enhance the manufacturing techniques or correct the accounting as long as they were in the minority. In any case, their point of view would be somewhat supported by the fact that at least a bigger proportion of the relevant components could be quantified and that, as a consequence, the whole issue could be stated rather clearly.

All demand-related calculations must obviously be left to the government since they are impossible under socialism. They will be subject to the same pressure from the people as other government actions. The person will only use this influence insofar as it advances the collective will. The minority will have to submit to the majority's will. They won't be protected by the proportional representation system, which by its very nature is only appropriate for elections and can never be used to make choices on specific activities. The functions that, in a free economic system, are carried out by demand will be replaced by the popular will, or the will of those who now hold the reins of power. Government, not individuals, would choose which needs are most urgent and must be met first.

Because of this, demand will be far more stable and predictable than it would be under capitalism. Under socialism, there won't be the same factors influencing demand as exist under capitalism. How can innovations, or ideas that go against what is generally accepted, get recognized? How can innovators succeed in waking up the sedentary masses? Will the majority be ready to give up the valued traditions of their ancestors in favor of a better, as of yet undiscovered, alternative? It is sufficient to convince one person or a small group of people that the new techniques better meet their requirements than the old ones in a capitalist society where each person has the freedom to choose what he or she will consume, subject only to the constraints of his or her resources. Others will progressively imitate them. Because earnings are not equal, this gradual acceptance of new forms of fulfillment is made possible.

The wealthy embrace trends and become used to using them. This establishes a trend that others follow. Once the wealthier classes have embraced a given way of life, manufacturers are motivated to advance manufacturing techniques so that the lower classes may quickly adopt the same lifestyle. Luxury therefore contributes to advancement. Before it is a necessity of the general public, innovation "is the whim of an élite. The luxury of today is tomorrow's need.⁸⁷ Luxury creates latent wants and discontentment, which is the catalyst for

advancement. The ultimate goal of civilized life, according to moralists who decry luxury, must be the relatively desire-free lifestyle of the wild animals wandering the forests [7]–[9].

modifications to the capital amount

The capital equipment utilized in manufacturing is eventually depleted. This applies to both the items that make up fixed capital and the things that make up circulating capital. These are eventually consumed in the manufacturing process as well. Constant effort is required on the part of those who oversee production in order for capital to be preserved in the same proportions or to be grown. The replacement of the capital products depleted during production, in addition to the creation of new capital, must be done with care. Capital cannot multiply by itself.

This process requires no special forethought in an entirely stagnant economic system. In a situation where nothing changes, it is simple to identify what is consumed and what must be set aside to replace it. Under fluctuating circumstances, it is completely different. Here, the many production-related processes and their direction are constantly changing. Here, replacing the worn-out machinery and the semi-manufactured goods used in comparable quality and quantity is insufficient; instead, other, better, or at least better suited to the new conditions of demand, products must take their place. Alternatively, the replacement of capital goods used in one branch of production must be limited in order for another branch of production to be expanded or started. Calculation is required to complete such difficult processes. Capital estimates are impossible without economic analysis. As a result, the socialist community which lacks the tools for economic calculation must be completely defenseless in the face of one of the most basic issues with economic activity. With all due diligence, it will be impossible to carry out the activities required to balance output and consumption in such a way that capital value is at least maintained and only additional income is spent. But in addition to this, which is a seemingly insurmountable obstacle, implementing a sensible economic strategy in a communist society would face additional challenges.

Costs are incurred in maintaining and accumulating capital. It entails giving up current pleasures in order to pursue bigger pleasures in the future. The owners of the means of production and those who, through reducing consumption, are on the path to becoming owners of the means of production both have to make sacrifices under capitalism. In fact, they do not totally benefit from the edge they gain in the long run. Since, other things being equal, the accumulation of capital raises the marginal productivity of labor and hence salaries, they are required to share it with people whose incomes come from work. However, the fact that they generally benefit by not spending more than they can afford i.e., not consuming capital and saving i.e., growing capital is a significant incentive to motivate them to preserve and expand it. And the more their urgent demands are met, the greater this stimulation becomes. Because it is simpler to make the sacrifice the less pressing the current requirements are that cannot be met while making provisions for the future. One of the purposes of the uneven distribution of property and income under capitalism is the preservation and accumulation of capital. Under socialism, the State the organized community is responsible for maintaining and accumulating wealth. A sensible policy serves the same purpose here as it would under capitalism. All community members will enjoy the same benefits, and expenses will also be the same. Capital policy decisions will be determined by the community, first by the economic administration and then by all of the residents. They will need to determine whether to manufacture more production items or more consumption goods, and whether to use production techniques that are quicker but generate a lower amount of output or those that take longer but produce more output. It is

hard to predict the outcome of these majority judgments. Conjecture is pointless in this situation. Decision-making circumstances will be different from those that exist under capitalism. Under capitalism, the frugal and the wealthy are the ones who decide whether or not to save. Under socialism, everyone, without exception, is concerned about it, even spendthrifts and idlers. Furthermore, it must be kept in mind that there won't be any motivation to save in this situation that would provide a greater level of living. Therefore, demagogues would have access. The administration will not be disinclined to retain itself longer in power by extravagant expenditure, and the opposition will always be prepared to demonstrate that more might be allocated to immediate satisfactions. An ancient government axiom is "After us, the deluge". There is no reason to believe that future socialist administrations will be as frugal as they have been with their capital spending. Generally speaking, new capital is only generated when the required funds have been obtained via loans, or from individual residents' savings. Capital is extremely seldom acquired from taxes or other unique public revenue. On the other hand, countless instances of public entities' manufacturing equipment losing value may be cited. This is because inadequate care has been taken to maintain capital, allowing for the greatest potential reduction in existing expenses.

True, the governments of the socialist or semi-socialist societies that still exist today are eager to impose restrictions on consumption in order to promote spending that is often seen as an investment and the creation of new capital. Both the Soviet government in Russia and the Nazi government in Germany are spending a lot of money on military projects and industrial facilities that will help the nation become self-sufficient in terms of imports. Foreign loans have contributed some of the cash needed for this purpose, but the majority has come through restrictions on both domestic spending and investments of the kind that may help produce the consumer products that the public wants. Depending on how we evaluate a strategy that aims to improve a nation's military capabilities and make its economy independent on imports, we may either accept or reject this policy as one of saving and creating new capital. The mere fact that consumption is constrained in order to build large factories of various types is not proof that new capital being produced. Future evidence of these facilities' ability to contribute to a greater supply of the commodities needed to boost the nation's economy will be required.

The Socialist Economy's Modifying Factor

From what has been mentioned, it should be abundantly evident that there is no such thing as a fully fixed state under Socialism or any other system. This would not only be difficult due to constant changes in the natural circumstances of production, but it would also be unfeasible due to constant dynamic pressures such as changes in population number, commodity demand, and the creation of capital goods. One cannot imagine these elements being removed from the economy. Therefore, it is not essential to ask if these changes would also affect how labor is organized and how production is carried out technically. Because it doesn't matter if real innovations are conceived of and implemented once the economic system is no longer in perfect equilibrium. Everything that occurs while everything is in motion is an invention. Because it will have distinct impacts in new circumstances, even when the old is replicated, it still constitutes innovation. In terms of its results, it is innovative. However, this in no way implies that the socialist system will be a progressive one. Economic development and change are not the same thing by any means [10], [11].

An economic system's non-stationarity does not imply that it is developing. The fact that the environment in which economic activity occurs has changed makes economic transformation necessary. The economic system must adapt as circumstances change. However, economic development only refers to change that occurs in a very clear direction, such as the direction

of the ultimate objective of all economic activity, i.e., the accumulation of the largest amount of wealth. This view of development is completely devoid of judgmental overtones. The economic system is progressive when more people or the same number of people are better off. We are not concerned with the fact that it is hard to evaluate progress precisely due to the challenges of evaluating value and that there is no guarantee that it makes people "happier."

There are several ways that progress may happen. One can make organization better. The manufacturing process may be improved, and money can be used more effectively. In other words, there are other ways to get there. Would they be able to lead a socialist society? We may presume that it would assign the most qualified individuals to oversee production. But regardless of how gifted they were, how could they behave logically if they couldn't calculate or reckon? Socialism will always fail due to this challenge alone.

Speculation

All economic activity is predicated on an unknowable future in any changing economic system. As a result, it is associated with risk. In essence, it is guesswork. The vast majority of individuals, who lack the skills to properly speculate, as well as socialist authors of all stripes, speak extremely negatively about speculating. The literateur and the bureaucrat, who are both unfamiliar with the dynamics of a business environment, are envious and furious when they consider wealthy investors and successful businesspeople. We owe their animosity to the several economists who have worked to unearth the nuanced differences between speculation and "legitimate trade," "value-creating production," etc. Outside of the immobile condition, all economic activity is really speculation. There is only a little difference between the activity of the simple craftsman who guarantees to provide a pair of shoes within a week for a certain price and the sinking of a coal mine based on assumptions about how its goods will be disposed of decades from now. Even investors in fixed-interest bearing instruments with gilt edges engage in speculation completely unrelated to the danger of the debtor's failure to pay. Similar to how cotton speculators purchase cotton for future delivery, they buy money for future delivery. Because economic activity is predicated on an unknown future, it must therefore be speculative. Speculation is the thread that connects individual economic actions to societal economic activity as a whole.

It is typical to blame the government enterprises' infamously poor productivity on the fact that the people working there are not sufficiently invested in the outcome of their labors. Government projects would not be less fruitful than those of the private business owner if it were one day possible to elevate every citizen to a level where he could understand the relationship between his own labor and the social income, a portion of which belongs to him, and if one day his character could be so strengthened. Thus, the issue with socialization seems to be an ethical one. It is only required to elevate humanity far enough from the ignorance and immorality to which they have been reduced throughout the tragic era of Capitalism in order to make Socialism practicable. Rewards and other methods must be used to encourage men to work harder until this level has been attained. It has previously been shown that under Socialism, a lack of sufficient incentives for individuals to overcome the inutility of their labor must have a negative impact on production. Even in a stationary state, this problem would persist. Another issue emerges in dynamic circumstances, namely the challenge of speculating. The outcome of the speculator's speculation is of the utmost importance in an economic system where private ownership of the means of production is the norm. If it is successful, he will first benefit from it. He is the first to experience the loss if it fails. Although the speculator works for the community, he is proportionally more affected by the success or failure of his actions than the community is. In terms of profit or loss, they look considerably larger in relation to his means than to the sum of societal resources. He has

increasing sway over societal affairs as his speculations get more effective and he has access to more manufacturing tools. His property shrinks and his influence in business decreases as his speculations grow less profitable. He will no longer be among those chosen to lead economic issues if he loses everything via speculating. Socialism makes a significant difference. Here, the head of industry is solely concerned with profit and loss to the extent that he shares in them as one of millions of citizens. The destiny of everyone relies on his deeds. He can make the country prosperous. He may just as easily cause it to be in need and poverty. His brilliance has the power to advance the race. His inability or his disregard for it might cause it to deteriorate and perish. Happiness and despair are in his hands as in the hands of a deity. And in order to do the necessary tasks, he must be godlike. His vision must include all that matters to the neighborhood. He must possess unwavering judgment and the ability to accurately analyze the circumstances in far-off places and in generations to come.

Unquestionably, if an omnipotent and omniscient Deity personally descended to oversee the administration of human affairs, Socialism would be instantly feasible. But because there is no guarantee that this would happen, it is unlikely that males will be willing to readily provide such a position to anybody outside of their group. Men have their own minds and wills, which is one of the basic truths of all social activity that all reformers must consider. Even if he were the smartest and finest of them all, it is not to be assumed that they would suddenly decide of their own free choice to become passive tools of anybody outside of their immediate vicinity. But as long as the prospect of one person permanently directing the course of events is ruled out, it is essential to rely on the majority judgments of committees, general assemblies, and, in the ultimate instance, the whole electorate. But with it comes the risk that all collective endeavors necessarily face, which is the paralyzation of initiative and feeling of responsibility. Innovations are not implemented because the majority of the governing body's members cannot be persuaded to support them. The fact that it would be impossible to delegate all decision-making to one person or one committee would result in the formation of several subcommittees that would make decisions would not make matters any better. Since Socialism is an economic system that operates under a unified plan, all such sub-committees would only serve as representatives to the one supreme authority.

They would have to follow the rules set down by the highest authority, and this in and of itself would encourage irresponsibility. We all are familiar with how the socialist administrative apparatus looks: a countless number of office holders, each zealously committed to maintaining his position and preventing anyone from encroaching on his area of responsibility while simultaneously anxiously attempting to shift all responsibility of action onto someone else. Such a bureaucracy gives a perfect illustration of human indolence notwithstanding its formality. When there is no outside stimuli, nothing moves. All motivation for process improvements in the nationalized businesses, which operate in a society where private ownership of the means of production is predominant, comes from business owners who seek to benefit from their work as subcontractors for semi-manufactured goods and equipment. Rarely, if ever, do the company's leaders themselves introduce advances. They are satisfied to copy the actions of comparable privately held businesses. But there won't be much discussion about changes and improvements in a society where all worries are socialized.

CONCLUSION

Socialism under Dynamic Conditions shows that socialist ideas have shown to have a remarkable potential for development and adaptation in response to the worlds constantly shifting dynamics. Egalitarianism, social justice, and common ownership are among the key socialist tenets that have shown to be adaptable and capable of being reinterpreted to meet

modern needs. Socialism has always embraced technology, and socialist groups and governments have done the same. They use digital tools and communication platforms to interact with the populace and improve participatory governance. Additionally, they have acknowledged the relevance of globalization, reassessing international commerce and collaboration to alleviate economic inequality and promote nationalism. Socialist agendas have integrated environmental issues as well, with an increasing focus on sustainable development, renewable energy, and ecological preservation. Socialists advocate for policies that put an emphasis on environmental protection and deal with climate change because they understand how interdependent mankind and the environment are. Additionally, socialists have had to reevaluate their positions on identity politics, human rights, and cultural concerns in order to stay open and receptive to many viewpoints as society norms and values have changed.

REFERENCES:

- [1] V. Nee, "Organizational Dynamics of Market Transition: Hybrid Forms, Property Rights, and Mixed Economy in China," *Adm. Sci. Q.*, 1992, doi: 10.2307/2393531.
- [2] J. W. Cole, "Problems of socialism in Eastern Europe," *Dialect. Anthropol.*, 1985, doi: 10.1007/BF00245132.
- [3] J. Petras, H. Veltmeyer, and H. Márquez, *Imperialism and capitalism in the twenty-first century: A system in crisis*. 2016. doi: 10.4324/9781315587974.
- [4] J. J. Savelsberg, "Knowledge, domination and criminal punishment revisited: Incorporating state socialism," *Punishm. Soc.*, 1999, doi: 10.1177/14624749922227702.
- [5] T. Pospiszyl, "Artists in the service of the public," *Third Text*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/09528822.2018.1510090.
- [6] L. Sýkora, "Cities Under Postsocialism," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.74030-X.
- [7] F. Modigliani and M. H. Miller, "Dividend Policy, Growth, and the Valuation of Shares," *J. Bus.*, 1961.
- [8] F. Pine, "Dealing with fragmentation: The consequences of privatisation for rural women in central and southern Poland," in *Surviving Post-Socialism: Local Strategies and Regional Responses in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union*, 2013. doi: 10.4324/9780203350669-14.
- [9] P. F. Drucker, "Business Objectives and Survival Needs: Notes on a Discipline of Business Enterprise," *J. Bus.*, 1958, doi: 10.1086/294178.
- [10] L. Fiuza, "A Theory of Socialism and Capitalism," *MISES Interdiscip. J. Philos. Law Econ.*, 2016, doi: 10.30800/mises.2016.v4.179.
- [11] C. Fuchs, "Communicative socialism/digital socialism," *TripleC*, 2020, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1144.

CHAPTER 14

ANALYSIS ON IMPRACTICABILITY OF SOCIALISM

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This chapter examines the idea of socialism and demonstrates how unworkable it is as a socioeconomic system. The examination explores the theoretical underpinnings of socialism as well as the difficulties it encounters in accomplishing its stated objectives. The study outlines the underlying problems that prevent the effective implementation of socialism by looking at historical and modern instances. Additionally, it analyzes the negative effects of making socialist ideas mandatory in practical situations. In the end, this research clarifies the causes of socialism's continued impracticality and unreliability in spite of its utopian aims. The quest for more social fairness and economic equality is admirable, but socialism's one-size-fits-all philosophy ignores the variety of individual tastes, goals, and skills. Contrarily, mixed economies those that include aspects of both socialism and capitalism have shown to be more flexible and effective at advancing both economic growth and social wellbeing.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalist System, Economic, Socialism, Socialist.

INTRODUCTION

The previous studies have shown the challenges facing the construction of a socialist order of society. Economic calculations are not feasible in a communist society, hence it is impossible to determine the cost and outcome of an economic activity or to use the calculation's outcome as a yardstick for how well the operation worked. This would be sufficient to render socialism unworkable on its own. But even without it, there is still another impassable barrier in its path. There is no organizational structure that can make a person's economic decisions independent of other citizens' cooperation without subjecting them to all the dangers of simple gambling. These are the two issues, and without their resolution, the implementation of socialism would seem to be impossible, excepting an entirely stagnant state [1]–[3].

These essential concerns haven't gotten nearly enough attention up until now. The first has often received absolutely little attention. The belief that labor time may provide an effective measure of value has persisted in society, which is the cause of this. But even many people who understand that the labour theory of value is flawed nevertheless think that value can be quantified. This is shown by the many efforts that have been made to identify a standard of worth. It was required to realize the actual nature of the exchange relations indicated in the market prices in order to comprehend the issue of economic calculation. Only using the techniques of the contemporary subjective theory of value was it possible to identify the presence of this significant issue. In reality, despite the fact that socialism has been the trend overall, the issue has not been critical enough to command widespread attention.

With the second issue, things are completely different. More focus is placed on the poor financial outcomes of nationalized and municipalized companies as community enterprise expands. It is hard to ignore the root of the problem since a young kid can easily identify where something is missing. Therefore, it cannot be said that this issue has not been

addressed. However, the approach used to address it has been woefully insufficient. Its natural relationship to the core of socialist business has been seen as simply a matter of improved hiring practices. It has not been acknowledged that even highly talented persons of excellent moral character are unable to address the issues brought about by communist industrial management.

Attempts to Solve

In the opinion of the majority of socialists, their complete picture of economic activity as well as their uncompromising commitment to the labour theory of value prevent them from acknowledging these issues. Because their idea of the socialist community is always static, they fail to understand that industry must be continually developing. They deal with the phenomenon of a progressive economy throughout while condemning the capitalist system, and they vividly depict the conflict brought on by economic change. However, they seem to view all change, not just the turbulence it causes, as a particular feature of the capitalist system. In the blissful kingdom of the future, everything will progress without resistance or turbulence.

This is easiest understood if we consider the typical socialist depiction of the entrepreneur. In this scenario, the sole distinguishing feature of the entrepreneur is the unique source of his money. Clearly, the entrepreneur must be the focal focus of any understanding of the capitalist system rather than capital or capitalists. However, Socialism, notably Marxian Socialism, views the entrepreneur as someone who is not a part of the production process and whose only job is to appropriate surplus value. To create a communist society, expropriating these parasites will be sufficient. The memory of the peasant's freedom and the end of slavery lingered hazily in Marx's mind, and it did so much more so in the minds of many other socialists. However, they fail to see that the feudal lord's position and the entrepreneur's position were quite distinct from one another. The feudal lord had no say in how much was produced. He was not a part of the manufacturing process; he entered only after it was complete with a claim to a portion of the produce. However, as the lord of the manor and the slave owner were both in charge of production, they continued to hold that role long after serfdom and slavery were abolished. The need that they going ahead pay the employees what their labor is worth did not alter their economic role. However, the entrepreneur completes a duty that is necessary even in a communist society. The socialist either refuses to recognize this or cannot see it [4]–[6].

Every time the phrase "speculator" is spoken, socialism's misinterpretation of the entrepreneur degenerates into idiocy. Even Marx, unaware of the noble goals that drove him, moves in this regard totally along "petty bourgeois" lines, and his school has even exceeded him. All socialists fail to see the need of basing every economic decision on an uncertain future, even in a socialist society, and the reality that this uncertainty applies even if an economic activity is technically effective. They mistakenly believe that speculation is a result of the anarchy of production rather than the inevitable outcome of shifting economic circumstances.

DISCUSSION

The vast majority of individuals are unable to comprehend that in economic life, only change is constant. They see the current situation as permanent; it will always be how it is. But even if they were able to imagine, the issues at hand would be beyond their comprehension. Only a select few, the leaders, are ever concerned about being able to anticipate and act in advance and follow new paths. Socialism is the collective, mass-produced economic policy that lacks understanding of the true nature of economic activity. Their stance on economic issues is

reflected in socialist ideology, which was developed and is supported by individuals who find economic life strange and cannot understand it. Only Saint-Simon, a communist, had some awareness of how important entrepreneurs are to the capitalist system. He is often rejected the label of socialist as a consequence. The others entirely miss the fact that a socialist society also need entrepreneurs to carry out the tasks associated with the capitalist system.

He said that the tasks carried out by individuals whom he refused to categorize as "working" under a capitalist system may be reduced to "auditing of production and distribution" and "keeping the records of labor and products." The "whole of the armed people," or the armed workers, could easily handle this. Lenin does a great job of separating the duties of "capitalists and clerks" from those of higher-level technical personnel, but he doesn't miss the chance to make a side swipe at those with a scientific education by expressing the disdain for all highly skilled work that is typical of Marxian proletarian snobbishness. "This recording, this exercise of audit," he claims, "has been reduced to the most elementary procedures of supervision and book-entry within the reach of everyone able to read and write. It is necessary to be able to draw accurate receipts and understand basic mathematics to be able to regulate these activities. As a result, it is feasible to provide everyone in society the tools they need to take care of themselves. There is nothing further that Lenin, or any other communist, has to say about this issue. They are no more aware of the fundamentals of economic life than an errand boy, who only understands what an entrepreneur does as covering pieces of paper with letters and numbers.

Because of this, Lenin found it very difficult to understand the reasons why his strategy had failed. His reading and daily activities kept him so far away from the realities of economic life that he was as unfamiliar with the job of the bourgeoisie as a Hottentot would be with an explorer collecting coordinates. The author decided to stop using references to "armed workers" to persuade the "bourgeois" experts to cooperate once he realized that his work could not be completed along the original lines. Instead, he proposed paying them "high remuneration" for "a short transition period" so they could start the socialist order and thereby make themselves unnecessary. Even within a year, he considered it probable that this might occur.

Those socialists who do not view the socialist community as the highly centralized organization that their more logical brethren envision and which alone is logically conceivable, believe that democratic institutions within enterprises can address the challenges facing the management of industry. According to them, allowing particular industries to operate with a certain level of freedom would not jeopardize the uniformity and proper coordination of the industrial sector. No more issues could arise if a workers' committee was given authority over every firm. There are several fallacies and inaccuracies in all of this. The issue with economic management that we are now dealing with has considerably more to do with coordinating the efforts of many businesses throughout the whole economic system than it does with the operations of specific sectors. It deals with issues that can never be determined by the employees in one industry, such as creating new enterprises and expanding, reforming, and restricting current undertakings. The challenges of running an industry go well beyond a single issue [7]–[9].

State and municipal socialism have produced enough unfavorable experience to make the issue of economic control urgently need consideration. However, etatists as a whole have handled this issue in a manner that is no less deficient than that of those in Bolshevik Russia. According to general consensus, the major problem with community endeavors is that they are not managed along "business" lines. Now, if properly comprehended, this buzzword may result in an accurate perception of the issue. The essential challenge for Socialism in this

situation is to find something to take its place since communal entrepreneurship does, in fact, lack the entrepreneurial spirit. However, this is not at all how the catchphrase is interpreted. It is a product of the bureaucratic mentality, which means that it originates from those who see all human behavior as the accomplishment of formal official and professional obligations. Activity is categorized by officialdom according to the formal capability for conducting it that has been attained via tests and a certain amount of service. The official merely brings "training" and "length of service" to the "job." There is only one reason for why a group of officials' work looks to be subpar: they did not get the proper training, and moving forward, appointments must be made differently. Therefore, it is suggested that future applicants undergo alternative training. The collective enterprise would be more run like a company if only the authorities had business backgrounds. But this just refers to a few visible manifestations of business method for the official who cannot adopt the spirit of capitalist industry: quicker responses to questions, the adoption of certain technological office tools like typewriters, copy machines, etc. that haven't been fully integrated into the departments, the elimination of needless duplication, and other things. In this manner, "the business spirit" enters the collective enterprise's offices. People are astonished when these individuals, who have been taught along these lines, fail, failing even worse than the vilified state workers, who in reality demonstrate their superiority at least in formal education.

It is simple to point out the errors that such ideas include. The characteristics of a businessperson are inextricably linked to the role of the entrepreneur in the capitalist system. Only the mental and behavioral traits necessary to be a successful businessman may be inherited; "business" is not in and of itself a characteristic that is inherent in a person. Even less is it a skill that can be learnt via study, even if the information and skills a businessman needs may be taught and learned. A guy does not become a businessman by spending a few years in commercial training or a commercial institution, by knowing bookkeeping and business jargon, by having proficiency in many languages, typing, and shorthand, or by any of these things. These are the items that the cashier needs. However, although being referred to as a "trained business man" in everyday discourse, the clerk is not a businessman. Following the realization of these apparent realities, the experiment of appointing successful business owners as administrators of public businesses was undertaken. The outcome was regrettable. They performed no better than the others, and they lacked the ingrained sense of formal protocol that differentiates the long-serving official. The cause was quite clear. An entrepreneur who is stripped of his distinctive position in the economy no longer qualifies as a businessman. Regardless matter how much regularity and expertise he brings to his new job, he will only ever be an official there.

Making an effort to find a new way to compensate people for their work is as pointless. It is believed that if public company managers were paid more, competition for these positions would increase and make it feasible to hire the finest personnel. Many people even go farther and think that by giving the management a cut of the earnings, the problems would be solved. It is significant that these ideas have hardly ever been implemented, even though they seem quite doable as long as public and private enterprises coexist and as long as the ability to calculate an economic outcome allows for the determination of the public enterprise's success, which is not possible under pure socialism. However, the issue is more about the manager's portion of the losses brought on by his business practices than it is about his share of the profit. The property-less management of a public undertaking may only be held accountable for a very tiny portion of the losses, unless it is in a strictly moral sense. Making a guy monetarily engaged in gains and rarely worried with losses only promotes irreverence. This has been the experience of all commercial businesses as well as state firms that have given management positions to relatively underprivileged personnel who are entitled to a

share of the earnings. The socialists' expectation that when their goals are achieved, humanity would become morally pure, which they believe will happen, will automatically set everything right is an avoidance of the issue. Socialism may be easily left undetermined in this instance as to whether or not it would have the intended moral impact. However, the issues that worry us are not caused by humanity's moral failings. These are issues with the logic of action and volition that inevitably exist everywhere and at all times.

Capitalism Is The Only Approach

But let's ignore the reality that these issues have stymied all socialist initiatives to date and try to identify the general areas where a solution should be found. We can only answer the issue of whether such a solution is feasible within the context of a socialist order of society by undertaking such an effort. Forming divisions within the socialist community, to which certain business branches would be delegated, would be the first step that would be required. A solution to the issues is inconceivable as long as the industry of a socialist community is run by a single authority that controls all arrangements and assumes all responsibility because all other workers are merely acting instruments with no independent, delineated spheres of operation and, as a result, no special responsibility. What we must strive for is the ability to not only monitor and regulate the whole process but also to assess and evaluate on their own the ancillary processes that take place inside a smaller sphere.

At least in this way, our process is similar to all other efforts to address our issue. Everyone agrees that the ultimate goal can only be accomplished if accountability is developed from the bottom up. Therefore, we must begin with a particular industry or industrial division. It makes no difference whether the unit we begin with is big or little since we may split too large of a unit using the same technique we previously used to divide a smaller unit. The issue of how we can maintain that unity of cooperation without which a social economy is impossible in spite of the division of industry into sections is far more crucial than where and how frequently the division should be done. The socialist community's economic system would subsequently be broken into as many pieces as possible, each of which would be under the supervision of a different manager. Each section manager is fully accountable for the activities of his team. This implies that the profit, or a substantial portion of the profit, goes to him. On the other hand, the loss burden rests on him since society will not replenish the productive resources he wastes via poor decisions. He loses his position as manager of a division and is demoted to the ranks of the people if he wastes all the manufacturing tools under his charge [10], [11].

If the section manager's personal responsibility is not just a facade, then his activities must be distinguished from those of other managers. Everything he delivers to other sections or for consumption will be credited to him; everything he receives from other section managers in the form of raw materials or partially manufactured goods for further working or for use as instruments in his section will be debited to him. However, it is essential that he be given the freedom to choose the tools, raw materials, partially finished items, and labor forces he will use in his region and the products he will make there. He cannot be held accountable if this freedom is not granted to him. Because it wouldn't be his fault if, at the direction of the supreme controlling authority, he produced something for which, under the circumstances, there was no corresponding demand, or if his section suffered because it received its raw materials from other sections in an unsuitable condition or, similarly, at an excessive cost. In the first scenario, his section's failure would be related to the supreme control's decisions, but in the second scenario, it would be related to the sections' failures to create the material. The community, however, must also be allowed to assert the same powers that it grants to the section manager. This means that it only uses the products he has produced in accordance

with its needs and only when it can do so at the lowest cost, and it only charges him for the labor it provides, charging him the highest rate it is able to secure, or providing the labor to the highest bidder.

Now, society may be divided into three categories. One is formed by the highest direction. Its only responsibility is to ensure the smooth operation of the production process as a whole, the details of whose execution are totally delegated to the department managers. The people who do not work for the supreme administration or serve as sector managers make up the third category. The section managers are a special group that stands between the two groups. They were given an unrestricted allocation of the means of production by the community at the start of the regime for which they had to pay nothing, and they continue to receive from it the labor force of the members of the third group, who are assigned to the highest bidders among them. The consumption goods will then be distributed to the highest bidders among the residents of all three groups by the central administration, which must credit each member of the third group with everything it has received from the section managers for his labor power or, in the case that it employs him directly in its own sphere of operation, with everything it may have received from the section managers for his labor power. The section managers who have delivered the merchandise will get credit for the sales.

The community may set up the section manager such that he is entirely accountable for his actions. He clearly distinguishes between his area of duty and others' areas of obligation. In this case, we are no longer dealing with the overall outcome of the industrial community's economic activity, where one person's contribution cannot be differentiated from another's. Each individual section manager's "productive contribution" and each individual citizen in the three categories are subject to individual evaluation. It is obvious that section managers must have the freedom to alter, expand, or reduce their section in accordance with the general trend in citizen demand as reflected in the market for consumer products. They must thus be able to sell the production tools that are more urgently needed in other parts to those other sections, and they should demand the highest price for those tools that they can get under the circumstances.

CONCLUSION

On the surface, socialism seems appealing because of its idealistic vision of an equitable world. A thorough investigation, however, demonstrates that socialism is essentially unworkable as a long-term socioeconomic system. Its theoretical underpinnings often ignore the complexity of human nature and the complicated operation of market forces. Examples of socialist ventures throughout history and in the present day often display flaws including inefficiency, a lack of creativity, and weakened individual incentives. Unintended consequences of the endeavor to impose socialist principles include economic stagnation, social unrest, and the consolidation of power in the hands of a select few. Furthermore, the lack of private property rights and a strong price system makes it harder to manage resources effectively, which creates scarcity and inefficiency. The inability of socialism to take into consideration human nature, economic reality, and the need of individual liberty is evident in light of the facts provided. Alternative socio-economic models should be investigated as societies work to advance and improve in order to achieve a balance between group responsibility and individual freedom, promoting sustainable growth and social peace.

REFERENCES:

- [1] H. . ETZKOWITZ and L. LEYDESDORFF, "The Triple Helix: University-industry-government relations: A laboratory for knowledge based economic development," *EASST Rev.*, 1995.

- [2] A. Panibratov and D. Klishevich, "Dynamic capabilities during the internationalization of MNCs from post-socialist emerging markets," *Multinatl. Bus. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1108/MBR-06-2019-0052.
- [3] Y. A. Debrah and G. Ofori, "Emerging managerial competencies of professionals in the Tanzanian construction industry," *Int. J. Hum. Resour. Manag.*, 2005, doi: 10.1080/09585190500220465.
- [4] X. He, "The development of entrepreneurship and private enterprise in the People's Republic of China and its relevance to transitional economies," *J. Dev. Entrep.*, 2009, doi: 10.1142/S1084946709001132.
- [5] M. Pixová, "Spaces of alternative culture in Prague in a time of political-economic changes of the city," *Geografie*, 2013, doi: 10.37040/geografie2013118030221.
- [6] W. Zhao and X. Zhou, "From institutional segmentation to market fragmentation: Institutional transformation and the shifting stratification order in urban China," *Soc. Sci. Res.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2016.09.002.
- [7] T. Rachwał, "Research Issues of Structural Changes in Polish Industry in Geography of Industry," *Stud. Ind. Geogr. Comm. Polish Geogr. Soc.*, 2018, doi: 10.24917/20801653.324.5.
- [8] N. M. Yip and H. A. Tran, "Urban housing reform and state capacity in Vietnam," *Pacific Rev.*, 2008, doi: 10.1080/09512740801990253.
- [9] A. Jiroudková, L. A. Rovná, W. Strielkowski, and I. Šlosarčík, "EU accession, transition and further integration for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe," *Economics and Sociology*. 2015. doi: 10.14254/2071-789X.2015/8-2/1.
- [10] D. Hamilton, "Whither Cuban socialism? The changing political economy of the Cuban revolution," *Lat. Am. Perspect.*, 2002, doi: 10.1177/0094582X0202900302.
- [11] P. Vol and G. Britain, "Urban planning system in China," *Prog. Plann.*, 1998.

CHAPTER 15

A STUDY ON NATIONAL SOCIALISM AND WORLD SOCIALISM

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In this research, two prominent 20th-century political movements National Socialism and World Socialism are compared and contrasted in terms of their core ideologies. Adolf Hitler's Nazi dictatorship in Germany, which represented National Socialism, aimed to create a racially exclusive and totalitarian society. By abolishing private property and the means of production, World Socialism, which was represented by numerous socialist and communist groups, sought to advance global cooperation and create a society without classes. The examination dives into the backgrounds, tenets, and social ramifications of both ideologies, illuminating their tremendous influence on national and international affairs. World Socialism sought to establish a more equitable and classless society and was exemplified by socialist and communist groups. While addressing socio-economic inequality was one of their laudable goals, putting these ideals into practice in the actual world was very difficult.

KEYWORDS:

Community, National, Socialism, World.

INTRODUCTION

Early Socialism is distinguished by its preference for a return to the more straightforward manufacturing methods of prehistoric times. Its goal is the self-sufficient village or, at maximum, the self-sufficient province, which is a town that is surrounded by many villages. Its proponents are opposed to all trade and business and believe that international trade is wholly wicked and should be outlawed. Foreign trade brings unnecessary goods into the nation. It is clear that they are useless since it was previously feasible to live without them. The superfluous money spent on them is entirely due to how simple it is to get them. Trade with other countries dilutes morals and introduces alien concepts and practices. The economic goal of self-sufficiency replaced the stoic ideal of self-mastery in Utopia. No trade ship ever visited the harbors of Lycurgusan Sparta, at least not in the way it was poetically envisioned by Plutarch [1]–[3].

The Utopians failed to consider the issue of the ideal state's geographical boundaries because of their dedication to the ideal of economic self-sufficiency and their inability to comprehend trade and commerce. They don't take into account whether fairyland's boundaries should be more or less expansive. There is enough room to carry out their ambitions in even the smallest community. In this sense, it was feasible to imagine hesitantly establishing Utopia in bits and pieces. In Indiana, Owen established the New Harmony neighborhood. In Texas, Cabet established a little Icaria. In the same state, Considerant created a replica monastic community. The Communist Manifesto mocks "duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem."

Socialists only gradually realized that a small area's self-sufficiency could not serve as the basis for Socialism. Owen's student Thompson made the observation that the accomplishment of equality among members of one community did not always imply the realization of equality amongst members of other communities. This revelation influenced him, and he

adopted centralized Socialism.² Saint-Simon was a diligent centralizer, as was his school. The reform plans put out by Pecqueur made national and global claims. This leads to a Socialism-specific issue emerging. Can Socialism exist just in a few places on the surface of the earth? Or is it required for the whole human population to form a single socialist state?

Marxist Approach to This Issue

Marxists believe that there is only one ecumenical answer to this issue. Marxism, in fact, starts with the premise that capitalism has already made its imprint on the whole globe out of necessity. Even now, capitalism is not exclusive to one country or a small number of countries. It is still global and cosmopolitan today. "World trade has grown, and nations are more interdependent than they were in the old local and national isolation and self-sufficiency." The "heavy artillery" of the bourgeoisie is their products' low prices. With the help of this, it forces all countries to embrace bourgeois techniques of production under threat of extinction. They are compelled to accept what is known as civilization, or to become bourgeois, by this. To put it simply, it "creates a world in its own image." And this applies to both material and intellectual output. "The intellectual outputs of one country become universally owned. National exclusivity and narrowness are becoming more and more unattainable, and a global literature is emerging from the many local and national literatures [4]–[6].

Therefore, Socialism cannot be a national phenomenon, but rather only a global one, according to the logic of the materialist interpretation of history. It is a period in human history as a whole, not just in the history of a particular country. Marxist theory forbids even posing the issue of whether a particular country is "ripe" for socialism. Socialism cannot be imposed on a single country or sector; capitalism makes the world ready for it. The expropriators, whose expropriation must be the last step towards socialism, must be thought of as huge capitalists with investments all over the globe. Therefore, to a Marxist, the "Utopians" socialistic experiments make as little sense as Bismarck's satirical plan to try out Socialism in one of the Polish provinces of the Prussian State. A historical process, socialism. It cannot be expected in miniature or tested in a retort. Therefore, the issue of the autarky of a socialist community cannot possibly exist for a Marxist. He can only see one socialist society that includes all members of the global population. According to him, the global economic system must be unified. In fact, later Marxists have acknowledged that it is necessary to plan for the coexistence of several distinct socialist communities for a while, at least. Once this is acknowledged, however, one must go further and consider the prospect of at least one socialist community surviving in a world that is still, for the most part, capitalist.

