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A **political spectrum** is a way of modeling different political positions by placing them upon one or more geometric axes symbolizing independent political dimensions.

Most long-standing spectra include a right wing and left wing, which originally referred to seating arrangements in the 18th century French parliament. According to the simplest left-right axis, communism and socialism are usually regarded internationally as being on the left, opposite fascism and conservatism on the right. Liberalism can mean different things in different contexts, sometimes on the left, sometimes on the right.

However, researchers have frequently noted that a single left-right axis is insufficient in describing the existing variation in political beliefs, and often include other axes. Though the descriptive words at polar opposites may vary, often in popular biaxial spectra the axes are split between cultural issues and economic issues, each scaling from some form of individualism (or government for the freedom of the individual) to some form of communitarianism (or government for the welfare of the community). In this context, the left is often considered individualist (or libertarian) on social/cultural issues and communitarian (or populist) on economic issues, while the right is often considered communitarian (or populist) on social/cultural issues and individualist (or libertarian) on economic issues.
**Historical origin of the terms**

The terms *Right* and *Left* refer to political affiliations which originated early in the French Revolutionary era of 1789-1796, and referred originally to the seating arrangements in the various legislative bodies of France. The aristocracy sat on the right of the Speaker (traditionally the seat of honor) and the commoners sat on the Left, hence the terms Right-wing politics and Left-wing politics.

Originally, the defining point on the ideological spectrum was the *ancien régime* ("old order"). "The Right" thus implied support for aristocratic or royal interests, and the church, while "The Left" implied support for republicanism, secularism and civil liberties.[1] Because the political franchise at the start of the revolution was relatively narrow, the original "Left" represented mainly the interests of the bourgeoisie, the rising capitalist class. At that time, support for laissez-faire capitalism and Free markets were counted as being on the left; today in most Western countries these views would be characterized as being on the Right.

As the franchise expanded over the next several years, it became clear that there was something to the left of that original "Left": the precursors of socialism and communism, advocating the interests of workers and peasants.

**Academic investigation**

For almost a century, social scientists have considered the problem of how best to describe political variation; a sample of their results is given below.
Early research

In 1950, Leonard W. Ferguson carried out an analysis of political values using ten scales measuring attitudes toward:

- Birth control
- Capital punishment
- Censorship
- Communism
- Evolution
- Law
- Patriotism
- Theism
- Treatment of criminals
- War

Submitting the results to factor analysis, he was able to identify three factors, which he named Religionism, Humanitarianism, and Nationalism.

Leonard Ferguson's Religionism was defined by belief in God and negative attitudes toward evolution and birth control; Humanitarianism was related to attitudes opposing the harsh treatment of criminals, capital punishment, and war; and Nationalism described variation in opinions on censorship, law, patriotism, and communism.

This system was derived empirically; rather than devising a political model on purely theoretical grounds and testing it, Ferguson's research was exploratory. Although replication of the Nationalism factor was inconsistent, the finding of Religionism and Humanitarianism had a number of replications by Ferguson and others.^[2][3]

Eysenck's research

Shortly afterward, Hans Eysenck began researching political attitudes in Great Britain. He believed that there was something existentially similar about the National Socialists or Nazis on the one hand, and the Communists on the other, despite their opposite positions on the left-right axis.

As Hans Eysenck described in his 1956 book Sense and Nonsense in Psychology,^[4] Eysenck compiled a list of political statements found in newspapers and political tracts and asked subjects to rate their agreement or disagreement with each.

Submitting this value questionnaire to the same process of factor analysis used by Ferguson, Eysenck found two factors, which he named "Radicalism" (R-factor) and "Tender-Mindedess" (T-factor).

Eysenck's R-factor is easily identified as the classical "left-right" dimension, although the T-factor is less intuitive; high-scorers favored pacifism, racial equality, religious education, and restrictions on abortion, while low-scorers had attitudes more friendly to militarism, harsh punishment, easier divorce laws, and companionate marriage.

Despite the difference in methodology, location, and theory, the results attained by Eysenck and Ferguson matched; simply rotating Eysenck's two factors 45 degrees renders the same factors of Religionism and Humanitarianism identified by Ferguson in America.^[5]

Hans J. Eysenck was an outspoken opponent of what he perceived as the authoritarian abuses of the left and right, and accordingly he believed that, with this T axis, he had found the link between nazism and communism: according to Eysenck's research findings, members of both ideologies were tough-minded. Central to Eysenck's thesis was the claim that tender-minded ideologies were democratic and friendly to human freedoms, while tough-minded ideologies were aggressive and authoritarian.

Although he was a longstanding opponent of nazism, having left Nazi Germany to live in Britain, Eysenck was not shy in attacking communism, noting the anti-Semitic prejudices of the Russian communist government, the luxurious lifestyles of the USSR's leaders despite their talk about equality and the poverty of their people, and the Orwellian "doublethink" of East Germany's naming itself the German Democratic Republic despite being "one of the
most undemocratic regimes in the world today." Accordingly, he carried out studies on nazism and communist groups, finding members of both groups to be more dominant, and more aggressive, than control groups.\cite{5}

At the time, Hans J. Eysenck's conception of 'tough-mindedness' was criticized for a number of reasons.

- Firstly, virtually no values were found to load only on the tough/tender dimension.
- Secondly, his interpretation of tough-mindedness as a manifestation of "authoritarian" versus tender-minded "democratic" values was incompatible with the Frankfurt school's single-axis model, which conceptualized authoritarianism as being a fundamental manifestation of conservatism, and many researchers took issue with the idea of "left-wing authoritarianism."\cite{7}
- Thirdly, the theory which Eysenck developed to explain individual variation in the observed dimensions, relating tough-mindedness to Extroversion and Psychoticism, returned ambiguous research results.\cite{8}
- Lastly, Eysenck's finding that nazists and communists were more tough-minded than members of mainstream political movements was criticised on technical grounds by Milton Rokeach.\cite{9}

Despite the problems of Hans J. Eysenck's model, his dimensions of R and T were found by factor analyses of values in Germany and Sweden,\cite{10} France,\cite{5} and Japan.\cite{11}

One interesting result Eysenck noted in his 1956 work was that in the United States and Great Britain, most of the political variance was subsumed by the left/right axis, while in France, the T-axis was larger, and in the Middle East, the only dimension to be found was the T-axis: "Among mid-Eastern Arabs it has been found that while the tough-minded/tender-minded dimension is still clearly expressed in the relationships observed between different attitudes, there is nothing that corresponds to the radical-conservative continuum."\cite{5}

**Rokeach's research**

Dissatisfied with Hans J. Eysenck's work, Milton Rokeach developed his own two-axis model of political values in 1973, basing this on the ideas of freedom and equality, which he described in his book, *The Nature of Human Values*.\cite{12}

Milton Rokeach claimed that the defining difference between the left and right was that the left stressed the importance of equality more than the right. Despite his criticisms of Eysenck's tough-tender axis, Rokeach also postulated a basic similarity between communism and nazism, claiming that these groups would not value freedom as greatly as more conventional social democrats, democratic socialists and capitalists would, and he wrote that "the two value model presented here most resembles Eysenck's hypothesis."\cite{12}

To test this model, Milton Rokeach and his colleagues used content analysis on works exemplifying nazism (written by Adolf Hitler), communism (written by V.I. Lenin), capitalism (by Barry Goldwater) and socialism (written by various socialist authors).

Multiple raters made frequency counts of sentences containing synonyms for a number of values identified by Rokeach, including freedom and equality, and Rokeach analyzed these results by comparing the relative frequency rankings of all the values for each of the four texts:

*In excerpts from...*

- **Socialists** (socialism) - Freedom ranked 1st, Equality ranked 2nd
- **Hitler** (nazism) - Freedom ranked 16th, Equality ranked 17th
- **Goldwater** (capitalism) - Freedom ranked 1st, Equality ranked 16th
- **Lenin** (communism) - Freedom ranked 17th, Equality ranked 1st

Later studies using samples of American ideologues\cite{13} and American presidential inaugural addresses\cite{14} were consistent with this model.
**Later research**

In further research,[15] Hans J. Eysenck refined his methodology to include more questions on economic issues. Doing this, he revealed a split in the left-right axis between social policy and economic policy, with a previously undiscovered dimension of *socialism-capitalism* (S-factor).

While factorially distinct from Eysenck's previous R factor, the S-factor did positively correlate with the R-factor, indicating that a basic left-right or right-left tendency underlies both social values and economic values, although **S tapped more into items discussing economic inequality and big business, while R is known to relate more to the treatment of criminals, and to sexual issues and military issues.**

Most research and political theory since this time has replicated the factors shown above, either with two axes or three.

A recent analysis of survey data using principal component analysis was carried out in 2003 in the UK; the results of this study yielded the same two dimensions as found by Eysenck's original research: the familiar "left-right" R-dimension that mixes economic issues and social issues, and a second T-dimension that is described as "pragmatism vs idealism." See[16][17] for more information.

Another replication came from Dr. Ronald Inglehart's research into national opinions based on the World Values Survey, although Inglehart's research described the values of countries rather than individuals or groups of individuals within nations. Inglehart's two-factor solution took the form of Ferguson's original Religionism and Humanitarianism dimensions; Inglehart labelled them "secularism-traditionalism", which covered issues of tradition and religion, like patriotism, abortion, euthanasia and the importance of obeying the law and authority figures, and "survivalism-self expression", which measured issues like everyday conduct and dress, acceptance of diversity (including foreigners) and innovation, and attitudes towards people with specific controversial lifestyles such as homosexuality and vegetarianism, as well as willingness to partake in political activism. See[18] for Inglehart's national chart.

**Other proposed dimensions**

Numerous alternatives exist, usually developed by those that feel their views are not fairly represented on the traditional right-left spectrum.

One alternative spectrum offered by the conservative *American Federalist Journal* accounts for only the "Degree of Government Control" without consideration for any other social or political variable, and thus places "Fascism" (totalitarianism) at one extreme and "Anarchy" (no government at all) at the other extreme.

In 1998, political author Virginia Postrel, in her book *The Future and Its Enemies*, offered another single axis spectrum that measures one's view of the future; on one extreme are those who allegedly fear the future and wish to control it: *stasists*, and on the other hand are those who want the future to unfold naturally and without attempts to plan and control: *dynamists*. The distinction corresponds to the utopian versus dystopian spectrum used in some theoretical assessments of liberalism, and the book's title is borrowed from the work of the anti-utopian classic-liberal theorist Karl Popper.

Other proposed axes include:

- **Focus of political concern**: *Communitarianism vs. Individualism*. These labels are preferred to the loaded language of "totalitarianism" (anti-freedom) vs. "libertarianism" (pro-freedom), because one can have a political focus on the community without being totalitarian and undemocratic. Council communism is a political philosophy that would be counted as communitarian on this axis, but is not totalitarian or undemocratic.

- **Responses to conflict**: according to the political philosopher Charles Blattberg, those who would respond to conflict with conversation should be considered as on the left, with negotiation as in the centre, and with force as on the right. See his essay "Political Philosophies and Political Ideologies."[20]
• **Role of the church:** Clericalism vs. Anti-clericalism. This axis is less significant in the United States (where views of the role of religion tend to be subsumed into the general left-right axis) than in Europe (where clericalism versus anti-clericalism is much less correlated with the left-right spectrum).

• **Urban vs. rural:** This axis may be the most useful and significant today in European as well as Australian politics and Canadian politics. The urban vs. rural axis was equally prominent in the United States' political past, but its importance is debatable at present. In the late 18th century and early 19th century in the United States, it would have been described as the conflict between Hamiltonian Federalists and Jeffersonian Democrats.

• **Foreign policy:** interventionism (the nation should exert power abroad to implement its policy) vs. non-interventionism (the nation should keep to its own affairs); similarly, multilateralism (coordination of policies with other countries) vs. isolationism and unilateralism.

• Relations with individual states or groups of states may also be vital to party politics. During the Cold War, parties often had to choose a position on a scale between pro-American and pro-Soviet Union, although this could at times closely match a left-right spectrum. At other times in history relations with other powerful states has been important. In early Canadian history relations with Great Britain were a central theme, although this was not "foreign policy" but a debate over the proper place of Canada within the British Empire.

• **International action:** Multilateralism (states should cooperate and compromise) versus Unilateralism (states have a strong, even unconditional, right to make their own decisions).

• **Political violence:** pacifism (political views should not be imposed by violent force) vs. militancy (violence is a legitimate or necessary means of political expression). In North America, particularly in the United States, holders of these views are often referred to as "doves" and "hawks", respectively.

• **Foreign trade:** globalization (world economic markets should become integrated and interdependent) vs. autarky (the nation or polity should strive for economic independence). During the early history of the Commonwealth of Australia, this was the major political continuum. At that time it was called Free trade vs. Protectionism.

• **Trade freedom vs. trade equity:** Free trade (businesses should be able trade across borders without regulations) vs. Fair trade (international trade should be regulated on behalf of social justice).

• **Diversity:** multiculturalism (the nation should represent a diversity of cultural ideas) vs. assimilationism or nationalism (the nation should primarily represent, or forge, a majority culture).

• **Participation:** Democracy (rule of the majority, or mob rule) vs. Aristocracy (rule by the enlightened) vs. Tyranny (total degradation of Aristocracy, ancient Greek philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle recognized tyranny as a state in which the tyrant is ruled by utter passion, and not reason like the philosopher, resulting in the tyrant pursuing his own desires rather than the common good.)

• **Freedom:** Positive liberty (having rights which impose an obligation on others) vs. Negative liberty (having rights which prohibit interference by others).

• **Social power:** Totalitarianism vs. Anarchism (Control vs. No Control) Analyzes the fundamental political interaction between people, and between individuals and their environment. Often posits the existence of a 'moderate' system as existing between the two extremes.

• **Change:** radicals (who believe in rapid change) and progressives (who believe in measured, incremental change) vs. conservatives (who believe in preserving the status quo) vs. reactionaries (who believe in changing things to a previous state).

• **Origin of state authority:** popular sovereignty (the state as a creation of the people, with enumerated, delegated powers) vs. various forms of absolutism and organic state philosophy (the state as an original and essential authority) vs. the view held in anarcho-primitivism that "Civilization originates in conquest abroad and repression at home."[^21]

• **Levels of sovereignty:** unionism vs. federalism vs. separatism; or centralism vs. regionalism. Especially important in societies where strong regional or ethnic identities are political issues.