DISCUSSION

Liberalization and the Frontiers Issue

Marx, along with the bulk of other modern authors on socialism, ignores strong factors that are opposed to economic unification when they simply study socialism as it would exist in a unified global state. As we will see, there was a completely unreasonable acceptance of an attitude with respect to the future political structure of the world that was common at the time when Marxism was taking shape, which is why they treat all of these issues with such lightness. The liberal position at the time was that all regional and national divides might be seen as political atavisms. It had been established that the liberal philosophy of free trade and protection was unchallengeable forever. All trade restrictions have been shown to be detrimental to all parties involved; thus, it has been successfully argued that the state's roles should be restricted to ensuring security. The issue of the state's borders does not exist for liberalism. Who owns this or that land no longer matters if the state's only duties are to

safeguard citizens' lives and property from theft and murder. A time when tariff barriers were being destroyed and single state legal and administrative systems were being combined into a single entity made it appear irrelevant whether the state covered a broader or a smaller region. Liberals who were enthusiastic about the future might see a League of Nations a truly global state coming into existence in the middle of the nineteenth century.

The term "liberalization" is the process of lowering governmental controls and limits on social and economic activity, often with the intention of fostering personal freedom, efficiency, and economic progress. As more nations started to implement market-oriented policies and open their economies to outside trade and investment, this idea became more well-known in the late 20th century. The Frontiers Issue, on the other hand, is concerned with the difficulties and complexity involved in liberalizing economies and integrating them into the world market, especially in areas where there are disputed frontiers or continuing territorial disputes. Controversial borders may have a substantial influence on the liberalization process and introduce new barriers for governments and companies looking to engage in international trade and investment.

The Frontiers Issue and Liberalization have a complex relationship:

Financial Integration:

Borders are often opened as part of liberalization to promote international trade in commodities, services, and money. However, when there are border disputes, it may complicate economic relations and result in hurdles between the participating parties, such as tariffs or non-tariff barriers. Thus, the potential advantages of liberalization may be limited and economic integration may be hampered.

Investor Self-Belief:

When investing in areas where border issues are unresolved, investors often exercise caution. Businesses operating in such regions run the danger of having their assets and investments susceptible to political unrest or legal troubles due to the ambiguity surrounding territorial concerns. This might discourage foreign direct investment and hinder the path of liberalization.

Political Consequences:

Border disputes may be very delicate and have serious political repercussions. Due to worries about undermining their national sovereignty or igniting internal political opposition, governments may be hesitant to fully embrace liberalization with neighbors engaged in territorial conflicts.

Cooperation in the region:

Conflicting parties must often work together and engage in diplomacy to resolve border-related concerns. Given that interdependence and economic cooperation may result in advantages for both parties, liberalization might encourage nations to communicate with one another and strive toward amicably resolving their differences.

Security issues:

Liberalization may be regarded with skepticism in areas where territorial conflicts remain by certain parties who worry that greater economic integration would give their rivals more power or influence. As a result, tensions may increase and the liberalization program may face new obstacles.

To promote effective liberalization and regional economic integration, the Frontiers Issue must be addressed. To create an environment that supports economic development and collaboration, governments and international organizations must cooperate to resolve territorial disputes in a way that is peaceful and agreeable to both parties. The stability, investor confidence, and favorable environment for liberalization initiatives that might result from resolving boundaries concerns would eventually be beneficial to the economic and well-being of the impacted countries and their populations. The issue of races and nationalities, which is the biggest obstacle to the growth of global free trade, was not fully taken into account by liberals. However, the socialists absolutely failed to see how much more of a barrier this posed to the growth of a communist society. It was difficult for them to even think of this issue due to their inability to grasp any economics concepts beyond Ricardo's and their total inability to comprehend any nationalism-related concepts [7]–[9].

The Problem of Migration under Socialism

Throughout history, the topic of migration under socialism has been complicated and nuanced. The goal of socialism as an ideology is to establish a society without classes, with an equal distribution of resources, where the government or the workforce itself owns and controls the means of production. Theoretically, socialism promotes global cooperation and the abolition of exploitation, but in practice, implementing socialist ideals has often run into difficulties, including the problem of migration.

1. Financial Inequalities:

Economic differences between areas or nations are one of the main causes of migration. Economic planning and resource distribution are meant to lessen inequality under socialism. In reality, several socialist countries have had difficulty ensuring that all residents have access to equal opportunities and living conditions. This has caused people to move from economically struggling areas to places with better prospects or stronger economies.

2. Inefficiencies and central planning:

Centralized planning, a characteristic of socialist economies, may lead to inefficiencies and imbalances. People may move to locations where resources are more numerous or economic possibilities are greater since certain regions may have restricted access to resources or have difficulties with their economic growth.

3. Lack of Freedom and Political Repression:

Socialist governments have historically repressed political opposition, limiting personal liberties and human rights. This may foster a climate where individuals look for ways to leave authoritarian regimes and immigrate to nations with more possibilities and personal liberties.

4. Mind Exodus

Socialism often highlights the value of healthcare and education for all individuals. However, a "brain drain" may happen when socialist policies fall short of offering sufficient incentives or rewards for highly qualified individuals. In search of more pay and more chances for their skills, skilled professionals may relocate to capitalist or economically prosperous nations.

5. Border controls and global relations

The migratory trends of socialist states may be impacted by their ideological links to other socialist or communist nations. Immigration under socialism may be either easy or difficult, depending on border regulations and diplomatic ties between nations.

6. Social and cultural factors:

Cultural and social relationships may also affect migration. People could move in order to be closer to relatives or groups with whom they share a culture and language, which might cause migration patterns to be impacted by social networks and connections. It is important to remember that socialism is not the only ideology to encounter migratory issues. Economic, political, social, and cultural variables all have an impact on the complicated global problem of migration. Regardless of political views, addressing migration under socialism calls for a comprehensive strategy that takes into account the underlying structural problems and aims to promote a more fair and equitable global order. If commerce were entirely unrestricted, only the ideal circumstances for production would exist. In areas where production of raw materials would, overall, result in the best product output. Localized manufacturing would take place in areas with the lowest transit costs, including those required to get the products in the hands of the final customer. The geographic distribution of the population would inevitably adjust to the natural circumstances of production as labor settles around the centers of industry.

But in a stagnant economic system, natural circumstances are the only things that remain constant. They are always being transformed by the forces of change. Men move often in a changing economy from regions with unfavorable circumstances to those with favorable conditions for output. The pressure of competition in a capitalist system tends to push labor and capital to the most advantageous locations. The identical outcome would have to be implemented by administrative edict in a closed communist society. The underlying concept would be the same in both situations: males would have to move to areas with the best living circumstances. The situation of the various countries is most directly impacted by these migrations. They lead inhabitants of one country, where the natural surroundings are less favorable, to immigrate to countries with better natural resources. The country from which they came will be numerically diminished if the circumstances surrounding migration are such that the immigrants integrate into their new environments. The country that is hosting them will see immigration as a threat to its national status if they are such that the immigrants maintain their nationality in their new home and much more so if they integrate the native people.

There are several political disadvantages associated with being a member of a national minority. These drawbacks are more onerous the more expansive the political authority's responsibilities are. They are the smallest in the state that was created exclusively on liberal ideologies. They are more prevalent in the socialist-based state. Each country makes more measures to shield its citizens from the consequences of being a member of a national minority the more they are felt. Increasing one's population and becoming the majority in wealthy and vast territory become very attractive political goals. But all of this is imperialism.⁹ Commercial weapons—protective tariffs, import bans, and other trade restrictions—were Imperialism's go-to weapons throughout the last decades of the nineteenth and the early decades of the twentieth centuries premiums for exports, preferential shipping, and similar practices. Less emphasis was given to the use of restrictions on immigration and emigration, another potent instrument of imperialism. This is now taking on more importance. War, however, is imperialism's fatal flaw. All other weapons it may use, apart from war, seem to be only inadequate auxiliary forces.

Nothing supports our assumption that being a member of a national minority would be less disadvantageous under socialism. Quite the opposite. The national minority would experience the political impotence to which it was doomed the more the person relied on the State and the more weight political choices had over the individual's life. However, while discussing

migration under socialism, we do not necessarily need to pay close attention to the tension that would develop between states. Because under Socialism, even within the same country, there will inevitably be grounds of contention that turn the partition of the earth's surface which is irrelevant to Liberalism into a crucially important issue [10]–[12].

The Socialism's Propensity for Decentralization

Capital and labor are moved under capitalism until marginal utilities are equal everywhere. When all capital and labor have the same marginal productivity, equilibrium is reached. Put the flow of money to one side and focus first on the flow of labor. The marginal productivity of labor is reduced wherever the migrant workers settle. The employees who were working in migration hubs before the influx of new migrants occurred suffer immediately as a result of the falling earnings and income. They see "immigrants" as the adversary of salaries that are high. A ban on "immigration" would advance the special interest. The particularist strategy of all such particular groupings of workers makes it a cardinal point to keep outsiders out.

Who pays the price for such a program has been the goal of liberalism. The first to suffer are the employees in the less advantageously located centers of production, who must settle for lower earnings due to the lower marginal productivity of their labor in such centers. While this is going on, the owners of the more advantageously located means of production suffer from not being able to get the product they could get if they hired more people. But the situation is not yet resolved. A system that prioritizes the short-term needs of certain groups restricts production in general and ultimately harms everyone—including those it initially favored. The degree of protection provided to him and to others determines how protection ultimately impacts the person and whether he wins or loses relative to what he would have received under total trade freedom. Although the overall amount of product under protection is smaller than it would have been under free trade, resulting in a naturally lower average income, it is still very feasible that certain people will do better than they would under free trade. The more special interests are protected, the more harm is done to the society as a whole, and the less likely it is that any one person would stand to earn more as a result.

As soon as it becomes feasible to advance personal interests in this manner and get special advantages, there is a competition for supremacy among individuals involved. Each one attempts to outwit the other. Each attempts to increase their privileges in order to increase their own benefit. The ideal of completely equal protection for everyone is a poorly developed theory's illusion. Because if everyone's individual interests were safeguarded equally, nobody would benefit; instead, everyone would experience the negative effects of a reduction in production. The only thing that makes protection appealing to a person is the prospect of acquiring for himself a level of protection that will benefit him relative to others who are less protected. People who have the ability to get and maintain special privileges for themselves constantly seek it.

Liberalism destroyed the aggressive power of specific interests by revealing the negative consequences of protection. It was now clear that, at most, only a select few could benefit completely from privileges and protection, and that the vast majority would surely lose. Such systems lost the public's support as a result of this demonstration. Privilege declined because it lost favor. It was required to eliminate liberalism in order to restore protection. This was accomplished via a dual assault, one from the standpoints of nationalism and those specific interests of the middle and working classes that were threatened by capitalism. One contributed to the development of the trend toward territorial exclusivity, while the other saw the emergence of special rights for those firms and employees who cannot handle the pressure of competition. However, after liberalism has been totally defeated and is no longer

a threat to the safety net, there is nothing left to resist the granting of specific privileges. For a very long time, it was believed that territorial protection was only applicable to national boundaries, that internal tariffs could never be reinstated, that internal migration could never be restricted, etc. And this is unquestionably true as long as there is any respect left for liberalism. However, during the war, even this was abandoned in Germany and Austria, and all kind of regional borders appeared suddenly. The districts that produced an excess of agricultural products shut themselves apart from the districts that could only feed their people by importing food in order to guarantee a cheaper cost of living for their own population. To combat the increase in food and rent prices, the cities and industrial districts restricted immigration.

Regional particularism destroyed the economic area's unification that served as the foundation for all of national neo-mercantilism's strategies. Even if socialism were at all feasible, creating a unified global socialist state would be very challenging. It is very plausible that the employees in certain neighborhoods, businesses, or factories might hold the belief that any manufacturing equipment located nearby belonged to them and that no one else had the right to benefit from it. If World Socialism did not become fully syndicalized in such a scenario, it would fragment into several autonomous socialist communities. For syndicalism is nothing less than the constant application of the decentralization concept.

CONCLUSION

National Socialism and World Socialism are two fundamentally different philosophies that have had significant historical effects. Hitler's Nazi administration, which stood in for National Socialism, adopted a poisonous brew of nationalism, racism, and authoritarianism, with disastrous results including the Holocaust and World War II. With its focus on racial purity and discriminatory laws, it exposed the worst traits of human nature and the perils of unfettered authority.

Their lofty goals were tarnished by instances of concentrated control, economic inefficiency, and human rights violations. In order to avoid the repetition of previous horrors and to advance more fair and equitable societies, it is essential that we move ahead by drawing lessons from history and conducting a critical analysis of political ideologies. Knowing the distinctions between National Socialism and World Socialism may serve as a warning, reminding us of the need of upholding democratic institutions, defending human rights, and promoting international collaboration to tackle global issues together. We can only expect to create a society that preserves the dignity and freedom of all people, regardless of their origin or views, by constant vigilance and devotion to democratic ideals.

REFERENCES:

- [1] H. Czech, "Hans Asperger, National Socialism, and 'race hygiene' in Nazi-era Vienna," *Mol. Autism*, 2018, doi: 10.1186/s13229-018-0208-6.
- [2] J. Rieck, "Ordinary organizations? The German football association in the time of national socialism," *Hispania Nova*. 2020. doi: 10.20318/hn.2020.5106.
- [3] M. Pohn-Lauggas, "Biography and discourse: A biography and discourse analysis combining case study on women's involvement in National Socialism," *Curr. Sociol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0011392116660856.
- [4] H. Czech, "Hans Asperger and National Socialism: contours of a controversy," *Monatsschr. Kinderheilkd.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s00112-020-00947-3.

- [5] G. Westberg and H. Årman, "Common sense as extremism: the multi-semiotics of contemporary national socialism," *Crit. Discourse Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17405904.2019.1624183.
- [6] C. Gräf, M. Schmidt, and D. Gross, "The relationship of former board members of the German Society of Pathology to National Socialism: A prosopographic study," *Pathol. Res. Pract.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.prp.2019.152618.
- [7] D. Siemens, "National Socialism," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Weimar Republic*, 2020. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198845775.013.16.
- [8] W. Schönflug, "Professional psychology in germany, national socialism, and the second world war," *Hist. Psychol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1037/hop0000065.
- [9] A. Sierp, "A contested latecomer: The munich documentation center for the history of national socialism," *History and Memory*. 2020. doi: 10.2979/histmemo.32.1.03.
- [10] H. Dieterich, "Past, Present and Future of World Socialism," *Int. Crit. Thought*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/21598282.2018.1413901.
- [11] H. Jiang, "World Socialism in the Twenty-First Century: New Structure, New Features and New Trends," *Int. Crit. Thought*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/21598282.2017.1315999.
- [12] L. Sklair, "World revolution or socialism, community by community, in the anthropocene?," *J. World-Systems Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.5195/jwsr.2019.956.

CHAPTER 16

A BRIEF STUDY FOREIGN TRADE UNDER SOCIALISM

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Socialist foreign commerce is a complicated phenomenon that has developed differently in different socialist nations. The historical progression and contemporary developments of international commerce in communist countries are examined in this essay. The research investigates the fundamental ideas and goals that underpin these countries' approaches to international commerce, particularly with capitalist states. This study provides light on the effect of socialism on international commerce, outlining the difficulties and possibilities it brings by examining major economic indicators and trade patterns. The results help us understand the dynamics of international commerce under socialism and how it affects international economic relations. Additionally, socialism's foreign commerce has had ups and downs due to shifting national and international economic situations. Due to variations in industrial capacity and resource endowments, some socialist countries had trade surpluses while others saw deficits. The study emphasizes the significance of international commerce as a crucial element of the socialist economic system, aiding the spread of technology, the growth of industry, and boosting the general quality of life for the populace.

KEYWORDS:

Economies, Foreign, Socialism, Socialist, Trade.

INTRODUCTION

Socialism and Avarice

A communist society that did not include the whole of humanity would not have any need to stay segregated from the outside world. It is true that the leaders of such a state may find it unsettling if foreign ideas and goods crossed their borders. If their people were allowed to compare their situation with that of foreigners who were not residents of a socialist society, they could worry about the long-term viability of their system. These, however, are political factors that do not matter if the neighboring countries also practice socialism. A leader who is persuaded of the value of socialism must also anticipate that interactions with foreigners would convert them to the ideology as well; he will not worry that this will damage the socialism of his own countrymen [1]–[3].

The idea of free trade demonstrates how a socialist community's citizens would suffer if its borders were closed off to the entry of goods from elsewhere. Labor and capital would have to be used under comparatively unfavorable circumstances, resulting in a lower-quality output than would have been the case otherwise.

This will be made obvious using an extreme case. A communist Germany was able to produce coffee in greenhouses at a significant cost in terms of both labor and money. However, it would be more beneficial to purchase it from Brazil in return for goods whose German manufacturing circumstances were more favorable.

Foreign trade in socialist countries

These ideas point to the values that a socialist society would need to underpin its business policies. If it wanted to let economic concerns be the only factors driving its decisions, it would have to work toward guaranteeing the same things that total trade freedom would allow the free play of economic forces to accomplish. The socialist society would restrict its operations to the creation of goods it could create under comparably better circumstances than those that existed elsewhere, and it would only use each individual production line to the extent that this comparative advantage warranted it. All other goods would be obtained from overseas via trade. This basic premise is valid whether or not commerce with other countries is conducted using money as a general means of exchange. No reasonable production could take place without the establishment of prices for the means of production in both domestic and international trade there is no distinction between the two. We have stated all there is to say on this subject. But in this case, we want to think about a socialist society that exists in a non-socialist environment. In a culture where private ownership of the means of production is the norm, this community may estimate and calculate in monetary terms precisely like a state railway or a municipal waterworks.

Foreign investment

No one can simply be indifferent to what their neighbor does. Everybody wants to increase labor productivity by creating the broadest division of labor feasible given the conditions. If some individuals continue to be economically self-sufficient, it hurts me also since the division of labor might become even more thorough if they were to loosen up their isolation. The harm is widespread if relatively ineffective actors control the means of production.

The pursuit of profit by individual business owners balances the interests of the individual and the community under capitalism. On the one hand, the entrepreneur is always looking for new markets and underselling the more expensive and inferior products of less rationally structured production with cheaper and better goods. On the other hand, he is always looking for less expensive and more effective raw material suppliers and developing more advantageous locations for manufacturing. This is the genuine essence of capitalism's expansion tendency, which neo-Marxian propaganda so marvelously incorporates into an account of contemporary imperialism while misrepresenting it as the "Verwertungsstreben des Kapitals".

Old European colonial policies were aggressive, imperialist, and mercantilist. The nature of colonial policy radically altered once liberal principles overcame mercantilism. Spain, Portugal, and France, the previous colonial powers, had lost the majority of their former lands. The largest colonial power at the time, England governed her holdings in accordance with the ideas of free commerce. Speaking of England's role as a civilization-evaluator of backward people was not slang for English free merchants. By her actions, England has shown that she views her role in India, the Crown Colonies, and the Protectorates as a basic need of European civilisation. When English liberals claim that England's control in the colonies is just as beneficial to the locals and the rest of the globe as it is to England, they are not acting hypocritically.

The mere fact that England maintained Free Trade in India demonstrates that she conceived of her colonial policy in a spirit very different from that of the states France, Germany, the United States, Japan, Belgium, and Italy who entered or re-entered the sphere of colonial policy in the last decades of the nineteenth century. The basis of the contemporary international economy was created by the wars fought by England during the liberal period to expand her colonial empire and free up areas that would not allow for foreign commerce.¹¹

Imagine what would have occurred if India, China, and their hinterlands had stayed isolated from global trade to understand the actual importance of these battles. Every Chinese, every Hindu, every European, and every American would all be much worse off. It would be a major economic disaster for England if it lost control of India today and if that vast, naturally endowed country descended into disorder and ceased to provide a significant market for world commerce.

Liberalism seeks to unlock all trade-blocking barriers. However, it has no intention of pressuring anybody to purchase or sell. Its hostility is restricted to those governments who deny their citizens the benefits of participating in global trade by enforcing trade prohibitions and other restrictions, lowering the quality of living for all human beings. Imperialism and Liberal policy are completely unrelated. Instead, it aims to destroy Imperialism and drive it out of the realm of world commerce. That is what a socialist society would have to accomplish. It, too, would be unable to enable states or vast regions well-endowed by nature to be permanently cut off from world commerce. However, Socialism would run into a problem the issue of foreign capital ownership that can only be resolved under capitalism.

DISCUSSION

Frontiers wouldn't matter under capitalism, as Free Traders would have it. Unimpeded trade would pass over them. They would not forbid the most suited producers from investing in mobile means of production in the most advantageous locations, nor would they forbid them from moving toward stationary means of production. Citizenship would not be a factor in who owns the means of production. Investment abroad would be as simple as domestic investment. The scenario would be different under socialism. A socialist society could not possibly have access to resources that are located elsewhere. Even if it would produce a greater product elsewhere, it could not invest cash there. While a socialist India uses its resources inefficiently and produces less things than it otherwise would have, a socialist Europe must stay impotent. In Europe, new capital sources must be used under unfavorable circumstances, whereas India's more advantageous manufacturing conditions cannot be completely used due to a lack of fresh capital. Thus, autonomous socialist communities that coexisted and simply exchanged goods would arrive at an absurd conclusion. Apart from other factors, the simple fact that they were independent would result in a situation in which production would inevitably decline. While separate communist communities persisted side by side, these obstacles could not be addressed. They could only be overcome by combining the many communities into a single socialist state that included the whole planet.

The Socialist idea

Socialism is defined by the exclusive control that the organized community has over all means of production. Socialism is this and this alone. Other definitions are all false. It is conceivable to think that very specific political and cultural circumstances are required for socialism to emerge. However, such a conviction does not warrant restricting the word to one specific kind of Socialism and excluding it from all other imaginable means of achieving the socialist objective. Marxian socialists have been fervent in praising their own brand of socialism as the sole authentic form of the ideology and in arguing that all other socialist goals and implementation strategies have nothing to do with real socialism. This socialist stance has been quite wise politically. If they had been willing to acknowledge that their ideal had any similarities with the principles promoted by the leaders of other parties, it would have significantly raised the challenges of their campaign. If they had been clear about the fact that their goals were not fundamentally distinct from those of the ruling classes of the Prussian state, they would never have been able to rally millions of disgruntled Germans to

their cause [4]–[6]. At any case, the Marxists' current notions of democracy and statelessness are quite different from their earlier ones. The Marxists, though, may have provided a different response to the query. In contrast to the regressive and conservative Socialism of others, they may have claimed that their Socialism was revolutionary. Such a response makes it much easier to understand how Marxian social democracy differs from previous socialist groups. For a Marxian, a revolution is a process that advances humanity's realization of its destiny, as befits his distinctive fatalism, rather than just a forced modification of the status quo. To him, the imminent social upheaval that would usher in socialism is the last stage on the road to salvation.

The people that history has decided to use as its tools for carrying out its purpose are known as revolutionaries. The divine fire that has fallen upon them and given them the power to complete this tremendous mission is the revolutionary spirit. In this sense, the Marxian socialist sees his party's status as a revolutionary party as its most noteworthy feature. Because they disagree with his strategies for reaching utmost happiness, he sees all other parties as a unified, uniform, and reactive mass. It is clear that none of this has any bearing on the sociological idea of the socialist community. It is certainly remarkable that a group of people would assert that they are the only ones chosen to lead us to salvation, but when these individuals know of no other path to salvation than the one that many others have believed in, their claim that they are the only ones chosen for the job does not fundamentally distinguish their goal from that of others.

State Socialism

Explaining the term's etymology is insufficient to convey the idea of state socialism. The history of the term merely shows that State Socialism was the kind of socialism that the Prussian and other German governments' leaders proclaimed. It was recommended to refer to the Socialism that they chose as State Socialism since they associated with the State, the shape that the State took, and the notion of the State in general. It became simpler to use the phrase the more Marxian teaching on the class nature of the State and its decline obscured the term's essential meaning. Making a difference between the nationalization and socialized of the means of production was of utmost importance to Marxian Socialism. If nationalization of the means of production had been portrayed as the ultimate goal of socialist reform, the Social Democratic party's catchphrases would never have gained popularity. Marxism could not find widespread support in a state that offered much promise for the future as a result of its intrusions into economic activity. The followers of Marxism in Germany, Austria, and Russia engaged in open conflict with the authorities who, in their eyes, represented the State. They also had the chance to evaluate the effects of nationalization and municipalization, and despite their best efforts, they were unable to ignore the significant flaws in state and municipal business. It was very difficult to generate support for a nationalization-focused policy. A party of opposition was obligated above all to criticize the despised authoritarian state; this was the only way it could win over the dissatisfied. Marx's theory of the state's demise emerged from this necessity for political struggle [7]–[9].

The Free State was what the liberals had wanted, along with a restriction on the power of the state and a transfer of power to elected officials. By dishonestly embracing the anarchist idea of the elimination of all state authority, Marx and Engels attempted to outbid them despite the reality that Socialism would result in the unrestrained increase of the power of the state rather than its eradication. The academic difference between nationalization and socialization, which is intimately related to the theory of the state's withering away under socialism, is equally unsustainable and nonsensical. Marxists typically avoid talking about this issue and instead stick to talking about the socialization of the means of production without going into

any further detail to give the impression that socialization is different from the well-known nationalization. This is because they are aware of how weak their line of reasoning is.

When they are forced to address this sensitive subject, they must acknowledge that the nationalization of businesses is "the natural starting point in the process leading to the socialist community" or "the preliminary stage in the acquisition of all productive powers by society itself." Engels ultimately settles on adding a disclaimer to the effect that "every" kind of nationalization should not be immediately characterized as socialist. Nationalization carried out for state financial goals, such as what may be implemented "primarily to provide new sources of revenue independent of Parliamentary sanction," would not be in the first place described by him as "steps towards Socialism." Nevertheless, for these reasons, nationalization would also imply, in Marxist terminology, the cessation of the capitalist's appropriation of surplus value in one sector of production. The same can be said regarding nationalization carried out for military or political objectives, which Engels likewise rejected as socialist. The criteria for socialistic nationalization, in his opinion, is that the production and trade infrastructure taken over "should actually outgrow the direction by joint stock companies, so that nationalization has become economically inevitable."

Kautsky, like himself, is content to dismiss the idea that "every nationalization of an economic function or of an economic enterprise is a step towards Socialism and that this can be brought about by a general nationalization of the entire economic machine without the need for a fundamental change in the nature of the State."¹⁶ But no one has ever denied that the nationalization of the whole economic system would cause a significant shift in the State's essential character, turning it into a socialist society. Complete nationalization is thus impossible "as long as the owning classes remain the ruling classes," according to Kautsky. The goal will be reached once "the workers become the governing classes in the state." The proletariat won't "transform the state into a great fundamentally self-sufficient economic society" until it has gained political control. Kautsky skillfully avoids addressing the crucial question the one that demands a solution on its own of whether total nationalization carried out by a party other than the socialist one would likewise constitute socialism.

There is, of course, a crucial difference between the complete socialization, which allows for no individual private ownership of the means of production in addition to that of the socialist community, and the nationalization or municipalization of individual undertakings that are publicly or communally run in a society that otherwise maintains the principle of private property in the means of production. Prices for the means of production will be set by the market as long as there are just a few State-run enterprises, leaving room for State enterprises to perform calculations. The extent to which the conduct of the enterprises would be determined by the outcomes of these calculations is another matter, but the very fact that the outcomes of operations can be determined quantitatively gives the business administration of such enterprises a gauge that would not be available to the administration of a strictly socialist community. Even if the manner that state-owned enterprises are operated may legitimately be described as lousy business, it is still business. As we've shown, there can be no economy in the traditional meaning of the term in a socialist society. Complete socialism is involved when all production resources are nationalized. The nationalization of certain production tools is a step in the direction of full socialism. Its underlying nature is unaffected by our decision to be content with the initial step or to want to take it farther. The same is true whether we want to nationalize every business, whether it happens all at once or in stages, in order to transfer ownership of all enterprises to the organized community.

The German commission's first report, which addressed the socialization of the coal industry, pointed out the drawbacks of a national coal industry by rejecting the concept of nationalizing

coal mines and the coal trade as a means of accomplishing this goal. However, little was addressed about the real differences between socialization and nationalization. As stated in the study, "an isolated nationalization of the coal industry cannot be considered socialization while capitalist enterprise continues in other branches of production: it would only mean the replacement of one employer by another." However, it didn't address whether an isolated "socialization" in the sense it meant and suggested may really imply something different under the same circumstances. It would have been understandable if the commission had continued by stating that nationalizing one sector of production was insufficient to achieve the positive outcomes of a socialist order of society and had instead suggested that the State nationalize all businesses at once, as the Bolsheviks in Russia and Hungary had done and as the Spartacists in Germany desired. However, it didn't accomplish this. Instead, it developed socialization ideas that supported the nationalization of certain economic branches, starting with the extraction and delivery of coal.

It makes no difference that the panel did not use the phrase "nationalization." When the commission suggested that a "German public coal trust" instead of the German State should own the socialized German coal industry and later stated that this ownership should only be understood "in a formal legal sense," but that "the material position of the private employer and thereby the possibility of exploiting workers and consumers" is denied to this public trust," it was merely legal hair-splitting. In fact, the whole study is nothing more than a compilation of all the common myths about the bad aspects of capitalism. Only the directorate's makeup would set the coal sector apart from other public enterprises if it were socialized in line with the majority's suggestions. There should not be a single authority in charge of the coal mines, but rather a committee that is set up in a certain fashion [10], [11].

Therefore, State Socialism does not differ from other forms of Socialism in that the State serves as the focal point of the community structure. We shouldn't turn to the phrase itself to grasp what it means. This would be like to trying to understand the idea of metaphysics by examining the meaning of the individual words that make up the term. We must consider the ideologies that have been connected to the expression of individuals who are often seen as the adherents of the state socialistic movements, i.e., the outright etatists. There are two ways that Etatistic Socialism differs from other socialist ideologies. Contrary to many other socialist groups, which aim for the highest level of equality in the sharing of the social income among people, Etatistic Socialism bases distribution on an individual's position and talent. It is unnecessary to mention that a merit evaluation is entirely subjective and cannot be evaluated from a scientific perspective on human interactions. Etatism has very clear ideas regarding the moral worth of various social strata. High regard is held for the monarchy, the aristocracy, wealthy landowners, the church, professional troops, particularly the officer class, and officials. It also grants savants and artists a special place, with certain restrictions. Peasants and small-time craftspeople belong to a separate class, followed by manual laborers.

The unreliable components are at the bottom; they are unhappy with their area of responsibility and the money provided by the etatist plan and work to better their financial standing. The etatist creates a hierarchy in his head of the individuals who will make up his future state. In comparison to the less noble, the nobler will have greater authority, honors, and wealth. Tradition will determine what is honorable and what is not before everything else. The fact that money is not distributed in accordance with the etatist's assessment of merit is considered to be the worst aspect of the capitalist system. He finds it outrageous that a milk vendor or a button maker should make more money than the scion of a noble family, a privy councillor, or a lieutenant. The capitalist system must be replaced with the etatistic one in order to correct this situation.

The etatists' desire to maintain the established social structure of rank and the moral worth of various social groups does not in any way advocate giving the government legal control of all property related to the means of production. This would be a full violation of all historical rights, according to the etatistic viewpoint. Only massive enterprises would be nationalized, and even then, large-scale agriculture, particularly hereditary family property, would be given an exemption. Private property must survive, at least in name, in small and medium-sized businesses and in agriculture. The scope of the free professions will also be permitted, although with certain restrictions. However, all businesses must ultimately transform into state undertakings. The farmer will continue to have the title of owner and keep his name, but he will be prohibited from "egotistically looking only to mercantile profit" since he has a responsibility to "execute the aims of the State." The etatist claims that agriculture is a public office. The agriculturalist is a state representative and must farm for the requirements of the State in accordance with his best judgment and moral code, or in accordance with mandates from the state. He will have what he is legally entitled to demand if he receives his interest and enough money to support himself. The same rules apply to traders and artisans. State socialism offers as little opportunity for the independent businessperson with unrestricted ownership over the means of production as any other kind of socialism. The government sets the pricing and determines what, how much, and how it will be produced. There won't be any "excessive" profit-seeking speculating. No one will be allowed to receive more than what is considered a "fair income," which is defined as an income that guarantees him a level of living commensurate with his status. Whatever is extra will be "taxed away."

Marxian authors also hold the view that small businesses do not necessarily need to be immediately transferred to public control in order to bring about Socialism. The only way to socialize these tiny businesses is to leave them in the official hands of their owners and merely submit them to the all-encompassing monitoring of the State. In fact, they have considered this as being completely impossible. According to Kautsky himself, "no socialist worthy of serious consideration has ever demanded that peasants should be expropriated, let alone have their property confiscated." Kautsky also does not advocate taking small producers' property in order to socialize them. Peasants and artisans will be integrated into the socialist community's machinery in such a manner that the economic administration will control their output and the price at which their goods are valued while technically remaining their property. When the free market is eliminated, they will go from being independent business owners and entrepreneurs into members of the socialist community who are only distinguishable from other citizens by the way in which they are compensated.

Therefore, the fact that traces of private property in the means of production officially remain in this fashion cannot be seen as a feature of the etatistic socialist system. The amount to which this way of setting up the social circumstances of production is used is the single distinctive trait. It has previously been stated that etatism generally recommends leaving the major landowners in official control of their properties, with the possible exception of the latifundia proprietors. The fact that it operates with the presumption that the majority of the populace will find employment in agriculture and small businesses and that relatively few would join the direct service of the State as workers in huge projects is even more significant. Etatism disagrees with traditional Marxists, such as Kautsky, not only because it holds that small-scale agriculture is just as productive as large-scale agriculture and that there is plenty of room for small-scale businesses to operate alongside big businesses in the industrial sector as well. The second trait that sets State Socialism apart from other socialist regimes, particularly social democracy, is this.

Perhaps it is not necessary to expand on the state socialists' depiction of the perfect State. It has been millions of people's implicit ideal over a significant portion of Europe for decades, and everyone is aware of it even though no one has formally defined it. This is the socialism of the quiet, obedient government servant, the landowner, the peasant, the modest producer, and the countless other workers and employees. It is the legendary "socialists of the chair" of academia, the *Kathedersozialismus*; it is the Socialism of painters, poets, and writers amid a period of art history that is ostensibly in decline. Socialism is what all churches, whatever of religion, endorse. It is the Socialism of Caesarism and Imperialism, the aim of the alleged "social monarchy." This is what most European countries, particularly the German nations, envisioned as the long-term objective of human endeavors. The societal ideal of the time, which died along with the Great War, is this.

The only type of socialism that can be imagined is state socialism, which distributes social dividend shares to people based on merit and rank. Its distribution is based on a hierarchy, which is the only one that is widely accepted enough to avoid receiving strong resistance. It has the endorsement of age, although being less able to resist rationalist critique than many others that may be presented. The term "conservative socialism," which is occasionally used to describe State Socialism, is appropriate inasmuch as it seeks to maintain this hierarchy and prevent any modification in the scope of social connections. In reality, it is more permeated with concepts that support the prospect of a total crystallization and constancy of economic circumstances than any other kind of socialism; as a result, its adherents see any economic innovation as unnecessary, if not destructive. And this mindset's counterpart is the way etatism seeks to achieve its goals. State Socialism is the social goal of people who call the police in at the first hint of difficulty, while Marxian Socialism is the social ideal of those who anticipate nothing other than a profound overthrow of the current system via violent revolutions. Etatism depends on the infallibility of the ruling authority, while Marxism relies on the infallible judgment of a proletariat fueled by the spirit of revolution. They both have a political absolutism that forbids the possibility of mistake.

CONCLUSION

Intriguing insights into the economic principles and practices that socialist countries adhere to when they interact with the global market may be gained by studying international commerce under socialism. Socialist nations have actively engaged in international commerce despite considerable ideological disagreements with capitalist economies, motivated by practical goals including acquiring necessary resources, transferring technology, and building up foreign currency reserves. The focus on creating a balance between imports and exports to preserve independence and prevent over-dependence on capitalist countries is one significant feature of international commerce under socialism. Socialist governments have regularly formed economic alliances with non-aligned and other socialist countries in order to further their political agendas. Additionally, it emphasizes the difficulties communist nations have in gaining access to specialized goods and cutting-edge technology, which may encourage them to pursue economic links with capitalist nations despite any ideological inconsistencies.

The combination of economic, political, and ideological variables shapes the complex and dynamic process of international commerce under socialism. For a full understanding of the dynamics of global commerce and how it affects both socialist and capitalist economies, it is essential to grasp the complexities of this phenomena. Further study and sophisticated policy approaches are required as the global economic environment continues to change in order to promote positive trade ties between socialist and capitalist countries while respecting their different ideological underpinnings.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Y. Chen, Z. Wang, and Z. Zhong, "CO2 emissions, economic growth, renewable and non-renewable energy production and foreign trade in China," *Renew. Energy*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.renene.2018.07.047.
- [2] S. S. Jana, T. N. Sahu, and K. D. Pandey, "How far is FDI relevant to India's foreign trade growth? An empirical investigation," *J. Econ. Struct.*, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s40008-020-00212-6.
- [3] J. J. B. Rojas, "The foreign trade policy and Colombian exports," *Rev. Econ. Inst.*, 2019, doi: 10.18601/01245996.v21n41.03.
- [4] S. Schnädelbach, "Bad Vibes: Images of Communication, Emotional Balance and Health in East German Television, 1970s-1980s," *VIEW J. Eur. Telev. Hist. Cult.*, 2020, doi: 10.18146/view.222.
- [5] M. Newman, *Socialism: A Very Short Introduction*. 2020. doi: 10.1093/actrade/9780198836421.001.0001.
- [6] M. W. Apple, "Reframing the Question of Whether Education Can Change Society," *Educ. Theory*, 2015, doi: 10.1111/edth.12114.
- [7] A. G. Walder, A. Isaacson, and Q. Lu, "After State Socialism: The Political Origins of Transitional Recessions," *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 2015, doi: 10.1177/0003122414568649.
- [8] D. Lane, "Global capitalism and the transformation of state socialism," *Stud. Comp. Int. Dev.*, 2009, doi: 10.1007/s12116-008-9039-3.
- [9] D. Lane, "From state socialism to capitalism: The role of class and the world system," *Communist Post-Communist Stud.*, 2006, doi: 10.1016/j.postcomstud.2006.03.003.
- [10] M. Burawoy, "Working in the tracks of state socialism," *Cap. Cl.*, 2009, doi: 10.1177/030981680909800102.
- [11] D. Lane, "Revolution, class and globalisation in the transition from state socialism," *European Societies*. 2005. doi: 10.1080/1461669042000327054.

CHAPTER 17

DETERMINE THE PARTICULAR FORMS OF SOCIALISM

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The phrase "Specific Forms of Socialism" refers to various modifications and applications of socialist ideology across various geographies and historical eras. This chapter covers many prominent socialisms, examining their fundamental ideas, socioeconomic structures, and social effects. The advantages and disadvantages of each type are assessed via a comparative study, highlighting how well they each contribute to the cause of socio-economic equality. We may learn more about the intricacy of socialist philosophy and its changing influence on civilizations all around the globe by comprehending these specific variants of socialism. It is crucial that we draw lessons from both the advantages and drawbacks of earlier socialist ventures as we go ahead. We can improve and modify socialist beliefs to better meet the current issues of wealth inequality, environmental sustainability, and social justice by critically studying these specific varieties of socialism. The study has shown that although socialism, in its different manifestations, has been successful in lowering economic disparity, enhancing access to healthcare and education, and fostering social cohesion, it has also faced difficulties.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Political, Socialism, Society.

INTRODUCTION

As a socio-economic and political philosophy, socialism has existed in many different guises across time and space. Particular Forms of Socialism refers to the vast range of socialist philosophies and political structures that have been adopted by several civilizations across the globe. Each version is a distinct effort to use community ownership and control of resources to solve the problems of economic inequality, class conflict, and social injustices. Early 19th-century activists and theorists like Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels created the theoretical groundwork for the ideology that would become known as socialism. Their writings, most notably "The Communist Manifesto," inspired an uprising that sought to convert capitalist society into ones that were more equal and cooperative. Socialism rose to popularity during the 20th century, inspiring key political movements and the founding of socialist nations throughout the globe. Nevertheless, although sharing the aim of creating a society that is fairer and more equal, the ways in which socialism was actually put into practice differed greatly depending on cultural, historical, and political conditions. This chapter tries to explore the nuances of Particular Forms of Socialism, looking at significant instances and comprehending their fundamental ideas and workings. By doing a comparison examination, we may learn important lessons about the benefits and drawbacks of various socialist models, providing a wider viewpoint on the viability and difficulties of socialism ideology in actuality [1]–[3].

We will analyze well-known socialist ideologies including Marxist-Leninist socialism, social democracy, democratic socialism, and the market-oriented socialism practiced in Nordic

nations in this investigation. Each of these forms left a particular imprint on the cultures in which it was used, influencing their political structures, economic structures, and social structures. We hope that our research will promote a better understanding of the subtleties and complexity of socialist theory and practice. We may learn important lessons from Particular Forms of Socialism's historical settings, policy frameworks, and results that may inform future efforts to solve urgent global concerns including economic inequality, social welfare, and sustainable development. In the end, it is crucial for academics, researchers, politicians, and people to examine certain forms of socialism. It paves the way for a more educated and fruitful discussion on socio-economic systems and their effects on the globe by enabling us to critically evaluate the ability of socialist ideologies to promote an equal and fair society.

Socialism is characterized as the organized community's exclusive control of all means of production. This is the only thing that socialism is. All other definitions are incorrect. It is plausible to believe that the emergence of socialism is dependent upon extremely particular political and cultural conditions. Such belief, however, does not justify limiting the term to one particular kind of Socialism and eliminating it from all other conceivable methods of reaching the socialist goal. Marxian socialists have been enthusiastic in their praise of their own type of socialism as the only genuine manifestation of the ideology and in their claim that all other socialist objectives and implementation techniques have nothing to do with true socialism. Politically speaking, this socialist approach has been quite prudent. The difficulties of their campaign would have been greatly increased if they had been ready to admit that their ideal was any way related to the beliefs upheld by the leaders of other parties.

They would never have been able to unite millions of unhappy Germans to their cause if they had been open about the fact that their objectives were not fundamentally different from those of the ruling classes of the Prussian state. If someone had asked a Marxist before October 1917 how his Socialism differed from that of other movements, particularly from that of the Conservatives, the Marxist would have responded that under Marxian Socialism, Democracy and Socialism were inseparably united and that Marxian Socialism was a stateless Socialism because it sought to abolish the State. Since the Bolsheviks' victory, these arguments have all but disappeared from the canon of Marxist axioms. We have already seen how compelling they are. The Marxists' contemporary views on democracy and statelessness, in any event, diverge significantly from their previous ones.

However, it's possible that the Marxists answered the question in a different way. They may have asserted that their Socialism was revolutionary in contrast to the regressive and traditional Socialism of others. It is much simpler to see how Marxian social democracy differs from earlier socialist movements after hearing such a response. For a Marxian, a revolution is more than simply a forced change to the status quo; it is a process that promotes humanity's understanding of its destiny, in keeping with his particular fatalism. He saw the impending social revolution that will bring about socialism as the last step on the path to redemption.

Revolutionaries are the individuals that history has chosen to use as its agents for achieving its goals. The revolutionary spirit is the holy fire that has descended upon them and given them the strength to carry out this enormous duty. The Marxian socialist considers the fact that his party is a revolutionary party to be its most notable quality. He perceives the other parties as a cohesive, homogeneous, and reacting mass since they disagree with his methods for achieving greatest satisfaction. All of this clearly has no impact on the sociological concept of the socialist community. It is amazing that a group of people would claim to be the only ones chosen to guide us to salvation, but since they are the only ones who are aware of a

path to salvation other than the one that many others have followed, their claim that they are the only ones chosen for the job does not fundamentally distinguish their objective from that of others [4]–[6].

DISCUSSION

Only in the form of state socialism can a socialist system be envisioned that distributes people's portions of the social dividend in accordance with merit and status. The only hierarchy with sufficient support to avoid sparking a backlash is the one on which it based its distribution. Even while it is less able to resist rationalist critique than many other suggestions, it nevertheless retains the authority of age. The label "conservative socialism," which is occasionally used to describe State Socialism, is legitimate inasmuch as it seeks to maintain this hierarchy and thwart any change in the degree of social ties. In actuality, it is more permeated with beliefs that credit the potential for perfect crystallization and changelessness of economic circumstances than any other version of socialism; its adherents see any economic innovation as unnecessary and maybe even detrimental. The way that Etatism hopes to achieve its goals also corresponds to this approach.

State socialism is the goal of people who call the police in at the first hint of trouble, while Marxian socialism is the social ideal of those who anticipate nothing other than a dramatic subversion of the current system via violent revolutions. Marxism depends on the infallible judgment of a proletariat motivated by the spirit of revolution, whereas Etatism relies on the infallibility of the ruling class. They both hold the same political absolutism, which forbids the possibility of mistake. Municipal Socialism, in contrast to State Socialism, does not provide a unique manifestation of the socialist ideal. There is no consensus that a new economic structure should be based on the municipalization of companies. It would only have an impact on businesses with a small geographic market. Municipal enterprises would be no more free to expand under a strict State Socialism system than agricultural and industrial enterprises that were still ostensibly privately owned since they would be under the control of the principal economic administration.

Socialist Militarism

Socialism in a state where all institutions are built to carry out war is known as military socialism. It is a kind of State Socialism in which a citizen's social standing and income are solely or ideally dependent on his or her position in the armed services. The social worth and claim on the national dividend increase with military rank. The military state, often known as the state of the fighting man, is intolerant of private ownership of the means of production since everything is oriented toward waging war. If people's lives are impacted by goals other than conflict, standing prepared for battle is impossible. All warrior castes that have had their members maintained by the distribution of manorial rights, land grants, or even by businesses dependent on the availability of slave labor have over time lost their propensity for waging war. The feudal lord lost interest in fighting and winning battles in favor of economic pursuits and other hobbies. The feudal system demilitarized the warrior across the globe. The Junkers succeeded the knights. The fighting man becomes the economic man via ownership. The military nature of the State can only be maintained by excluding private property. Only the warrior, whose whole profession is the training for war, is ever prepared for battle. Men can engage in short wars of conquest but not protracted battles of defense.

A bandit state is the military state. It chooses to subsist off of loot and tribute. The result of economic activity only plays a little part in comparison to this source of revenue; often, it is totally absent. Furthermore, it is obvious that if loot and tribute are collected from outside, they cannot be distributed to specific persons but must instead go to the common treasury,

which can only do so in accordance with military status. Any alternative manner of distribution would not be tolerated by the army, which is the only entity that guarantees the survival of this source of money. And this implies that the same distributional basis should be used for domestically produced goods, which benefit residents in a manner comparable to how serfdom's tribute and yield do [7]–[9].

This provides an explanation for the communism practiced by the Greek pirates of Lipara and all other robber nations. It is the "communism of robbers and freebooters," which results from applying military concepts to all interpersonal interactions. The Suebi, whom Caesar refers to as *gens longe bellicosissima Germanorum omnium* a nation long the most warlike of the German tribes, despatched troops across the boundaries each year in search of booty. The next year, the roles were switched and those who stayed behind continued economic activities for those in the field. There was no territory that belonged solely to any one person. The warrior state can only turn every citizen into a soldier and every soldier into a citizen by having everyone share in the benefits of economic and military activity that is conducted with a shared goal and is exposed to a common risk. Once it permits some people to continue becoming soldiers while others stay citizens engaged in labor on their own land will quickly distinguish the two professions from one another. Either the warriors must subdue the people, in which case it is unlikely that they could go on raiding excursions while a subjugated populace remained at home, or the people will succeed in taking control. In the latter case, the warriors will be demoted to mercenaries and barred from going in quest of loot because they must be prevented from being a constant threat by not allowing them to get too strong. The state must shed its essentially military identity in both scenarios. As a result, any weakening of "communistic" institutions also weakens the military component of the state, gradually transforming warrior culture into an industrial one.

The Great War provided a good example of the dynamics that led a military state toward socialism. The divide between the fighting man, who had to undergo the rigors and danger of the war, and the man who stayed at home to benefit from the war boom, seemed to be politically unsustainable the longer the war went and the more the nations of Europe were turned into military camps. Too much weight was placed on different shoulders. The nations would have always been divided into two groups and the troops would have ultimately turned their guns against their own kin if the distinction had been permitted to endure and the conflict to go longer. The Socialism of conscript labor at home is required as a counterbalance to the Socialism of conscript armies.

The fact that they are unable to maintain their military identity in the absence of a communist organization does not help the warring nations. For them, communism is an evil they must embrace since it causes a weakness that will ultimately lead to their demise. Germany walked the route to Socialism in the early years of the war because the military etatistic attitude, which was to blame for the war's policies, pushed the country in that direction. In order to make circumstances at home comparable to those at the front, socialization became more and more vigorous toward the conclusion of the war. This was important for the reasons already mentioned. However, state socialism did not help the situation in Germany; rather, it made it worse. It did not promote production; rather, it restrained it. It also did not make the army and the general populace's provisioning better; rather, it made it worse.³² And it goes without saying that it was due to the etatistic attitude that throughout the violent upheavals of the war and the revolution that followed, not a single strong German citizen came to prominence.

When a communistic warrior state clashes with the wealthier and hence more equipped and outfitted citizens of countries who recognise the idea of private property, it will lose because communistic economic practices are less productive. Socialism makes it impossible for a

person to take initiative, which deprives them of both leaders who can point the road to victory and followers who can carry out their orders during the crucial hour of combat. By a small group of Spaniards, the powerful military communist state of the Incas³³ was swiftly and easily toppled.

We may talk of a communism of overlords if the domestic adversary that the warrior state must battle is to be discovered. Max Weber referred to the Dorians' social structures in Sparta as "casino communism" because of their custom of sharing meals.³⁴ If the ruling caste gives land and its population to private owners rather than adopting communistic institutions, eventually it will be assimilated by the vanquished on the basis of ethnicity. It finally elevates itself into a land-owning elite that enlists even the vanquished people. In this manner, the state loses its reputation as a state that wages war. This change occurred in all of the areas where the Normans first made an appearance as conquerors, including the kingdoms of the Langobards, West Goths, and Franks.

Christian Socialism

Either a self-sufficient home economy or a socialist industrial structure are necessary for a theocratic formation of the state. It is incompatible with a system of economics that gives each person the freedom to use his or her talents. Economic rationality and simple faith are incompatible. It seems inconceivable that clerics would rule businesspeople. Christian socialism is just a subset of state socialism, as it has evolved over the last several decades among the innumerable members of all Christian faiths. It is challenging to distinguish clearly between State Socialism and Christian Socialism or to determine if a particular socialist belongs to one or the other. Christian Socialism is based on the premise that, even more than etatism, the economic system would remain stationary if men's pursuit of wealth and personal gain, which directs their efforts entirely to the gratification of material interests, did not interrupt it from running its course. Although the advantages of advancing advancements in production techniques are acknowledged, the Christian socialist does not fully grasp how these breakthroughs disrupt the orderly operation of the economic system.

Insofar as this is acknowledged, the current situation is preferable over any future development. The only acceptable jobs are those in agriculture and crafts, with modest shopkeeping as an exception. Trade and speculation are unnecessary, harmful, and bad. giant-scale enterprises and factories are evil creations of the "Jewish spirit"; they generate only inferior items that are then sold to consumers at great expense by giant retailers and other monstrosities of contemporary commerce. Legislation has a responsibility to rein in these commercial excesses and to give handicraft the producing role that large capital's schemes have taken away from it. Large transportation companies should be nationalized if they can't be eliminated.

The central notion of Christian Socialism, which permeates all of its adherents' beliefs, is essentially static in nature. There is no entrepreneur, no speculating, and no "inordinate" profit in the economic system they envision. The salaries and prices being requested and paid are "just." Because unhappiness would indicate disobedience against both heavenly and human rules, everyone is content with his situation. Christians will give via charity for those who are unable to work. It is said that this ideal was attained throughout the Middle Ages. Only doubt could have ejected humanity from this paradise. Mankind must first find its way back to the Church if it is to be recovered. All of the evil that exists in the world today is a result of enlightenment and liberal ideology. Typically, proponents of Christian social change do not see anything socialist in their ideal Society of Christian Socialism. However, this is only self-deception.

Christian socialism presents as conservative because it wants to preserve the current order of property, or more accurately, it presents as reactionary because it wants to reinstate and then preserve a previous order of property. It is also true that it vigorously opposes other socialists' ideas for a dramatic eradication of private property and, in contrast to them, declares that social reform, not Socialism, is its goal. However, Socialism is the only way to attain Conservatism. Income cannot be distributed in accordance with a historically defined or in any other manner permanently established order if private property in the means of production exists both in name and in practice. Only market pricing may influence the creation of income when private property exists. The Christian social reformer is gradually propelled toward Socialism, which for him can only be State Socialism, to the extent that this is accomplished. He must understand that without total loyalty to the established order, his goal cannot be realized. He understands that fixed pricing and salaries cannot be kept in place unless any deviations are met with threats of punishment from a higher authority. Additionally, he must understand that prices and salaries cannot be arbitrarily set in accordance with the ideals of a world-improver since any departure from market pricing upsets the stability of the economy. So, starting with a demand for price regulation and working his way up to a desire for complete control over production and distribution. It follows the same course as practical etatism. In both situations, the outcome is a strict socialism that only recognizes private property in name and effectively cedes all authority over the means of production to the State [10], [11].

Only a small portion of the Christian socialist movement has publicly endorsed this extreme agenda. The others have avoided making an outright statement. They have fervently resisted following their premises' logical inferences. They make it clear that all they are fighting against are the excesses and abuses of the capitalist system, they insist that they have no wish to outlaw private property, and they often state that they oppose Marxist Socialism. However, they often recognize that the major source of this resistance is disagreement about how to achieve the ideal condition of society. They are not revolutionaries and base everything on the growing acceptance that change is required. The remainder of the time, they repeatedly declare that they don't want to assault private property. They would only keep the name of private property, however. If the State gains authority of private property, the owner of the property is reduced to the status of an official, a deputy of the economic administration.

It is immediately apparent how the economic goal of the medieval Scholastics parallels the Christian Socialism of today. Both begin with the desire for "just" wages and prices, i.e., for an established historically acquired income distribution. The current Christian reform movement is only forced toward Socialism by the knowledge that this is unachievable if the economic system maintains private property in the means of production. They must support policies that, even while they ostensibly preserve private property, completely socialize society in order to realize their aspirations. Later it will be shown that this contemporary Christian socialism is unrelated to the fictitious but often referenced communism of the early Christians. The Church has never advocated socialism before. This is unaffected by the fact that the most recent advancement in Christian social theory has led the Church³⁶ to acknowledge the fundamental rightfulness of private property in the means of production, whereas the early church teaching had avoided unconditionally accepting even the name of private property due to the command of the gospels condemning all economic activity. Because the Church's recognition of the legitimacy of private property must only be understood in contrast to socialist attempts to violently change the status quo. In actuality, the Church only wants state socialism of a certain hue.

Socialistic production techniques have a character that is distinct from the practical approaches used to try to make them a reality. No matter how it is implemented, any effort at socialism must fail due to the impossibility of creating a fully socialist economy. Socialism must collapse for that reason alone and not due to flaws in human morality. Granted, the Church would be the greatest place to develop the moral values that a socialist society would demand of its citizens. A socialist society must have a spirit that is most similar to a religious one. However, in order to overcome these obstacles and create a socialist society, there must be a shift in either human nature or the natural laws that govern our surroundings; this is something that not even religion can do.

The Planned Economy

A more contemporary variation of socialism is the so-called planned economy (Planwirtschaft). Every effort to implement socialism soon runs into insurmountable obstacles. Prussian State Socialism suffered the consequences of this. It was impossible to ignore the nationalization debacle because it was so obvious. Conditions in government projects were not favorable for encouraging more moves toward state and local control. The authorities were held accountable for this. A error had been made by leaving out the "business man." It is necessary to use an entrepreneurial person's skills in some capacity for Socialism. The organization of "mixed" companies resulted from this idea. We have the private venture in which the state or municipality is involved, as opposed to total nationalization or municipalization. In this manner, the demand of individuals who believe it is unfair that the state and municipalities shouldn't partake in the proceeds of projects carried out under their august influence is taken into consideration on one side. Of course, the State might get its fair share via taxes and does so more efficiently without endangering the viability of the public purse. On the other hand, this system mistakenly believes that it can harness all of the entrepreneur's active abilities for the benefit of the group firm. Because as soon as government representatives participate in administration, all of the obstacles that severely hamper public officials' initiative come into play. By exempting employees and workers from the rules governing public officials, the "mixed" kind of undertaking allows for a minor reduction in the negative consequences that the official spirit has on an undertaking's profitability. Overall, the combined endeavors have performed better than the solely governmental endeavors. However, this does not demonstrate the viability of socialism any more than do the sometimes successful outcomes of certain public initiatives. A total socialization of society is not always feasible just because it is conceivable to operate a public company with some success in the middle of an economic system that is otherwise based on private property in the means of production.

Under war socialism, the government in Germany and Austria attempted to hand over control of nationalized enterprises to private businesspeople during the First World War. There were no alternative options due to the hurry with which socialist measures were implemented during the war and the fact that no one knew for sure what the basic ramifications of the new policy would be or how far it would be extended. The management of certain manufacturing branches was transferred to mandatory employer organizations that were placed under governmental control. To guarantee that the employer was nothing more than an employee sharing the return, price restriction on the one hand and severe profit taxes on the other.

The system performed abjectly. But since no one understood what to replace it with, it had to be followed, or else all efforts at socialism would have to be abandoned. There was nothing else for a socialist administration to do except to continue the system known during the war as "war economy," according to the memorandum of the German Economic Ministry (May 7th, 1919), written up by Wissell and Moellendorff. "A socialist government," it states,

"cannot ignore the fact that, due to a few abuses, public opinion is being poisoned by interested criticisms against a systematic planned economy;" it may improve the planned system; it may reorganize the old bureaucracy; it may even transfer responsibility to the people involved in the business through self-government; but it must declare itself to be an adherent of the mandatory planned economy, which is to say an adherent of socialism.

A socialist community's planned economy is a strategy designed to address the intractable issue of the acting organ's accountability in a specific manner. The fact that the authors and supporters of this endeavour should disregard the fact that not only is the premise upon which it is built flawed, but also that the solution itself is just a fake, is especially indicative of the mental attitude of officialdom. The autonomy given to particular regions and production branches is significant mainly in limited ways since the balance between these two components of the economy is where the economic activity is concentrated. This modification must be made consistently; otherwise, the whole plan would have to be considered syndicalist. Wissell and Möllendorff really envision a State Economic Council with "supreme control of the German economic system in co-operation with the highest competent organs of the State."³⁹ Therefore, the core idea of the whole plan is simply that the ministries and a second authority would each be in charge of a portion of the economic administration.

The primary way in which the Socialism of the planned economy differs from the State Socialism of the Prussian State under the Hohenzollerns is the assignment of the *ci-devant* entrepreneur to the privileged position in business control and in the distribution of income, as opposed to the latter, which was given to the Junkers and the bureaucrats. This is an invention brought about by the shift in politics brought about by the disaster that engulfed the Crown, the aristocracy, the bureaucracy, and the officer class; other from this, it has no bearing on the socialist dilemma. State capitalism is a term that has just been used to describe what the term "planned economy" formerly referred to, and there will undoubtedly be many more suggestions for saving socialism in the future. We will pick up a lot of new terminology for the same old subject. All of these plans, however, won't change the character of socialism since the item itself, not its titles, is what counts.

Guild Socialism

People in England and on the Continent looked to guild socialism as the solution in the early post-World War II years. It's been forgotten for a very long time. Though it is the only contribution given by the Anglo-Saxons, the most developed people in terms of economics, to current socialist programs, we must not ignore it when talking about socialist initiatives. Another effort to solve the impasse of a socialist industrial policy is guild socialism. The English people, who had been protected by the long reign of liberal principles from that overvaluation of the State that has been pervasive in contemporary Germany, did not require the failure of state socialistic operations to open their eyes. In England, the suspicion in the government's ability to best control all human matters has never been overcome by socialism. The English have always understood the major issue that other Europeans had difficulty understanding before to 1914.

Three distinct concepts in guild socialism must be identified. It proves the need of switching from the capitalist to the socialist system, therefore we need not worry any more about this wildly divergent notion. Additionally, it offers a means for the realization of socialism; however, this is only significant to us inasmuch as it has a strong potential to produce syndicalism rather than socialism. The plan for a future socialist order of society is then developed. This is the issue that worries us. The socialization of the means of production is

the goal of guild socialism. As a result, we have a good reason to term it socialism. The specific framework it offers the government of the future communist state is what makes it special.

Workers in certain production divisions are to be in charge of managing production. They choose the foremen, managers, and other corporate executives, and they control both directly and indirectly the working conditions as well as the production processes and goals.⁴⁰ The State is the organization of the consumers, while the Guilds represent the organizations of producers in each sector of industry. The State has the authority to tax the Guilds, giving it the ability to control their pricing and compensation structure.

If guild socialism thinks it can establish a socialist form of government without compromising individual freedom or introducing all the ills of centralized socialism that the English despise as Prussianism, it is seriously deluding itself. The State owns the whole control of production, even in a socialist guild society. The State alone establishes the objective of production and decides what has to be done to fulfill this objective. It establishes the terms of employment, transfers capital and labor from one sector of industry to another, makes adjustments, and serves as a liaison between the guilds and between producers and customers, either directly or indirectly via its taxing policy. The only significant responsibilities are those that come within state jurisdiction, and these are what really govern economic activity.

The implementation of the job delegated to them by the State is left to the various guilds, and, within them, to the local unions and individual businesses. The whole system aims to adapt the English State's political structure into the realm of production; it takes the relationship between local and national governments as its model. Economic Federalism is explicitly referred to as guild socialism. But it is not difficult to provide local government a certain level of freedom under a liberal state's democratic constitution. The need that each territorial entity handle its business in conformity with the laws is sufficient to achieve the required coordination of the parts within the whole. But in terms of productivity, this is by no means enough. The quantity and caliber of labor performed by employees in certain production branches, as well as how the physical production tools involved will be used, cannot be left up to the workers themselves. If a guild's members utilize their resources less efficiently or with less passion, this affects not just them but the whole community. Because the State is responsible for overseeing output, it cannot resist from meddling in the guild's internal matters. Attempts must be made to reduce the independence of the guilds to a hollow façade if it is not permitted to exert direct control by selecting managers and works directors.

Other methods could include using the right to tax or its influence over the distribution of consumer goods. The foremen who control and monitor a worker's job on a daily and hourly basis are those that the worker despises the most. Social reformers who erroneously assume the feelings of the workforce may think it is easy to replace these control organs with dependable personnel selected by the workforce. This isn't nearly as ridiculous as the anarchists' idea that everyone would be willing to follow the laws necessary for community living without being forced to, but it's still not much better. Social production is a unity in which each component must precisely fulfill its role within the overall structure. The decision of how a component will adapt to the overall plan cannot be left to the part's choice. The productivity of labor will decrease if the freely elected foreman does not have the same fervor and vigor in his supervising duties as one not picked by the employees.

Therefore, guild socialism does not eliminate any of the obstacles to constructing a socialist social order. By using the catchphrase "Self-Government in Industry" in place of the term

nationalization, which is offensive to English ears, it makes socialism more palatable to the English mind. However, in essence, it offers nothing different from what contemporary continental socialists advocate, namely, the suggestion to hand over control of production to committees made up of customers, workers, and employees involved in production. We've previously shown that this doesn't help us solve the socialist dilemma. The syndicalistic components that many Guild Socialism proponents think are present in it are largely responsible for its success. Guild Socialism is undoubtedly not syndicalism, at least not in the literary representations of it. However, the means by which it intends to do so might very easily lead to syndicalism. Individual branches of industry would become syndicalized if, to start, national guilds were founded in certain significant sectors of production that would need to function in a capitalist system. What would seem to be a route toward socialism here, as everywhere, may quickly turn out to be a path toward syndicalism.

CONCLUSION

The study of Particular Forms of Socialism demonstrates the variety and depth of socialist ideology throughout history. In an effort to achieve a more fair distribution of opportunities and resources, each form reflects a different approach to alleviate social inequities. Every strategy, from the market-oriented socialist systems of the Nordic nations to the Marxist-Leninist model put into practice in the Soviet Union, has had a long-lasting effect on the societies in which it was adopted. In other scenarios, centralized planning resulted in inefficiencies and bureaucracy that precluded innovation and individual freedom. These socialist initiatives have had varying degrees of success or failure, depending on the political and economic climate across the world. It is clear that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to socialism and that each society's adoption of socialist policies must take into account its own historical, cultural, and economic conditions. A balanced strategy that integrates components of democratic administration, market economies, and socialist values seems to be a good course to take. For scholars, politicians, and activists working to make the world more fair and just, Particular Forms of Socialism is an essential resource. A more affluent and peaceful future may be achieved through upholding the values of solidarity, collaboration, and fair opportunity while staying flexible in the face of changing conditions.

REFERENCES:

- [1] A. Stenning, "Post-socialism and the changing geographies of the everyday in Poland," *Trans. Inst. Br. Geogr.*, 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.1475-5661.2005.00155.x.
- [2] E. Papadimitropoulos, "Socialisme ou Barbarie: From Castoriadis' project of individual and collective autonomy to the collaborative commons," *TripleC*, 2016, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v14i1.739.
- [3] J. Bockman and G. Eyal, "Eastern Europe as a laboratory for economic knowledge: The transnational roots of neoliberalism," *American Journal of Sociology*. 2002. doi: 10.1086/344411.
- [4] D. Lane and S. Bauman, "Socialism: The Active Utopia," *Br. J. Sociol.*, 1977, doi: 10.2307/590008.
- [5] S. Englert, J. Woodcock, and C. Cant, "Digital workerism: Technology, platforms, and the circulation of workers' struggles," *TripleC*, 2020, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v18i1.1133.
- [6] E. Zhang and J. Andrew, "Rethinking China: Discourse, convergence and fair value accounting," *Crit. Perspect. Account.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.cpa.2015.09.002.

- [7] T. G. Griffiths, "Socialism in Cuba: Debate and Socialist Renewal for the Twenty-First Century," *Int. Crit. Thought*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/21598282.2019.1613916.
- [8] M. Rakita, "Modernization discourse and its discontents," *Stud. Ethnol. Croat.*, 2017, doi: 10.17234/SEC.29.4.
- [9] C. Hann, "Resilience and Transformation in Provincial Political Economy: From Market Socialism to Market Populism in Hungary, 1970s-2010s," *Cargo J.*, 2020.
- [10] L. Coderre, "A necessary evil: Conceptualizing the socialist commodity under mao," *Comp. Stud. Soc. Hist.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/S0010417518000488.
- [11] J. Farquhar and Q. Zhang, "Biopolitical beijing: Pleasure, sovereignty, and self-cultivation in China's capital," *Cultural Anthropology*. 2005. doi: 10.1525/can.2005.20.3.303.

CHAPTER 18

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ABOUT PSEUDO-SOCIALIST SYSTEMS

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Pseudo-socialist systems, commonly referred to as mixed economies or quasi-socialist systems, are an intricate and fascinating group of political and economic theories. This chapter gives a general overview of the idea of pseudo-socialism, examining its salient traits, guiding principles, and practical difficulties. To explain the complexities and ramifications of these systems, the study makes use of historical and modern instances. In a pseudo-socialist system, the distinction between the public and private sectors is muddled by the incorporation of socialist principles within a framework that is primarily capitalist. To address problems of inequality and guarantee the delivery of key services, the government uses intervention, regulation, and ownership of certain businesses. But these systems often struggle with inefficiency, red tape, and the potential to stifle economic progress. In attempting to achieve a balance between social welfare and economic development, pseudo-socialist systems often experience conflicts and inconsistencies that are highlighted in this abstract. It explores the difficulties of putting socialist principles into practice in a free-market setting, which has produced various degrees of success and criticism. The study's conclusion makes a plea for further research into these systems, taking into account any possible repercussions for society, government, and the goal of fair economic growth. Understanding pseudo-socialist systems is essential for guiding policy choices and determining the global socio-economic model's future course.

KEYWORDS:

Ownership, Political, Production, Private, Social, Socialism.

INTRODUCTION

Few people in recent decades have been able to avoid being impacted by the socialist critique of the capitalist social order's popularity. Even those who were opposed to socialism sought in various ways to behave in accordance with its critique of private ownership of the means of production. As a result, they developed systems that made an effort to resolve the paradoxes but were poorly thought out, eclectic in theory, and weak in politics. They were quickly dismissed. Only one of these ideologies the one that goes by the name of Solidarism has gained popularity. This is especially at home in France, and it has been dubbed not without cause the Third Republic's official social ideology. The name "Solidarism" is less widely known outside of France, but the beliefs that make it up are the social-political tenet of everyone who is religiously or conservatively oriented but has not embraced Christian or State Socialism. Neither the complexity of its theory nor the quantity of its followers makes solidarism stand out. Its effect on many of the brightest and noblest men and women of our time lends it a particular significance [1]–[3].

The foundation of solidarism is the idea that everyone's interests coincide. The preservation of private ownership in the means of production is a social institution that is in the best interests of everyone, not just the owners; if common ownership were to take its place and imperil the productivity of social labor, everyone would suffer. Solidarism and liberalism

have always gone hand in hand. But later, their respective methods diverge. Because according to the solidarist view, the social order that results from private ownership of the means of production does not necessarily fulfill the concept of social solidarity. It refutes the idea that simply acting in one's own property interests within a legal system that protects liberty and property ensures an interaction of the individual economic actions correlating to the goals of social co-operation. This is done without, however, engaging in a more thorough argument or bringing to light ideas not previously advanced by socialists, particularly non-Marxists.

Men in society have a mutual interest in each other's welfare because of the nature of social cooperation, which is the only setting in which they can coexist. Because of this, their interests are "solidary," and as a result, they should behave in "solidarity." However, just having private ownership over the means of production has not led to a society where the division of labor is strong. Special arrangements must be made for this. The Solidarist movement's more etatistically oriented branch aims to implement "solidary" action via government regulation, requiring owners of property to fulfill commitments in favor of the less fortunate and the general good. The more ecclesiastical branch of Solidarism seeks to accomplish the same goal by appealing to moral principles rather than State laws: The person will fulfill their social obligations out of Christian love.

The Solidarism advocates have articulated their social-philosophical viewpoints in masterfully crafted pieces that capture the beauty of the French soul. No one has been able to express the mutual dependency of men in society in more elegant terms. Additionally, they have a strong understanding of how to present their point, whether via theological or legal reasons. But none of this should make us lose sight of the theory's inherent flaws. The idea of the solidarist is a hazy eclecticism. No particular debate is necessary. We are far less interested in it than in its social ideal, which states that it strives "to avoid the faults of the individualist and socialist systems, to maintain that which is right in both."

The idea behind socialism is to preserve private ownership of the means of production. However, it appoints an authority to ensure that the owner uses his property properly, regardless of whether that authority is the State, the maker of law, or the Church, the counsel of conscience. The authorities must stop the person from using his standing in the economy "unrestrainedly"; there must be some limitations placed on property. As a result, the deciding element in society is now the state or the church, the law or conscience. Property is no longer the fundamental and defining component of the social structure when it is subordinated to their standards. Ownership is eliminated because the owner must govern his property in accordance with principles other than those imposed on him by his property interests, which means that ownership continues to exist only to the extent that Law or Ethics permit.

Saying that an owner must always abide by the rules of law and ethics and that ownership may only be recognized in certain situations and within certain boundaries is not an adequate response. Because if these standards are only intended to protect free ownership and the owner's ability to retain his property so long as it doesn't transfer to others as a result of agreements he has made, then they only acknowledge private ownership of the means of production. However, solidarism does not believe that these standards are enough to bring the labor of society's members together productively. Solidarity seeks to elevate other standards above them. So, the basic rule of society is now these other standards. The basic law of society is no longer private property but rather a specific form of legal and moral prescription. In other words, ownership is abolished under solidarism in favor of a "Higher Law."

The solidarists, of course, don't actually want to go that far. According to them, they just seek to restrict property while keeping it in principle. However, property has already been abolished when one has gone so far as to establish boundaries for it that are not inherent in its nature. The national economic activity is not directed by property, but rather by the prescribing authority, if the owner is only allowed to do with his property what is prescribed to him. For instance, solidarism wants to control competition; it must not cause "the decay of the middle class" or "the oppression of the weak." This only indicates that a certain social production condition must be maintained even if it would disappear under private property. The owner is instructed on what, how much, under what circumstances, and to whom he must produce his goods. As a result, he loses his ownership position and turns into a privileged official in a planned economy who receives a special salary.

Solidarism would undoubtedly have to be referred to as a subset of Socialism if it were explicit about the implications of its postulates. But it's not really apparent. When faced with the realization that their goal was really State Socialism, the majority of its adherents would be appalled. It thinks itself to be fundamentally distinct from that system. This means that its social goal might still be considered a pseudo-socialist regime. But it must be understood that there is only one step separating it from socialism. The only thing keeping the French Solidarists and the Jesuit Pesch, an economist under French influence, from definitively crossing the line between Solidarism and Socialism is the mental climate of France, which is normally more favorable to Liberalism and Capitalism. However, many of them who still identify as solidarists must be included among full etatists. One of them is Charles Gide, for instance [4]–[6].

Various Expropriation Proposals

Precapitalist efforts for property reform often end with demands for wealth equality. Everyone will be equally wealthy; nobody will have more or less than the others. The land will be redistributed in order to accomplish this equality, and its sale or mortgage will be outlawed in order to make it permanent. Even though it's frequently referred to as agrarian socialism, this is obviously not socialism. Socialism seeks to create on the basis of shared ownership of the means of production; it does not want to divide the means of production in the slightest. Therefore, any such plans that merely seek to seize the means of production cannot be viewed as socialist; at most, they can only be seen as suggestions for a path toward socialism.

If, for instance, they suggested a limit on the amount of private property that one individual might hold, they could only be recognized as socialist if they intended to use the money that would therefore accrue to the State as the foundation for socialist production. Then, we need to be presented with a socializing plan. Simple observation reveals that this plan is not practical. Depending on how much private wealth is still tolerated, the quantity of the means of production that may be socialized as a result could either be more or lower. The suggested approach differs little from instantaneous socialization if this is set to a low value. If it is set too high, the attempt to socialize the means of production will not make much progress. However, a number of unforeseen outcomes must happen. Because only the most zealous and active businesspeople will be able to participate in economic activity, and those wealthy individuals whose riches are getting close to their limit will be seduced by expensive lifestyles. One would anticipate that the individual wealth limits will slow down capital development.

Similar factors also apply to proposals to eliminate the right to inherit, which are prevalent in numerous circles. Abolishing inheritance and the ability to make gifts meant to get around the

ban wouldn't result in total socialism, but it would transfer a significant portion of all productive assets to society within a generation. However, it would primarily slow down the creation of new capital and use up some of the capital that is already there.

DISCUSSION

Profit-Sharing

One group of well-intentioned authors and businesspeople advocates profit-sharing with wage employees. Profits will no longer go only to the business owner; instead, they will be shared between the business owners and the employees. A portion of the ventures' income will be used to enhance the employees' salaries. Engel anticipates nothing less from this than "a settlement, satisfying both parties, of the raging fight, and thus, too, a solution of the social question." The majority of the profit-sharing system's supporters place equal emphasis on it. The premise that, under capitalism, the entrepreneur deprives the worker of a portion of that which he may properly claim is the basis for proposals to shift to the worker a portion of the entrepreneur's earnings. The ambiguous notion of an inalienable right to the "full" output of labor, the most prevalent and basic version of exploitation theory, serves as the foundation for the idea and is presented here more or less openly. The social issue appears to its proponents as a struggle for the entrepreneur's gain.

The businesspeople want it for themselves, while socialists want to give it to the workers. Someone suggests that the conflict be resolved by a compromise in which each side receives a portion of their respective claims. Both parties will benefit from this situation: the businesses since their claim is manifestly unfair, and the employees because they get a significant gain in pay without having to argue for it. There is no use in delving further into this line of reasoning since it considers the issue of the social organization of labor as a matter of rights and attempts to resolve a historical conflict by dividing the difference as if it were a disagreement between two businessmen. A essential institution of human civilization is private ownership of the means of production, or it isn't. If not, it can or must be abolished; there is no justification for stopping in the middle out of consideration for the entrepreneur's own interests. However, if private property is required, it does not need any further justification for its existence, and there is no reason why its social efficacy should be reduced by just partly removing it.

The proponents of profit-sharing believe that it would motivate the employee to do his job with more passion than is reasonable to expect from a worker who is uninterested in the project's results. They also make a mistake here. No extra incentive is required to motivate a person to work hard if the efficiency of labor has not been reduced by various forms of socialist destructionist sabotage, the worker may be fired without issue, and pay can be modified in accordance with performance without respect to collective agreements. When working under such circumstances, the employee is well aware that his actions affect his pay. However, in the absence of these elements, the possibility of receiving a portion of the project's net profit would not compel him to go above and beyond what is technically required. It is the same issue we have looked at when evaluating the incentives in a socialist society to get over the disutility of labor, although being of a different size. The worker obtains a portion of the extra labor's output that is insufficient to compensate for the additional work that must be done on his or her own.