• **European Integration (in Europe):** Euroscepticism vs. European federalism. nation state vs. multi-national state.
Other multi-axis models

Nolan: economic freedom, personal freedom

The Nolan chart was created by libertarian David Nolan. This chart shows what he considers as "economic freedom" (issues like taxation, free trade and free enterprise) on the horizontal axis and what he considers as "personal freedom" (issues like drug legalization, abortion and the draft) on the vertical axis. This puts left-wingers in the left quadrant, libertarians in the top, right-wingers in the right, and what Nolan originally named populists in the bottom. It is possible to consider the Nolan chart to be an Eysenck model that has been rotated 45 degrees. The popular "diamond" presentation of the Nolan chart makes this particular comparison readily apparent.

The traditional left-right spectrum forms a diagonal across the Nolan chart, with communism and fascism both in the ultra-populist corner, an assignment hotly disputed by more liberal-minded communists who do not advocate state control over matters of personal freedom. There are some discrepancies between various forms of the model. In some, the bottom section is labeled with neutral, non-pejorative terms (such as 'communitarian') whereas others use emotional, loaded terms such as 'statist', 'authoritarian', or 'totalitarian'.

The Nolan chart has been reoriented and visually represented in many forms since David Nolan first created it, and has been the inspiration for an endless array of political self-quizzes, perhaps the most famous of these being the World's Smallest Political Quiz, which places one on the Diamond Chart with "statist" at the bottom. As of 2005 this quiz is being used in 420 schools. It can be found in at least a dozen popular textbooks that feature the Quiz as part of their enhanced digital content. More recently, The Institute for Humane Studies has created Politopia, a similar quiz. Interestingly, the Institute found that most applicants fell into the lower, populist section.
Three axis variants of Nolan Chart

There are two three-axis models based on the Nolan Chart. The Friesian Institute has suggested a model that combines the economic liberty and personal liberty axes with positive liberty, creating a cube. The Vosem Chart (from Russian восемь vosem 'eight') splits the economic axis of the Nolan chart into two axes, corporate economics (z-axis) and individual economics (y-axis), which combine with the civil liberty axis (x-axis) to form a cube.

Political compass

The political compass largely follows the Eysenck method with the two-axes representing economic issues as right-vs-left and issues of freedom as authoritarian-vs-liberal. One can determine their position on the political compass through an online quiz[^26] by the same name.

Greenberg & Jonas: left-right, ideological rigidity

In a 2003 *Psychological Bulletin* paper[^27], Jeff Greenberg and Eva Jonas posit a model comprising the standard left-right axis and an axis representing ideological rigidity. For Greenberg and Jonas, ideological rigidity has "much in common with the related concepts of dogmatism and authoritarianism" and is characterized by "believing in strong leaders and submission, preferring one's own in-group, ethnocentrism and nationalism, aggression against dissidents, and control with the help of police and military." Greenberg and Jonas posit that high ideological rigidity can be motivated by "particularly strong needs to reduce fear and uncertainty" and is a primary shared characteristic of "people who subscribe to any extreme government or ideology, whether it is right-wing or left-wing."

UK inferred model: left-right, political pragmatism

While multiple axes on the political spectrum had been postulated for a while, statistical analysis of survey data using principal component analysis to verify the theory and establish their existence, number and meaning was not done until recently. A 2003 study by Chris Lightfoot in the UK consisted of a survey that yielded two significant eigenvectors (that is, groups of questions that tend to be answered consistently), one less well-constrained than the other. Upon examining the survey questions one could assign a meaning to the axes: one is like the familiar "left-right" axis that mixes economic and social issues, and the other indicates a degree of "political pragmatism". The outcome of that study is that the UK political spectrum is most sensibly described with two axes.[^16][^17]

Pournelle: liberty-control, irrationalism-rationalism

This very distinct two-axis model was created by Jerry Pournelle in 1963 for his doctoral dissertation in political science. The Pournelle chart has liberty on one axis, with those on the left seeking freedom from control or protections for social deviance and those on the right emphasizing state authority or protections for norm enforcement (farthest right being state worship, farthest left being the idea of a state as the "ultimate evil"). The other axis is rationalism, defined here as the belief in planned social progress, with those higher up believing that there are problems with society that can be rationally solved, and those lower down skeptical of such approaches.

Inglehart: tradition-secular, self expression-survivalist

In its January 4, 2003 issue, *The Economist* discussed a chart,[^18] proposed by Dr. Ronald Inglehart and supported by the World Values Survey (associated with the University of Michigan), to plot cultural ideology onto two dimensions. On the y-axis it covered issues of tradition and religion, like patriotism, abortion, euthanasia and the importance of obeying the law and authority figures. At the bottom of the chart is the traditionalist position on issues like these (with loyalty to country and family and respect for life considered important), while at the top is the secular position. The x-axis deals with self-expression, issues like everyday conduct and dress, acceptance of diversity (including foreigners) and innovation, and attitudes towards people with specific controversial lifestyles such as vegetarianism, as well as willingness to partake in political activism. At the right of the chart is the open
self-expressionist position, while at the left is its opposite position, which Dr. Inglehart calls survivalist. This chart not only has the power to map the values of individuals, but also to compare the values of people in different countries. Placed on this chart, EU countries in continental Europe come out on the top right, Anglophone countries on the middle right, Latin American countries on the bottom right, African, Middle Eastern and South Asian countries on the bottom left, and ex-Communist countries on the top left.

Mitchell: Eight Ways to Run the Country

In his book Eight Ways to Run the Country: A New and Revealing Look at Left and Right, Brian Patrick Mitchell identifies four main political traditions in Anglo-American history. Mitchell analyzed modern American political perspectives according to their regard for kratos (defined as the use of force) and archē or “archy” (defined as the recognition of rank), grounding this distinction of archy and kratos in the West's historical experience of church and state and crediting the collapse of the Christian consensus on church and state with the appearance of four main divergent traditions in Western political thought:

- republican constitutionalism = pro archy, anti kratos
- libertarian individualism = anti archy, anti kratos
- democratic progressivism = anti archy, pro kratos
- plutocratic nationalism = pro archy, pro kratos

Mitchell charts these traditions graphically using a vertical axis as a scale of kratos/archeia and a horizontal axis as a scale of archy/anarchy. He places democratic progressivism in the lower left, plutocratic nationalism in the lower right, republication constitutionalism in the upper right, and libertarian individualism in the upper left. The political left is therefore distinguished by its rejection of archy, while the political right is distinguished by its acceptance of archy.

For Mitchell, anarchy is not the absence of government but the rejection of rank. Thus there can be both anti-government anarchists (Mitchell's "libertarian individualists") and pro-government anarchists (Mitchell's "democratic progressives", who favor the use of government force against social hierarchies such as patriarchy). Mitchell also distinguishes between left-wing anarchists and right-wing anarchists, whom Mitchell renames "akratists" for their opposition to the government's use of force.