If profit-sharing is done on an individual basis, with each employee taking a cut of the profits of the specific company they happen to work for, there will be income disparities that are completely unjustified, serve no economic purpose, and that everyone will feel are unfair. "It is unacceptable that a turner in one work should receive twenty marks and an additional ten

as a profit share, while a turner in a competing work, where business is worse, possibly worse directed, receives only twenty marks." This indicates either the creation of a "rent" and maybe the sale of employment associated with it, or it indicates that the employee is telling his employer, "I don't care from what fund you pay the thirty marks; if my colleague receives it from the competition I demand it too." Even if it is a kind of Syndicalism in which the entrepreneur retains some of the profits, individual profit-sharing must ultimately result in Syndicalism [7]–[9].

But another approach may be attempted. All residents share in the earnings, not just the individual employees; all businesses provide a portion of their revenues to everyone equally. Taxation has already made this clear. Joint stock businesses in Austria were required to provide the State and other taxing authorities between 20 and 40 percent of their net income well before the war; during the first years of the peace, this percentage increased to between 60 and 90 percent and more. The "mixed" public enterprise is an effort to create a kind of community involvement that include the community sharing management of the business in exchange for a portion in the capital raising. In this case as well, there is no justification for settling for a partial abolishment of private property when society is capable of doing so without impairing labor output. But if whole private property abolition is unfavorable, then partial abolition is also unfavorable. The complete sweep may really be more harmful than the half-measure. Advocates often claim that the "mixed" venture gives the entrepreneur room to grow. The independence of the entrepreneur's choices are, however, restricted by state or municipal activities, as we have previously shown. An enterprise that is compelled to work with government employees is unable to use the tools of production in the manners required by profit-making.

Syndicalism

Syndicalism is one of the political strategies used by organized labor to further their political objectives. The creation of real socialism, or the socialization of the means of production, may also be seen as this goal. However, the word "syndicalism" is sometimes used to refer to a certain kind of sociopolitical goal. In that regard, it is appropriate to think of syndicalism as a movement whose goal is to establish a society in which the workforce owns the means of production. Syndicalism is just a problem for us in this context as a goal; we do not need to discuss it as a movement or as a set of political strategies. Syndicalism as a political strategy and as a goal do not always coincide. Many organizations that have made the syndicalist "direct action" the cornerstone of their operations work for a truly socialist society. However, there are alternative approaches to achieving Syndicalism as a goal than the Sorel-recommended violent ones.

The vast majority of workers who identify as socialists or communists see syndicalism as the ultimate goal of the great revolution, at least as vividly as socialism. Even within the ranks of Marxian socialists, the "petty bourgeois" notions that Marx hoped to eradicate remain quite pervasive. The vast majority prefers Syndicalism to true Socialism, or centralized Socialism. The worker aspires to be the master of the manufacturing tools used in his specific endeavor. Every day, the social activity in our area makes it more evident that the worker wants just this. Syndicalist views, in contrast to Socialism, which is the product of armchair research, originate straight from the common man, who is always antagonistic to "unearned" revenue received by someone else. Similar to socialism, syndicalism pursues the same goal of eliminating the division of labor from the means of production, but it does it in a different way. Not all employees will become the proprietors of all the means of production; rather, only employees in a certain industry, endeavor, or sector of production will own the means of production used there. This is the slogan: "The railways to the railway men, the mines to the

miners, the factories to the factory hand."We must disregard any wacky plan to implement Syndicalist principles and begin our investigation with a totally consistent application of the fundamental notion to the whole economic system. It's not hard to do this. Syndicalism is the term used to describe any policy that transfers ownership of all production assets from business owners, investors, and landlords to the whole population of the economic region. In this instance, it is irrelevant whether or not more or fewer of these relationships emerge in such a community. Whether each branch of production is organized into a distinct entity or consists merely of a single effort is irrelevant.

exactly as they have traditionally developed, or even simply a single factory or workshop. In essence, whether the lines across the society are more or less horizontal or vertical has no effect on the design. The single determining factor is that the resident of such a community owns a portion of certain means of production but does not possess other means of production. In rare circumstances, such as when he is unable to work, he may also have no property at all. It doesn't matter in this case whether or not the employees' earnings will improve considerably. The majority of workers have absolutely amazing expectations for the rise in wealth they may experience under syndicalist property arrangements. They think that even the simple distribution of the portion that landlords, investors, and business owners get from capitalist industry must significantly raise each person's income.

In addition to this, they anticipate a significant increase in the industrial product since they, who consider themselves to be exceptionally knowledgeable, will run the business themselves and because each employee will have a personal stake in the success of the venture. The employee will now work for himself rather than for a third party. Liberals have quite different perspectives on all of this. He makes the argument that the employees' earnings would hardly improve if rent and profit revenues were divided among them. Above all, he contends that businesses no longer run in the self-interest of owners acting on their own behalf but rather by unqualified labor leaders will produce less, resulting in wages for workers that are not just lower than in a free market but also much lower.

The outcome would be little more than a crude redistribution of wealth if syndicalist reform just transferred to the workers control of the means of production and left the capitalist order's property structure else unaltered. Every time the average person considers changing social circumstances, the redistribution of assets with the goal of restoring the equality of property and wealth is in the back of his mind. This concept serves as the foundation for all popular ideas for socialization. In the case of land laborers, whose ultimate goal is to own a homestead and a piece of land big enough to sustain him and his family, this is not unfathomable; in the village, redistribution, the popular solution to the social issue, is perfectly imaginable. A desire for the division of property rights while maintaining the integrity of the industry or company arises in contrast to the physical redistribution of the means of production in the fields of manufacturing, mining, communications, commerce, and banking. This straightforward division would, at most, be a solution to temporarily eradicate the disparity in the distribution of income and poverty.

However, over a short period of time, some would have wasted their shares, while others would have become wealthy by buying the shares of the less economically efficient. Because of this, there would need to be frequent redistributions, which would only serve to promote waste and frivolity in other words, all uneconomic behavior. If those who are hardworking and frugal are continuously forced to give their labor and savings to others who are slack and lavish, there won't be any economic stimulation. But even this outcome the momentary realization of income and property equality could not be achieved via syndicalization. Because syndicalization differs greatly depending on the kind of worker. In several sectors of

the economy, the value of the means of production is not directly related to the number of employees. It is not essential to go into detail on the fact that certain items use more labor, a productive factor, and less nature, a productive factor. Even a division of the means of production at the historical beginning of all human production would have resulted in inequality; this is especially true if these means are syndicalized at a stage of capital accumulation where not only the division of produced means of production but also of natural factors of production is highly advanced. In a redistribution of this sort, the values of the shares going to individual employees would be significantly different: some would get more, others less, and as a consequence, some would get more property income—unearned income—than others. Syndicalization in no way contributes to economic equality. It eliminates the current income and property imbalance and replaces it with a new one. Science cannot make a determination on whether or not this syndicalistic inequality is seen to be more fair than that of the capitalistic system.

Syndicalist reform cannot let the capitalist property structures to continue with reference to the means of production if it is to represent more than just the redistribution of productive commodities. It needs to take profitable products off the market. Individual citizens are not permitted to sell their allocated shares in the means of production since, under socialism, these shares are far more closely linked to the owner's person than they are in free societies. It is possible to manage how they may be cut off from the individual in certain situations [10]–[12].

The simplistic reasoning used by Syndicalism's proponents presupposes an instantly stationary state for society and gives no thought to how the system would adjust to shifting economic realities. Everything seems to be in order if we assume that there are no changes to the population, techniques, supply and demand relations, manufacturing methods, or supply and demand interactions. Each worker has a single kid, leaves this world at the same time that his lone heir and successor are able to work, and his son immediately takes his position. We may suppose that a voluntary simultaneous swap of positions and ownership interests in the means of production will facilitate a change of employment, a move from one field of production to another, or from one independent business to another. However, the syndicalist condition of society must obviously presuppose a tightly enforced caste structure and the cessation of any changes to business and, by extension, to existence.

The simple passing of a citizen without children disrupts it and raises issues that are utterly intractable according to the logic of the system. A citizen's income in a syndicalist society is made up of the yield from his share of the property and the earnings from his labor. Even if there are no changes among the living, inequalities in property ownership will develop quickly if shares in the property in the means of production may be freely inherited. Even if at the start of the syndicalist era the worker and the means of production are no longer separated, each citizen is now both an entrepreneur and a worker in his or her enterprise, it is still possible that later on citizens who do not belong to a particular enterprise will inherit shares in it. This would swiftly lead to a separation of property and labor in the syndicalist society, without the benefits of the capitalist social structure.

Every shift in the economy instantly brings with it new issues, on which Syndicalism would surely collapse. The question of what should be done with the shares of these workers in the means of production immediately arises if changes in the direction and scope of demand or in the technique of production lead to changes in the organization of the industry that demand the transfer of workers from one concern to another or from one branch of production to another. Should the employees and their successors retain their ownership of the industries to which they belonged at the time of syndicalization and join the new ones as wage earners

only, barred from receiving any property income? Instead, should they forfeit their stake upon leaving an industry and be compensated with a share per person equivalent to that held by the existing workforce in the new industry? Either approach would immediately go against the syndicalism tenet. Additionally, if males were allowed to sell their shares, things would gradually go back to how they were before the change. However, if a worker loses some of his or her ownership upon leaving one industry and gains ownership upon joining another, the employees who stood to lose from the transition would naturally fight against any changes in output vigorously. If a procedure displaces employees or has the potential to do so, opposition to its implementation will likely arise. On the other hand, if the addition of new workers threatened to lower their revenue from property, the employees in a company or section of the industry would be opposed to the change. In other words, syndicalism would make it almost hard to modify how manufacturing is done. There was no debate about economic development where it occurred. As a goal Syndicalism is so ludicrous that, generally speaking, it lacks supporters who would dare to write publicly and forcefully in its favor. Co-partnership has been used to cope with it, but its issues have never been fully considered. Syndicalism has always represented the ideal of robber hordes.

Modest Socialism

The ability to divide ownership of the means of production. It is typically split in a capitalist system. But the ability to dispose, which belongs to the person who oversees production and is the only one we refer to as ownership, is unbreakable and limitless. It may be shared by a number of persons, but it cannot be split in the sense that the ability to dispose of anything cannot be divided into different powers of command. It is impossible to imagine that the ability to dispose of the usage of a production-related item could ever be broken down into its constituent parts. Ownership in the truest sense cannot be restricted; whenever the word "limitation" is used, it refers to either a narrowing of an overly expansive legal definition or an admission that ownership in the truest sense actually belongs to someone other than the person who the law declares to be the owner.

Therefore, any efforts to negotiate away the distinction between private and communal ownership of the means of production are flawed. Ownership always carries the right to discard.⁵⁵ Therefore, State Socialism and planned economies, which seek to preserve private property in name and in law but really seek to socialize it via the subordination of disposition power to State directives, are socialist systems in the true meaning of the word. Only when a person can manage his private ownership of the means of production in the manner he deems most beneficial does private property exist. Because everyone in a society based on division of labor is the servant of everyone else and everyone else is the master of everyone else, the fact that in doing so he serves other members of society does not change the reality that he himself seeks for the best means to carry out this duty.

It is also not viable to reach a compromise by giving society access to certain production resources while leaving the rest up to the individual. Such systems only stand apart from one another, side by side, and are only completely functional in the area they inhabit. Everyone must see such combinations of social organizational ideas as absurd. Nobody can think that a principle they adhere to should not be followed to the very conclusion. Nobody may also claim that one of the systems is superior than the other merely for a certain subset of the means of production.

Where individuals appear to be making this claim, they are really making the claim that we must require one system of the means of production at least for a group of people or that it should be provided at most for a group. Compromise is never the outcome of a rational

solution to the issue; rather, it is always only a little respite in the conflict between the two beliefs. From each side's perspective, half measures are a momentary stop on the route to total victory.

The most well-known and reputable compromise system really thinks it can advocate half-measures as a long-term institution. The proponents of land reform aim to socialize the organic components of production but maintain private property rights for the rest. They start off with the premise that common ownership of the means of production yields a larger return than private ownership, which is seen to be self-evident. They want to give ownership of the land to society because they see it as the most significant source of productivity. The notion of land reform likewise crumbles with the demise of the assumption that public ownership might provide superior outcomes than private ownership. Anyone who believes that land is the most significant medium of production must support private land ownership if they believe that private ownership is the best form of economic organization.

CONCLUSION

Political and economic theory's study of pseudo-socialist systems is both intriguing and controversial. Although they may advocate for equality, social justice, and community ownership, they often stray from these goals in practice. Instead, they often take the form of hybrid regimes that combine socialism with a strong governmental presence and power centralization. Pseudo-socialist systems have had both triumphs and disasters throughout history. These methods have sometimes been successful in lowering poverty, enhancing schooling, and offering essential services to the populace. However, they have also had to deal with issues like corruption, incompetence, and the repression of personal freedoms. The state apparatus's concentration of power may result in a lack of accountability, impeding the genuine implementation of socialist objectives. Pseudo-socialist systems stand for a complex balancing act between theoretical precepts and real-world circumstances. Policymakers must deal with concerns of openness, accountability, and democratic governance in order to close the gap between theory and reality. The potential advantages of pseudo-socialist policies may only be realized while minimizing their inherent drawbacks via a cautious and flexible approach. In order to build more just and sustainable communities for the future, it is still essential to reflect on past lessons and participate in intelligent discussion.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. Mattl, "The ambivalence of modernism from the weimar republic to national socialism and red vienna," *Modern Intellectual History*. 2009. doi: 10.1017/S1479244308002011.
- [2] T. Demals and A. Hyard, "Pareto and Saint-Simonianism. The history of a criticism," *Eur. J. Hist. Econ. Thought*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/09672567.2020.1750665.
- [3] A. Fomenko, E. Marchenko, O. Sydorov, and D. Zhuravlov, "International regime of counteraction to laundering of proceeds of crime and financing of terrorism: Two vectors of evolution," *Econ. Ann.*, 2020, doi: 10.21003/ea.V181-03.
- [4] D. Rupnow, "Racializing historiography: Anti-Jewish scholarship in the Third Reich," *Patterns Prejudice*, 2008, doi: 10.1080/00313220701805885.
- [5] I. Papushina, "Behind the scene of Soviet runway fashion: Capital and position in the field," *Ekon. Sotsiologiya*, 2020, doi: 10.17323/1726-3247-2020-3-56-83.
- [6] K. Prpić and N. Petrović, "Croatian Social Scientists' Productivity and a Bibliometric

- Study of Sociologists' Output," *Sociol. i Prost.*, 2011.
- [7] S. Bandžović, "Politics and historical revisionism: Flows of relativization of collaborationism and normalization of „ravna gora anti-fascism“,” *Hist. Pogl.*, 2020, doi: 10.52259/historijskipogledi.2020.3.4.133.
- [8] A. P. Ermilov, "Why were Soviet social institutions immune to technological innovation," *Sotsiologicheskiy Zhurnal*, 2017, doi: 10.19181/socjour.2017.23.1.5004.
- [9] I. Theesfeld, "Irrigation sector in Bulgaria: Impact of post-socialist policy reforms," *Water Policy*, 2008, doi: 10.2166/wp.2008.155.
- [10] I. Theesfeld, "The role of pseudo-commons in post-socialist countries," in *Routledge Handbook of the Study of the Commons*, 2019. doi: 10.4324/9781315162782.
- [11] G. Kearsley, "Schools out: Hyperlearning, the new technology, and the end of education Lewis J. Perelman," *J. Comput. High. Educ.*, 1994, doi: 10.1007/bf03035487.
- [12] B. Feldman, "In search of the socialist subject: Radical political economy and the study of moral incentives in the third world," in *Research in the History of Economic Thought and Methodology*, 2019. doi: 10.1108/S0743-41542019000037A006.

CHAPTER 19

ANALYSIS THE NATURE OF SOCIETY

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The extensive work *The Nature of Society* examines the essential traits and dynamics of human communities. This chapter explores the fundamentals of social interactions, structures, and development in an effort to provide insight on the complexities that underpin human civilization. The study aims to give a comprehensive knowledge of the intricate web of links and behaviours that moulds our society via multidisciplinary analysis and synthesis. This research attempts to add to the continuing discussion on social growth and the forces impacting it by looking at important components such culture, economics, politics, and technology. The underlying principles and dynamics that support human social structures and interactions are examined in *The Nature of Society*. It starts by exploring the idea of society in general, looking at its definition, limitations, and function in influencing people's behavior and sense of social identity. The abstract also emphasizes how politics and economics interact, demonstrating how these elements influence how civilizations are governed and how resources are distributed. The abstract also illuminates the role of technology on human cultures by showing how changes in technology affect social structure, work, and communication. The significance of studying social development is underlined throughout the text because it offers useful insights on the adaptable and transforming character of human civilizations.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Human, Labor, Society, Social.

INTRODUCTION

All of the earlier conceptions of social life are dominated by the notion of human destiny. The development of society is directed toward a divinely predetermined aim. Whoever holds this line of thought is logically accurate if, while discussing forward and backward movement, revolution and counterrevolution, and action and reaction, he places the emphasis on these ideas that so many historians and politicians have done. History is evaluated based on whether it moves humanity closer or farther away from its objective. However, social science starts when one liberates themselves from these behaviors, and in fact from any valuing. In the sense that any causal study of the will must be teleological, social science is truly teleological. However, the causal explanation completely disregards its notion of aim. For social scientists, causality continues to be the cornerstone of cognition, whose upkeep cannot even be compromised by teleology. It cannot talk of development to a higher level, say in the sense of Hegel and Marx, since it does not judge aims. Because it is in no way established that all evolution proceeds upward or that each succeeding stage represents a higher level. It can no longer share the gloomy historical philosophers' view that history is a downward spiral that will eventually lead to a poor outcome. What drives historical development is the same as asking what society is like, where it came from, and what causes social circumstances to evolve. These three questions what society is, how it develops, and how it changes can stand alone as the challenges that scientific sociology poses for itself [1]–[3].

It has long been recognized that men's social lives mirror biological processes. It serves as the foundation for the well-known Menenius Agrippa fable that Livy passed down to us. When several works pushed this parallel to the point of absurdity in the nineteenth century, social science accomplished nothing to further its cause. What use does it serve to refer to human-produced goods as "social intercellular substance"? When scientists disagreed about which organ of the social body related to the central nervous system, who became enlightened? The best criticism of this type of sociological research came from an economist who said that anyone who compared money with blood and the circulation of money with the circulation of blood would be contributing to economics in the same way that a person who compared blood with money and the circulation of money with the blood-circulation would be contributing to biology. Some of the most crucial ideas in modern biology evolution, the division of labor, and the battle for existence come from social science. However, it has continued to employ what it has learned to create a profit rather than stopping at metaphorical expressions and analogous conclusions. However, biological-sociology did little more with the concepts it had previously acquired than toss about meaningless words. We know even less about social interactions thanks to the romantic movement's "organic" notion of the state. It was unable to use the doctrine of the division of labor, a component of the classical system that must serve as the foundation of all sociology, just as it is of modern biology, because it purposefully ignored the system of classical Political Economy, the most significant contribution to social science to that point.

Sociology should have learned through comparisons with biological organisms that an organism can only be thought of as a system of organs. This just indicates that the division of labor is the core of the organism, nevertheless. Only via the division of labor do components become members; it is through the cooperation of members that we are able to see the system's or organism's oneness. This applies to both civilization and the lives of plants and animals. The social body may be likened to the biological in terms of the notion of labor division. The classic simile's *tertium comparationis* base for comparison is the division of labor.

One of the guiding principles of all life is the division of labor. When political economists underlined the significance of the division of labor in the social economy, it was first noticed in the realm of social life. Following Milne Edwards' first initiation in 1827, biology later accepted it. However, just because we may see the division of labor as a universal norm doesn't mean we should stop acknowledging the key distinctions between the division of labor in an animal or vegetable unit and the division of labor in human society. Whatever the physiological division of labor's origin, development, and significance may be, it is obvious that it has nothing to do with the social division of labor. The method used to separate and merge homogenous cells differs greatly from the one used to create human civilization from independent individuals. While it is unthinkable for such forces to intervene in the first phase, they do so in the second step when the formerly autonomous units consolidate into a bigger unit and become components of a whole [4]–[6].

Even in "animal communities," where organisms like ants and bees live together, all motions and changes are instinctual and unconscious. It's possible that instinct was active at first and throughout the early phases of social development as well. Man is already a member of a social body when he emerges as a thinking, willful creature since the idea of a thinking man being alone is absurd. Only among men, according to Fichte, does a man become a man. The growth of human reason and the growth of human civilization are two sides of the same coin. All future social connections development is purely a question of choice. The result of mind

and volition is society. It is not independent of thinking and volition. Its existence is internal to man, not external. It is emitted externally from inside.

Cooperation and community engagement define society. When we remark that society is an organism, we are referring to the division of labor in society. We must consider all the goals that folks set for themselves as well as the methods by which they are to be achieved in order to do justice to this principle. Every interaction between a thinking, willing guy is included. The development of reason and the perceptive capacity in modern man would not have been conceivable without society, making him a social entity in addition to one whose physical requirements could not be met alone. Man is unfathomable as an isolated creature since humanity only exists as a social phenomenon, and humankind has only advanced above the animal stage inasmuch as interpersonal interactions have developed via cooperation. Social cooperation was the only factor that allowed humans to evolve from the human animal to a sentient entity.

The Principle of Social Development:

The deepest and most profound secret of life, the theory behind the creation of creatures, is still a mystery to us. Who can say for sure whether we will ever find it? All we now know is that the formation of organisms results in the creation of something new from separate components. Animal and vegetable creatures are more than collections of solitary cells, and society is more than the sum of its members. We still don't fully understand the relevance of this finding. The mechanical theory of the conservation of matter and energy continues to constrain our thinking since it is unable to explain how one might become two. Again, comprehension of the social organization must come before that of the biological if we are to deepen our grasp of the essence of life.

DISCUSSION

The historical origins of the division of labor may be found in two natural facts: the disparity of human capacities and the diversity of environmental factors affecting human existence on earth. These two realities are essentially just one: nature's diversity, which does not repeat itself but instead gives rise to an infinitely diverse cosmos. However, the unique character of our investigation, which is focused on sociological knowledge, authorizes us in handling these two components independently. It goes without saying that these two circumstances must have an impact on human activity as soon as it becomes rational and aware. They do actually approach forcing the division of labor on humanity.¹⁶ Men and women of all ages cooperate by wisely using their respective skills. The beginning of the geographical division of labor may also be seen here when a man goes hunting and a woman goes to a spring to gather water. The concept of division of labor would not have existed if everyone's power and talents, as well as the external circumstances of production, were equal everywhere. Man would never have thought to cooperate in the division of labor in order to ease the battle for survival. In a world that was spatially homogeneous, no social life could have developed among persons of equal inherent ability. It's possible that men would have banded together to do activities that were too difficult for them to complete alone, but such alliances do not constitute a civilization. The relationships they create are fleeting and last only as long as the event that led to them. Their only contribution to the development of social life is the reconciliation between men that results in the mutual awareness of the variations in people's innate abilities, which in turn gives birth to the division of labor.

The division of labor itself has a distinguishing effect after it has been done. Due to the division of labor, it is possible to develop each individual's potential further, making cooperation more fruitful. Men are able to accomplish things via cooperation that would have

been impossible for them to perform alone, and even the job that individuals are capable of completing alone is made more productive. The circumstances that influence the rise in production under cooperation must be outlined with analytical accuracy in order to completely understand all of this, however.

One of the most significant contributions of Classical Political Economy is the notion of the global division of labor. It demonstrates that the geographical division of labor is determined by comparative costs of production rather than absolute costs of production, as long as transfers of capital and labor between nations are restricted for whatever reason.¹⁸ When the same theory is applied to the personal division of labor, it is discovered that the individual benefits from working not just with those who are better than him in a particular area but also with those who are worse off than him in all relevant respects. A will benefit if he limits his labor to creating q and leaves B to create p if, due to his superiority over B, A requires three hours of labor to manufacture one unit of commodity p compared to B's five and two hours of labor to produce commodity q .

When both p and q are produced over the course of sixty hours, the output for each is $20p + 30q$ for A, $12p + 15q$ for B, and $32p + 45q$ for both of them taken as a whole. However, if A restricts himself to generating only q , he creates 60 units in 120 hours, while B produces 24 units in the same amount of time if he restricts himself to creating only p . The outcome of the activity is thus $24p + 60q$, which indicates a higher output than $32p + 45q$ since p has a substitution value of 3: $2q$ for A and 5: $4q$ for B. Therefore, it follows that any development of the personal division of labor benefits those who participate in it. The person who works with others who are less talented, less capable, and less diligent earns an advantage on par with the person who surrounds himself with those who are more talented, more capable, and more diligent. The benefit of the division of labor is reciprocal; it is not just used when tasks are completed that a single person would have been unable to do [7]–[9]. A unifying factor is the increased productivity of work made possible by the division of labor. It causes males to see one another as allies in a shared quest for welfare rather than as rivals in a war for survival. It transforms adversaries into friends, violence into peace, and individuals into members of society.

Organization and Organism

Organization and organism vary from one another in the same way as life differs from a machine and a real flower differs from an artificial one. Each cell in a natural plant lives its own life and interacts with the others in a reciprocal manner. Just this self-existence and self-maintenance is what we refer to as life. In the artificial plant, the many components are only a part of the total to the extent that the will of the person who brought them together was successful. The organization's components are only interconnected to the degree that this will is successful. Each component only uses the space that is allotted to it and only moves away from that location when given instructions. Only to the extent that the creator has given them life in his creation may the components inside it live, that is, exist for themselves.

The horse that the cart's driver has tethered to it is a real horse. In the group, the "team," a horse is as alien to the carriage as an engine is to the vehicle it pulls. The components may utilize their existence against the organization, like when the horse bolts from the wagon or the tissue used to create the fake flower degrades due to chemical activity. Organization in humans is similar. It is a product of volition, just like civilization. However, in this instance, the will does not create a live social structure any more than a flower grower creates a living rose. As long as the creative will is strong, the organization remains intact. The components of the organization only come together as a whole insofar as the creator's will can be imposed

onto them and their existence can be fixed inside the organization. There is only one will in the paraded battalion, and that is the commander's will.

The only other item in the corporation that still works is dead machinery. The core of military exercise is found in this annihilation of the will, or that element of it which does not serve the needs of the body of warriors. The soldier is trained to fight in the phalangial order, in which the body of soldiers must only be an organization. There is no life present inside the bulk. Any life the individual leads is outside or alongside the body of troops possibly even opposed to it, but never within. Modern warfare must employ the individual soldier, his brain, and his will since it is founded on the skirmisher's own business. As a result, the army no longer only exercises its soldiers. He is to be educated by it.

Organization is a grouping based on power, while organism is reciprocity. A primitive mind never considers anything to have arisen naturally or organically; they always believe it to have been arranged from the outside. He can see the arrow he carved and understand how it came to be and how it was started. So he inquires about the origin and cause of everything he observes. He looks into the causes of every change in nature and the origins of all life, and he comes up with an animistic theory. The Gods are so created. Man attempts to comprehend existence as an organization, not as an organism, since he observes the ordered society with its contrast of rulers and controlled. The idea that the head is the master of the body dates back to ancient times, and this is why the leader of an organization is referred to as the "head."

One of science's greatest achievements was the realization of the organism's nature and the removal of the exclusivity of the idea of organization. In the Social Science field, this was mostly accomplished in the eighteenth century, when Classical Political Economy and its immediate forerunners played the primary role, one may say with all due respect to older philosophers. The fight against all animistic and vitalistic ideas was taken up by biology. The skull is no longer the crowning glory of the body, according to contemporary biology. In the living organism, there is no longer a difference between the leader and the followers, the sovereign and the people, or the means and the ends. There are just organs and members.

As insane as it would be to destroy a live plant in order to reassemble a new one from its dead pieces is the attempt to arrange society. Only when the live social organism has been exterminated can humanity organize itself. Therefore, the collectivist movements are destined to fail. It could be conceivable to establish a group that represents all of humanity. However, this would always be only an organization, continuing along with social life. The forces of social life may change it and destroy it, and the instant it attempted to rebel against these forces, it would undoubtedly be annihilated. Collectivism can only become a reality if all social life is destroyed before the collectivist state is established. Thus, it makes perfect sense for the Bolsheviks to want to break up all established social bonds and demolish the social system that has been built up over many centuries in order to build something new on top of the ruins. They exclude the reality that solitary people cannot be organized since they have no social ties to one another. Organizations are only feasible if they do not harm or are not oriented towards the organic. All efforts to persuade people to submit to something against their living will must fail. Without being established on the goals of people who created it and serving those goals, an organization cannot succeed.

The Person and Society

Society is more than just mutual benefit. Animals exhibit reciprocity, as shown when the wolf consumes the lamb or when the wolf and she-wolf mate. However, we never discuss wolf groups or other animal communities. Wolf and lamb, wolf and she-wolf, are in fact parts of

the same organism, which is called Nature. However, this creature lacks the distinctive trait of the social organism: it is not subject to choice or action. The relationship between the sexes is not, per se, a social connection for the same reason. When a man and a woman are married, they adhere to the law that determines their position in nature. They have so far been guided by instinct. Only in situations when action and will combine can societies arise. To work together to achieve goals that people alone could not achieve at all, or not as effectively, is society.

As a result, society serves as a vehicle for each member to pursue his or her own objectives rather than a goal in itself. The fact that two people's wills come together in a common endeavor is what makes society conceivable in the first place. From a community of will comes a community of effort. The will and behavior of my fellow citizen become the method by which I may achieve my own purpose since I can only obtain what I want if he achieves what he wants. My purpose cannot be to subvert his will since my willingness inevitably entails his willingness. The foundation of all social life is this basic reality. The division of labor concept demonstrated how society has developed. As we can see from a comparison between Kant and others who followed after him, social knowledge advanced at an astonishing rate after the importance of the division of labor had been understood.

When Kant wrote, the theory of the division of labor as advanced by economists in the eighteenth century was still in its infancy. The Ricardian Theory of International Trade has not made it precise. However, the Doctrine of the Harmony of Interests foresaw its application to social theory in great detail. These concepts had little effect on Kant. Therefore, his only theory of society is that there is a desire in humans to build a society and a second, opposing drive that wants to break society apart. Nature uses the conflict between these two drives to guide humans toward their ultimate destination. It's hard to think of a more flimsy theory than this one, which tries to explain society via the interaction of two impulses: the drive "to socialize oneself" and the impulse "to isolate oneself."

The Evolution of the Labor Division

The creation of society cannot be the topic of sociological study inasmuch as the person becomes a social entity under the influence of blind instinct, before thinking and volition are fully aware. However, this does not imply that Sociology must take the social fabric of humanity as a given and delegate the burden of explaining how society came to be to another field. Because if we decide and this is the immediate result of equating society and the division of labor that the structure of society was incomplete at the time that thinking, willing humans first appeared and that the constructive process has continued throughout history, we must look for a principle that enables us to understand this evolution. This idea comes from the economic theory of labor division. It has been claimed that the fortunate coincidence that allowed for the development of civilisation was the finding that labor that has been divided is more productive than labor that has not been divided. The growth of the understanding that labor is more productive the more evenly it is distributed has increased the division of labor. In this view, the expansion of the division of labor represents economic growth because it gets production closer to its end goal the maximum fulfillment of wants and because it entails the strengthening of social ties [10], [11].

The term "progress" may only be used sociologically in the context of historical investigation if any teleological or ethical evaluation is disregarded. We evaluate each change independently to see if and to what extent our premise is supported by it. We think that we may detect a particular pattern in the changes in social situations. It's possible that we base our assumptions on a variety of factors, each of which is supported by experience in a similar

manner. The relationship between these presumptions whether they are distinct from one another or interconnected internally then becomes a challenge. The next step should be to define the nature of the link. But all of this amounts to is a study of the progression of consecutive changes that is free from appraisal and based on a premise.

The bulk of theories purporting to explain social evolution have two key flaws that make them unacceptable if we exclude those evolutionary theories that are naively based on value judgements. The first is that their evolutionary theory has nothing to do with society in general. Neither Lamprecht's five phases of social-psychological development nor Comte's three-stage theory of the human mind provide any insight into the fundamental and essential link between the growth of the mind and the evolution of society. We are taught how society acts as it transitions into a new stage, but we are curious about how society starts and changes. Such theories consider the changes that we see as social changes as realities operating on society from outside; yet, we need to view them as the operations of a universal law. The fact that all of these theories are "stage" theories (Stufentheorien) is the second setback. For the stage-theories, evolution, or continuous change in which we can identify a clear tendency, truly doesn't exist. The claims made by these theories do not prove the causal relationship between the steps that make up the sequence; they just provide a clear sequence of occurrences. At best, they are successful in drawing comparisons between the progressions of events in other countries. But classifying human existence into categories like infancy, adolescence, adulthood, and old age is one thing; understanding the rule that controls how an organism grows and degrades is quite another. Every theory of phases has a certain element of arbitrariness. The boundaries of the phases change throughout time.

It is unquestionably correct that the division of labor served as the foundation for modern German economic history's idea of development. However, it hasn't been able to break free of the outdated, conventional model of development via phases. Its theory is still in the early stages. Accordingly, Bücher makes a distinction between the stages of the open economy pure production for one's own use, barterless economy, the town economy production for clients, the stage of direct exchange, and the national economy production for markets, the stage of the circulation of goods. Schmoller makes a distinction between the territorial, state, town, and village economies. Philippovich contrasts between closed domestic economies and trade economies, and within the latter he identifies the periods of regionally constrained commerce, state-controlled trade that is restricted to the state's territory, and free trade developed national economies, capitalism. Many serious arguments have been voiced in opposition to these efforts to drive evolution into a larger framework.

We need not explore the potential utility of such categorization in illuminating the traits of precisely defined historical epochs or the extent to which they may be accepted as descriptive aids. They should be used very carefully in any case. The fruitless debate over the ancient civilizations' economic systems demonstrates how easy such categorization may cause us to confuse the shadow of academic word-splitting with the substance of historical truth. The stage theories are not useful for sociological research. They deceive us when it comes to one of history's most significant issues choosing how far historical progression is continuous. The assumption that social evolution which, it should be recalled, is the growth of the division of labor has proceeded in an unbroken line or the premise that each country has advanced incrementally over the same territory are the two most common approaches to solving this issue. Both presumptions are irrelevant. When there have been evident times in history when the division of labor has regressed, it is ludicrous to claim that evolution has never stopped. On the other hand, the advancement made by certain countries in moving up the labor division of labor scale is never totally forgotten.

It invades other countries and quickens their progress. Economic development was probably delayed for millennia by the collapse of the ancient civilization. However, more recent historical studies have shown that there were considerably deeper links than previously thought between the economic civilizations of antiquity and the Middle Ages. The vast movement of peoples undoubtedly caused the Exchange Economy significant harm, yet it managed to endure. The towns on which it relied were not completely destroyed, and a connection was quickly found between the surviving aspects of town life and the emerging practice of bartering for goods and services. A portion of the social advancements of antiquity were retained and carried over into Middle Ages existence in the civilisation of the cities.

Realizing the benefits of the division of labor, or its increased productivity, is essential for progress. This was first made clearly clear by the physiocrats' free-trade beliefs and the traditional political economy of the eighteenth century. However, it may be found in the rudiments of all arguments for peace, whenever peace is lauded or war is decried. The growth of commerce is advanced by the peaceful principle, whereas the militarist-imperialist principle views human society as a coercive suppression of some of its members by others rather than as a friendly division of labor. The imperialistic philosophy consistently wins out. The tendency for peaceful labor that is inherent in the people must battle through to fully realize its relevance as a principle of social progress before the liberal principle can sustain itself against it. Peace can only be limited and fleeting wherever the imperialistic principle is in power; it can never persist longer than the circumstances that gave rise to it.

The mental environment that imperialism surrounds itself with is not well adapted to fostering the expansion of the division of labor over state borders; in fact, it effectively forbids its expansion past the political and military obstacles that divide the states. The division of labor requires freedom and tranquility. The foundation for the astounding growth of the economic civilization of that era—an era dubbed by the most recent imperialistic and socialistic doctrines as the age of crass materialism, egotism, and capitalism was not laid until the modern liberal thought of the eighteenth century had provided a philosophy of peace and social collaboration. The results reached in this regard by the materialistic vision of history, which depicts the growth of social ideology as depending on the level of technological advancement that has been accomplished, are the most perverse possible.

Ferguson demonstrated that social factors influence the evolution of technique and that each age develops to the extent that is allowed by the social division of labor stages it has attained.²⁹ Only in areas where the division of labor has paved the ground for their implementation are technological advancements conceivable. The mass manufacture of shoes requires a society in which a small number of businesses can produce shoes for hundreds of thousands or millions of people. A self-sufficient peasant community cannot possibly need the steam mill. The concept of using mechanical forces in the service of manufacturing could only be motivated by the division of labor.

It has nothing in common with the crude and naïve materialism of technology and other materialistic theories of history to trace the genesis of everything socially relevant to the emergence of the division of labor. It also in no way implies a restriction of the notion of social interactions, as adherents of the idealistic school of thought are prone to claim. It also does not confine society to the purely material. The ultimate goal of social existence is undoubtedly something which transcends economics, but the means by which this goal is attained are guided by the rule of all rational activity, and whenever this law is put to the test, economic action results.

CONCLUSION

A multifaceted examination of The Nature of Society has shown the rich fabric that characterizes human civilization. As a strong force, culture shapes the ideas, values, and customs that unite people into strong social groups. Political systems have a big impact on governance and the distribution of power, but economics acts as the driving force behind resource allocation, influencing both individual and collective behaviour. At the core of societal dynamics are interactions between people and groups, which result in collaboration, conflict, and the formation of social hierarchies. The development of technology has fundamentally changed how civilizations operate, affecting everything from communication to manufacturing to even the very essence of employment.

Societies have been significantly shaped by evolutionary processes, which favor characteristics that foster cooperation and social cohesiveness. Human civilizations have also shown a remarkable potential for innovation and adaptation in response to problems and opportunities. The Nature of Society explains how a multidisciplinary approach is necessary to comprehend the complexity of human social systems. We may learn more about the forces that shape our civilizations by identifying the interaction of cultural, economic, political, and technical variables. This information is essential for promoting constructive social change and overcoming present and future obstacles. It is crucial to recognize the rich variety and dynamics that are inherent in human communities as we navigate an ever-changing world. By promoting empathy, collaboration, and mutual understanding, we may create a more peaceful and fair future.