In addition to the four main traditions, Mitchell identifies eight distinct political perspectives represented in contemporary American politics:

- communitarian = ambivalent toward archy, pro kratos
- progressive = anti archy, pro kratos (democratic progressivism)
- radical = anti archy, ambivalent toward kratos
- individualist = anti archy, anti kratos (libertarian individualism)
- paleolibertarian = ambivalent toward archy, anti kratos
- paleoconservative = pro archy, anti kratos (republican constitutionalism)
- theoconservative = pro archy, ambivalent toward kratos
- neoconservative = pro archy, pro kratos (plutocratic nationalism)

A potential ninth perspective, in the midst of the eight, is populism, which Mitchell says is vaguely defined and situation-dependent, having no fixed character other than opposition to the prevailing power.
Political spectrum-based forecasts

As shown by Russian political scientist Stepan S. Sulakshin, political spectrum can be used as a forecasting tool. Sulakshin offers mathematical evidence that stable development (positive dynamics of the vast number of statistic indices) depends on the width of the political spectrum: if it is too narrow or too wide, stagnation or political disasters will result. Sulakshin also showed that, in the short run, the political spectrum determines the statistic indices dynamic and not vice versa.

Notes

[16] Beasts.org (http://politics.beasts.org)
[18] (http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/wvs/articles/folder_published/article_base_54)
Political spectrum

External links

- Ideolog (Education+Quiz) (http://www.idealog.org)
- Politopia (Quiz) (http://www.politopia.com/)
- The Political Compass (http://politicalcompass.org/)
- Redefining the Political Spectrum - The Rational Spectrum (http://rationalrevolution.net/articles/redefining_the_political_spectru.htm)

Left–right politics

The left–right political spectrum is a common way of classifying political positions, ideologies, or parties along a political spectrum. Left-wing politics and right-wing politics are often presented as opposed, and although a particular individual or party may take a left-wing stance on one matter and a right-wing stance on another, the terms left and right are used to refer to two globally opposed political families. In France, where the terms originated, the Left is called "the party of movement" and the Right "the party of order."[1][2][3][4]

Traditionally, the Left includes progressives, social liberals, social democrats, socialists, communists and some anarchists.[5][6][7][8] The Right includes conservatives, reactionaries, capitalists, monarchists, nationalists and fascists.[9]

Differences between left and right

The main factor dividing the left and right wings in Western Europe is class. The Left seeks social justice through redistributive social and economic policies, while the Right defends private property and capitalism. But the nature of the conflict depends on existing social and political cleavages and on the level of economic development.[10] Left-wing values include the belief in the power of human reason to achieve progress for the benefit of the human race, secularism, sovereignty exercised through the legislature, social justice, and mistrust of strong personal political leadership. To the Right, this is regularly seen as anti-clericalism, unrealistic social reform, doctrinaire socialism and class hatred. The Right are skeptical about the capacity of radical reforms to achieve human well-being while maintaining workplace competition. They believe in the established church both in itself and as an instrument of social cohesion, and believe in the need for strong political leadership to minimize social and political divisions. To the Left, this is seen as a selfish and reactionary opposition to social justice, a wish to impose doctrinaire religion on the population, and a tendency to authoritarianism and repression.[11][12]

The differences between left and right have altered over time. The initial cleavage at the time of the French Revolution was between supporters of absolute monarchy (the Right) and those who wished to limit the king's authority (the Left). During the 19th century the cleavage was between monarchists and republicans. Following the establishment of the Third Republic in 1871, the cleavage was between supporters of a strong executive on the Right and supporters of the primacy of the legislature on the Left.[13]

History of the terms

The terms "left" and "right" appeared during the French Revolution of 1789 when members of the National Assembly divided into supporters of the king to the president's right and supporters of the revolution to his left. One deputy, the Baron de Gauville explained, "We began to recognize each other: those who were loyal to religion and the king took up positions to the right of the chair so as to avoid the shouts, oaths, and indecencies that enjoyed free rein in the opposing camp." However the Right opposed the seating arrangement because they believed that deputies should support private or general interests but should not form factions or political parties. The contemporary press occasionally used the terms "left" and "right" to refer to the opposing sides.[14]
When the National Assembly was replaced in 1791 by a Legislative Assembly composed of entirely new members the divisions continued. "Innovators" sat on the left, "moderates" gathered in the center, while the "conscientious defenders of the constitution" found themselves sitting on the right, where the defenders of the Ancien Régime had previously gathered. When the succeeding National Convention met in 1792, the seating arrangement continued, but following the coup d'état of June 2, 1793, and the arrest of the Girondins, the right side of the assembly was deserted, and any remaining members who had sat there moved to the center. However following the Thermidorian Reaction of 1794 the members of the far left were excluded and the method of seating was abolished. The new constitution included rules for the assembly that would "break up the party groups."\[^{15}\]

However following the Restoration in 1814-1815 political clubs were again formed. The majority ultraroyalists chose to sit on the right. The "constitutionalists" sat in the center while independents sat on the left. The terms *extreme right* and *extreme left*, as well as *center-right* and *center-left*, came to be used to describe the nuances of ideology of different sections of the assembly.\[^{16}\]

The terms "left" and "right" were not used to refer to political ideology but only to seating in the legislature. After 1848, the main opposing camps were the "democratic socialists" and the "reactionaries" who used red and white flags to identify their party affiliation.\[^{17}\]

With the establishment of the Third Republic in 1871, the terms were adopted by political parties: the Republican Left, the Center Right, and the Center Left (1871) and the Extreme Left (1876) and Radical Left (1881). Beginning in the early twentieth century the terms left and right came to be associated with specific political ideologies and were used to describe citizens' political beliefs, gradually replacing the terms "reds" and "the reaction" or " republicans" and "conservatives". By 1914 the left half of the legislature was composed of Unified Socialists, Republican Socialists and Socialist Radicals, while the parties that were called "left" now sat on the right side.\[^{18}\]

There was asymmetry in the use of the terms left and right by the opposing sides. The right mostly denied that the left–right spectrum was meaningful because they saw it as artificial and damaging to unity. The left, however, seeking to change society, promoted the distinction. As Alain observed in 1931, "When people ask me if the division between parties of the right and parties of the left, men of the right and men of the left, still makes sense, the first thing that comes to mind is that the person asking the question is certainly not a man of the left".\[^{19}\]

The terms left and right came to be applied to British politics during the 1906 general election, which saw the Labour Party emerge as a third force.\[^{20}\]

The sociologist Robert M. MacIver noted in *The Web of Government* (1947):

> The right is always the party sector associated with the interests of the upper or dominant classes, the left the sector expressive of the lower economic or social classes, and the center that of the middle classes. Historically this criterion seems acceptable. The conservative right has defended entrenched prerogatives, privileges and powers; the left has attacked them. The right has been more favorable to the aristocratic position, to the hierarchy of birth or of wealth; the left has fought for the equalization of advantage or of opportunity, for the claims of the less advantaged. Defense and attack have met, under democratic conditions, not in the name of class but in the name of principle; but the opposing principles have broadly corresponded to the interests of the different classes.\[^{21}\]
Political parties in the political spectrum

Political scientists have observed that the ideologies of political parties can be mapped along a single left–right axis. Klaus von Beyme categorized European parties into nine families, which described most parties. He was able to arrange seven of them from left to right: communist, socialist, green, liberal, Christian democratic, conservative and right-wing extremist. The position of agrarian and regional/ethnic parties varied. A study conducted in the late 1980s on two bases, positions on ownership of the means of production and positions on social issues, confirmed this arrangement.

There has been a tendency for party ideologies to persist, and values and views that were present at a party's founding have survived. However they have also adapted for pragmatic reasons, making them appear more similar. Klaus von Beyme categorized European parties into nine families, which described most parties. He was able to arrange seven of them from left to right: communist, socialist, green, liberal, Christian democratic, conservative and right-wing extremist. The position of agrarian and regional/ethnic parties varied. A study conducted in the late 1980s on two bases, positions on ownership of the means of production and positions on social issues, confirmed this arrangement.

The first modern political parties were liberals, organized by the middle class in the 19th century to protect them against the aristocracy. They were major political parties in that century but declined in the twentieth century as first the working class came to support socialist parties and economic and social change eroded their middle class base. Conservative parties arose in opposition to liberals in order to defend aristocratic privilege. But in order to attract voters they became less doctrinaire than liberals. However they were unsuccessful in most countries and generally have only been able to achieve power through cooperation with other parties.

Socialist parties were organized in order to achieve political rights for workers and were originally allied with liberals. However they broke with the liberals when they sought worker control of the means of production. Christian democratic parties were organized by Catholics who saw liberalism as a threat to traditional values. Although established in the 19th century, they became a major political force following the Second World War.

Communist parties emerged following a division within socialism first on support of the First World War and then support of the Bolshevik Revolution.

Right-wing extremist parties are harder to define, other than being more right-wing than other parties, but include fascists and some extreme conservative and nationalist parties.

Green parties were the most recent of the major party groups to develop. They have rejected socialism and they are very liberal on social issues.

These categories can be applied to many parties outside Europe. Ware (1996) asserted that in the United States both major parties were liberal, even though there are left–right policy differences between them.

Contemporary usage in the United States

The terms left-wing and right-wing are widely used in United States but, as on the global level, there is no firm consensus about their meaning. The only aspect which is generally agreed upon is that they are the defining opposites of the United States political spectrum. Left and right in the U.S. are generally associated with liberal and conservative respectively, although the meanings of the two sets of terms do not entirely coincide. Depending on the political affiliation of the individual using them, these terms can be spoken with varying implications. A 2005 poll of 2,209 American adults showed that "respondents generally viewed the paired concepts liberals and left-wingers and
conservatives and right-wingers as possessing, respectively, generally similar political beliefs", but also showed that around ten percent fewer respondents understood the terms left and right than understood the terms liberal and conservative.[37]

The contemporary Left in the United States is usually understood as a category including New Deal liberals, Rawlsian liberals, social democrats and civil libertarians, and is generally identified with the Democratic Party. In general, left-wing implies a commitment to egalitarianism, support for social policies that favor the working class, and multiculturalism. The contemporary Left usually defines itself as promoting government regulation of business, commerce and industry; protection of fundamental rights such as freedom of speech and freedom of religion; and government intervention on behalf of racial, ethnic, and sexual minorities and the working class.[38]

The contemporary Right in the United States is usually understood as a category including social conservatives, Christian conservatives and free market liberals, and is generally identified with the Republican Party. In general, right-wing implies a commitment to conservative Christian values, support for a free-market system, and "traditional family values". The contemporary Right usually defines itself as promoting deregulation of banking, commerce, and industry.

Whether something is to your left or to your right depends on where you stand. According to liberal commentator David Sirota, writing in Salon.com, "On economic issues, we are often told that right is center, center is left, and left is fringe."[39]

**Relevance of the terms today**

Some political scientists have suggested that the classifications of "left" and "right" are no longer meaningful in the modern complex world. Although these terms continue to be used, they advocate a more complex spectrum that attempts to combine political, economic and social dimensions.[40]

However, a survey conducted between 1983 and 1994 by Robert Altemeyer of Canadian legislative caucuses showed an 82% correlation between party affiliation and score on a scale for right-wing authoritarianism when comparing right-wing and social democratic caucuses. There was a wide gap between the scores of the two groups which was filled by liberal caucuses. His survey of American legislative caucuses showed scores by American Republicans and Democrats were similar to the Canadian Right and liberals, with a 44% correlation between party affiliation and score.[41]

Norberto Bobbio saw the polarization of the Italian Chamber of Deputies in the 1990s as evidence that the linear left/right axis remained valid. He thought that the argument that the spectrum had disappeared occurred when either the Left or Right were weak. The dominant side would claim that its ideology was the only possible one, while the weaker side would minimize its differences. He saw the Left and Right not in absolute terms, but as relative concepts that would vary over time. The key distinction was one of equality. The Right was committed to inequality while the further left one went the more committed to equality one was. In his view, the left/right axis could be applied to any time period.[42]

The political philosopher Charles Blattberg has proposed response to conflict as the basis of a reinterpreted political spectrum. According to Blattberg, those who would respond to conflict with conversation should be considered as on the left, with negotiation as in the centre, and with force as on the right. See his essay "Political Philosophies and Political Ideologies."[43]

Libertarian writer David Boaz argued that terms left and right are used to spin a particular point of view rather than as simple descriptors, with those on the "left" typically emphasizing their support for working people and accusing the right of supporting the interests of the upper class, and those on the "right" usually emphasizing their support for individualism and accusing the Left of supporting collectivism. Boaz asserts that arguments about the way the words should be used often displaces arguments about policy by raising emotional prejudice against a preconceived notion of what the terms mean.[44]
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• Political Philosophies and Political Ideologies (http://www.mapageweb.umontreal.ca/blattbec/pdf/essays/1_Political_Philosophies.pdf) (PDF); by Charles Blattberg, originally published in Public Affairs Quarterly 15, No. 3 (July 2001) 193–217.
• Brief article on left wing and right wing politics & links to political orientation tests (http://www.governingdynamo.com/blog/2009/8/1/left-wing-and-right-wing-politics-where-are-you.html)
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• Progressive Republicans (http://www.progressiverepublicans.org)

Sinistrisme

Sinistrisme is a neologism invented by Albert Thibaudet in Les idées politiques de la France (1932). He referred to the progressive substitution of left wing parties by new, more radical parties, which in turn pushed each party towards the center (the Radical Party being replaced by the French Section of the Workers’ International (SFIO, a socialist party), the Socialists by the French Communist Party, etc). This historical movement (seen by Thibaudet as a historical necessity) thus explained, according to Thibaudet, the tendency of the right-wing, in particular in France, to disavow the label droit (right), long associated in French history with monarchy, in favour of left.

Hence, those who rallied to the Republic in 1893 still adopted the denomination Droite constitutionnelle or républicaine (Constitutional or Republican Right), but replaced it in 1899 by Action libérale, under which they went to the 1902 elections. An explicit right wing group resurged in 1910, gathering the last nostalgics of the monarchy. According to historian René Rémond, since 1924 the term "right wing" vanished from the parliamentary group's glossary. Deputies from the Democratic Republican Alliance (ARD), which was the main center-right parliamentary formation under the Third Republic, sat in the parliamentary group of "Left-wing Republicans". Following the Liberation, the Rally of the Republican Lefts (RGR) gathered conservative deputies, mostly from the Radical-Socialist Party (and opponents of Pierre Mendès-France as well as Independent Radicals who had left the Radical Party in 1928, opposed to its alliance with the left-wing during the Cartel des gauches), and from the UDSR.

René Rémond remarked that "at the 1974 presidential election, only one candidate declared himself as belonging to the right-wing: Jean-Marie Le Pen; in 1981, no one."[1] Conservative (which had been the name of an ultra-royalist review in 1818-1820) was a synonym of "right wing" often used under the Third Republic, in particular by the Bloc national Chamber. Independents, used in the 1920s for deputies close to the Action française royalist movement, was later used by less reactionary politicians.
Footnotes
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Cleavage (politics)

Cleavage in political science is a concept used in voting analysis and is the division of voters into voting blocs.