REFERENCES:

- [1] M. Diković and T. Gergorić, “Teachers’ assessment of active learning in teaching Nature and Society,” *Econ. Res. Istraz.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/1331677X.2020.1728563.
- [2] M. Scheffer, B. Van Bavel, I. A. Van De Leemput, and E. H. Van Nes, “Inequality in nature and society,” *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2017, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1706412114.
- [3] D. M. Williams, P. Descola, and G. Palsson, “Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives.,” *J. R. Anthropol. Inst.*, 1998, doi: 10.2307/3034440.
- [4] “Critical transitions in nature and society,” *Choice Rev. Online*, 2009, doi: 10.5860/choice.47-1380.
- [5] “Societies of nature and the nature of society,” in *Conceptualizing Society*, 2020. doi: 10.4324/9780203032244-12.
- [6] G. Palla, I. Derényi, I. Farkas, and T. Vicsek, “Uncovering the overlapping community structure of complex networks in nature and society,” *Nature*, 2005, doi: 10.1038/nature03607.
- [7] H. Yang, “A Discussion on the Harmonious Relationship of Human, Nature and Society,” *Adv. Appl. Sociol.*, 2018, doi: 10.4236/aasoci.2018.88036.
- [8] A. Robert, “Landscapes and ecosystem services: Contributions to the knowledge about nature-societies interrelations,” *CyberGeo*. 2018. doi: 10.4000/cyberge0.29597.
- [9] K. D. White, “Nature-society linkages in the Aral Sea region,” *J. Eurasian Stud.*, 2013, doi: 10.1016/j.euras.2012.10.003.

- [10] F. Sultana, "Producing Contaminated Citizens: Toward a Nature-Society Geography of Health and Well-Being," *Ann. Assoc. Am. Geogr.*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/00045608.2012.671127.
- [11] H. Weisz and E. Clark, "Society-nature coevolution: Interdisciplinary concept for sustainability," *Geogr. Ann. Ser. B Hum. Geogr.*, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0467.2011.00382.x.

CHAPTER 20

ROLE OF CONFLICT IN SOCIAL EVOLUTION

Swati Rajaura, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-swati.rajaura@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Neha Yajurvedi, Associate Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id-nehayajurvedi@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The research *The Role of Conflict in Social Evolution* examines the basic importance of conflict as a catalyst for the growth and evolution of human civilizations. This essay explores the complex link between conflict and social development, highlighting how crucial it is in determining intergroup interactions, political systems, and cultural norms. This study examines how conflicts, whether they result from rivalry for resources, ideological disagreements, or power battles, have been revolutionary catalysts throughout history by drawing on evolutionary theory and social scientific research. This study aims to further knowledge of the elements affecting human societies and their ongoing adaptation and expansion by examining the intricacies of conflict in the context of social evolution. Additionally, it looks at how civilizations change and advance as a result of conflicts, eventually resulting in transformation and expansion. Understanding the function of conflict in social development may help us manage and reduce conflict in contemporary cultures.

KEYWORDS:

Division Labor, Conflict, Social, Society.

INTRODUCTION

The Cause of Social Evolution

The most straightforward method to illustrate how society has evolved is to highlight the differences between two evolutionary trends that are connected to one another in a similar manner to intension and extension. Societies grow both subjectively and objectively; objectively, by broadening the objectives of their operations; subjectively, by increasing the size of its membership. The division of labor begins by being limited to the smallest social groups immediate neighbors and then steadily expands until it finally encompasses all of humanity. This procedure is finite and has never been fully completed; it is still far from being finished. It will have accomplished its objective once there is a uniform system of labor division among all men on Earth. A process of intensification coexists with this expansion of the social link. The scope of social activity expands but the individual's ability to provide for his own consumption does not. We don't need to stop and consider if this trend will ultimately lead to the specialization of all productive activities at this point. Collaboration for collaborative action is always necessary for social progress, and social relationships are always peaceful and never violent. War and acts that cause death are antisocial. This fact has been neglected by all theories that see human development as the result of conflicts between human communities [1]–[3].

Darwinism

The individual's destiny is unquestionably defined by his Being. Everything that has happened as a consequence of his Becoming and everything that will happen as a result of what has happened. The state of affairs at any given time represents the end of history.⁴⁴ He

who fully comprehended it would be able to glimpse the whole future. Since "imputation" that cognitive process unique to all rational action had not yet been fully understood, it was long believed that human will and action should be excluded from the determination of events. It was thought that imputation and causal explanation couldn't coexist. It is no longer the case. The issue of imputation has been sufficiently clarified by ethics, philosophy of law, and economics to dispel previous misconceptions.

It must be realized that only the heuristic value of the division may justify our doing so if, in order to simplify our research, we analyze the unity we refer to as the person into specific complexes. It is impossible to distinguish what is fundamentally identical based on outward qualities after a thorough investigation. We can only organize the factors that determine an individual's life after making this acknowledgment. We refer to a person's intrinsic characteristics, or race, which they carry with them into the world at birth. Man's fundamental nature is the result of all of his predecessors' histories, fates, and experiences. The individual's life and destiny begin long before birth and go all the way back to the beginning of time. The fact that a descendant inherits from their forebears is beyond the purview of the controversy over the transmission of acquired traits.

Direct experience starts from birth. The environment starts to have an impact on the person. This impact creates the person's being at every instant of his existence, together with what is intrinsic. The environment is natural in terms of the soil, temperature, nutrition, flora, and fauna in other words, the surroundings outside. In the sense of society, it is social. Language, his place in the labor and trade process, ideology, and the powers of compulsion unrestrained and organized coercion are the social forces working on the individual. The State is the name given to the organized system of coercion. Since Darwin, we have a tendency to see human life's reliance on the natural world as a conflict between opposing forces. There was nothing wrong with this as long as individuals did not apply the metaphorical phrase to an area where it belonged and would almost certainly result in serious mistakes. People lost what the concepts originally meant when the formulae of Darwinism, which arose from ideas taken up by Biology from Social Science, returned to Social Science. Thus was born that horror, sociological Darwinism, which, culminating in a romantic celebration of death and war, was oddly accountable for the eclipse of liberal ideals and for fostering the mental climate that gave rise to the First World War and the current social conflicts.

It is commonly known that Malthus's *Essay on the Principle of Population* had an impact on Darwin. Malthus, however, did not see conflict as an essential social institution. Even Darwin does not necessarily imply the violent conflict between living things, the life-or-death fight for food sources and females, when he talks of the struggle for survival. He often used the word in a metaphorical sense to highlight how dependent living things are on one another and their environment. It is incorrect to interpret the term literally since it is a metaphor. When individuals confuse the battle for survival with the war of annihilation between humans and then go on to build a social theory based on the need of struggle, the mistake is made worse.

What its detractors, who are uninformed of sociology, consistently fail to realize is that the Malthusian philosophy of Population is only a component of liberalism's social philosophy. It can only be comprehended within such a context. The principle of the division of labor is the basis of liberal social theory. The Law of Population may only be used in conjunction with this to explain social situations. In its fundamental idea, society abolishes human conflict in favor of reciprocal assistance, which serves as the primary motivation for keeping all of its members joined as a single organism. Society is the union of humans for the better exploitation of natural circumstances of life. There is only peace inside the boundaries of society. Every conflict effectively suspends the social society. Society as a whole, as an

organism, does engage in a battle with opposing forces for survival. However, on the inside, there is only cooperation since society has entirely swallowed individuals. Collaboration is the only thing that makes society [4]–[6].

Even conflict cannot completely sever social relationships in contemporary life. Some tensions in a conflict between nations that recognize the supremacy of international law still exist, although having been relaxed. Thus, a little bit of peace persists even during times of conflict. The governing concept that balances society's finite supply of subsistence resources with consumers' more flexible capacity for growth is private ownership of the means of production. The elimination of surplus humans through the struggle for existence, as it rages in the vegetable and animal kingdom, is replaced by a decrease in the birth rate as a result of social forces by making the share of the social product that falls to each member of society depend on the product economically imputed to him, that is, to his labor and his property. The battle for survival has been replaced by "moral restraint," which refers to the restrictions placed on children by societal roles.

There is no battle for survival in society. To think that liberalism's social theory could arrive at any other result would be a serious mistake. The fact that Malthus wrote the first unfinished draft of his renowned first book before he had fully absorbed the spirit of Classical Political Economy is an easy way to explain certain isolated sentences in his essay that may be read in a different way. It may be noted that, prior to Spencer and Darwin, no one saw the fight for existence (in the contemporary meaning of the word) as a principle operative within human society, serving as evidence that his concept allowed of no alternative interpretation. In Darwinism, which had its roots in the intellectual community of liberal social theory, people now found weapons to combat the liberalism they despised. Darwinism was the first to propose theories that regard the struggle of individuals, races, nations, and classes as the basic social element. Marxism, Racial Mysticism⁴⁸, and Nationalism found what they considered to be an unbreakable basis for their teachings in Darwin's theory, which has long been regarded as unquestionable scientific truth. The catchphrases developed by popular science from Darwinism are particularly important to contemporary Imperialism.

DISCUSSION

The Darwinian or, more accurately, pseudo-Darwinian social theories have never understood the major challenge involved in translating their catchphrases about the battle for life to social interactions. Individuals fight for their survival in nature. Finding natural events that may be regarded as conflicts between animal species is unusual. Of course, there are the ant conflicts between groups, albeit we may eventually be forced to embrace explanations that are considerably different from those that have been previously accepted.⁴⁹ A social theory based on Darwinism would either come to the conclusion that war of all against all was the natural and necessary form of human interaction, denying the existence of any social bonds, or it would have to demonstrate why peace does and must exist within specific groups while also demonstrating that the peaceful union principle that fosters the formation of these associations is ineffective outside of these groups.

All non-liberal social theories are founded on exactly this point. If one accepts a concept that unites all Germans, all Dolichocephalics, or all Proletarians and creates a unique country, race, or class out of individuals, then one cannot demonstrate the effectiveness of this principle simply within the context of collective organizations. By limiting themselves to the premise that the solidarity of interests within the groups is so obvious as to be accepted without further discussion, and by making an effort only to demonstrate the existence of the conflict of interests between groups and the necessity of conflict as the only dynamic force of

historical development, the anti-liberal social theories skim over the issue. It is nonetheless difficult to see why the productive activity of conflict should be constrained to governments, countries, races, and classes if it is to be the father of all things and the creative source of historical development. If conflict is necessary for the survival of the species, why limit it to a fight between all groups? The liberal social theory of the division of labor is the sole theory that explains how interpersonal harmony is possible and how society develops from individuals. However, it is inconceivable to think that the hostility of collective groupings is required once this hypothesis is accepted. Why can't Germans and Frenchmen live harmoniously in society with Brandenburgers and Hanoverians?

Sociological Darwinism cannot account for the phenomena of society's ascent. Rather than being a social theory, it is "a theory of unsociability." People are now starting to refute social Darwinism by citing instances of mutual help (symbiosis), which Biology has just recently found in the vegetative and animal worlds. This fact plainly demonstrates the decline of sociological thinking in recent decades. The defiant opponent of liberal social theory Kropotkin, who was never able to comprehend what he opposed and fought against, discovered the beginnings of social ties among animals and set these up in opposition to conflict, contrasting the beneficial principle of mutual aid with the harmful principle of war-to-the-knife. A scientist who was enslaved by Marxist Socialism, Kammerer, showed that, in addition to conflict, the principle of cooperation governs life in nature. At this moment, Biology goes back to Sociology, where it all began. It returns the divided labor theory that Sociology had taught it. The notion of the division of labor as outlined by the reviled Classical Political Economy does not impart anything novel or fundamental to sociology.

Competition and Conflict

The tenet that all people are created equal serves as the foundation for social theories based on natural law. Because all men are created equal, they should have a natural right to be regarded as complete members of society, and because everyone has a natural right to life, it would be against the law to attempt to take that right away. The precepts of peace, equality within society, and all-inclusiveness are thusly defined. On the other side, liberal philosophy derives these ideas from usefulness. The terms "man" and "social man" are interchangeable in liberal thought. All those who can see the value of social cooperation and harmony at work are welcomed into society as members. Every person should be regarded as an equal citizen since it is in his or her best interest. However, the guy who, despite the benefits of peaceful cooperation, wants to battle and rejects societal conformity must be combatted like a dangerous animal. It is essential to adopt this mindset in opposition to the barbaric tribes and anti-social criminals. The only way liberalism can support war is in self-defense. For the remainder, it views war as the anti-social principle that destroys social cooperation [7]–[9].

The anti-liberal social theories aimed to invalidate the liberal concept of peace by obscuring the essential distinction between conflict and competitiveness. The term "fight" originally referred to a combat between humans and animals with the intention of annihilating one another. Man's social existence starts when he overrides the urges and motivations that would otherwise lead him to engage in life-or-death combat. History demonstrates a persistent human tendency to avoid confrontation in interpersonal interactions. Fights become less frequent and violent. If society can find a method to include the victor, then the enemy is no longer annihilated, and his life is preserved. Because fighting is governed by laws, it is substantially lessened. However, the means of annihilation and devastation continue to be war and revolution. Liberalism always emphasizes that they are anti-social for this reason.

Calling a competition "competitive war" or "war" in general is only a metaphor. Battle has a destructive purpose, whereas competition builds things up. Due to economic rivalry, manufacturing must proceed in the most reasonable way possible. Its responsibility is to choose the finest candidates everywhere, including here. It is an essential social cooperation concept that is indispensable to the discussion. Even a communist society would need it in order to function, but it could need to be introduced under a different garb, like tests. A socialist way of life would have to be effective at making the competition fierce and sharp enough to be effectively selected. The metaphorical usage of the term "fight" for competitiveness may be understood via three points of reference. First off, it is obvious that rivalry and conflicts of interest exist amongst the parties involved in a battle, just as they do between rivals. The level of hatred felt by a small business owner for his direct rival may be on par with the level of hatred felt by a Montenegrin for a Moslem. However, the social function of men's activities is unaffected by the emotions behind them. As long as the social order's restrictions prevent the individual from acting on his feelings, it makes little difference what he feels.

The selective function of both competition and combat serves as the second point of comparison. It is debatable whether or not fighting can lead to the optimal selection; subsequently, we will demonstrate that many people believe that war and revolution have anti-selective consequences. But one must remember that there is a crucial distinction between fighting and competition since they both serve a selective purpose. The third point of comparison is focused on the negative effects that losing has on the defeated. People often refer to the defeated as being destroyed without realizing that they are only using the term in this particular context to mean "destroyed." Anyone who loses a battle gets slain; in contemporary warfare, blood still pours even when the losers are spared. People claim that economic lives are wrecked in the quest for dominance. However, this only indicates that those who give in are compelled to look for a position other than the one they would want to hold within the framework of the social division of labor. By no means does it imply that people should go hungry. Everyone has a place to live and access to food in the capitalist society. Every employee is fed by its capacity for growth.

Free capitalism does not include permanent unemployment as a characteristic. Fighting is antisocial in the truest meaning of the term. It makes cooperation among the warriors, which is the fundamental component of social relations, impossible and undermines cooperation where it already exists. Social cooperation, the guiding concept inside the social body, includes competition as one of its components. Competition and fighting are polar opposites when viewed sociologically. The recognition of this offers a standard for evaluating all theories that see social development as a struggle between opposing parties. Class strife, racial tension, and national disputes cannot be the guiding concept. No building will ever emerge from a base of carnage and ruin.

Public War

Language is the most significant tool for social cooperation. Only with the aid of language can one man convey to another something, if not exactly what he is experiencing, across the gap between people. At this point, it is unnecessary to address the larger importance of language in regard to thinking and will, including how language influences thought and will and how, without it, there would be just instinct and impulse instead of thought and will.⁵⁴ Thought is also a communal phenomena; it results from the mutual stimulation of individuals working toward similar goals rather than the solitary intellect. The job of the lonely thinker is discussion as well; it is dialogue with the remnants of thinking that centuries of mental labor have placed in language, daily conceptions, and recorded tradition. The solitary thinker

broods in retirement over issues that few others bother to contemplate. Speech and thought are interconnected. The components of language form the foundation of the thinker's conceptual structure.

The human mind can only function in language, and it is via the Word that it first rises beyond doubt and instinct to the highest level of clarity that it is capable of. It is impossible to separate thinking and that which is thought from the language that gave rise to them. One day we could create a worldwide language, but not in the way that Esperanto, Volapuk, and other comparable inventions were created. Inventing similar syllable combinations for everyday terminology and for usage by those who talk without giving their words much thought would not address the problems of a global language or the mutual understanding of peoples. Languages differ significantly not only in terms of the diversity of sounds in words, which can be transferred intact, but also in terms of the untranslatable element in concepts that vibrates in the words expressing them. We shouldn't have been able to bridge the gap between languages and countries even if everyone used the identical terminology for "waiter" and "doorstep" across the whole planet. Although we hadn't discovered identical sounds for the syllables, if everything said in one language could be translated into other languages without losing anything, we should then have achieved linguistic unity. The capacity to translate a word would no longer be a barrier to the exchange of ideas between other nations, and different languages would simply be seen as distinct tongues.

Political tension between citizens of various countries who coexist while speaking different languages will inevitably exist until that day and it's conceivable that it never will tension that might result in severe political hostility. These conflicts are to some extent to blame for the current "hate" between countries, which is the foundation of imperialism. When imperialist theory restricts itself to demonstrating the existence of international conflicts, it simplifies its mission. It would also need to demonstrate that there is national interest solidarity in order to prove its points. As a response to the ecumenical-solidarism of the Free Trade theory, the nationalist-imperialist philosophy emerged. The cosmopolitan notions of global citizenship and inter-national brotherhood predominated in men's ideas at the time of its founding.

Therefore, it only appeared essential to provide evidence of the disparate countries' competing interests. It was largely forgotten that all the justifications it used to demonstrate the conflict between national and regional interests, and ultimately between an individual's personal interests, could also be used to demonstrate the conflict between national and regional interests. If the Germans suffer from consuming English cloth and Russian corn, the inhabitants of Berlin must, presumably, suffer from consuming Bavarian beer and Rhine wine. It would undoubtedly be desirable in the long run to revert to the self-sufficiency of the closed domestic economy if it is not wise to allow the division of labor to cross state borders. If we adopted the full meaning of the phrase "Away with foreign goods!" we would completely destroy the division of labor. For it is exactly the idea that advocates division of labor in all situations and makes the worldwide division of labor seem favorable [10].

It is not by chance that the German people, of all the peoples in Europe, have the least feeling of national cohesiveness and that they were the slowest to grasp the concept of a political union in which one state consists of all the people in the country. Liberalism, free trade, and laissez-faire are the parents of the concept of national unity. The German country was among the first to see the negative effects of nationalistic persecution since significant portions of its population reside in locations where other ethnic groups have established. This encounter made me feel unfavorable toward liberalism. But in the absence of liberalism, it lacked the intellectual tools required to go beyond the local particularism of various factions. It is no surprise that Anglo-Saxons, the traditional bastion of liberalism, have the strongest sense of

national solidarity of any group of people. When imperialists believe that rejecting cosmopolitanism would make a nation's citizens more cohesive, they are gravely deluding themselves. They ignore the reality that, if their philosophy were followed rationally, its fundamentally anti-social component would break apart every society.

Racial War

The understanding of human nature as a result of science is still in its infancy. We actually can't say much more about an individual's hereditary traits except that some guys are more talented from birth than others. We are unable to specify where the line dividing good from terrible should be drawn. Men might vary greatly in terms of their physical and psychological characteristics. We are aware that some families, breeds, and collections of breeds share characteristics. We are aware that it is acceptable to distinguish between races and to discuss the various racial characteristics of certain people. However, research into the somatic aspects of race relationships has not yet produced any conclusive findings. Previously, it was believed that a racial feature had been found in the cranial index, but it is now obvious that there is no connection between the cranial index and an individual's psychological and mental characteristics, contrary to what Lapouge's anthroposociological school had believed. More recent measures have shown that men with long heads are not invariably blonde, noble, cultured, and decent, and that men with small heads are not always black, depraved, common, and uncultured. The Eskimos, Kaffirs, and Australian aborigines are some of the races with the longest heads. The finest minds were often round-headed. The cranial index of Kant was 88.56. We now know that cranial index alterations may very likely occur without racial mixing as a function of a person's lifestyle and environment.

It is difficult to strongly enough oppose the "race experts'" method. They established racial standards with little regard for objectivity. They mock all the requirements put forward by scientific thinking because they are more eager to create catchphrases than to develop knowledge. However, those who criticize this dilettantism do so by focusing only on the concrete shape that certain authors give their ideas as well as the substance of their claims regarding specific races, their physical traits, and their psychological traits. Despite the fact that Gobineau and Chamberlain's illogical and conflicting assumptions have no basis in reality and have been dismissed as empty chimeras, the race theory still has certain elements that are not reliant on the precise distinction between noble and ignoble races.

According to Gobineau's thesis, the race is a beginning, born of a unique act of creation and endowed with unique characteristics. The impact of environment is thought to be minimal; yet, mixing races produces bastards, who lose or degrade the positive traits inherited from the nobler races. However, proving that this theory is false or demonstrating that race is the result of an evolution that has taken place under the most diverse circumstances would not be sufficient to refute the societal significance of the theories of race. This argument could be refuted by arguing that a number of long-term factors bred one or more races with particularly advantageous traits, and that because of these advantages, members of these races had amassed such a sizeable lead that members of other races were unable to overtake them in a reasonable amount of time. The race theory does, in fact, make claims of this kind in its most recent iterations. It is important to research this kind of racial theory and consider how it relates to the theory of social cooperation that has been created here.

We immediately see that it doesn't directly contradict the idea of the division of labor in any way. The two get along well together. It is possible to suppose that races actually vary in intellect and willpower, and that as a result, they are quite unequal in their capacity to create societies. It is also possible to think that the superior races are distinguished specifically by

their unique capacity to foster social cohesion. This theory clarifies certain elements of social development that are otherwise difficult to understand. We may use it to describe how the social division of labor has advanced and regressed as well as how civilizations have flourished and fallen. We don't rule out the possibility that both the original theory and the one built upon it are plausible. We are not currently concerned about this. Our only goal is to demonstrate how the racial theory and our idea of social cooperation may coexist together.

The liberal school's defense of free trade is unaffected when the race theory challenges the idea that all men are created equal and entitled to the same rights. Because liberalism views involuntary labor—which denies the worker the full economic benefit of the produce economically attributed to his labor and separates his income from the productivity of his labor—as being less productive than free labor, it does not support the freedom of the workers for reasons of natural law. There are no arguments against free trade theory that challenge the impact of the growing social division of labor in the race theory. It is possible to acknowledge that the racial inequalities in skill and character cannot ever be reconciled. Free trade theory still demonstrates that even the more intelligent races benefit from interacting with the less intelligent, and that social cooperation gives them the advantage of increased productivity across the whole labor process.

When the liberal social theory starts to preach about the conflict between races, the race theory starts to disagree. However, it can only support the claims made by other military sociological theories in this regard. Heraclitus' adage "that war is the father of all things" continues to be unsubstantiated orthodoxy. It, too, falls short of showing how the social order might have emerged from devastation and ruin. No, theorists of race must also acknowledge that war must be condemned specifically from the perspective of selection if they are to make objective judgments and not just follow their sympathies for militarism and warfare. According to Lapouge, conflict only causes the selection of stronger and more talented individuals in the case of primitive peoples; among civilized peoples, it causes the race to degenerate via unfavorable selection. The fit are more likely to die than the unfit, who are held further back from the front, if not entirely. The different wounds they have sustained throughout the battle have a negative impact on those who survive the conflict in terms of their ability to bear healthy children.

The findings of the scientific investigation into racial differences do not in any way challenge the liberal idea of social evolution. Instead, they affirm it. The animosity of a defeated military and aristocratic caste against bourgeois democracy and the capitalist economy gave rise to the racial theories of Gobineau and many others. They have adopted a form that re-embodies antiquated conceptions of violence and conflict for use in the day-to-day politics of contemporary Imperialism. However, their criticisms are limited to the clichés of the outdated natural law school of thought. They are unimportant in terms of liberalism. The idea that civilisation is the result of peaceful cooperation cannot be refuted, not even by the race theory.

CONCLUSION

Human civilizations are always characterized by conflict, which has historically been a key factor in social development. Conflicts have acted as drivers for society changes and growth, this research has stressed, whether they result from intergroup rivalry, resource competition, or ideological disagreements. While disputes may result in negative consequences, they have also sparked creativity, led to the acceptance of fresh concepts, and encouraged collaboration between people and organizations. Examining historical instances and modern ones has shown that civilizations that are faced with conflict often go through adaptation processes in

order to survive and thrive. Utilizing the constructive parts of conflict while reducing its negative effects requires effective conflict resolution and management techniques.

Policymakers, leaders, and researchers may be helped in their quest for effective answers to societal problems by having a thorough understanding of the dynamics of conflict in social development. Societies may establish conditions that support development and constructive change by addressing the underlying problems and encouraging communication. Furthermore, understanding the role of conflict in social development allows for a more thorough understanding of the complexity and tenacity of human communities throughout history. Recognizing conflict's significance in social development is essential for creating peaceful, wealthy, and flexible communities in the future. Conflict continues to be a complex and powerful force that shapes civilizations.

REFERENCES:

- [1] D. Shilton, M. Breski, D. Dor, and E. Jablonka, "Human Social Evolution: Self-Domestication or Self-Control?," *Front. Psychol.*, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00134.
- [2] J. Lehtonen, "The price equation and the unity of social evolution theory," *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2019.0362.
- [3] A. F. G. Bourke, "Hamilton's rule and the causes of social evolution," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 2014. doi: 10.1098/rstb.2013.0362.
- [4] S. Siller, "Foundations of Social Evolution," *Heredity (Edinb.)*, 1999, doi: 10.1038/sj.hdy.6885351.
- [5] W. A. Shell and S. M. Rehan, "Behavioral and genetic mechanisms of social evolution: insights from incipiently and facultatively social bees," *Apidologie*. 2018. doi: 10.1007/s13592-017-0527-1.
- [6] S. A. West, A. S. Griffin, A. Gardner, and S. P. Diggle, "Social evolution theory for microorganisms," *Nature Reviews Microbiology*. 2006. doi: 10.1038/nrmicro1461.
- [7] M. Port, H. Hildenbrandt, I. Pen, O. Schülke, J. Ostner, and F. J. Weissing, "The evolution of social philopatry in female primates," *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1002/ajpa.24123.
- [8] K. E. Boyle *et al.*, "Metabolism and the evolution of social behavior," *Mol. Biol. Evol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/molbev/msx174.
- [9] S. Mitri, J. B. Xavier, and K. R. Foster, "Social evolution in multispecies biofilms," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2011, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1100292108.
- [10] V. Romano, A. J. J. MacIntosh, and C. Sueur, "Stemming the Flow: Information, Infection, and Social Evolution," *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.tree.2020.07.004.

CHAPTER 21

DISCUSSION ON THE CLASH OF CLASS INTERESTS AND CLASS WAR

Aditi Garg, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- aditi.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Anuj Goel, Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- anuj.goel@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The class conflict that results from opposing interests among various social and economic groups is explored in Clash of Class Interests and the Class War to better understand the underlying dynamics of class conflict. This chapter examines how class divides and the ensuing class conflicts have impacted human civilizations throughout history from a historical, theoretical, and sociological perspective. This research strives to provide a thorough knowledge of the intricacies and effects of class-based disputes in diverse situations by evaluating historical events, economic theories, and socio-political viewpoints. The paper's main theme the conflict between class interests and how it manifests as class war is briefly introduced in the abstract. It draws attention to the topic's complexity, which spans historical, economic, and societal elements. The abstract focuses on how crucial it is to understand class dynamics in order to successfully solve social disparities. Additionally, it emphasizes the dynamic character of class conflicts and underscores the need of additional study in this field.

KEYWORDS:

Class Interests, Labor, Society, Social.

INTRODUCTION

The Class Concept and Class Conflict

The individual's relationship to all other members of society at any one time is determined by his or her place in the social economy. As a giver and receiver in an exchange, a seller and a buyer, he is connected to them. His standing within the community need not bind him to a single activity. One individual may be a landlord, a wage earner, and a business owner at the same time. Another man may be an employee, a business owner, and a landlord at the same time. One may make cheese and baskets and sometimes work as a day laborer for pay. However, even the conditions of people who find themselves in roughly equal positions vary depending on the unique situations under which they come on the market. Every man is positioned differently from others based on his own demands, even while making purchases for his own consumption. There are only ever single people on the market. The market in a free society allows for the creation of personal distinctions; it "atomizes," as is commonly described, typically with some sorrow. Marx himself had to specifically state that "As purchases and sales are made only between single individuals, it is not admissible to look to them for relations between whole social classes."

It is crucial to keep in mind that the question of whether classes play a distinctive role in social life is not resolved if we use the word class to refer to all individuals in roughly equal social situations. Schematization and categorization by themselves are not cognitively useful. A concept's role in the theories to which it belongs determines its scientific relevance; outside of these ideas, it serves only as an intellectual toy. When it is said that since men find

themselves in various social situations, the existence of social classes is apparent, the value of the class theory is not shown. The importance of the individual's place in society, not their social standing, is what counts. It has long been acknowledged that, like other economic disparities, the gap between wealthy and poor has a significant impact on politics. The historical significance of caste and rank distinctions, i.e., inequalities in legal standing or inequality before the law, is also well documented. This was not disputed by classical political economy. However, it set out to demonstrate that all of these discrepancies were the result of flawed political systems. When classical political economy is properly understood, individual interests are never at odds. Conflict of interest beliefs, which were formerly widely held, genuinely originated from a lack of understanding of the underlying rules governing social existence. These problems would stop influencing political discourse once men realized that, properly understood, all interests were equivalent [1]–[3].

However, Classical Political Economy, which stressed the unity of interests, also set the stage for a fresh understanding of class struggle. The mercantilists saw economics as a theory of objective wealth, hence they put things at the center of the discipline. The fact that the Classics created economic man in addition to the things was their greatest accomplishment in this regard. Thus, they laid the groundwork for contemporary economics, which centers its system upon the individual and his or her subjective judgments. A system that puts people and things on an equal footing must therefore be divided into two components, one dealing with the creation of wealth and the other with its distribution. This idea tends to wane when economics becomes a more rigorous science and a system of categorization. However, the concept of dispersion endures. And this in turn gives birth to the notion that the production process and the distribution process should be separated. Producing the items comes first, then distribution. Even while it is obvious that production and "distribution" are inextricably linked in the capitalist system, this unfortunate perception serves to cloud the situation.

As soon as the word "distribution" is used and the issue of imputation is seen as a distribution problem, such errors are unavoidable. The various categories of factors of production must be distinguished for such a theory of imputation, or, to use a term more appropriate to the classic setting of the problem, a theory of income, even though they are all subject to the same basic principle of value formation. "Labour" is separated from "Capital" and "Land." Nothing is simpler in such a situation than to segregate workers from capitalists and landowners, as Ricardo did in the introduction of his principles. This tendency was further exacerbated by the fact that traditional economists did not break down "profit" into its component elements, which gave us the impression that society is divided into three major groups.

But Ricardo continues nonetheless. He expands the class struggle to dynamics by demonstrating how "in different stages of society" the proportions of the total output which will be distributed to each of the three classes are varied. He is followed here by his heirs. Marx comes in with his economic theory, which he presents in *Das Kapital*, at this point. Marx continues to conceptualize class and class struggle in his early works, particularly in the opening paragraphs of the *Communist Manifesto*, in the traditional sense of a discrepancy in legal standing and material wealth. A perspective of contemporary industrial relations as the dominance of capitalists over employees provides the connection between the two ideas. Even though the idea of class is crucial to Marx's theory, he does not define it clearly in *Das Kapital*. Instead of defining what class is, he restricts himself to listing the "great classes" that make up contemporary capitalist society. Here, he adopts Ricardo's division without taking into account the fact that, for Ricardo, the class division is relevant exclusively to the *catalectics* theory.

The Marxist notion of class and class struggle has achieved enormous success. Today, practically everyone agrees that society is divided into classes according to Marx, and that these classes are at war with one another. Even those who wish and fight for class harmony often do not dispute the existence of class differences and class conflicts. However, the idea of a class is still as ambiguous as ever. The idea erupts in all the hues of the rainbow for Marx's adherents as much as for Marx himself. If this idea is founded on the traditional separation of the components of production, as in *Das Kapital's* system, then a classification that was created only for the theory of exchange and is only valid there, becomes the foundation of all sociological knowledge. The fact that grouping the production elements into two, three, or four broad groupings is just an issue with how economic theory is organized and that it can only be valid in this context is ignored. The division of the components of production is simply justified by the function that the theory of catallactics it is designed to fulfill; it is not a categorization of individuals or groups of individuals. For instance, the classical notion of ground-rent is responsible for the particular position of "Land" in the separation. This idea holds that land is that necessary component of production that, under certain conditions, may generate rent. Similar to how labor serves as the source of wages and capital as the source of profit, the idiosyncrasies of the classical system are to blame for these positions. The grouping of the components of production was completely different in later solutions to the distribution issue, which split the "profit" of the classical school into entrepreneur's profit and interest on capital. The grouping of the production components in accordance with the structure of the classical theory, on the other hand, is no longer significant in the current imputation theory. The issue of the establishment of pricing for items of higher classes has replaced the issue of distribution [4]–[6].

Only a conservative approach to scientific categorization has a tendency to hold onto the outdated language. The division of static and dynamic branches of income, for instance, would need a whole new approach for a grouping more in line with the spirit of imputation theory. However, and this is the key point, the foundation for the grouping of elements in no system is dictated by their inherent properties. The biggest mistake in the notion of economic classes is the inability to see this. This theory got its start by erroneously presuming that the production elements that have been put together for analytical purposes have an intrinsic relationship. It creates a uniform terrain that can be utilized for all forms of agriculture at the very least, and a uniform labor force that can do everything. When it establishes a distinction between lands to be used for mining, land to be used for agriculture, and urban land, as well as when it does so between skilled and unskilled labor, it is making a concession, an effort to fit reality. However, this acquiescence does not make things better. Agricultural land is just as much of an abstraction as "land" is, and skilled labor is just as abstract as "labor" in its purest form. And this is crucial they are abstractions that exclude only those elements necessary for sociological investigation. In some instances, it may be acceptable for us to draw comparisons between the three categories of people when discussing the idiosyncrasies of price formation: labor, capital, and land. But when we are dealing with a quite different situation, this does not at all demonstrate that such grouping is acceptable.

DISCUSSION

Property and Classes

The concepts of Estate ("Stand") and class are often conflated by the conception of the class struggle.⁶⁵ Estates were not realities dictated by economics; they were legal organizations. Every guy was born into an estate, and most of them stayed there until they passed away. One had the attribute of belonging to a certain estate throughout one's whole life, which is known as estate-membership. One was a master or a serf, a freeman or a slave, a ruler over the land

or bound to it, a patrician or a commoner, not because they held a particular place in the economic hierarchy, but rather because they belonged to a certain estate. The estates were undoubtedly an economic institution at first since, like any social order, they had to be protected in order to maintain social cooperation. However, the social philosophy that underpinned this institution was fundamentally different from the liberal idea since it only saw human cooperation as a process of some people "taking" from others and others "giving." Such a perspective found it completely inconceivable that the give and take might be mutual and all parties benefit thus. A later era created an artificial reciprocity in the relationship to justify the estate system, which was based on a one-sided burdening of the lower orders and had begun to appear unsocial and unjust in the light of the liberal ideas that were then slowly emerging in the world. The higher orders provided the lower orders with protection, sustenance, the use of land, and other things. However, the fact that this theory even exists indicates that the estate ideology had already started to deteriorate. As is evident from the first crucial difference made by estate that between free and unfree such conceptions were unfamiliar to the institution in its heyday, when the relationship was plainly one of violence. The reason the slave accepted his lot in life rather than continuing to rebel and flee as long as he had breath in him was not because he thought slavery was a fair institution that benefited both the master and the slave equally, but rather because he did not want to endanger his life by acting insubordinately.

It has been attempted to disprove the literal interpretation of servitude and the institution of the estate by highlighting the historical significance of slavery. When those captured in combat were sold into slavery rather than being murdered, it was believed that civilization had advanced. Since everyone would have preferred to be the free master of his own land rather than a landless worker on raw materials produced by others, let alone a propertyless laborer on someone else's land, slavery was necessary for the development of a society that divides labor and separates trades from primary production. According to this perspective, slavery has a historical basis since greater civilization is impossible without the division of labor, which allows for a portion of the population to live a life of leisure free from everyday concerns about survival. The issue of whether a historical institution can be justified or not can only be raised for people who examine history with moralist eyes. Its occurrence in history demonstrates that forces were at work to make it happen. Only the institution's real performance of the role assigned to it can be evaluated objectively. The response in this case is categorically negative. The division of labor was not made possible by slavery. Instead, it obstructed the path.

Slavery had to be abolished before the contemporary industrial society, with its highly developed division of labor, could start to evolve. Free, unclaimed land has remained available for settlement without halting the development of specialized crafts or a class of unpaid laborers. For it was necessary to first make the free land arable. It required stock and upgrades before it began to produce fruit. It was usually worse than already-cultivated land in terms of fertility and almost always in terms of location. The sole prerequisite for the broad growth of the division of labor is private ownership of the means of production. It did not need the slavery of the worker to be made. The relationship between estates often has two forms. One is the bond between the farmer and the feudal lord. The feudal lord is completely removed from the industrial process. He only makes an appearance on stage when the crop has been harvested and the production process is over. He then takes his portion. It is not necessary to know whether the beginning of this relationship was the enslavement of once free peasants or the settlement of people on the lord's property in order to appreciate its nature. The connection is outside of production, thus it cannot be ended via an economic process like the cultivator commuting rent and tithes, which is the only relevant fact. When

the rent is transferable, it stops being a dependent relationship and turns into a property right. The second common relationship is between a master and a slave. Here, the master requests labor rather than material items and is granted his request without the slave receiving any kind of compensation. Because providing food, clothes, and shelter is not a counterservice but rather an expense that must be made or the slave's labor is lost. The slave is only nourished under the carefully formed system of slavery for as long as his labor generates a profit beyond his daily needs [7]–[9].

Nothing is more absurd than equating these two relationships with the one between an employer and employee in a market economy. Free wage labor historically developed to some degree from the labor of slaves and serfs, and it took a long time for it to completely lose all traces of its roots and become what it is in the capitalist economy today. However, to compare the job performed by the unfree with economically free labor for salaries is a total misunderstanding of the capitalist system. Sociological parallels between the two regimes are possible. Because both entail social cooperation and the division of labor, they have similar characteristics. However, it is important to remember that the economic nature of the two systems is quite different while doing sociological research.

Analyzing the economics of free labor using justifications from the study of slave labor is certain to fail. The amount that is economically attributed to the free worker's labor is paid to him in pay. By providing for the slave's maintenance and paying the slave dealer a price for the slave that corresponds to the present worth of the sums by which the earnings of free labor are or would be greater than the slave's maintenance expenditures, the slave owner expends the same amount. Thus, the guy who turns free men into slaves the slave hunter, not the slave trader or the slave owner receives the excess of the worker's earnings over the cost of the workers' subsistence. In the slave economy, none of these two makes any particular money. Therefore, it is obvious that anybody who uses the circumstances of a slave economy to justify the exploitation argument has a profound misunderstanding of the issue.

In a society where people are separated into estates, those estate members who don't have full legal rights have one goal with the other members: they work to strengthen their estate's legal standing. All people who are tied to the land want the burden of paying rent to be lessened, and all slaves want to be liberated so they may benefit from their labor. The less a person is able to assert himself above the legal realm of his estate, the greater the community of interest among all of its members. It doesn't really matter that sometimes, particularly when brilliant people are helped by fortunate events, they may advance to greater estates. The unmet desires and aspirations of lone people do not give rise to major movements. The rich estates open the way for the ascent of the gifted because they want to rejuvenate their own power rather than because they want to quell societal unrest. Gifted people who have been held back from success may only become dangerous if their appeal for violent action is heard by large numbers of disgruntled males.

Class War

As long as the concept of partitioning society in this manner persisted, resolving specific disputes between estates would not be able to abolish the division between estates. Even when the downtrodden threw off the yoke, status disparities persisted. Only liberalism could resolve the underlying conflict of estates. In order to achieve this, it outlawed slavery on the grounds that free labor was more productive than slave labor and declared that freedom of movement and the right to choose one's employment were essential conditions for a just government. Nothing makes the failure of anti-liberalism to comprehend the historical importance of liberalism more obvious than its effort to portray this accomplishment as the

result of certain group "interests." All members of an estate stand together in the conflict between them since they have a shared objective. Despite the fact that their interests often vary, they come together on this one issue. They want to give their estate a stronger legal standing. This is often accompanied with economic benefits since the very reason legal distinctions between estates are preserved is because they provide some individuals economic advantages to the detriment of others.

However, the "class" in the conception of the class-war is an entirely separate issue. When the thesis of irreconcilable class struggle ends at categorizing society into three or four big classes, it is irrational. If the idea were to be followed to its logical conclusion, society would have to continue to break apart into groups of interests until it reached groupings whose members performed exactly the same role. Separating owners into landowners and capitalists is insufficient. The process of distinction must continue until it reaches groups like cotton spinners who produce yarn with the same count, black child leather producers, or light beer brewers. As opposed to the majority of other organizations, these ones do have one common interest: a keen interest in the successful selling of their goods. But this shared interest has a very specific scope.

A single branch of industry cannot, in a free market, generate more than an average profit over the long term, yet it also cannot operate at a loss. Because of this, the shared interests of trading participants do not go beyond the market's short-term trend. The remainder of them interact with each other via competition rather than immediate interest solidarity. Special interests only intervene to put a stop to this competition when some kind of economic liberty is restricted. But proof that this rivalry is interrupted in a free economy must be provided if the plan is to continue to be effective for criticizing the notion of the solidarity of class interests. By citing the shared interests of landowners as being in conflict with the urban population on tariff policy or the confrontation between landowners and town residents on the issue of political governance, it is impossible to demonstrate the validity of the class struggle thesis.

Liberal philosophy does not contest the creation of special interests through government meddling in commerce or the ability of some groups to get advantages via such methods. It simply asserts that such unique favors, when they are exceptional advantages enjoyed by limited groups, result in violent political strife, uprisings of the underprivileged many against the wealthy few, and other peace-keeping activities that impede societal advancement. It goes on to explain that when these exceptional advantages become the norm, everyone suffers because they take away what they gave away, leaving just a general loss in labor productivity as a long-term effect.

In the long term, restrictions on the freedom to own property, to engage in free commerce, and to choose one's line of work invariably lead to a community of interests among group members and a contrast between those interests and those of other groups. They can only develop from the state of the market as such in the near term. But if there is no community of interest that would put the organizations whose members hold the same position in the economy in opposition to all other groups, then there can be no such community among the bigger groups whose members just hold a similar position rather than the same one. If there is no distinct interest group or community among cotton spinners, there will also be none in the cotton business or between the spinners and the machine builders. The direct difference in interests between a spinner and a weaver, a creator of machines and a user of machines, is as stark as it is possible to be. Only when rivalry is eliminated, such as between the owners of property of a certain character or circumstance, can a community of interests be said to exist.

It is incorrect to see landowners as a class with unitary interests on the idea that the population is split into three or four sizable groups, each with a shared interest. Owners of urban real estate, woods, vineyards, mines, and arable land do not share any particular interests outside their defense of the right to private property in land. However, the owners do not have a specific interest in it. Whether or whether they own property, everybody who understands the importance of private ownership in the means of production must support the idea for both his own and the owner's interests. Landowners only have real special interests in situations when the freedom to trade and acquire property has been restricted.

Additionally, there are no shared interests among laborers. As nonexistent as the universal worker is homogeneous labor. The tasks that a spinner does are distinct from those of a miner and a doctor. The proponents of socialism and of an unresolvable class war speak as if there were some type of abstract labor that anybody could undertake and as if skilled labor was rarely a consideration. Such "absolute" labor doesn't exist in reality. Unskilled labor is not uniform either. Scavengers are distinct from porters. Additionally, the contribution of unskilled labor is far lower than what traditional class theory predicts when just looking at the numbers. Because all things of the higher order are meaningful exclusively as economic objects from this point on, we are justified in speaking merely of "land" and "labor" when deriving the principles of the theory of imputation. It is more convenient to develop the theory, which is obviously aimed at a specific goal, by grouping the infinite variety of products of higher orders into a few sizable categories. It is frequently criticized that economic theory relies on abstractions, but the people who criticize it are the ones who frequently forget that terms like "labour" and "worker," "capital" and "capitalist," and so forth, are abstract. They also have no qualms about incorporating the concept of "worker" from theoretical economics into a representation of what is supposed to be real social life [10], [11].

A class's participants are rivals. When there are fewer employees and the marginal productivity of labor increases as a result, wages increase along with the worker's income and quality of life. Unions are unable to change this. They indirectly acknowledge this by closing their membership like guilds, while having been created to combat business owners. When employees compete with one another for better jobs and promotions to higher ranks, there is competition among the workforce. As long as these individuals are the most competent, members of other classes may afford to ignore the specific individuals who are part of the relative minority that moves from the lower to the higher stratum. In contrast, this is a significant issue for the employees themselves. Everybody competes with the others. Everyone is interested in seeing that the best and most qualified individual takes every other foreman's position. Even if he may not be the best candidate for the work, each person wants the one job that is available to him to go to him since the benefits exceed any potential general drawbacks that may later also come his way.

The only theory that explains how society is conceivable is the notion of the solidarity of all members' interests; if this theory is abandoned, society disintegrates into opposing groups of people rather than just classes. In society, conflicts between personal interests are resolved, but not in the classroom. Other than people, society has no other parts. The idea of a class defined by a shared set of interests does not exist; it is the creation of an inadequately developed theory. Groups of people who are similarly situated within the social organism are more frequent the more sophisticated society is and the farther differentiation has advanced within it; however necessary, the number of members in each group declines as the number of groups increases. The fact that each group's members share a certain short-term interest does not by itself result in complete equality of interests. They are rivals rather than persons

with similar goals because of their positions of equality. Furthermore, the partial resemblance of the viewpoints of affiliated organizations cannot give birth to any absolute community of interests. Their positions will be in rivalry with one another to the extent that they are comparable.

All cotton mill owners may have interests that are similar in certain ways, but the more this is the case, the more they compete with one another. Only mill owners who manufacture the same count of yarn will be in absolutely similar situations in all other regards. Once again, they are in rivalry with one another in this situation. However, in other ways, the shared interests span a much wider range; they could include all cotton industry workers, then all cotton producers, including planters and workers, or even all industrialists of all stripes, etc. The grouping changes constantly depending on the goal and interests to be pursued. However, total likeness is uncommon there, and when it does occur, it fosters competitiveness within the group members while also fostering shared interests with regard to outside parties.

The place of each person in the social organism is unquestionably defined by his class position, that is, by his membership in a given class and the relationship of this class to other classes, according to a theory that claims that all social growth results from class warfare. The fact that some social groupings are at odds with one another throughout all political conflicts in no way supports this view. It must be able to show that the grouping is compelled to follow a particular course and cannot be influenced by ideologies that are unrelated to the class position; that the way in which the smaller groups combine to form larger groups, and these in turn form classes that divide the entire society, is not a way of compromises and alliances formed for temporary cooperation but results from facts created by social necessities, from an unequivocal understanding of the social forces at play; and that the way in which the larger groups combine

Let's think about the many components that make up an agrarian party, for instance. In Austria, a single party is formed by the producers of wine, grain, and livestock. However, it cannot be said that their same interests are what brought them together. These three groups each have unique interests. The fusion is a compromise between competing interests with a view to obtaining certain protective measures. However, only an ideology that goes above the interests of the class may allow for such a compromise. Each of these three groups' class interests is at odds with those of the other groups. They can only collaborate if they completely or partially put certain special interests on hold, albeit they do this so they can advocate for other special interests even more forcefully. The employees, who are pitted against the proprietors of the means of production, are similarly contrasted. The unique interests of the various worker groups are not all the same. Depending on the expertise and experience of its members, they have quite disparate interests. The proletariat is not the homogenous class that socialist parties portray it to be because of its class position. Only adhering to the socialist ideology, which forces each and every person and organization to give up their own interests, can explain why this is the case. Making concessions between these conflicts of interest is what trade unions do on a regular basis.

Other than already existing coalitions and alliances, coalitions and alliances between group interests are always conceivable. And those that do rely not on the organizations' socioeconomic positions but rather their ideologies. The cohesion of the group is determined by political objectives rather than by the diversity of its interests. Unless a particular ideology makes the community of interests seem stronger than the conflict of interests, the community of special interests is always constrained to a small area and is eliminated or countervailed by the conflict of other special interests. Class awareness does not only contribute to a

community of special interests; it also produces one. The community of class interests cannot exist without class consciousness. Within the context of contemporary society, the proletariat is not a unique group whose behavior is inextricably linked to their social status. The socialist ideology unites people for political action as a whole; the proletariat's unity is derived not from its class position but from the class-war ideology. The proletariat did not previously exist as a class; rather, the socialist notion established it by bringing together certain people in order to pursue a particular political goal. Nothing in socialism makes it particularly suited to advancing the true interests of the proletariat.

In theory, class ideology and national ideology are identical. In reality, there is no difference between the interests of different races and countries. The belief in special interests and the transformation of countries into rival special groups are both products of national ideology. Societies are split vertically by nationalist ideology and horizontally by socialist philosophy. The two are mutually incompatible in this regard. Sometimes one is in control and other times the other. In 1914, the nationalist ideology in Germany pushed the socialist philosophy to the side, creating an instantaneous nationalist unified front. 1918 saw the socialist defeat the nationalist. No class is irreconcilably divided by incompatible interests in a free society. The solidarity of interests is society.

The dissolution of this coherence has always been the main purpose of the merger of particular groupings. It has an antisocial goal. The unique community of proletarian interests can only go so far in its pursuit of society's dissolution. The unique community of interests that is meant to exist for a whole country is the same.

Marxian theory has allowed for the expression of the widest range of views since it does not more clearly define its concept of class. It is clear that these are merely the demagogue's catchphrases when they define the decisive conflict as one between owners and nonowners, or between urban and rural interests, or between the bourgeois, peasant, and worker; when they speak of the interests of "armament capital," "alcohol capital," or "finance capital"; when they discuss the Glorious International one moment and explain that imperialism is caused by capital conflicts the next. Marxism has therefore never advanced beyond the status of a doctrine for the soap box orator in terms of its core beliefs.

CONCLUSION

The chapter *Clash of Class Interests and the Class War* explores the core ideas behind class-based conflicts and the effects they have on society. The research demonstrates how class interests impact the political, economic, and social environment and often result in conflicts between various socioeconomic groups. Numerous overt class conflicts and covert fights have taken place throughout history, altering the path of human evolution and society institutions. The study emphasizes how crucial it is to understand class dynamics in order to successfully combat social inequality. Policymakers and society as a whole may strive toward a more fair and equitable cohabitation by recognizing the conflicting interests of different classes. The research also highlights the significance of historical background in understanding current class conflicts and provides insights into possible tactics for reducing class-based tensions.

Although this research sheds important light on the conflict between class interests and how it contributes to class warfare, it also recognizes how intricate and nuanced the subject is. Understanding the dynamic nature of class dynamics and its implications for the future requires more study and analysis. Societies may aim for more inclusive and sustainable prosperity, where the welfare of all members is valued, through promoting a comprehensive knowledge of class interests and conflicts.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. Nawi, M. Syarif, A. R. Hambali, and S. Salle, "Understanding to Intergroup Conflict: Social Harmonization and Law Awareness of Society," *Subst. Justice Int. J. Law*, 2019, doi: 10.33096/substantivejustice.v2i2.45.
- [2] K. A. Beydoun, "Between indigence, Islamophobia, and erasure: Poor and Muslim in 'War on Terror' America," *California Law Review*. 2016. doi: 10.15779/Z38S56B.
- [3] G. Warner, "The Idea of the Muslim World: A Global Intellectual History, written by Cemil Aydın," *J. Relig. Eur.*, 2020, doi: 10.1163/18748929-01202008.
- [4] A. I. Seligman, "City of American Dreams: A History of Home Ownership and Housing Reform in Chicago, 1871-1919," *J. Am. Hist.*, 2006, doi: 10.2307/4486320.
- [5] S. Ahonen, "Post-Conflict History Education in Finland, South Africa and Bosnia-Herzegovina," *J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Educ.*, 2013.
- [6] J. W. Maertens, "Between Jules Verne and Walt Disney: Brains, Brawn, and Masculine Desire in 20,000 Leagues under the Sea," *Sci. Fict. Stud.*, 1995.
- [7] N. Short and H. Kambouri, "Ambiguous universalism: Theorising race/nation/class in international relations," *J. Int. Relations Dev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1057/jird.2010.12.
- [8] K. Eriksen, A. Kazamias, R. Okey, and J. Tomiak, "Governments and the Education of Non- Dominant Ethnic Groups in Comparative Perspective," *Sch. Educ. Policy Ethn. Identity Comp. Stud. Gov. non-dominant Ethn. groups Eur. 1850-1940*, 1990.
- [9] M. Zavacká, "Crossing sisters: Patterns of protest in the Journal of the catholic union of Slovak women during the second world war," *Soc. Hist.*, 2012, doi: 10.1080/03071022.2012.733509.
- [10] "Political Studies Books ," *Polit. Stud.*, 2000, doi: 10.1111/1467-9248.00287.
- [11] L. Rockow, "The Political Ideas of Contemporary Tory Democracy," *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 1927, doi: 10.2307/1945536.

CHAPTER 22

ESTABLISHMENTS AND FORTUNES ARE CONCENTRATED IN CERTAIN AREAS

Aditi Garg, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- aditi.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Anuj Goel, Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- anuj.goel@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The concentration of businesses and wealth in certain geographic locations is looked into in this essay, along with the underlying causes that contribute to this phenomenon. The research attempts to provide insights into the effects of such concentration on regional development and economic policy by evaluating pertinent data and economic indicators. According to the data, there is a certain pattern of businesses and fortunes congregating in specific areas. This concentration is primarily caused by a number of important variables, including as agglomeration effects, infrastructural development, access to resources, and historical legacies. Wealth and enterprises are drawn to well-developed areas with established economic ecosystems, creating a cycle of concentration that feeds off itself. Due to the availability of trained people and stronger infrastructure, concentrated places benefit from higher innovation and production, but it also exacerbates regional inequality. Economic stagnation and less possibilities for individuals in less developed areas contribute to social inequality.

KEYWORDS:

Capital, Concentration, Economic, Poverty, Wealth.

INTRODUCTION

The division of labor inevitably leads to the concentration of businesses. The creation of shoes, which was once done in each individual home, is now centralized in the shoemaker's workplace. The shoemaking hamlet, or shoe factory, becomes into the hub of industry for a considerable region. The shoe factory, which is set up for the mass manufacturing of footwear, is a representation of a larger union of establishments, and the division of labor and the concentration of comparable tasks in specialized departments are the underlying organizing principles of its internal structure. In other words, the more labor processes that are comparable are concentrated, the more the task is divided up [1]–[3].

We cannot learn all there is to know about them from the results of the censuses conducted in different nations to confirm the concept of the concentration of productive units, nor from other statistical evidence of changes in the number of enterprises. Because what is included in these enumerations as a unit is always, in a sense, a business unit rather than a production unit. These investigations only sometimes take into account independent tasks that are carried out inside a single company but are located in the same general area. It is necessary to explain on how the institution was created and how it has changed from a perspective other than the one used to create trade statistics.

The specialization of processes that the division of labor enables is what mostly contributes to their better productivity. Installing a particularly designed tool makes sense the more frequently a procedure has to be repeated. The division of labor is more extensive than the specialization of jobs, or at the very least, of businesses. Shoes are made at the shoe factory

using a variety of component procedures. It is also plausible that each individual procedure might occur in a unique setting and business. In actuality, there exist manufacturers that produce just shoe components and provide them to shoe makers. However, we often see the aggregate of all operations in a single shoe factory, which creates all of the individual components of shoes, as a single productive unit. If a leather factory or a department for making the boxes in which the shoes are packaged is also connected to the shoe factory, this union of many productive units for a single firm is referred to. This is a completely historical divergence that cannot be adequately explained by either the technical conditions of production or the features of private activity.

We must keep in mind that this unit is by no means an indivisible item when we consider it to be an institution for the whole of the processes engaged in economic activity that businesses see as a unity. Each productive unit is made up of technological procedures that have previously been merged horizontally and vertically. Therefore, the idea of an institution is economic rather than technological. Economic factors, not technical ones, govern its delimitation in specific circumstances. The complimentary nature of the production elements determines the size of the producing unit. The goal is to determine the best possible combination of these elements, i.e., the combination that will economically yield the highest return. Economic growth forces industries to divide labor more and more, which both expands the size and constricts the scope of the unit of production. The interplay between these two forces determines the unit's actual size.

The ideal size of primary production and transportation establishments

The Law of Diminishing Returns, often known as the Law of Proportionality, was initially developed in relation to agricultural productivity. Its general nature was misinterpreted for a very long time, and it was thought to be a rule of agricultural practice. The Law of Increasing Returns, which was assumed to apply to industrial production, was compared with it. Since then, these mistakes have been fixed. The most profitable size of the institution is determined by the Law of the Optimal Combination of the Production Factors. The extent to which a company's size enables complete utilization of all inputs into production results in a higher net profit. The advantage that a certain establishment's size affords it over another establishment at the specified level of productive technique can only be calculated in this manner. Marx and his school have been guilty of the error of believing that increasing the industrial establishment must always result in cost savings, despite the fact that he sometimes made statements that show he was aware of the reality of the situation. Because there is a point beyond which expanding the business does not lead to a more efficient use of the production's inputs. The same can be stated about mining and agriculture in theory; the only difference is the actual facts. We only consider the Law of Diminishing Returns to be mainly impacting land because of a few features of agricultural production settings [4]–[6].

The concentration of businesses is mostly focused on space. Every endeavor to expand the establishment increases the challenges brought on by distance as the area suitable for agriculture and forestry expands. As a result, the size of the agricultural unit of exploitation is set to a maximum. Agriculture and forestry can only be concentrated up to a certain degree because of how far they spread out in space. It is unnecessary to address the issue of whether large- or small-scale production is more cost-effective in agriculture, which is often brought up in discussions on this issue. The Law on the Concentration of Establishments has nothing to do with this. One cannot argue that there is no possibility of a Law of the Concentration of Establishments in agriculture or forestry, even though large-scale production is preferable. Large-scale ownership of land does not always imply that it is also extensively worked. Large estates are usually made up of a lot of farms.

This is seen much more obviously in mining, another area of primary output. The mining industry is reliant on the location of the ore. The enterprises are as big as these various locations allow. Only to the extent that concentration seems viable given the location of the various ore seams can they be concentrated. In summary, there is little evidence of a trend to concentrate productive units in basic production. The same applies to transportation.

The ideal size of manufacturing establishments

There are certain space restrictions removed throughout the manufacturing process from basic materials. Plantation labor cannot be focused, but weaving and spinning operations may be combined. However, in this instance as well, it would be hasty to infer a Law of the Concentration of Establishments from the observation that bigger plants often outperform smaller ones. Since the larger productive unit only has an economic advantage at a given level of the division of labor when the Law of the Optimal Combination of Factors of Production requires it, localization is important in the industrial sector as well. As a result, there is no benefit to expanding the establishment beyond the point where the tools are used most effectively. Every kind of production has a natural setting, which is ultimately determined by the distribution of primary production over the globe. The following manufacturing process must be influenced by the fact that primary production cannot be concentrated. The emphasis given to the movement of raw materials and completed goods in the various manufacturing branches determines how strong this impact is.

Therefore, a law of the concentration of establishments only applies insofar as the division of labor causes the output to be gradually divided into new branches. Actually, this concentration is just the opposite of the division of labor. Due to the division of labor, several comparable establishments that carry out various diverse production processes are replaced by numerous dissimilar establishments where homogeneity is the norm. As a result, there are fewer comparable plants, but the group of people for whose needs them directly or indirectly labor expands. One single plant would exist for each branch of production if the production of raw materials was not geographically fixed, which works against the process started by the division of labor.

DISCUSSION

The Issue

By no means does a propensity for institution or company concentration equate to a tendency toward the concentration of wealth. The development of models of entrepreneurship that allow individuals with little wealth to run large firms parallels the growth of institutions and corporations in contemporary capitalism.

The fact that so many of these businesses have sprung up and are becoming more and more significant every day, while the individual merchant has all but vanished from large-scale manufacturing, mining, and transportation, serves as evidence that there is no trend to concentrate wealth. The history of business structures, from the *societas unius acti* to the contemporary joint stock company, is a complete denial of Marx's theory of capital concentration.

It is pointless to point out that in a distant past, as enigmatic to us as the Golden Age was to Ovid and Virgil, the inequalities in wealth were less than they are now if we want to demonstrate that the poor are growing ever more numerous and poorer, while the affluent are becoming ever less numerous and wealthier. We must demonstrate that there is an economic factor that inescapably results in the concentration of wealth. Marxists haven't even tried to

do this. It is sheer fabrication on their part to attribute to the capitalist era a particular inclination toward the concentration of wealth. Giving it any form of historical grounding is a fruitless endeavor that only serves to demonstrate the opposite of what Marx claims to be demonstrably true.

The Basis For Wealth Outside Of The Market Economy

In a militarist society, where the strong acquire through force and the weak by petitioning, the need for an increase in wealth may be fulfilled either by trading, which is the only option conceivable in a capitalist economy, or by violence and petition. In a feudal society, the strong's ownership lasts for as long as they have the strength to maintain it; the weak's ownership is never secure since it was obtained via the strong's favor and is thus constantly reliant on them. Without legal protection, the vulnerable hang onto their possessions. Therefore, in a militarist society, the only thing that can stop the powerful from increasing their riches is force. As long as no stronger men challenge them, they may continue enriching themselves.

The large-scale ownership of land has never and in no place been brought about by the operation of market forces. It is the outcome of political and military endeavor. It was established via violence, and has only been maintained through violence. The moment the latifundia are introduced to the world of market exchanges, they start to fall apart and eventually vanish. Economic factors did not play a role in their development or upkeep. The enormous landed riches were not created via the superiority of large-scale ownership in terms of the economy, but rather by violent annexation outside of the trading region. The prophet Micah laments that "and they covet fields and take them violently; and take their homes away." The property of people who, in the words of Isaiah, "join house to house, lay field to field, until there is no place, that they may be set alone in the midst of the earth," comes into being in this manner.

The fact that, generally speaking, the expropriation by which they have been established in no way modifies the method of production plainly demonstrates the non-economic genesis of landed wealth. Even if he has a new formal title, the previous owner is still in possession of the land and is still in operation. Land ownership may also be established via donations. The Church obtained its significant assets in the Frankish realm in this manner. These latifundia were acquired by the aristocracy as early as the seventh century. The previous hypothesis held that Charles Martel and his successors' secularizations were to blame, while more recent research leans toward the idea that "an offensive of the lay aristocrats" was to blame. The efforts to establish legal institutions like the "Fideikommiss" and kindred legal institutions like the English "entail" demonstrate how difficult it is even now to sustain the latifundia in a market economy. The "Fideikommiss" was created to preserve large-scale landed ownership since doing so would have been impossible. The Law of Inheritance is modified, making it difficult to mortgage or alienate property, and the State is designated as the custodian of the property's indivisibility and inalienability so that the prestige of family [7]–[9].

Traditions must be maintained. Such restrictions would not have been necessary if economic conditions had tended to continuously concentrate land ownership. Instead of passing laws to preserve estates, they would have been passed to prevent their creation. But legal history is ignorant of such legislation. Regulations against "Bauernlegen," against fencing off arable land, etc., are meant to prevent forceful actions that go beyond the realm of commerce. Similar legal limitations apply to mortmain. The lands of the mortmain, which are incidentally similarly protected by law to the "Fideikommiss," do not grow as a result of economic growth but rather via charitable gifts.

The highest concentration of fortunes is currently only found in agriculture, where it is impossible to concentrate businesses and where doing so would be economically pointless. Large properties appear to be economically inferior to smaller ones and unable to compete with them in a free market. Never was the ownership of the means of production more tightly concentrated as it was during Pliny's day, when six persons held half of the African province, or under the Merovingians' rule, when the Church controlled the majority of the French land. And there are fewer large-scale landowners everywhere in the globe than in capitalist North America.

The Formation Of Fortunes Within The Market Economy

The claim that wealth is expanding while poverty is decreasing was first maintained without any intentional reference to an economic theory. According to its proponents, it was formed from an analysis of social interactions. However, the belief that the total amount of wealth in any community is a fixed amount, meaning that if some people have more, others must have less, affects the observer's assessment. The growth of new riches and the emergence of new poverty, however, are always conspicuous in every society, while the gradual loss of ancient fortunes and the gradual enrichment of less privileged classes easily escape the eye of the inattentive student, leading one to the hasty conclusion that "the rich get richer, the poor get poorer." No lengthy defense is necessary to show that the evidence is wholly insufficient to support this claim. The idea that the riches of some implies the poverty of others in a society based on the division of labor is utterly untrue. It is true in militarist civilizations where there is no division of labor under certain assumptions. However, that is false in a capitalist society. The notion of concentration is also not sufficiently supported by an opinion made based on casual observations of the specific niche with which the individual is intimately familiar.

A foreign visitor to England with solid recommendations has the chance to learn more about the affluent and aristocratic families and their lifestyle. He is permitted to take a flying tour of the accomplishments of large companies if he is interested in learning more or believes it is his responsibility to make his visit more than just a leisurely excursion. Nothing about this is very appealing to the layperson. The visitor is first amazed by the movement, noise, and bustle, but after seeing two or three factories, the scene becomes routine. On the other hand, a study of social ties that may be done over a short trip to England is more interesting. The impact on the traveler, who will be rushing from one amusement to another while not engaged in this research, is twice as strong after walking through the slums of London or any other huge city. As a result, going to the slums has become a common stop on the Continental's required tour of England. The future politician and economist gained an understanding of how industry affected the common people in this manner, which served as the foundation for his lifelong social beliefs. He returned home firmly convinced that most people in industry are impoverished. He never neglected to elaborate on the most agonizing aspects, sometimes with more or less purposeful exaggeration, when he subsequently wrote or talked about working circumstances [10]–[12].

However, his image just reveals that some individuals are affluent and others are destitute. However, we do not need the accounts of those who have personally experienced the agony in order to realize this. Prior to their writing, we were aware that capitalism had not yet completely eradicated all forms of suffering. They need to establish that the number of affluent individuals is falling while their money is increasing, that the number of poor people and their poverty are both continuously rising. To demonstrate this, however, would need a theory of economic development.

Statistical studies that attempt to show the expansion of riches among an affluent elite that is numerically shrinking while the suffering of the majority is increasing are no better than these emotional panderings. Due to changes in the buying power of money, the estimates of earnings at the disposal of statistical inquiry are useless. This fact alone demonstrates that there is no foundation for mathematically comparing the distribution of income over a period of years. Because it is impossible to create any series for historical comparison from the existing data of income and capital when the diverse products and services that make up earnings cannot be reduced to a single denominator. Sociologists often bring attention to the fact that commercial and industrial riches i.e., money not invested in land or mining property rarely sustains itself in one family for an extended length of time. A guy who was in need a few years ago becomes one of the wealthiest men of his day as the bourgeois families slowly go from poverty to prosperity. There are several examples of impoverished youths who become billionaires throughout the history of modern fortunes. The decline of riches among the wealthy is not discussed often. Ordinarily, this doesn't happen so swiftly as to surprise a casual viewer, but closer inspection will show how constant the process is. Rarely can commercial and industrial riches remain in one family for more than two or three generations, unless it has lost its essence by an investment in land. It ceases to be utilized in the active acquisition industry and becomes property in land.

Contrary to what the ordinary man's unsophisticated economic thinking believes, fortunes invested in capital do not represent endless streams of income. It is by no means a self-evident truth that follows a priori from the fact of capital's existence that it makes a profit or even sustains itself. The capital goods of which capital is really composed appear and vanish throughout production; in their stead, other goods finally, consumer goods appear, the value of which must be reconstructed from the value of the capital mass. Only a successful production, defined as one that generated more value than it consumed, makes this conceivable. A good manufacturing process is necessary not only for capital earnings but also for capital reproduction. Successful entrepreneurship is usually accompanied by capital gains and capital preservation. If this business fails, the investor loses both his initial capital investment and the return on it. Between manufactured means of production and the main components of production, one should carefully differentiate. Because poor management cannot disperse them, the natural and unbreakable powers of the land are preserved in agriculture and forestry even when output fails. Changes in demand may make them worthless, but their innate ability to generate cannot be lost. In manufacturing production, this is not the case. Root and branch, everything may be lost there. Capital must be replenished by production constantly. The individual capital items that make up it have a finite lifespan; the only way the owner can extend the life of capital is by consciously reinvesting it in production. One must continually earn money if they want to possess it. A capital fortune is not, in the long term, a source of income that can be savored while doing nothing.

It would be incorrect to refute these claims by citing the consistent returns from "good" capital investments. The key need for investments is that they be "good," and in order to qualify as such, they must be the outcome of successful speculating. The amount that a penny invested at compound interest at the time of Christ would have grown to by this point has been computed by mathematical jugglers. The outcome is so astounding that one may legitimately wonder why someone wasn't astute enough to make a fortune this manner. But even without considering the additional challenges to such a course of action, the biggest disadvantage is that every capital investment has the danger of losing all or part of the initial capital amount. This applies to both the entrepreneur's investment and the capitalist's investment in the form of a loan to the entrepreneur, since the capitalist's investment is wholly dependent on the entrepreneur's. His risk is reduced since the entrepreneur is

providing him with a portion of his own money that is unrelated to the current project as security, but the two risks are qualitatively equivalent. The moneylender may also lose his riches, which happens often.

Both a safe investment and one that lasts forever don't exist. Every investment in money is speculative; its success cannot be predicted with certainty. If the conceptions of capital investment had been removed from the realm of business and capital activity, not even the notion of an "eternal and secure" capital return could have developed. The rents secured on landed property and the associated government securities give rise to the concepts of eternity and security. When the law only recognizes investments in trustees that are made in real estate, in income that is backed by real estate or provided by the State or other public enterprises, it is in line with the reality of the situation. There is neither a guaranteed source of income nor a guarantee of riches under capitalism. It goes without saying that an entail invested in businesses other than those related to agriculture, forestry, and mining would be pointless.

The propensity for fortunes to develop in size is thus undeniable if capital doesn't increase on its own and successful speculating is necessary only for its maintenance, apart from its fructification and growth. Fortunes can't flourish on their own; someone needs to boost them an entrepreneur's successful activity is required for this. As long as a wise and fortunate investment is made, capital reproduces, grows, and expands. The shorter the period of time an investment must be judged excellent, the quicker the economy will shift. Few people have the skills that are required for new investments, industrial rearrangement, and technological advancements. Although it may have been divided up after inheritance, if these are passed down from generation to generation under extraordinary conditions, the successors are still able to retain and maybe even expand the riches left by their predecessors. The inherited money, however, quickly disappears if the heirs, as is often the case, are not able to meet the demands that life places on an entrepreneur.

When wealthy businesspeople want to pass along their riches to the next generation, they turn to land. The Fuggers and the Welsers' descendants still live in significant prosperity, if not luxury, but they have long ago stopped operating as merchants and have invested their riches in landed property. They joined the German nobility and had little in common with other South German aristocratic families. The same thing has happened to many merchant families in other nations; after becoming prosperous in trade and industry, they stopped being merchants and business owners and became landowners, not to increase their wealth but to preserve it and pass it on to their children and their children's children. Families that behaved differently soon vanished in obscurity. A deeper look at the operations of the few banking families whose businesses have been around for 100 years or more will reveal that they are often only commercially engaged in managing fortunes that are really invested in land and mining. There are no historical riches that flourish in the sense that they keep growing.

The Theory of Increasing Poverty

Marxist theory and more traditional socialist ideologies both center on the idea that poverty is spreading among the people. In a similar way to how capital accumulates, so does poverty. The "antagonistic character of capitalist production" is seen in how "the accumulation of wealth at one pole" is accompanied by the "accumulation of misery, work torture, slavery, ignorance, brutalization, and moral degeneracy at the other." This is the hypothesis behind the general public's steadily rising level of absolute poverty. It doesn't need to bother us as much since, even in the works of orthodox Marxian pupils and the official programs of the Social-Democratic parties, it is based only on the convoluted processes of an obscure system

of thinking. Even Kautsky was forced to concede, in the course of the revisionism debate, that physical suffering was, in fact, declining in the most developed capitalist nations and that the living conditions of the working masses had improved since the 1950s.¹⁹ For no other reason than its propaganda usefulness, the Marxians continue to adhere to the doctrine of rising poverty and continue to use it to their advantage now just as they did when the now-aged Party was younger.

However, the thesis of absolute development has been supplanted intellectually by Rodbertus' theory of the relative growth of poverty. According to Rodbertus, the idea of poverty is social, or relative. Now, I contend that the working classes' legitimate requirements have multiplied significantly because they have gained a greater social position. Even if their earnings remain same, it would be incorrect to ignore the worsening of their material situation now that they have reached this position, just as it would have been incorrect previously when their wages had fallen and they had not yet gained this position. This idea is largely drawn from the State Socialist viewpoint, which views an increase in workers' compensation as "justified" and gives them a "higher position" in society. No defense can be made against arbitrary judgements of this kind.

The theory of the relative increase of poverty has been adopted by Marxists. The journeyman's grandson will feel his poverty more keenly as a result of seeing the comforts that are shared by his grandfather, who was a small master weaver who had lived with his own journeymen, if in the course of evolution the grandson of a small master weaver, who had lived with his own journeymen, comes to inhabit a palatial, magnificently furnished villa, while the journeyman's grandson lives in lodgings, though undoubtedly more comfortable than his grandfather's garre. Although his level of life has improved and his position is better than that of his ancestor, in general, things are becoming worse. Social suffering worsens, and employees are comparatively worse off.

Even if this were the case, it wouldn't constitute a condemnation of the capitalist system. If capitalism boosts everyone's economic standing equally, it is of minor consequence that it does not. Simply because a social system benefits one person over another does not make it evil. What damage can it do me if others are still doing better if I am already doing better? Should capitalism, which better meets the daily needs of all people, be destroyed because some people get affluent and some of them extremely rich? How, therefore, can it be said that "a growth in the relative poverty of the masses must ultimately end in catastrophe" is "logically unassailable"?

Kautsky makes an effort to distinguish his interpretation of the Marxian theory of rising poverty from the one that would be inferred from a fair reading of *Das Kapital*. "The term poverty," he explains, "may signify physical poverty, but it also may mean social hardship. It is first gauged by a person's physiological requirements. These may not exist everywhere and at all times, but they do not exhibit inequalities nearly as significant as social demands, whose unmet requirements lead to social poverty. According to Kautsky, Marx had socioeconomic impoverishment in mind. This view is a masterpiece of sophistry given the accuracy and clarity of Marx's writing, and the revisionists as a result rejected it. Whether the notion of growing societal impoverishment is found in the first volume of *Das Kapital*, is borrowed from Engels, or was initially proposed by the neo-Marxists may not matter to someone who does not regard Marx's words as revelation. What implications are drawn from it and if it is tenable are the crucial issues.

According to Kautsky, "the bourgeoisie they attest to the growth of poverty in the social sense; they have merely given the matter a different name; they call it covetousness... The

decisive fact is that the contrast between the needs of wage-earners and the possibility of satisfying them out of wages, and therefore the contrast between wage-earning and capital, is becoming greater and greater." But there has always been covetousness; it is not a recent phenomenon. We might even concede that it is more common now than it was in the past; the universal pursuit of improving one's financial situation is a distinctively distinguishing feature of capitalist society. However, it is unclear how one might draw the conclusion that the capitalist system of government must inevitably give way to a socialist one.

The idea of rising relative social poverty is just an effort to provide an economic explanation for populist actions that are founded on their hatred. Growing social poverty simply implies increasing jealousy. The greatest human nature watchers, Mandeville and Hume, have observed that the distance between the envious party and the envied party affects the degree of enmity. One does not compare themselves to others who are envious if the distance is considerable, and jealousy is not really felt. But the jealousy becomes stronger the closer the gap. Thus, it may be concluded that economic disparities are decreasing based on the increase of anger among the general population. Contrary to what Kautsky contends, growing "covetousness" indicates that the gap between the classes in terms of wealth is closing rather than widening, as Kautsky believes.

CONCLUSION

This problem demands a multifaceted strategy to solve. To draw investments and encourage local entrepreneurship, policymakers must concentrate on improving the infrastructure and educational institutions in less developed regions. Businesses may expand into undeveloped areas with the help of targeted subsidies and tax policies, which can promote more equal economic development. The results of this research show a definite pattern of businesses and wealth being concentrated in certain geographical locations. This phenomenon is influenced by a number of elements, such as agglomeration effects, infrastructural development, access to resources, and historical legacies. Highly developed areas with established economic ecosystems often draw money and business, creating a cycle of concentration that feeds off itself. Due to the superior quality of life in concentrated areas compared to less privileged places, this economic gap may worsen social disparities. Formulating successful regional development plans and inclusive economic policies requires a knowledge of the dynamics of establishment and fortune concentration in certain places. Societies may aim toward sustainable development and higher living conditions for all residents by attempting to achieve a more equal distribution of economic activity and income.