The preliminary assumption is that voters don’t come in predefined groups of pros and cons for or against a certain subject. Ballot analysis assumes that voters opt for a certain party, or decide for the solution or option that comes closest to their own position. Cleavage separates the voters into advocates and adversaries on a certain issue, or voting for a certain party. If you imagine parties on a horizontal line for a certain issue, cleavage is the vertical line that divides the parties into supporters and opponents of the issue.

Examples

There are probably as many cleavages in society as diverse members, but Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan (1967) defined four basic cleavages for western civilization after the Industrial Revolution. According to Lipset and Rokkan, these cleavages determined the emergence and the content of all European parties.

• Centre – Periphery - The division between elites in the urban areas, and those in more outlying areas. This usually expresses itself in terms of regional nationalism. For example, in Spain many regions have regionalist or separatist parties. This division is, according to Lipset and Rokkan, caused by the creation of modern nation-states, where some states were better than others at assimilating other cultures into the majority nation.

• State – Church - A division between religious and secular voters. In the Netherlands until the 1970s there were five major parties: the Catholic People's Party (KVP), the Protestant Anti Revolutionary Party (ARP) and Christian Historical Union (CHU), the social democratic Dutch Labour Party (PvdA), and the liberal People's Party for Freedom and Democracy (VVD), the last two being secular.

• Owner – Worker - A class cleavage, causing the formation of parties of the left and parties of the right. Sometimes it is argued that this cleavage represents a conflict between the rich and poor. Various parties have claimed to represent either interest, though this may or may not be genuine.
• Land – Industry - Continued state exercise of control over Tariffs against freedom of control for industrial enterprise.

Contemporary ballot analysis speaks of the emergence of new cleavages. The traditional opposition between Owner and Worker (Capital and Work) is being differentiated further among those who have work/ are employable and those who are not. Further, sex becomes another cleavage, especially in regard to getting and maintaining a paid labour position.

Further information

• Amie Kreppel (Jan 29, 2002). "Cleavages" [3].
• Seymour Martin Lipset and Stein Rokkan. "Cleavage Structures, Party Systems, and Voter Alignments" [4].

Biology and political orientation

A growing number of studies find physiological differences in populations correlated with their group political orientation. According to studies relative hypertrophy of the portion of the brain that processes fear and identifies threats (the amygdala) is correlated with right political orientation/conservatism, [1] whereas having a relatively larger part of the brain that processes conflicting and contradictory information is correlated with left political orientation/liberalism[2].

Brain Studies

Structural differences

*Nature Neuroscience* in 2007 reported a study[2] by scientists at New York University and UCLA that showed that political orientation is related to differences in how the brain processes information. According to UCLA neurologist Dr. Marco Iacoboni, the study showed "there are two cognitive styles -- a liberal style and a conservative style."[3] The article "Neurocognitive correlates of liberalism and conservatism"[2] published in *Nature Neuroscience* "found that greater liberalism was associated with stronger conflict-related anterior cingulate activity, suggesting greater neurocognitive sensitivity to cues for altering a habitual response pattern."[2] According to a 2011 study[4] by cognitive neuroscientist Ryota Kanai’s group[5] at University College London published in *Current Biology*. 
people with different political views have different brain structures. The scientists performed MRI scans on 90 volunteer young adult people's brains. According to ABC, "Scans revealed that the liberal students tended to have a larger region of the brain that processes conflicting information. That, say the authors, might make for tolerance to uncertainty in more liberal views. The conservatives tended to have a larger part of the brain that processes fear and identifies threats. They might be more inclined to integrate conservative views into their politics." The results of the study showed that conservatives had a larger amygdala, an almond-shaped structure of brain involved in processing memory of emotional reactions. Liberals had increased grey matter in the anterior cingulate cortex, a comma-shaped structure of the brain that plays a role in a wide variety of autonomic functions, such as regulating blood pressure and heart rate, as well as rational cognitive functions, such as reward anticipation, decision-making, empathy and emotion. As a result of these structural differences, liberals may be more efficient at managing conflicting information, while conservatives may be more efficient at recognizing threats. The researchers concluded, "It's very unlikely that actual political orientation is directly encoded in these brain regions." Kanai also warned: "More work is needed to determine how these brain structures mediate the formation of political attitude.

In an earlier fMRI study published in Social Neuroscience, three different patterns of brain activation were found to correlate with individualism, conservatism, and radicalism. In general, fMRI responses in several portions of the brain have been linked to viewing of the faces of well-known politicians. Others believe that determining political affiliation from fMRI data is overreaching.

**Political genome studies**

_A Genome-Wide Analysis of Liberal and Conservative Political Attitudes_ by Peter K. Hatemi et al traces DNA research involving 13,000 subjects. The study identifies several genes potentially connected with political positions.

**Functional assays**

According to the ASA, IQ data from the "Add Health" survey averaged 106 for adolescents who self-identified as "very liberal," versus 95 for those calling themselves "very conservative." An unrelated study in 2009 found that among students applying to U.S. universities, conservatism correlated negatively with SAT, Vocabulary, and Analogy test scores though there was a greater correlation with economic differences. A 2012 study concluded that "In an analysis of two large-scale, nationally representative United Kingdom data sets (N = 15,874), we found that lower general intelligence (g) in childhood predicts greater racism in adulthood, and this effect was largely mediated via socially conservative ideology. A secondary analysis of a U.S. data set confirmed a predictive effect of poor abstract-reasoning skills on antihomosexual prejudice, a relation partially mediated by both authoritarianism and low levels of intergroup contact."

Cecil Adams of The Straight Dope disputed claims that Democratic-leaning states of the United States are smarter on average than Republican-leaning states, noting that a study published in The Economist in 2000 was a hoax, and a 2006 study by Satoshi Kanazawa was grossly flawed by failing to note that students in Southern states who did not take the SAT scholastic test were often taking the competing ACT exam instead.

In a survey of the perceived severity of moral transgressions, conservatives were more affected by the taste of a bitter drink than liberals. "...taste perception significantly affected moral judgments, such that physical disgust (induced
via a bitter taste) elicited feelings of moral disgust. Further, this effect was more pronounced in participants with politically conservative views”.

### Persistence of Patterns

A study by scientists at New York University and the University of California, Los Angeles found differences in how self-described liberal and conservative research participants responded to changes in patterns. Participants were asked to tap a keyboard when the letter 'M' appeared on a computer monitor and to refrain from tapping when they saw a 'W.' The letter 'M' appeared four times more frequently than W, conditioning participants to press the keyboard on almost every trial. Liberal participants made fewer mistakes than conservatives when they saw the rare W, indicating to the researchers that these participants were better able to accept changes or conflicts in established patterns.

The participants were also wired to an electroencephalograph that recorded activity in their anterior cingulate cortex, the part of the brain that detects conflicts between a habitual tendency and a more appropriate response. Liberals were significantly more likely than conservatives to show activity in the brain circuits that deal with conflicts during the experiment, and this correlated with their greater accuracy in the test.