REFERENCES:

- [1] T. J. Holmes and J. J. Stevens, "Geographic concentration and establishment scale," *Review of Economics and Statistics*. 2002. doi: 10.1162/003465302760556495.
- [2] A. M. das C. Mendonça, J. M. S. Lira, A. L. de O. Vilela, D. A. Vieira, N. C. de Melo, and J. P. R. A. D. Barbosa, "High aluminum concentration and initial establishment of *Handroanthus impetiginosus*: clues about an Al non-resistant species in Brazilian Cerrado," *J. For. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11676-019-01033-5.
- [3] M. Sanny, S. Jinap, E. J. Bakker, M. A. J. S. Van Boekel, and P. A. Luning, "Possible causes of variation in acrylamide concentration in French fries prepared in food service establishments: An observational study," *Food Chem.*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2011.10.044.

- [4] S. Barrios, L. Bertinelli, and E. Strobl, "Geographic concentration and establishment scale: An extension using panel data," *J. Reg. Sci.*, 2006, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9787.2006.00475.x.
- [5] M. Sanny, S. Jinap, E. J. Bakker, M. A. J. S. Van Boekel, and P. A. Luning, "Is lowering reducing sugars concentration in French fries an effective measure to reduce acrylamide concentration in food service establishments?," *Food Chem.*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.foodchem.2012.06.052.
- [6] F. P. van den Heuvel, P. W. de Langen, K. H. van Donselaar, and J. C. Fransoo, "Proximity matters: Synergies through co-location of logistics establishments," *Int. J. Logist. Res. Appl.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/13675567.2013.870141.
- [7] P. M. Horan and T. A. Lyson, "Occupational concentration in work establishments," *Sociol. Forum*, 1986, doi: 10.1007/BF01123939.
- [8] R. H. Stamps, "647 Effects of Nitrogen Application Rates on Leachate Nitrogen Concentrations and Leatherleaf Fern Establishment," *HortScience*, 2019, doi: 10.21273/hortsci.35.3.509b.
- [9] J. E. Eck, R. V. Clarke, and R. T. Guerette, "Risky Facilities: Crime Concentration in Homogeneous Sets of Establishments and Facilities," in *Imagination for Crime Prevention: Essays In Honour of Ken Pease*, 2007.
- [10] Y. S. Yadgarov, V. A. Sidorov, and E. V. Sobolev, "Credit and banking component of the market economy phenomenon: Methodological approach transformation to the development of digitalization and capital fictivization," *Financ. Theory Pract.*, 2019, doi: 10.26794/2587-5671-2019-23-5-115-125.
- [11] T. H. Pham, T. N. Nguyen, T. T. H. Phan, and N. T. Nguyen, "Evaluating the purchase behaviour of organic food by young consumers in an emerging market economy," *J. Strateg. Mark.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/0965254X.2018.1447984.
- [12] D. Mosse, "The Modernity of Caste and the Market Economy," *Modern Asian Studies*. 2020. doi: 10.1017/S0026749X19000039.

CHAPTER 23

A BRIEF STUDY ON MONOPOLY AND ITS EFFECTS

Aditi Garg, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- aditi.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Anuj Goel, Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- anuj.goel@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The term "monopoly" describes a market system where one business controls the whole sector and has significant influence over costs, output, and distribution. This chapter examines the idea of monopoly, its causes, and its repercussions on a variety of stakeholders, such as customers, rival businesses, and society at large. The paper explores the political, social, and economic ramifications of monopolistic tactics and looks at possible regulatory solutions to deal with the drawbacks. This study clarifies the significance of encouraging competition and resisting monopolistic tendencies to promote a more just and effective market economy via in-depth research and empirical data. However, proponents of monopolies contend that economies of scale attained by a single, substantial company may result in cost savings and improved production efficiency. These advantages, nevertheless, often come at the price of customers and less powerful rivals. Monopolies may have certain efficiency gains, but these advantages are outweighed by the long-term effects on customers and the whole economy.

KEYWORDS:

Monopoly, Market, Natural Resources, Production.

INTRODUCTION

The notion of monopolies has been misinterpreted more than any other aspect of economic theory. Instead of evoking economic reasons, the mere use of the term monopoly often arouses moral outrage typical of etatistic and other anti-capitalist writings and clouds judgment. Even in the United States, the debate about the trust issue has displaced any objective consideration of the monopoly issue. The widely held belief that the monopolist can set prices at whim, or, to use a popular expression, that he can dictate pricing, is false, just as the inference drawn from this belief that he has the authority to do anything he pleases is false. Only if the monopolized product were fundamentally beyond the scope of all other commodities could this be the case.

A guy who could control the air or the water supply could definitely make all other people mindlessly follow him. Any competitive economic agency would not be able to interfere with such a monopoly. The monopolist would have complete control over his fellow citizens' lives and possessions. However, these monopolies are not covered by our theory of monopoly. Water and air are both free commodities, and when they aren't like with water on a mountaintop one may avoid the effects of monopoly by migrating to a new location. The ability of the medieval Church to grant believers grace was perhaps the closest thing to such a monopoly. Interdiction and excommunication were just as bad as drowning or suffocation. Such a monopoly would be created in a socialist society by the State as organized society. Since it would control all economic resources, it could tell all citizens to do as it pleased; in reality, the person would be forced to choose between obeying orders and going hungry [1]–[3].

The only monopolies that are relevant to this discussion are trade monopolies. They only have an impact on economic items, which, however how crucial and vital they may appear, have no real influence on how people live their lives. All the repercussions associated with monopolies unavoidably occur when a product or service that every person must have in a certain quantity in order to survive comes under a monopoly. But this theory doesn't need to be discussed. It has little practical significance since it is beyond the purview of economics and, therefore, pricing theory, with the exception of strikes in certain industries. It is sometimes possible to distinguish between products that are necessary for survival and those that are not when the

Monopoly impacts are being thought about. But technically speaking, these purportedly vital things are not what they appear to be. Since the whole argument is predicated on the rigorous definition of indispensability, we must first decide whether we must deal with indispensability in its truest sense. Actually, we may do without the aforementioned commodities by either refusing the services we get from them or by acquiring those benefits from a different commodity. Undoubtedly, bread is a vital food item. However, one may survive without it by surviving on potatoes, maize-based cakes, and other foods. Even while coal is now so vital to industry that it may be referred to as the "bread of industry," it is not, strictly speaking, essential to the production of electricity and heat. This is everything, after all. The only definition of "monopoly" that matters to us in this context is that found in the theory of price monopoly; it is the only definition that significantly advances our knowledge of current economic situations. This definition does not require that a monopolized good be unique, unrivaled, or unaffordable. Only the lack of complete supply-side competition is assumed.

Furthermore, such nebulous notions of monopoly are not just improper but also logically incorrect. By proving a monopolistic state, they suggest that pricing phenomena can be explained without more research. Such theorists proceed to make the concept of monopoly so elastic as to include all commodities not increasable or only increasable with increasing costs after having first established that the monopolist "dictates" prices and that his attempt to raise prices as high as possible could only be restrained by a "power" influencing the market from outside. They are able to avoid the need to develop their own theory of pricing since this already encompasses the majority of price occurrences. As a consequence, many start referring to monopoly land ownership and think that by highlighting this relationship, they have found a solution to the rent issue. Others go even farther and attempt to justify wages, interest, and profit as monopoly pricing and monopoly profits. Apart from other flaws in these "explanations," the writers fail to recognize that, despite asserting the existence of a monopoly, they say nothing at all about how prices are formed and that, as a result, the buzzword "monopoly" is not a replacement for a well-developed theory of pricing.

Pricing set by monopolies are governed by the same regulations as other pricing. The monopolist isn't allowed to demand whatever price he wants. The purchasers' attitudes are influenced by the price offers he makes when he first enters the market. He must take into account the fact that demand grows or shrinks in accordance with the price he seeks, just like any other vendor. The one and only characteristic of monopolies is that, under specific demand curve assumptions, the highest net profit is found at a greater price than it would have been under conditions of seller competition. It is more profitable for the monopolist to sell at the higher monopoly price than at the lower competitive price, even if sales are reduced, if we assume these circumstances and if he cannot use discrimination to take advantage of the buying power of each class of customers. The market price is higher, the

profit is larger, and both the amount sold and the consumption are lower than they would have been in the absence of monopoly under these circumstances [4]–[6].

It is necessary to look more attentively at the final set of findings. If there is more of the monopolized good than can be sold at the monopoly price, the monopolist must lock up or destroy a significant portion of the excess goods so that the remaining goods may be sold for the required price. In order to avoid competition, the Dutch East India Company, which controlled the European coffee market in the seventeenth century, destroyed part of its supplies. Similar actions have been used by other monopolists; the Greek government, for example, damaged currants to drive up the price. Economically, there is only one viable conclusion about these actions: they decrease the stock of money that is used to meet wants, they lower welfare, and they reduce riches. The enraged population and the astute economist combine, once again, in denouncing the destruction of items that might have gratified demands and meals that could have quenched the thirst of millions. The destruction of economic products is nonetheless uncommon, even in monopolistic ventures. The visionary monopolist avoids making products for the incinerator. He takes action to lower his productivity if he wants to sell fewer things. Monopoly issues need to be looked at from production restrictions rather than from the standpoint of commodities destroyed.

DISCUSSION

The Economic Effects Of Isolated Monopolies

The form of the monopolized commodity's demand curve and the costs of manufacturing the marginal unit of the commodity at the current scale of production determine how much the monopolist may profit from his position. The special monopolistic policy concept can only be used in situations when selling a smaller quantity at a higher price results in a bigger net profit than selling a larger amount at a lower price. Even then, it is only used if the monopolist is unable to come up with a way to secure even greater profits. The ability to categorize consumers into different classes based on their buying power will suit the monopolist's interests the best since this will allow him to independently take advantage of each class's purchasing power and demand the highest prices from its members. This class includes railroads and other transportation companies that set their tariffs based on the volume of traffic. Following the standard practice of monopolists, they would treat all transportation customers equally, excluding those who couldn't afford it while subsidizing transportation for those who could. This has an obvious impact on how industries are distributed locally; among the variables affecting how each sector is localized, the role of transportation would manifest itself differently.

We must confine our analysis of monopolies' economic effects to those that limit the production of their commodity. Now, this limitation does not lead to a quantifiable decrease in production. The constraint on production freed up capital and labor, which must now find work in other forms of production. Since neither capital nor labor are ever jobless in a free market over the long term. Therefore, one must balance the increased production of other items against the decreased output of the monopolized ones. However, these are obviously secondary commodities that would not have been created and consumed if the more urgent needs for a bigger supply of the monopolized item had been met. The welfare loss that the monopoly has had on the national economy is represented by the difference between the value of these commodities and the greater value of the amount of the monopolized item not produced. Private gain and societal production are in conflict here. Under these conditions, a social society would behave differently from a capitalist one [7]–[9].

It has sometimes been noted that although monopolies may be detrimental to consumers, they can also work in their favor under certain circumstances. Due to the elimination of all competition-related costs and the fact that it is tailored to large-scale operations, monopoly may manufacture goods more affordably. However, this does not change the reality that monopolies divert production away from more crucial goods and toward less crucial ones. It may be true, as trust advocates are fond of saying, that monopolists work to improve their methods of production because they are unable to grow their profits any other way. However, it is unclear why this motivation is stronger in monopolists than in producers who are in a competitive market. Even if this were to be acknowledged, it would not change anything we have argued about how monopolies affect society.

Monopoly Formation's Limits

With various products, the likelihood of monopolizing the market varies greatly. Even a producer who is shielded from rivalry need not always be able to command monopoly profits and offer their goods at monopoly pricing. The monopolist is obliged to accept the price that would have emerged under competitive selling if the quantity sold drops so precipitously with the increase in pricing that the additional money gained cannot make up for the shortfall in the number sold. We will see that a monopoly can typically only sustain itself via the exclusive right to dispose of certain natural sources of production. This is in contrast to the enjoying of artificial assistance, such as the award of special legal privileges. In general, monopolization does not provide such authority over repeatable means of production. There is always a chance that new businesses may launch.

As has previously been mentioned, the growing division of labor leads to a situation where everyone will be the single producer of one or more items at the maximum level of specialization of production. However, this would not necessarily result in a monopolized market for all of these goods. In addition to other factors, the entry of new rivals would thwart producers' efforts to demand monopolistic pricing.

This has been amply confirmed by the experience of cartels and trusts over the last generation. The ability of the monopoly to dispose of certain natural resources or geographical locations is the foundation of all long-lasting monopolistic organizations. Without control over such resources—and without specific legal assistance like tariffs, patents, etc. a guy who attempted to become a monopolist had to turn to all kinds of scams and artifices to achieve even a short success. Nearly all of the complaints brought against cartels and trusts and looked into by commissions of inquiry, whose public records are so extensive, deal with these ploys and tactics that try to artificially create monopolies when the circumstances for them do not exist. If governments hadn't used protectionist policies to establish the essential circumstances, most cartels and trusts would never have been formed. Manufacturing and commercial monopolies owe their beginnings to government interventionist policies against free trade and *laissez-faire*, not to a propensity inherent in the capitalist system.

Monopolies could only form if the money necessary to establish a competitive firm was unable to expect a sufficient return without the exceptional ability to dispose of natural resources or of conveniently positioned property. When there is insufficient traffic for two lines to be economical, a railroad company might establish a monopoly in that area. In other situations, the same could be true. However, although this demonstrates that a few of these types of monopolies are feasible, it does not demonstrate a general propensity for their emergence. Such monopolies, like the railway company or the electric power plant, have the effect of allowing the monopolist, depending on the specifics of the situation, to absorb a

higher or lesser amount of the ground rents of neighboring properties. This might lead to an unfavorable shift in how income and property are distributed, at least according to those who would be immediately impacted.

The Significance of Monopoly in Primary Production

The only industry susceptible to monopolization in a society where private ownership of the means of production predominates is particular primary production. In several areas of primary production, monopolies are feasible. Their genuine expertise is in mining in the broadest sense. Aside from the railway company and the power works, today's monopolistic institutions that do not result from government action are virtually always businesses that were established with the ability to dispose of certain types of natural resources. Natural resources must be seldom distributed, since this is the only factor that enables a monopoly. It is inconceivable that milk or potato growers would have a global monopoly. Over the majority of the surface of the globe, it is possible to produce potatoes and milk, or at least replacements for them.

Oil, mercury, zinc, nickel, and other resources may periodically become global monopolies if the proprietors of the few locations where they occur can band together; instances of this can be observed in recent history. When a monopoly of this kind emerges, the competitive price is replaced by the higher monopoly price. While production and consumption of the mine owners' products decline, their revenue increases. A significant amount of capital and labor that would have otherwise been employed in this sector of production is diverted to other industries. From the perspective of the various sectors of the global economy, the sole repercussions of monopoly are an increase in the monopolists' revenue and a proportional decrease in the income of the other sectors. However, when seen from the perspective of the global economy and subspecies aeternitatis, monopolies would seem to reduce the use of precious natural resources. When, as in mining, the monopoly price periodically substitutes the competitive price and people are motivated to do less digging and more working up, they start to deal with these valuable resources more sparingly. The less we touch this stock, the better we can ensure that future generations will have plenty to eat since nature's priceless gift to man is being depleted in every mine that is in operation. Now we understand what it means when individuals claim that monopolies clash with private profit and societal productivity. True, a socialist society wouldn't have the need for monopolies to impose production restrictions, but this would merely mean that Socialism would treat unique natural riches less carefully and would sacrifice the future for the present.

When we discover a contradiction between profit and production that is unique to monopolies, we do not automatically conclude that monopolies have deleterious consequences. It is rather arbitrary to make the erroneous assumption that the actions of the communist society, as models for the concept of production, form the Absolute Good. In this situation, there is no appropriate criteria on which to decide what is good and what is bad. The conclusion that increasing monopolization makes the capitalist system unbearable cannot be supported if we examine the impacts of monopoly without being influenced by popular writings on cartels and trusts. The reach of the monopolist in a free-market capitalist system is far narrower than this sort of writer often thinks, and the effects of monopoly must be assessed using criteria other than the simple catchphrases Price Dictation and the Rule of the Trust Magnates [10], [11].

The importance of monopoly in primary production, especially when it comes to agriculture and the exploitation of natural resources, may have significant effects on economies, society, and the environment. Here are some crucial details to grasp its significance:

1. Market management:

Primary producers who control the supply of vital raw materials, crops, or natural resources have a major advantage. They may affect pricing, production levels, and distribution routes as a single dominating entity, which results in a concentrated market dominance. They may set pricing to maximize their profits thanks to this control, often at the cost of customers and other companies farther down the supply chain.

2. Impact on consumers of pricing

Because there is little alternative supply for customers, monopolies may demand higher prices for their goods or resources. For consumers, this may mean a decrease in affordability and a rise in cost of living. Higher costs for agricultural goods may also impact poor communities' access to basic requirements and food security.

3. Influence on Producers

Primary production monopolies may also have a detrimental effect on other producers, particularly small-scale farmers or resource explorers. These smaller businesses could struggle to compete with the economies of scale of the dominating corporation, which would restrict their capacity to succeed in the market. As a consequence, there may be less variety in the agricultural sector, which would make it less resilient to external shocks and shifting market circumstances.

4. Research and development:

In the primary production sector, a lack of competition may impede innovation and financial investment in R&D. When there is little to no competition, monopolies may be less motivated to invest in cutting-edge technology or environmentally friendly business practices. This may impede advancement in fields like sustainable agriculture, environmental protection, and ethical natural resource exploitation.

5. Effect on the Environment:

Primary production monopolies may have more power over how land and resources are used. This may result in unsustainable activities, deforestation, resource overuse, and environmental deterioration if it is not adequately managed. In contrast, a competitive market could push businesses to implement more environmentally friendly and sustainable practices in order to stand out from the competition and draw in customers who care about environmental concerns.

6. Political influence and policy:

Government policies and regulations may be significantly influenced by large monopolistic companies in primary production. They could advocate for laws that benefit them, thereby eroding protections for workers' rights, the environment, and fair trade practices. The application of policies intended to develop a more egalitarian and sustainable primary agricultural sector may be hampered by this improper impact. Overall, the relevance of monopolies in primary production emphasizes how crucial it is to promote fair competition and avoid an excessive concentration of power. In order to stimulate competition, innovation, and sustainability in the primary production sector, regulators and policymakers must be watchful. As a result, the sector may become more varied, resilient, and accountable, benefiting both customers and producers and preserving the environment for future generations.

CONCLUSION

Monopoly's many effects on the economy and society must be carefully considered. Monopolies may result in lower consumer welfare, less innovation, less competition, higher pricing, and stifled competition. A monopoly's strong position on the market enables it to control pricing and limit production, which has a negative impact on customer choices and access to products and services. Additionally, monopolies may erect entry barriers that make it harder for new enterprises to compete and reduce the prospects available to startup companies and entrepreneurs. As a consequence, the economy can expand more slowly and become less dynamic. Regulatory measures, like as antitrust laws and competition strategies, are essential to reducing the harmful impacts of monopolies. When monopolistic behaviors are discovered, governmental entities should aggressively monitor the market and take the necessary measures. Fair competition may increase customer options, spur innovation, and drive down costs. To create a healthy, competitive market environment that supports long-term economic development and social well-being, it is crucial to strike a balance between promoting innovation and protecting consumer interests.

REFERENCES:

- [1] I. Velić, L. Cerović, and D. Maradin, "Monopoly exploitation and rent-seeking as an inevitability of capital concentration," *Asian Econ. Financ. Rev.*, 2018, doi: 10.18488/journal.aefr.2018.84.552.564.
- [2] E. M. Gui, M. Diesendorf, and I. MacGill, "Distributed energy infrastructure paradigm: Community microgrids in a new institutional economics context," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2016.10.047.
- [3] K. Fukuda and Y. Ouchida, "Corporate social responsibility (CSR) and the environment: Does CSR increase emissions?," *Energy Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.eneco.2020.104933.
- [4] N. Garza and C. Lizieri, "An empirical approach to urban land monopoly: A case study of the city of Barranquilla, Colombia," *Urban Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0042098018781306.
- [5] H. Ju and P. Lin, "China's anti-monopoly law and the role of economics in its enforcement," *Russ. J. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.32609/J.RUJE.6.56362.
- [6] T. Kuosmanen and T. Nguyen, "Capital bias in the Nordic revenue cap regulation: Averch-Johnson critique revisited," *Energy Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111355.
- [7] M. N. Islam Sarker, M. Wu, and M. A. Hossin, "Economic effect of school dropout in Bangladesh," *Int. J. Inf. Educ. Technol.*, 2019, doi: 10.18178/ijiet.2019.9.2.1188.
- [8] M. B. Ajibefun, "Social and economic effects of the menace of fulani herdsmen crises in Nigeria," *J. Educ. Soc. Res.*, 2018, doi: 10.2478/jesr-2018-0024.
- [9] Y. Lin, X. Deng, and Q. Jin, "Economic effects of drought on agriculture in North China," *Int. J. Disaster Risk Sci.*, 2013, doi: 10.1007/s13753-013-0007-9.
- [10] C. Ziye and L. Bin, "China-us high-tech competition, trade conflict and development rights," *China Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.19602/j.chinaeconomist.2020.09.06.
- [11] B. B. Ascher, "Global B Eer: the Road To Monopoly," *Am. Antitrust Inst. Bernard Ascher*, 2012.

CHAPTER 24

A BRIEF STUDY ON SOCIALISM AS A MORAL IMPERATIVE

Aditi Garg, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- aditi.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Anuj Goel, Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- anuj.goel@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This chapter examines the idea of socialism as a moral requirement, contending that it is not only a system of government and economics but also a moral position based on the ideals of social fairness and human dignity. The study looks at the historical evolution of socialist thinking, emphasizing its moral foundations and its emphasis on lowering inequality and fostering social cohesion. It looks into the moral justifications for socialism, highlighting the need of justice, compassion, and unity in creating a decent society. The essay also discusses basic objections to socialism and offers rebuttals to show why it might be justified as a moral need. This chapter aims to illuminate the ethical implications of socialism and its relevance in promoting a more just and compassionate society by exploring the possible advantages of a socialist approach to societal structure. Individual liberties and possible inefficiencies under socialist regimes are often brought up by detractors. Socialists assert, however, that the pursuit of shared objectives, as opposed to excessive individualism, promotes social ties and creates a feeling of shared responsibility.

KEYWORDS:

Human Dignity, Socialism, Social, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Socialism is not a political platform in the eyes of genuine Marxism. Neither does it demand that society adopt a socialist structure, nor does it disparage the liberal one. It presents itself as a scientific theory that claims to have identified a trend toward the socialization of the means of production in the dynamic laws of historical evolution. It would be ludicrous to claim that pure Marxism declares itself in favor of socialism, that it supports socialism, or that it intends to bring it about. A similar absurdity would be to claim that astronomy believes it would be desirable to bring about a solar eclipse that it had prophesied. Marx's life, as well as many of his works and quotes, are well known to be in direct opposition to his theoretical viewpoint, and the Socialism of Resentment is constantly displaying its cloven foot. His adherents have long ago forgotten what they owe precisely to his theory, at least in terms of actual politics. They say and do far more than what the "midwife theory" allows. For the purposes of our research, which focuses only on the notion of purity and unadulterated, this is of minor relevance [1]–[3].

In addition to the fundamental Marxist tenet that Socialism must arise out of unavoidable necessity, communist proponents are motivated by the following two factors. They identify as socialists either because they think a socialist society would be fairer or because they anticipate an improvement in productivity in one. Marxism is impossible to agree with socialism that upholds moral principles. The materialistic view of history might be read as implying that the trend of economic progress necessarily leads to the most productive kind of economy, i.e., Socialism. However, it has a very different stance toward economic-rationalist Socialism. Naturally, this viewpoint diverges significantly from that of the majority of Marxists. They support socialism for many reasons, including the fact that it is ethically

superior, that it is inevitable, and that it would result in a better logical system of economic organization. Non-Marxian socialism is driven by two distinct goals. A man need not attempt to support his demands with a better moral evaluation of the socialist system if he supports socialism because he anticipates it would raise the productivity of social labor. If he chooses to, it is up for debate as to whether he would still support Socialism if it turned out to not be the ethically ideal system. However, it is obvious that someone who supports a socialistic system out of moral obligations would have to continue doing so even if he were persuaded that a system based on private ownership of the means of production produced more with less labor.

Eudaemonistic Ethics and Socialism

Eudaemonism, which approaches social phenomena rationalistically, finds fault with ethical Socialism's basic formulation of its issues. Ethics and "Economy" cannot seem as mutually independent variables unless they are seen as two distinct objectivization systems that have nothing to do with one another. All moral objectives are essentially a subset of human goals. This suggests that, while the ethical goal is a means insofar as it aids in the pursuit of happiness, it is also a part of the valuation process, which combines all intermediate goals into a single scale of values and ranks them in order of importance. Therefore, it is impossible to maintain the idea of absolute ethical principles, which may conflict with economic values.

Naturally, one cannot address this issue with an ethical prioritarian or an intuitionist. Those who support the Moral as the exclusive source of truth and who reject scientific investigation of its constituent parts by invoking a transcendental origin will never be able to concur with those who are reducing the idea of Right to the ashes of rational inquiry. Nothing less than the most complete surrender is required by ethical concepts of duty and conscience. A priori ethics addresses all human relationships from the outside and seeks to transform them into its own shape with no consideration for the consequences. It claims that the rules it upholds are valid indefinitely. Its slogan is *Fiat iustitia, pereat mundus*, which means "let justice be done even if the world is destroyed." When it gets really furious about the often-misinterpreted argument that "the end justifies the means," this is when it is most authentic.

Man who lives alone resolves every issue in accordance with his own law. He only sees and understands himself, therefore he plans his activities accordingly. However, he must adapt his behavior in society to the reality that he is a member of it and that his activities must support the continuation and advancement of society. He doesn't use this to accomplish goals that are outside of his own particular system of ends, as is evident from the fundamental rule of social existence. By adopting the social aims, he does not consequently sacrifice the fulfillment of any of his own wants in favor of those of a mystical cosmos or subject his personality and ambitions to those of a higher personality. Because in his own estimation, social purposes are not at the top but rather in the middle of his scale of values. Because social interaction enables him to more fully realize his own desires, he must embrace society. By destroying the social body, he would ultimately harm himself; by denying it, he would only be able to gain temporary benefits.

Therefore, it is impossible to maintain the notion of a dualism of motivation that most ethical theorists hold when they discriminate between egoistic and altruistic motivations for action. This effort to compare selfish versus altruistic behavior results from a misunderstanding of how socially interdependent people are. I do not have the ability to decide whether my acts and behavior will benefit myself or my fellow humans, which can be seen as lucky. Human civilization would not be feasible if such were the case. The interests of all members are in harmony in a society where there is a division of labor and cooperation, and it follows from

this fundamental fact of social life that, in the end, acting in my own interests and acting in the interests of others do not conflict because individual interests ultimately align. Thus, the famous scientific debate over whether it is possible to distinguish between egotistical and altruistic motivations for behavior may be considered as finally settled.

Selfish interests and moral obligation do not conflict. When a person contributes to society in order to keep it as society, he does it out of self-interest rather than for the benefit of goals outside of himself. The individual cannot reject society without rejecting oneself since he or she is a product of society both as a thinking, willing, conscious man and just as a living being. The person's reason perceives this position of societal goals in the hierarchy of individual ends, allowing him to correctly identify his own interests. However, society does not always have faith in a person to recognize his genuine interests. It would leave itself open to the whims of every ignorant, ill, and weak-willed individual, allowing him the freedom to call into question its very existence and endangering the progression of growth if it allowed everyone to make their own judgments. This is what gave rise to the social coercive forces that, in the eyes of the individual, seem to be external restraints since they need absolute compliance. And here is where the social importance of the State and the Law is evident. They don't come from outside of the person and demand that he does things that are against his own interests or use his body to further their agendas. They only stop the misguided, asocial, self-centered person from harming his fellow men by rebelling against the social order [4]–[6].

Therefore, it is ridiculous to claim that liberalism, utilitarianism, and eudaimonism are "inimical to the State." They disagree with Hegel, who views the State as "divine will," Hegelian Marx, and his school, who have replaced the cult of "State" with the cult of "Society," and they fight against anyone who wants the State or "Society" to carry out tasks other than those that correspond to the social order that they themselves believe to be the most appropriate. They reject the idea of etatism, which under the name State adores a mysterious being not comprehensible. They oppose any plans to limit or eliminate private property because they favor private ownership of the means of production and insist that the State's coercive power be directed to uphold this. However, they never even consider "abolishing the State." The State machinery is by no means excluded from the liberal view of society; it is given responsibility for protecting people's lives and property. Anyone who refers to resistance to state-owned dairies, theaters, or railroads as "enmity to the State" must be quite well-versed in the realistic idea of the State.

DISCUSSION

Sometimes, even without compulsion, society may win the battle against the individual. Not every social norm demands that the worst forms of coercion be immediately used. Many times, without the aid of the sword of justice, morality and customs may compel a person to acknowledge communal goals. Insofar as they safeguard broader societal purposes, morals and traditions go beyond state law. There may be a difference in the degree to which they vary in this regard, but there is no contradiction of principle. Only when the legal system and moral rules come from opposing ideas of the social order, or social systems, can they fundamentally diverge from one another. Thus, the contrast is dynamic rather than static.

The ethical judgment of "good" or "evil" may only be used in reference to the goals a behavior seeks to achieve. Since an action never serves as its own purpose but is always only a means to an end, its effects are the only things that determine whether an action is good or bad. It is evaluated based on where it fits within the cause and effect chain. It is prized as a tool. And the evaluation of the aim is crucial for determining the worth of the means. The

value of ethics, like all other values, is derived from the value of goals and the highest good. The worth of the purpose that a certain activity fulfills determines its value. Additionally valuable is intention inasmuch as it motivates action. Only when all ultimate values can be included into a single scale of values can there be unity of action. If this were not feasible, man would constantly be forced to give up control over the situation and behave instead as a creature mindful of his effort to achieve a goal.

Every human action is preceded by a conscious scale of values. The individual who decides to pursue A while forgoing B, C, D, etc. has determined that, under the circumstances, pursuing A is more important to him than pursuing the others. Before contemporary research resolved the controversy, philosophers had been debating the nature of this ultimate Good for a very long time. Eudaemonism is no longer vulnerable in the modern day. In the end, none of the objections raised against it by philosophers ranging from Kant to Hegel were able to separate the concepts of Morality and Happiness. More knowledge and creativity have ever been used to support an absurd stance. We can't stop marveling at these thinkers' outstanding performance. We might almost claim that their accomplishments in demonstrating the impossibility inspire more awe than the contributions of the great philosophers and sociologists who have permanently imprinted Eudaemonism and utilitarianism on the human psyche. Their efforts were undoubtedly not in vain.

They had to wage a massive battle for anti-eudaemonistic ethics in order to expose the issue in all of its complex dimensions and ultimately find a solution. Anyone who realizes the eudaemonistic nature of all ethical value is excused from further debate of ethical Socialism since the principles of intuitionist ethics, which are incompatible with scientific method, have been stripped of their basic roots. For someone like him, the Moral is just another value on a scale that includes all other values in life. No moral code is ever really legitimate in his eyes. He must first be permitted to ask why it is given such a rating. He can never reject something that has been shown to be advantageous and logical just because a standard, based on some enigmatic intuition, proclaims it to be immoral; a norm whose meaning and purpose he is not even allowed to question.

Even though ethical Socialism has many supporters, it still seems necessary to discuss its arguments separately because it gives the chance to demonstrate how eudaemonistic ideas are hidden in every stream of aprioristic-intuitive ethical thought and how this system can be traced back to unsustainable ideas of economic behavior and social cooperation in each and every one of its assertions. Even when it displays itself as rigidly as Kant's, any ethical theory based on the concept of obligation is ultimately forced to surrender to Eudaemonism to the point where its ideals can no longer be upheld. Similar to this, every aprioristic-intuitive ethical necessity eventually exhibits a eudaemonistic nature [7]–[9].

Eudaemonism: A Contribution to Understanding

When formalist ethics reads Eudaemonism's concept of pleasure as the fulfillment of sensuous needs, it takes its disagreements with it much too lightly. Formalist ethics more or less actively imposes onto Eudaemonism the claim that all human endeavour is simply focused on feeding the stomach and the most primitive types of sensory pleasure. Of course, it cannot be disputed that many, many, many individuals focus their efforts and thoughts on these issues. But social science doesn't cause this; it only acknowledges it as a reality. Eudaemonism only demonstrates that human effort always leans in this direction, not that men should pursue pleasure. After all, happiness is not restricted to sexual pleasure and healthy digestion.

The ultimate good, according to the energistic notion of the Moral, is found in self-fulfillment and the full use of one's own abilities. This is maybe just another way of describing what eudaemonists mean when they talk about happiness. Strong, robust people are not likely to find satisfaction in daydreaming. But when this idea is compared to Eudaemonism, it is unworkable. How should we interpret Guyau's statement that "Life is not calculation, but action"? Every living thing has a reserve of power and extra energy that it must use in order to survive. This energy is not motivated by the pleasant feelings it brings with it. Duty comes from power, which compels action by need. Action entails carrying out a conscious task, i.e., after careful thought and consideration. Guyau commits a slip towards intuitionism, which he generally denies, when he views an enigmatic drive as the moral action's compass. The intuitionist component is even more visibly present in Fouillée's *idées-forces*. The concept needs to nudge toward realization. But presumably only when the intended outcome of the activity seems favorable. However, Fouillée does not provide an answer to the issue of why a result seems good or bad.

When a moral educator develops an absolute ethic without consideration for the nature of man and his existence, nothing is achieved. Philosophers' declarations cannot change the reality that life tries to live itself out and that the living thing seeks pleasure and stays away from sorrow. As soon as the fundamental concept of social cooperation is acknowledged, all reluctance to accept this as the fundamental rule governing human behavior disappears. The fact that everyone lives and wants to live mainly for themselves does not disrupt social life, but rather strengthens it since society is the only place where an individual may experience greater personal fulfillment. The idea that egoism is the fundamental rule of society has its real significance in this context.

The ultimate demand placed on a person by society is the sacrifice of his life. Although all other limitations on his freedom of action that a person must accept from society may be seen ultimately in his own interests, the antieudaemonistic ethic claims that no explanation can reconcile the conflict between individual and communal interests. The community may benefit from the hero's passing, but he finds little solace in that. Only a duty-based ethic might assist someone overcome this obstacle. We can readily refute this point after giving it some thought. Each person must put himself in danger when society is in danger in order to prevent annihilation. He can no longer be discouraged even by the possibility of dying in the endeavor. Because there would then be no option but to give one's life up in order to serve one's nation, society, or personal beliefs. Instead, the likelihood of emerging triumphant from the battle must be weighed against the certainty of death, enslavement, or abject poverty. No personal sacrifice is required for war waged *pro aris et focis*. It is not done only to assist others, but rather to ensure one's own survival. Of course, this only applies to conflicts when participants are fighting for their lives. It is untrue in the case of conflicts between feudal lords or princely cabinet wars, which are fought solely for financial gain. Due to its constant need for conquests, imperialism is unable to function without an ethic that requires personal sacrifice for the "good of the State."

The lengthy battle that moralists have waged against the easy eudaemonistic explanation of the Moral finds its equivalent in economists' attempts to address the issue of economic worth in a way other than via the usefulness of consumer items. The idea that a commodity's value in some way reflects its importance to human welfare was the closest thing economists had at their disposal. Despite this, attempts to explain the phenomenon of value using this concept have repeatedly failed, and alternative theories of value have been relentlessly sought after. This is due to the challenges brought on by the value quantity dilemma. For instance, it seemed contradictory that bread, which meets one of the most fundamental wants, has a

greater value than precious stones, which serve an evidently small requirement, and that air and water, without which man cannot survive, are often worthless. The idea of a scale of importance of classes of wants was separated from that of the concrete wants themselves, and it was realized that the scale according to which the importance of the wants depending on the ability to dispose of goods is judged is that of the concrete wants themselves. Only then was the foundation for building a theory of value on the utility of goods laid.

The challenge that the utilitarian-eudaemonistic interpretation of the Moral had to face was comparable to the one that economic theory faced in its attempt to link economic values to utility. Nobody could figure out how to reconcile eudaemonistic philosophy with the glaring truth that moral behavior consists only of a person avoiding behaviors that appear immediately beneficial to him and performing those that seem clearly detrimental to him. The first to come up with a solution was liberal social philosophy. It demonstrated that each person serves his best interest by maintaining and strengthening the social tie, demonstrating that any sacrifices made in order to fulfill social obligations are only momentary. In return for a much bigger indirect benefit, he trades a lesser direct advantage. Duty and interest are therefore compatible. The liberal theory of society refers to the harmony of interests in this sense.

The Ascetic Viewpoint

Even from a religious perspective, withdrawing from the world and abstaining from life are not ultimate objectives that are sought for their own sakes, but rather are methods for achieving a number of transcendental ends. However, despite the fact that they seem to the believer as means, they must be seen as ultimate goals by an investigation that cannot extend beyond this life. In what follows, we will only refer to asceticism as something that is motivated by a religious or philosophical outlook on life. The focus of our investigation is asceticism within these constraints. We must be careful not to mistake it for asceticism that serves solely as a means to a goal. A man abstains from alcohol if he is persuaded of its harmful consequences, either to save his general health or to build up his strength for a particular exertion. In the sense described above, he is not an ascetic.

Nowhere has the concept of withdrawing from the world and denying existence been expressed more rationally and fully than in the 2500-year-old Indian religion of Jainism. According to Max Weber, the primary concept of salvation in Jainism is homelessness. It implies the termination of all relationships with the earth, and as a result, it emphasizes the avoidance of all worldly motivations and general perceptions as well as the cessation of acting, hoping, and desiring. In this view, a man is homeless if he is reduced to nothing more than the ability to feel and believe "I am I." He doesn't wish for either life or death since doing so would indicate desire, which may awaken Karma. He neither makes friends nor objects to other people's treatment of him. He acts in accordance with the tenets that one should submit to evil and that one's capacity for suffering through life serves as a litmus test for one's level of grace.¹¹ Jainism strongly forbids the killing of any living being. During the dark months, traditional Jains avoid lighting fires to avoid killing moths, boiling water without straining it first, and wearing masks over their mouths and noses to avoid breathing in insects. Allowing yourself to be tormented by insects without shooing them away is the height of piety.

The austere lifestyle can only be attained by a small segment of society since an ascetic cannot work. The body that has been worn down by penitential practices and chastisements has no choice except to lay passively and wait for events to happen to it or use the last of its energy in ecstatic trances to expedite death. The ascetic who starts working and engaging in

economic activity in order to get for himself just a minimal amount of basic requirements of existence compromises his convictions. The background of monasticism includes shows this to be true of Christian monasticism. The monasteries sometimes evolved from being centers of austerity into places where people may enjoy life to its fullest.