### See Also

- Amygdala hijack
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Left-wing politics

In politics, \textit{Left}, \textit{left-wing} and \textit{leftist} generally refer to support for social change to create a more egalitarian society.\cite{1}\cite{2}\cite{3}\cite{4} They usually involve a concern for those in society who are disadvantaged relative to others and an assumption that there are unjustified inequalities (which right-wing politics view as natural or traditional) that should be reduced or abolished.\cite{3}

The terms \textit{Left} and \textit{Right} were coined during the French Revolution, referring to the seating arrangement in the Estates General; those who sat on the left generally supported the radical changes of the revolution, including the creation of a republic and secularization.\cite{5} Use of the term "Left" became more prominent after the restoration of the French monarchy in 1815 when it was applied to the "Independents".\cite{6} The term was then applied to a number of revolutionary movements, especially socialism, anarchism\cite{7} and communism as well as more reformist movements like social democracy and social liberalism.\cite{8}\cite{9}

According to Barry Clark:\cite{10}

\begin{quote}
Leftists... claim that human development flourishes when individuals engage in cooperative, mutually respectful relations that can thrive only when excessive differences in status, power, and wealth are eliminated. According to leftists, a society without substantial equality will distort the development of not only deprived persons, but also those whose privileges undermine their motivation and sense of social responsibility. This suppression of human development, together with the resentment and conflict engendered by sharp class distinctions, will ultimately reduce the efficiency of the economy.
\end{quote}

History of the term

In politics, the term \textit{left wing} derives from the French Revolution, as radical Montagnard and Jacobin deputies from the Third Estate generally sat to the left of the president's chair in parliament, a habit which began in the Estates General of 1789. Throughout the 19th century in France, the main line dividing left and right was between supporters of the French Republic and those of the Monarchy.\cite{5} The June Days Uprising during the Second Republic was an attempt by the left to assert itself after the 1848 Revolution, but only a small portion of the population supported this.

In the mid 19th century, nationalism, socialism, democracy, and anti-clericalism became features of the French Left. After Napoleon III's 1851 coup and the subsequent establishment of the Second Empire, Marxism began to rival radical republicanism and utopian socialism as a force within left-wing politics. The influential \textit{Communist Manifesto} by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, published in 1848, asserted that all human history is the history of class struggle. They predicted that a proletarian revolution would eventually overthrow bourgeois capitalism and create a classless, stateless, post-monetary society.

In the United States, many leftists, social liberals, progressives and trade unionists were influenced by the works of Thomas Paine, who introduced the concept of asset-based egalitarianism, which theorises that social equality is possible by a redistribution of resources.

The International Workingmen's Association (1864–76), sometimes called the First International, brought together delegates from many different countries, with many different views about how to reach a classless and stateless society. Following a split between supporters of Marx and Mikhail Bakunin, anarchists formed the International Workers' Association.\cite{11} The Second International (1888–1916) became divided over the issue of World War I. Those who opposed the war, such as Vladimir Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, saw themselves as further to the left.

In the United States after Reconstruction, the phrase "the Left" was used to describe those who supported trade unions, the civil rights movement and the anti-war movement.\cite{8}\cite{12} More recently in the United States, \textit{left-wing} and \textit{right-wing} have often been used as synonyms for Democratic and Republican, or as synonyms for \textit{liberalism} and \textit{conservatism}.\cite{13}\cite{14}\cite{15}\cite{16}
Varieties

The spectrum of left-wing politics ranges from centre-left to far left (or ultra-left). The term centre left describes a position within the political mainstream. The terms far left and ultra-left refer to positions that are more radical. The centre-left includes social democrats, social liberals, progressives and also some democratic socialists and greens (in particular the eco-socialists). Centre-left supporters accept market allocation of resources in a mixed economy with a significant public sector and a thriving private sector. Centre-left policies tend to favour limited state intervention in matters pertaining to the public interest.

In several countries, the terms far left and radical left have been associated with communism, Maoism, Autonomism and many forms of anarchism. They have been used to describe groups that advocate anti-capitalist, identity politics or eco-terrorism. In France, a distinction is made between the left (Socialist Party and Communist Party) and the far left (Trotskyists, Maoists and Anarchists).\(^{[17]}\) The US Department of Homeland Security defines left-wing extremism as groups who want "to bring about change through violent revolution rather than through established political processes."\(^{[18]}\)

In China, the term Chinese New Left denotes those who oppose the current economic reforms and favour the restoration of more socialist policies.\(^{[19]}\) In the Western world, the term New Left refers to cultural politics. In the United Kingdom in the 1980s, the term hard left was applied to supporters of Tony Benn, such as the Campaign Group and Labour Briefing, as well as Trotskyist groups such as the Militant Tendency and Socialist Organiser.\(^{[20]}\) In the same period, the term soft left was applied to supporters of the British Labour Party who were perceived to be more moderate. Under the leadership of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown the British Labour Party re-branded itself as New Labour in order to promote the notion that it was less left-wing than it had been in the past. One of the first actions however of the Labour Party leader who succeeded them, Ed Miliband, was the rejection of the "New Labour" label.

Positions

Economics

Leftist economic beliefs range from Keynesian economics and the welfare state through industrial democracy and the social market to nationalization of the economy and central planning.\(^{[21]}\) During the industrial revolution, left-wingers supported trade unions. In the early twentieth century, the Left were associated with policies advocating extensive government intervention in the economy.\(^{[22]}\) Leftists continue to criticize what they perceive as the exploitative nature of globalization, the race to the bottom and unjust lay-offs. In the last quarter of the Twentieth Century the belief that government (ruling in accordance with the interests of the people) ought to directly involve itself in the day to day workings of an economy declined in popularity amongst the center left, especially social-democrats who became influenced by 'third way' ideology.

Other leftists believe in Marxian economics, which are based on the economic theories of Karl Marx. Some distinguish Marx's economic theories from his political philosophy, arguing that Marx's approach to understanding the economy is independent of his advocacy of revolutionary socialism or his belief in the inevitability of proletarian revolution.\(^{[23]}^{[24]}\) Marxian economics does not exclusively rely upon Marx, it draws from a range of Marxist and non-Marxist sources. The dictatorship of the proletariat or workers' state are terms used by Marxists to describe what they see as a temporary state between the capitalist and communist society. Marx defined the proletariat as salaried workers, in contrast to the lumpen proletariat, who he defined as outcasts of society, such as beggars, tricksters, entertainers, buskers, criminals and prostitutes.\(^{[25]}\) The political relevance of farmers has divided the left. In *Das Kapital*, Marx scarcely mentioned the subject.\(^{[26]}\) Mao Zedong believed that it would be rural peasants not urban workers who would bring about proletarian revolution.

Left-libertarians, Libertarian socialists and left-wing anarchists believe in a decentralized economy run by trade unions, workers' councils, cooperatives, municipalities and communes, and oppose both government and private
control of the economy, preferring local control, in which a nation of decentralized regions are united in a confederation.

**Nationalism**

The question of nationality and nationalism has been a central feature of political debates on the Left. During the French Revolution, nationalism was a policy of the Republican Left. The Republican Left advocated civic nationalism, and argued that the nation is a "daily plebiscite" formed by the subjective "will to live together." Related to "revanchism", the belligerent will to take revenge against Germany and retake control of Alsace-Lorraine, nationalism was sometimes opposed to imperialism. In the 1880s, there was a debate between those, such as Georges Clemenceau (Radical), Jean Jaurès (Socialist) and Maurice Barrès (nationalist), who argued that colonialism diverted France from the "blue line of the Vosges" (referring to Alsace-Lorraine), and the "colonial lobby", such as Jules Ferry (moderate republican), Léon Gambetta (republican) and Eugène Etienne, the president of the parliamentary colonial group. After the Dreyfus Affair however nationalism became increasingly associated with the far right.