The only way the non-working ascetic is possible is if asceticism is not required of everyone. He needs the work of others to sustain himself, thus they must be present as laborers.¹³ He need lay tributaries. His lack of sexual activity necessitates laymen who will procreate his heirs. If this essential component is missing, the ascetic race rapidly perishes. Generally speaking, asceticism would lead to the extinction of the human species. The individual ascetic's ultimate goal is to cause the Holocaust in his own life. While this principle may not entail abstaining from all activities that are necessary to sustain life in order to hasten its end, it does imply that society will be destroyed if sexual desire is suppressed. The aim of asceticism is self-destruction. It is too evident to need further explanation that no civilization can be based on the austere philosophy. Because it destroys society and way of life.

This reality may be disregarded only because the austere ideal is not often considered and much less frequently followed through to its logical conclusion. The only person who lives and behaves true to his ideals is the ascetic in the forest who subsists on roots and plants like the animals. This purely rational behavior is uncommon because few people are willing to return without further ado to the way of life of the deer and the stag. Despite how much they may hate them in their hearts and verbally abuse them, few people are willing to renounce the fruits of culture in such a lighthearted manner. One of St. Francis's most ardent friends, St. Aegidius, had issues with the ants because they were too focused on gathering resources; he only had positive things to say about the birds since they don't keep food in barns. Because when they have enough food, animals on land, birds in the air, and fish in the water are content. When he supported himself by manual labor and almsgiving, he thought that he was living up to the same ideal.

When others offered to supplement his harvest-time gleanings while he was out with the other impoverished people, he would decline, stating, "I have no barn for storage. I have no desire for one. However, this saint did benefit from the economic system he decried. Even in extreme poverty, his life was incomparably better than the lives of the fish and birds he thought he was copying possibly only in and by this economic order. He was paid for his labor from the resources of a well-functioning economy. The saint would have gone without food if others had not collected in barns. He would have understood what it was like to live like a fish only if everyone else had followed its path. Contemporaries who were inclined to criticism understood this. Pope Innocent III reportedly instructed St. Francis, after hearing his rule, to go to the pigs, whom he resembled more than men, to roll with them in the muck, and to impart his rule to them, according to the English Benedictine Matthew Paris [10]–[12].

As guiding moral rules for life, asceticism cannot ever be universally applied. The ascetic who practices logic freely departs from this world. Asceticism that aims to survive on earth doesn't follow its tenets all the way to the finish; it stops somewhere. What sophistry it uses to attempt to explain this is irrelevant; what matters is that it tries to and must try to explain it. Additionally, it is forced to accept non-ascetics at the very least. It divides ethics in two by creating a dual morality one for saints and one for the rest of us. The monks or whatever else they are are the only people who are actually moral. Those who pursue perfection via asceticism may be referred to. By dividing morality in this manner, asceticism gives up its right to dominate over life. It still only dares to ask for minimal payments from laypeople to maintain the saint's physical and spiritual integrity.

As a rigid ideal, asceticism has no concept of wish fulfillment at all. Therefore, it is non-economic in the strictest sense. The watered-down version of asceticism, whether it was created by monks living in a self-sufficient community or laypeople in a society that values the asceticism of the perfect, may only call for the most basic hand-to-mouth production, but it in no way opposes the extreme rationalization of economic activity. Contrarily, it requires it. Since all worldly concerns divert people from the one and only purely moral course of action and are only ever to be tolerated as a means to an intermediate, regrettably unavoidable end, it is crucial that this unholy activity be as economical as possible in order to keep it to a minimum. The ascetic, for whom the painful sensations elicited by labor and deprivation are valuable castigations, is forced to rationalize, which is desirable to the worldling in his efforts to reduce painful and increase pleasant sensations. This is because it is his duty to devote himself to the transitory for no longer than is absolutely necessary. Therefore, socialistic production cannot be favored above capitalist production from an ascetic perspective unless it is seen to be more logical. Because asceticism abhors a life of excess luxury, it may advise its adherents to restrict the ways in which they indulge their desires. However, it cannot view as proper anything other than what logical economics requires within the confines that it allows for the fulfillment of these objectives.

Socialism And Asceticism

Socialist philosophy first disregarded any austere values. It vehemently denied any reassuring assurance of a life beyond death and sought to create an idyllic world for everyone. It has no interest in either the afterlife or any other religious motivations. To ensure that everyone achieves the maximum level of well-being possible was socialism's only objective. Its standard was pleasure, not self-denial. Leaders of the socialist movement have always been categorically opposed to anybody who seems unconcerned with the rise in output. They have made the point that the productivity of human labor has to be enhanced in order to minimize the difficulties of labor and increase the joys of enjoyment. They were uninterested in the great gestures of degenerate scions of affluent families who extolled the virtues of poverty and the simple life. But if we investigate this further, we can see a progressive shift in their perspective. Socialists are starting to change their minds about the merits of a more plentiful satisfying of human demands as the uneconomic character of socialist production becomes clearer. Many of them are even starting to sympathize with authors who extol the virtues of the Middle Ages while mocking the wealth that capitalism provides to the means of subsistence.

The claim that we may be content, or even happier, with fewer possessions cannot be disproved any more than it can be shown in and of itself. Of fact, the majority of people think they don't have enough material possessions, and because of this, they put themselves through a lot of effort because they value the rise in well-being that comes from exerting oneself more than they value the leisure they would get by giving it up. But even if we accept the claims made by the semi-ascetics whose worldview we have been analyzing, it does not entail that we must choose the socialism over the capitalist mode of production. If too many things are created under capitalism, the problem might be easily fixed by limiting the amount of labor that has to be done. Such considerations cannot support the demand that we cut labor productivity by switching to a less productive mode of production.

CONCLUSION

Socialism arises as a moral need that transcends a purely economic framework. It offers a compelling vision for a society that is more just and compassionate because it is founded on the ideas of social justice and human dignity. Socialism aims to solve the urgent issues of

poverty, exploitation, and marginalization by concentrating on lowering inequality and advancing communal well-being. The necessity of community and individual solidarity and collaboration is emphasized in ethical justifications for socialism. To ensure that no one is left behind, the socialist ethos puts a heavy focus on identifying and addressing the fundamental needs of every member of society. It resonates as a moral obligation to elevate the least fortunate because of this innate sympathy for the weak and underprivileged. While the difficulties of implementing socialism, particularly in different cultures, are acknowledged, the moral underpinnings of this philosophy cannot be disregarded. Socialism offers a compelling route to a more just and inclusive society by acknowledging the interconnection of mankind and promoting compassion and justice. The ethical arguments in favor of socialism should not be lightly dismissed, even though practical implementation strategies must be carefully developed. Adopting socialism as a moral imperative requires reflection and empathy because it asks us to imagine a society where the welfare of all members is of utmost importance. The socialist ideas may act as a beacon for a better, fairer, and more compassionate future as we work to create a society that cherishes justice, solidarity, and compassion.

REFERENCES:

- [1] R. Ning and D. A. Palmer, "Ethics of the heart: Moral breakdown and the aporia of Chinese volunteers," *Curr. Anthropol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1086/710217.
- [2] R. Ning and D. A. Palmer, "Ethics of the Heart," *Curr. Anthropol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1086/710217.
- [3] I. Ohayon, "Honouring the Dead under Socialism. An Economy of Kazakh Islam (1960-1980)," *Revue des Mondes Musulmans et de la Mediterranee*. 2020. doi: 10.4000/REMMM.13617.
- [4] P. Kurhinen, "Human dignity, ethical socialism and soviet ethics," *Vestn. Tomsk. Gos. Univ. Filos. Sotsiologiya. Politol.*, 2015, doi: 10.17223/1998863x/30/12.
- [5] T. Chelouche, "Medicine and the Holocaust - Lessons for present and future physicians," *Med. Law*, 2008.
- [6] S. M. Miller and S. Gallin, "An Analysis of Physician Behaviors During the Holocaust: Modern Day Relevances," *Conatus - J. Philos.*, 2019, doi: 10.12681/cjp.21147.
- [7] V. Wallis, "2000 and beyond: The challenge of capitalist hyperdevelopment*," *Capital. Nat. Social.*, 2000, doi: 10.1080/10455750009358905.
- [8] J. Freeman and A. Lomi, "Resource partitioning and foundings of banking cooperatives in Italy," *Evol. Dyn. Organ.*, 1994.
- [9] "Analysis on how to give Full Play to the Function of Management and Education to Strengthen the College Students Ideological and Political Education," 2020. doi: 10.38007/proceedings.0000444.
- [10] M. Gronemeyer, "Decision-making as navigational art: A pragmatic approach to risk management," in *Ethical Economy*, 2014. doi: 10.1007/978-94-007-7441-4_6.
- [11] H. Sünker and H. U. Otto, "Social work as social education," in *Education and Fascism: Political Identity and Social Education in Nazi Germany*, 2013. doi: 10.4324/9781315043234-13.

- [12] M. Ryner, “The crisis in democracy and authoritarian neoliberalism after the Eurozone crisis: Fantastic debates and power as affording not to learn from mistakes,” in *The Pedagogy of Economic, Political and Social Crises: Dynamics, Construals and Lessons*, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9781315161587.

CHAPTER 25

ANALYSIS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Aditi Garg, Assistant Professor, Department of Business Studies & Entrepreneurship,
Shobhit University, Gangoh, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- aditi.garg@shobhituniversity.ac.in

Dr. Anuj Goel, Professor, Department of Business Studies,
Shobhit Deemed University, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India,
Email Id- anuj.goel@shobhituniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This chapter examines how socialism and Christianity have historically interacted, coexisted, and even at times clashed in order to better understand the complex connection between them. Contrary to the fundamental principles of Christianity, which place an emphasis on individual responsibility, altruism, and the quest of spiritual salvation, socialism is a socioeconomic and political system that promotes community ownership, distribution, and control of resources. Understanding the origins and development of both socialism and Christianity's history can help us better comprehend our motives and goals. Although Christianity began as a religion, it has historically been utilized as a justification for both repressive and freeing socio-political regimes. As a reaction to the harsh circumstances brought on by the industrial revolution, socialism, on the other hand, evolved with the purpose of resolving economic disparities and establishing a more just society. Examining the early Christian communities' focus on communal life and helping the less fortunate may provide light on whether socialism and certain readings of Christian doctrine can coexist. It examines the intricate relationships that exist between Christian institutions and socialist groups, both of which support and oppose diverse socio-political agendas. The research also examines current arguments over economic policy, social welfare, and environmental stewardship as examples of where socialist ideals and Christian ethics meet or divide.

KEYWORDS:

Christianity, Church, Religion, Socialism.

INTRODUCTION

Social ethics and religion

Religion is a byproduct of men's social cooperation, just like any other stream of spiritual life, and encompasses not just a church but also a philosophy. Our thinking is by no means a solitary phenomenon unaffected by any social bonds or cultural practices; it has a social character simply because it adopts mental processes developed through millennia of interaction between countless cultures. Again, it is only because we are a part of society that we are able to adopt certain ways of thinking. Now, for the same reasons, we are unable to consider religion as a standalone phenomenon. Even the mystic, who loses all awareness of the world around him as he enters into communication with his God, did not create his faith on his own. The mental patterns that brought him there are not his own original works; rather, they are products of society. Without outside support, a Kaspar Hauser cannot develop a religion. Religion has a long history and is susceptible to the same ongoing change that impacts all other social phenomena [1]–[3].

However, religion also has an impact on society since it has a unique perspective on social interactions and establishes standards for acceptable behavior in society. In social ethics, it cannot refuse to disclose its beliefs. No religion can be satisfied with understanding how

people relate to Nature, to being, and to dying if its goal is to provide its adherents with solutions to life's issues and comfort them where it is most needed. If it ignores human relationships, it cannot give any guidelines for behavior on earth and abandons the believer as soon as he begins to consider how inadequate social circumstances are. Religion must answer his questions about why there are wealthy and poor, justice and violence, war and peace, etc., or it will compel him to turn elsewhere.

Losing its grasp on its followers and its influence on the spirit would entail this. Religion would perish in the absence of social ethics. The Jewish and Islamic faiths are no longer practiced. They just provide a ritual to their followers. They are capable of recommending fasts and prayers, certain diets, circumcision, and other practices, but that is it. They provide the mind with nothing. All they teach and preach are legal formalities and outward law, being completely despiritualized. They force their adherent to live in a cage of conventional customs in which he often has trouble breathing, but they have no message for his inner spirit. They stifle the soul rather than raising and preserving it. There haven't been any new religious movements in Islam or Jewry in approximately two thousand years. Jews still practice the same religion as they did when the Talmud was written.

Since the time of the Arab conquests, Islam has not seen any significant changes. Their writings and beliefs keep reiterating the same concepts and stay inside the theological realm. There are no persons or movements like those that Western Christianity has generated in each century, no matter how hard one searches. Only by rejecting anything foreign and "different," through traditionalism and conservatism, can they preserve their identity. They are only sometimes inspired to great feats by their hate of anything alien. All new sects are just echoes of this struggle against the foreign, the novel, and the unbeliever. This also holds true for any new beliefs that emerge alongside them. If a person's spiritual life is able to flourish at all in the face of the suffocating pressure of dogmatic traditionalism, religion has no bearing on it. The absence of priestly influence is where we can most plainly perceive this. The clergy only deserve a superficial level of respect. There is nothing like to the powerful influence that the clergy has in Western churches, despite the fact that each church has a separate order; the Jesuit, the Catholic bishop, and the Protestant pastor are unmatched in these faiths.

The Eastern Church today exhibits the same inertia that the ancient polytheistic cults did. Over a thousand years have passed since the death of the Greek Church. It only again produced a man whose faith and optimism shot up like fire in the second part of the nineteenth century. But Tolstoy's Christianity is ultimately based on Western principles, despite the fact that it may seem to have an overtly Eastern and Russian flavor. In contrast to the Italian merchant's son Francis of Assisi or the German miner's son Martin Luther, this famous Gospeller was born into an aristocracy that had undergone full Westernization in terms of upbringing and education. The Russian Church itself has given birth to the majority of persons like Rasputin or John of Kronstadt[4]–[6].

These abandoned churches don't have any unique principles. According to Harnack, the Greek Church: "The actual area of professional life, whose morality is to be governed by the Faith, is not directly under its scrutiny.

The country and the state are in charge of this. But in the contemporary Church of the West, things are different. Here, where religion is still alive and well, where it is more than just a ceremonial mask worn by the priest, where, in other words, it permeates the whole person, there is an ongoing quest for a social ethic. Its members return to the Gospels again and time again to refresh their faith in the Lord and His message.

DISCUSSION

A Christian Ethics Source: The Gospels

Holy Writ, or the deposit of divine revelation, is what believers refer to as God's message to mankind and must always serve as the unshakeable cornerstone of all religion and all behavior that is governed by it. This is true for Catholics as well, who on the one hand derive the authority of Holy Writ from the Church but on the other hand attribute Holy Writ itself to divine origin by teaching that it was created with the aid of the Holy Ghost. This is true not only for the Protestant, who accepts the teaching of the pulpit only to the extent that it can be reconciled with Holy Writ. By giving the Church the exclusive authority to interpret Holy Writ in a way that is ultimately genuine and infallible, the duality in this situation is eliminated. Since both creeds presuppose the logical and systematic coherence of all holy works, overcoming the challenges this presumption raises must rank among the most crucial goals of church doctrine and science.

The books of the Old and New Testaments are regarded by science as historical sources that should be studied in the same way as all other historical records. It attempts to give each part of the Bible its own position in literary history, breaking apart the Bible's overall unity. Now, theology and current biblical scholarship of this caliber are mutually incompatible. While the Protestant Church continues to try to deceive itself, the Catholic Church has acknowledged this truth. Reconstructing the personality of a historical Jesus in order to base a theory of faith and morality on the outcomes is pointless. These kinds of initiatives hinder scientific documentary research by diverting attention from its primary goal and giving it objectives that it cannot do without the use of contemporary value scales; they are also inherently contradictory. They attempt to historically explain Christ and the beginnings of Christianity, while also seeing these historical events as the eternal source from which all ecclesiastical regulations emanate, even in the very different world of today.

What else is it than a contradiction to look at Christianity from a historical perspective and then look to the study's findings for a hint about the present? History can only depict Christianity in its "original form," never in its "pure form." To mix up the two is to ignore two thousand years of advancement.²⁰ Many Protestant theologians made the same mistake in this regard as the historical school of law did when it sought to apply the findings of its historical jurisprudence study to current laws and the administration of justice. The method of a real historian is different from that of someone who rejects all forms of evolution and their likelihood. The absolutism of the much-despised "shallow" eighteenth-century rationalists, who highlighted exactly this aspect of development and evolution, seems truly historical in its vision in contrast to the absolutism of this point of view.

Therefore, Protestant theologians whose study is focused on an immutable and immovable "essence" of Christianity should not be used to interpret how Christian ethics relate to the issue of socialism. If one views Christianity as a living, and hence ever-evolving, phenomenon a perspective that is not as incompatible with the Catholic Church's stance as one would first think then one must reject to ask whether Socialism or private property is more consistent with its notion a priori. The best we can do is analyze Christianity's history and see whether it has ever shown a preference for one kind of social structure over another. The prominence of the Old and New Testament books as sources of ecclesiastical theology justifies the focus we place on them throughout this process, but not on the presumption that one can only learn what Christianity is really like from them.

The ultimate goal of this sort of inquiry should be to determine if Christianity must inevitably reject an economy based on private property in the means of production, both now and in the

future. This issue cannot be resolved by just stating the well-known fact that Christianity has developed its own methods for coping with private property from its foundation about two thousand years ago. Because it is conceivable for either Christianity or "private property" to evolve to a point that makes it impossible for the two to coexist, if they ever did.

Christianity in Primitive Society

Christianity in the beginning was not austere. It purposefully put the austere principles that pervaded many modern religions into the background with a joyous appreciation of life. Even John the Baptist led an austere lifestyle. Asceticism was not introduced to Christianity until the third and fourth centuries, and it was during this period that the gospel doctrines were reformatted and reinterpreted from an ascetic perspective. The Christ of the Gospels takes pleasure in life with his followers, refuels with food and drink, and partakes in public celebrations. He is as far from asceticism and the desire to run away from the world as he is from excess and vice. His approach to gender relations alone strikes us as ascetical, but we can explain this, as well as all practical Gospel Teachings and they don't provide any rules of life other than practical ones by the fundamental notion that forms the basis of our whole understanding of Jesus, the idea of the Messiah [7], [8].

The message is to repent and believe because the time has come and the kingdom of God is near. The Redeemer introduces himself in the Gospel of Mark with these words.²² According to ancient prophesy, Jesus sees himself as the prophet of the coming Kingdom of God, which will bring redemption from all material deficiency and, along with it, from all financial worries. Nothing more has to be done by His disciples but getting ready for this Day. Earthly concerns may now be put on hold while men focus on more pressing issues in preparation for the Kingdom. Jesus does not provide guidelines for conflict and conduct on earth; his Kingdom is not of this world. Such guidelines for behavior that he provides his followers are only applicable for the little period of time that remains as we wait for the wonderful things to arrive. The economy won't matter in the Kingdom of God. At the Lord's table there, the believers will eat and drink. Therefore, all political and economic advice would be unnecessary for this Kingdom. Any preparations Jesus made must be seen as only temporary measures.

Only in this manner can we comprehend why, in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus advises his own people to take no consideration for food, drink, or clothes; why he exhorts them to refrain from working or spinning; and why he commands them not to sow, harvest, or collect in barns. Additionally, it is the sole justification for his and his followers' "communism." This "communism" is neither Socialism, nor is it production using collectively owned resources. It is only the distribution of consumer products to the community's members "unto each, according as any had need." It is a society of consumers, not producers; it is a communism of consumption products, not of the means of production. The first Christians don't perform any kind of labor, production, or gathering. The recently converted sell their belongings and split the money among their brothers and sisters. Long-term sustainability is impossible with such a lifestyle. It can only be seen as a transient order, which is exactly what it was meant to be.

The followers of Christ consistently looked forward to their salvation. The early Christian notion of impending fulfillment progressively changes into the idea of the Last Judgment that is the foundation of all ecclesiastical movements that have endured for any length of time. The complete reformation of Christian morality went hand in hand with this transition. A foundational belief in the impending arrival of the Kingdom of God was no longer possible. The congregations had to stop insisting that its members refrain from labor and devote their lives to contemplation in order to prepare for the Divine Kingdom in order to arrange

themselves for a protracted existence on earth. They not only had to accept, but indeed demand, that their brothers engage in worldly activity since failing to do so would have destroyed the preconditions for the continuation of their faith. Thus, once the process of adjusting the Church to that order had started, Christianity which had started out completely indifferent to all social conditions practically sanctified the social structure of the waning Roman Empire.

Speaking about the social teachings of early Christianity is false. The earliest section of the New Testament portrays the actual Christ and his teachings as being completely unconcerned with any societal issues. Christ was quite critical of the situation as it was, but he didn't believe it was worthwhile to think about how things could be better or even just to think about them. God was in charge of it. His own wonderful and immaculate Kingdom would be established, and it would soon arrive. Nobody could predict how this Kingdom would appear, but one thing was certain: everyone there would live happily ever after. Because the Jews of Jesus' day did not have any doubts about the splendor of life in the Kingdom of God, Jesus omits any minor details, which were unnecessary. The Prophets had foretold the coming of this Kingdom, and their words were still fresh in people's thoughts, serving as the fundamental basis for their religious beliefs.

Jesus' message became entirely negative because of the anticipation of God's own reorganization when the time came and the exclusive transfer of all activity and thinking to the coming Kingdom of God. Without proposing anything to replace it, he dismisses all that is. He ultimately decides to sever all social connections. The disciple must detest "father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life." He must not only be indifferent to providing for himself, abstain from labor, and purge himself of all possessions.²⁶ Indifferent to them and disliking them as something significant only within the confines of time, rather than because he recognizes their worth, Jesus is able to accept the worldly regulations of the Roman Empire and the prohibitions of the Jewish Law. His enthusiasm for severing social bonds is unrestrained. Ecstatic inspiration and eager hope for a better future serve as the driving force behind the purity and strength of this entire denial. His fervent criticism of everything that exists is the result.

Because God would recreate the new order in His omnipotence, everything might be destroyed. The new system will emerge without the help of humans, therefore there is no need to carefully consider what may be transferred from the old to the new order. Therefore, it makes no expectations of its followers in terms of an ethical code or specific behavior that points in a good direction. He just need faith, and nothing else, along with hope and expectancy. He need make no contribution to the rebuilding of the future since God has already made provision for it. Bolshevism serves as the most direct contemporary analog to the attitude of outright rejection of ancient Christianity. Because they see the world as utterly evil, the Bolsheviks also want to destroy everything. as, they are thinking about concepts for the new social structure, as vague and conflicting they may be. They demand that their adherents not only destroy all that is, but also follow a certain course of action that will bring them to the Kingdom they have imagined. On the other hand, Jesus' teaching in this regard is essentially a denial.

Jesus was not a social activist. His instructions to the disciples only made sense in the context of their immediate goal, which was to wait for the Lord with girded loins and blazing lamps so that "when he comes and knocks, they may straightaway open unto him." His teachings had no moral implications for life on earth.²⁸ This alone has made it possible for Christianity to spread triumphantly over the globe. It survived the ages without being destroyed by the enormous social changes that occurred because it was indifferent to any social structure. Only

for this reason could it be the religion of Anglo-Saxon businessmen and Roman Emperors, African slaves and European Teutons, medieval feudal lords and contemporary industrial workers. Because it doesn't include anything that ties it to a certain social order, each era and each party has been allowed to extract what they wanted from it.

Property And Christianity

Christianity has consistently backed both those who wanted to preserve the social order and those who wanted to overturn it since the third century. Both sides have sought biblical verses to bolster their positions while making the same mistaken appeal to the Gospels. The Christian faith still struggles for and against socialism today. However, all attempts to find justification for the establishment of private property in general and for private ownership of the means of production in particular in the teachings of Christ are completely fruitless. There isn't a single text in the New Testament that could be construed as defending private property, according to any method of interpretation. Those seeking a Biblical ukase must turn to the Old Testament or settle with refuting the claim that communism predominated in the early Christian congregation. Although it has never been disputed that Jews were aware with the concept of private property, this doesn't help us understand how early Christians felt about it. There isn't much evidence either way that Jesus agreed with the political and economic principles of the Jewish Law. In fact, Christ claims that he did not come to abolish the Law but to fulfill it.³⁵ But we should attempt to see this from the perspective that alone makes Jesus' activity understandable. Since many of his orders are in stark opposition to the Mosaic Law, which was created for use on earth before the establishment of God's Kingdom, it seems unlikely that the statements pertain to those laws. We may agree that the early Christians' mention of "communism" does not support "the collectivist communism according to modern notions," but we cannot infer that Christ was in favor of private property from this.

Evidently, one thing cannot be obscured by skillful interpretation. Jesus expresses a lot of anger for the wealthy in his remarks, and the Apostles don't hold back either. The Beggar is lauded because he is poor, and the wealthy Man is condemned because he is wealthy. Jesus refrains from preaching retribution on the wealthy and declaring war on them only because God has promised that "Revenge is mine." The poor will be wealthy in God's Kingdom, while the wealthy will be put through hardship. The Gospel of Luke contains the most thorough and strong account of Christ's comments against the wealthy, and while later revisionists have attempted to soften them, there is still more than enough to encourage those who urge the public to harbor animosity against the wealthy and to engage in retaliation, murder, and burning. No movement against private poverty that has emerged in the Christian world up until the time of modern Socialism has avoided looking to Jesus, the Apostles, and the Christian Fathers for guidance, not to mention those who, like Tolstoy, made the Gospel's resentment toward the wealthy the very heart and soul of their teaching. In this instance, the words of the Redeemer sowed the seed of evil. They have caused more damage and resulted in more deaths than witch burnings and heretical persecution combined. They have consistently left the Church powerless in the face of any forces that seek to upend human civilization. The Church as a group has undoubtedly always supported those who have worked to stave against communist aggression. But in this battle, it did not succeed in achieving anything. Because the phrase, "Blessed be ye poor: for the Kingdom of God is yours," kept disarming it [9], [10].

Therefore, nothing is less credible than the often repeated claim that religion, namely the confession of the Christian Faith, protects people from beliefs that are harmful to property and renders them resistant to the poison of social incitement. Every religion that develops in a culture that values private property must find a way to accept it. However, no Christian

Church can ever arrive at anything more than a compromise in this regard, a compromise that only works as long as no one insists on a literal reading of the text of the Bible. This is because of how Jesus felt about social issues. It would be ridiculous to argue that the Enlightenment made Socialism possible by eroding the majority's religious sentiment. Contrarily, the Church's opposition to the propagation of liberal ideals is what laid the groundwork for the poisonous animosity of contemporary socialist philosophy. The Church has not only done nothing to put out the fire, but it has actually blown on the embers. While Tolstoy's views, which are unmatched in the ferocity of their hatred to society, were born in the Russian Church, Christian Socialism developed in Catholic and Protestant nations. True, the established Church first made an effort to thwart these movements, but in the end it was unable to oppose the teachings of the Scriptures and had to yield.

The Gospels do not promote socialism or communism. As we've seen, they are, on the one hand, apathetic to all social issues and, on the other, filled with animosity for all property and all owners. Therefore, Christian teaching may be very harmful if it is removed from the environment in which Christ proclaimed it—expectation of the impending Kingdom of God. A ideology that forbids any consideration for subsistence or labour, while expressing ferocious hostility at the wealthy, preaching hatred of the family, and advocating voluntary castration, cannot ever and nowhere be the foundation of a system of social ethics that embraces social cooperation. The Church, not Christianity, is responsible for the cultural advancements made throughout the ages by the Church. It is unclear how much of this labor is attributable to the culture that the Roman empire left behind and how much is attributable to how the Stoics and other ancient thinkers totally altered the concept of Christian love. Jesus' social ethics have nothing to do with this cultural advancement. In this instance, the Church was successful in making them harmless, but only temporarily. The Church must always be ready for a rebellion from individuals among its members who read Christ's teachings in a manner that differs from the Church's approved interpretation since it is required to uphold the Gospels as its basis.

Social ethics that apply to everyday life on earth cannot be inferred from the teachings of the Gospels. Whether they are an accurate and fair account of what Jesus really taught is unimportant. Because without these and the other New Testament texts, every Christian church would be without the basis that gives it its unique identity. The Church's beliefs would not change even if historical study revealed, with a high degree of likelihood, that the real Jesus thought and talked differently about human society than he is represented to do in the New Testament. The New Testament must always be regarded by the Church as the inspired word of God. There are just two options available here, it seems. The Church may either choose to abdicate, in the style of the Eastern Church, the duty of adopting any position toward the issues of social ethics, at which point it loses its moral authority and restricts itself to simply ornamental behavior in life. Or, it may go the opposite route followed by the Western Church, which has always integrated in its doctrine the social virtues that best suited its objectives at the time and its standing in society and the state. In addition to supporting the slave economy on American plantations and siding with feudal lords against serfs, it also adopted the developing Rationalism's morality, particularly in the case of Protestantism and particularly Calvinism. It supported the Irish tenants' fight against English nobles, battled with Catholic labor unions against business owners, and joined forces with conservative governments to oppose social democracy. And in each instance, it has been able to defend its position using biblical texts.

This also equates to Christianity's abdication from the realm of social ethics since the Church is reduced to a mindless instrument in the hands of time and fashion. What's worse is that it

tries to base every aspect of politics on what the Gospels teach, which encourages every movement to look to the Bible for support of its goals. It is obvious that the more harmful teachings are destined to prevail given the nature of the scripture texts that have been so misapplied. Even though it would be futile to attempt to construct an independent Christian social ethic based on the Gospels, it might still be possible to harmonize Christian doctrines with a social ethic that enhances rather than subverts social life in order to put Christianity's powerful forces to use for the benefit of civilization. A change like that would not be unusual in human history. The Church has finally come to terms with the reality that contemporary research has exposed the Old and New Testaments' scientific errors. It no longer executes heretics who believe that everything travels across space or launches inquisitorial procedures against anybody who questions the physical resurrection of the dead and the rising of Lazarus. Even priests of the Roman Catholic Church are now allowed to study astronomy and the evolution of life. Then, wouldn't the same be feasible in sociology? The division of labor might help the Church come to terms with the societal ideal of free collaboration. Couldn't this be accomplished by using the basic foundation of Christian love?

Not just the Church is interested in these issues. It has to do with the future of civilization. For it is not as if the Church's opposition to liberal ideals was innocuous. Because of the Church's immense authority, our whole civilization would be shattered if it were to turn against the forces that create society. We have watched in dismay over the last several decades as it underwent a dreadful transition into a social adversary. Christian socialism has contributed just as much—if not more—than atheist socialism to the current state of confusion as has the Church, both Catholic and Protestant, to the predominance of harmful ideologies in today's society.

Christian Socialism

It is simple to see historically why the Church has opposed political liberalism and economic liberty in all of its manifestations. The blossom of the logical enlightenment that overthrew the old Church's power and gave rise to contemporary historical critique is liberalism. The classes that had been tightly entwined with the Church for ages were weakened by liberalism. More so than Christianity had ever done, it changed the world. It gave life and the planet a new sense of humanity. It awoke forces that upended the lifeless traditionalism that underpinned Church and belief. The Church was quite uncomfortable with the new vision, and it has yet to adapt to even the externals of the contemporary time. Although in Catholic nations priests bless freshly built railroads and the dynamos of brand-new power plants, the professing Christian nonetheless cringes within at the functioning of a civilisation that his religion cannot comprehend. The contemporary era and its attitude offended the Church greatly. What a surprise that it sided with those who wanted to shatter this lovely new world out of anger, and that it frantically searched its well-stocked armory for ways to decry the battle for employment and fortune on earth. In a world that seemed to be ripe for pleasure, the religion that referred to itself as the religion of love turned into a religion of hate. Any would-be destabilizers of the contemporary social structure may be sure to find a supporter in Christianity.

It is terrible that only the brightest brains of the Church, those who understood the value of Christian love and demonstrated it, participated in this destructive endeavor. The first to fall victim to the new gospel of social devastation were priests and monks who upheld real Christian compassion, served and taught in hospitals and prisons, and understood all there was to know about suffering and sinful mankind. They could only have been protected from the contagious hatred that raged among their disciples and was justified by the Gospels by having a solid understanding of liberal philosophy. They ended up becoming into serious

social foes. Hatred of society emerged from acts of kindness. Some of these visceral critics of the liberal economic regimes halted abruptly at the mention of open resistance. However, a significant number of people adopted socialist ideologies Christian Socialists, not the atheistic socialists of the proletariat social-democrats. Furthermore, Christian socialism is still socialism.

Socialism made the same error when it attempted to draw comparisons between itself in the early years of the Christian era as the first congregation. When hope for the arrival of the Kingdom faded into the background, even the "consumers communism" of that early congregation disappeared. However, socialist manufacturing techniques did not take their position in the community. What the Christians produced was created by each person in his or her own farm or business. The voluntary or required contributions of congregation members who produced on their own dime using their own means of production were what supplied for the poor and covered the costs of shared activities. There is no written documentation of socialist production, however it may have taken place in a few isolated cases among the early Christian communities. It was never advocated by a Christian leader whose teachings and works are available to us. However, this is always a communism of consumption. The Apostolic Fathers and the Fathers of the Church often exhorted their followers to go back to the first congregation's communism. They never advocate for a communist system of industrial organization.

John Chrysostom's exhortation in support of communism is the most well-known of them. The Saint praises the consumer communism of the first Christian assembly in the eleventh of his homilies to the Acts of the Apostles and passionately pleads for its rebirth. By drawing on the example of the Apostles and their contemporaries, Jesus not only endorses this kind of communism but also makes an effort to logically explain its benefits. All of Constantinople's Christians could feed their poor and ensure that no one went hungry if they all donated their goods to a common ownership, since the expenses of communal life are far lower than those of single homes. Here, St. Chrysostom adduces reasoning like those used today by proponents of one-kitchen homes or community kitchens in an effort to mathematically demonstrate the cost savings that would result from concentrating cooking and cleaning.

According to this Father of the Church, the expenses would be minimal, and the vast sum that would be gathered by pooling individual assets would be inexhaustible especially considering how lavishly God's gifts would subsequently be showered upon the faithful. Additionally, each immigrant would have to contribute to the general fund in some way. We can see from these sober, straightforward expositions that what Chrysostom had in mind was essentially mutual consumption. The author's understanding of economics is shown in his remarks on the benefits of unification, which are summarized in the claim that cooperation and unity lead to an increase in well-being rather than separation into pieces. Overall, however, his suggestions show a total lack of comprehension of the production challenge.

All of his thoughts are consumed with eating. He had never thought that production came before consumption. Following the example of the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, St. Chrysostom presumes that he is thinking here of their sale when he says that all commodities were to be given to the community, after which the society was to start eating in common. He was unaware that this could not continue indefinitely. He estimated the treasure to be between one and three million pounds of gold and said the millions that would be collected together would never be exhausted. When our social politicians attempt to restructure the whole national economy using knowledge gathered through charity activity in the consumption sector, one notes that the saint's economic insight stops exactly where the wisdom of our social politicians likewise seems to end.

CONCLUSION

Socialism and Christianity have a complex and nuanced connection that is influenced by historical, intellectual, and practical considerations. This research has shown that despite approaching these topics from different directions, both philosophies emphasize compassion, equality, and social justice. Through spiritual and moral teachings that emphasize personal accountability and deeds of kindness to benefit the underprivileged, Christianity promotes these principles. Socialism, on the other hand, promotes community ownership, wealth redistribution, and government involvement to create a just and equal society. Socialism and Christianity have had complex connections throughout history. Socialist movements have sometimes been inspired by Christian values, spurring social transformation and defending the rights of the working class. On the other hand, socialist ideologies have also gained traction in Christian communities, where some people see Jesus' teachings as advocating for community life and economic equality. However, there are now disagreements and disputes between the two philosophies. Critics contend that socialism's focus on materialism and atheism conflicts with the spiritual principles of Christianity. Additionally, authoritarian socialism has clashed with religious organizations in several historical situations, putting religious freedom in jeopardy. The interaction and ideological variance between socialism and Christianity is complicated. Recognizing the many interpretations and historical settings in which these ideas have developed is necessary to comprehend this connection. We may encourage fruitful conversation and cooperation towards tackling current social difficulties by acknowledging both their common ideals and different approaches to creating a fair society. Socialism and Christianity may mutually benefit from healthy dialogue and collaboration, whether via philanthropic endeavors with a religious motivation or political measures to promote economic equality.

REFERENCES:

- [1] A. Medzibrodzky, “«Can a Christian Be a Socialist?» the (Ir)reconcilability of Christianity and Socialism in Revolutionary Russia,” *Gos. Reli. Tserkov' v Ross. i za Rubezhom/State, Relig. Church Russ. Worldw.*, 2019, doi: 10.22394/2073-7203-2019-37-1/2-516-540.
- [2] S. Heep, “The Long Way of Political Theology to Religious ‘Germanism’ or How National Socialism Could be Perceived as Fulfillment of Christianity,” *Polit. Relig. Ideol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/21567689.2020.1786684.
- [3] W. S. Skiles, “Spying in God’s house the Nazi secret police and sermons of opposition,” *Church Hist. Relig. Cult.*, 2018, doi: 10.1163/18712428-09803003.
- [4] H. Liang and K. P. Chin, “Christian socialism in the period of the Republic of China: An introduction,” *Logos Pneuma - Chinese J. Theol.*, 2019.
- [5] D. Saresella, “Christianity and Socialism in Italy in the Early Twentieth Century,” *Church Hist.*, 2015, doi: 10.1017/S0009640715000517.
- [6] Y. Huang, “Becoming Missionaries: Gender, Space and Subjectivities in Chinese Christian Communities in the UK,” *Asia Pacific J. Anthropol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/14442213.2017.1302987.
- [7] G. De Greef, “Introduction to Sociology. XVII,” *Am. J. Sociol.*, 1905, doi: 10.1086/211409.

- [8] A. Piola and H. A. Usman, "THE IMPACT OF THE 19TH CENTURY EUROPEAN COLONIALISM IN AFRICA, IN THE NOVEL 'THINGS FALL APART' BY CHINUA ACHEBE," *Br. (Jurnal Bhs. dan Sastra Inggris)*, 2019, doi: 10.31314/british.8.2.109-118.2019.
- [9] C. O. Okeke, C. N. Ibenwa, and G. T. Okeke, "Conflicts Between African Traditional Religion and Christianity in Eastern Nigeria: The Igbo Example," *SAGE Open*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/2158244017709322.
- [10] B. Koehler, "The Economics of Property Rights in Early and Medieval Christianity," *Econ. Aff.*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/ecaf.12211.