The Marxist social class theory of proletarian internationalism asserts that members of the working class should act in solidarity with working people in other countries in pursuit of a common class interest, rather than focusing on their own countries. Proletarian internationalism is summed up in the slogan, "Workers of all countries, unite!", the last line of The Communist Manifesto. Union members had learned that more members meant more bargaining power. Taken to an international level, leftists argued that workers ought to act in solidarity to further increase the power of the working class.

Proletarian internationalism saw itself as a deterrent against war, because people with a common interest are less likely to take up arms against one another, instead focusing on fighting the ruling class. According to Marxist theory, the antonym of proletarian internationalism is bourgeois nationalism. Some Marxists, together with others on the left, view nationalism, racism (including anti-Semitism), and religion, as divide and conquer strategies used by the ruling classes to prevent the working class from uniting against them. Left-wing movements therefore have often taken up anti-imperialist positions. Anarchism has developed a critique of nationalism that focuses on nationalism's role in justifying and consolidating state power and domination. Through its unifying goal, nationalism strives for centralization, both in specific territories and in a ruling elite of individuals, while it prepares a population for capitalist exploitation. Within anarchism, this subject has been treated extensively by Rudolf Rocker in Nationalism and Culture and by the works of Fredy Perlman, such as Against His-Story, Against Leviathan and "The Continuing Appeal of Nationalism".

The failure of revolutions in Germany and Hungary ended Bolshevik hopes for an imminent world revolution and led to promotion of "Socialism in One Country" by Joseph Stalin. In the first edition of the book Osnovy Leninizma (Foundations of Leninism, 1924), Stalin argued that revolution in one country is insufficient. But by the end of that year, in the second edition of the book, he argued that the "proletariat can and must build the socialist society in one country". In April 1925 Nikolai Bukharin elaborated the issue in his brochure Can We Build Socialism in One Country in the Absence of the Victory of the West-European Proletariat? The position was adopted as State policy after Stalin's January 1926 article On the Issues of Leninism. This idea was opposed by Leon Trotsky and his followers who declared the need for an international "permanent revolution". Various Fourth Internationalist groups around the world who describe themselves as Trotskyist see themselves as standing in this tradition, while Maoist China supported Socialism in One Country.

Some link left-wing nationalism to the pressure generated by economic integration with other countries encouraged by free-trade agreements. This view is sometimes used to justify hostility towards supranational organizations such as the European Union. Left-wing nationalism can also refer to any nationalism which emphasises a working-class populist agenda which seeks to overcome perceived exploitation or oppression by other nations. Many Third World anti-colonial movements adopted left-wing and socialist ideas.
Social progressivism and counterculture

Social progressivism is another common feature of the modern Left, particularly in the United States, where social progressives played an important role in the abolition of slavery, women's suffrage, civil rights, and multiculturalism. Progressives have both advocated prohibition legislation and worked towards its repeal. Current positions associated with social progressivism in the West include opposition to the death penalty, and support for legal recognition of same-sex marriage, distribution of contraceptives, public funding of embryonic stem-cell research, and the right of women to choose abortion. Public education was a subject of great interest to groundbreaking social progressives such as Lester Frank Ward and John Dewey who saw that a democratic system of government was impossible without a universal and comprehensive system of education.

Various counterculture movements in the 1960s and 1970s were associated with the "New Left". Unlike the earlier leftist focus on union activism, the "New Left" instead adopted a broader definition of political activism commonly called social activism. U.S. "New Left" is associated with the Hippie movement, college campus mass protest movements and a broadening of focus from protesting class-based oppression to include issues such as gender, race, and sexual orientation. The British "New Left" was an intellectually driven movement which attempted to correct the perceived errors of "Old Left".

The New Left opposed prevailing authority structures in society, which it termed "The Establishment", and became known as "anti-Establishment." The New Left did not seek to recruit industrial workers, but rather concentrated on a social activist approach to organization, convinced that they could be the source for a better kind of social revolution. This view has been criticised by some Marxists (especially Trotskyists) who characterized this approach as 'substitutionism' - or what they saw as the misguided and apparently non-Marxist belief that other groups in society could 'substitute' for the revolutionary agency of the working class.[35][36]

Many early feminists and advocates of women's rights were considered left-wing by their contemporaries. Feminist pioneer Mary Wollstonecraft was influenced by the radical thinker Thomas Paine. Many notable leftists have been strong supporters of sexual equality, such as: the Marxists Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin and Alexandra Kollontai, the anarchist Emma Goldman, and the socialists Helen Keller and Annie Besant.[37] Marxists such as Clara Zetkin[38][39] and Alexandra Kollontai[40][41] however, though supporters of radical social equality for women, opposed feminism on the grounds that it was a bourgeois ideology. Marxists were responsible for organizing the first International Women's Day events.[42]

In more recent times the women's liberation movement is closely connected to the New Left and other new social movements that challenged the orthodoxies of the Old Left. Socialist feminism (e.g. Freedom Socialist Party, Radical Women) and Marxist feminism (e.g. Selma James) saw themselves as a part of the left that challenged what they perceive to be male-dominated and sexist structures within the left. Liberal feminism is closely connected with left-liberalism, and the left-wing of mainstream American politics. (e.g. the National Organization for Women).

Religion

The original French left-wing was anti-clerical, opposing the influence of the Roman Catholic Church and supporting the separation of church and state.[5] Karl Marx asserted that "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the heart of a heartless world, and the soul of soulless conditions. It is the opium of the people." In Soviet Russia the Bolsheviks originally embraced "an ideological creed which professed that all religion would atrophy" and "resolved to eradicate Christianity as such." In 1918 "ten Orthodox hierarchs were summarily shot" and "children were deprived of any religious education outside the home."[43][44]

Religious beliefs, however, have also been associated with some left-wing movements, such as the American abolitionist movement and the anti-capital punishment movement. Early socialist thinkers such as Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, and the Duc de Saint-Simon based their theories of socialism upon Christian principles. From St. Augustine of Hippo's City of God through St. Thomas More's Utopia major Christian writers defended ideas that socialists found agreeable. There is a strong thread of egalitarianism in the New Testament. Other common leftist
concerns such as pacifism, social justice, racial equality, human rights, and the rejection of excessive wealth can be found in the Bible. In the late 19th century, the Social Gospel movement arose (particularly among some Anglicans, Lutherans, Methodists and Baptists in North America and Britain,) which attempted to integrate progressive and socialist thought with Christianity in faith-based social activism, promoted by movements such as Christian Socialism. In the 20th century, the theology of liberation and Creation Spirituality was championed by such writers as Gustavo Gutierrez and Matthew Fox.

There are also left-wing movements such as Islamic socialism and Buddhist socialism. There have been alliances between the Left and anti-war Muslims, such as the Respect Party and the Stop the War Coalition in Britain. In France, the Left has been divided over moves to ban the hijab from schools, with some supporting a ban based on separation of church and state, and others opposing the ban based on personal freedom.

The environment

Both Karl Marx and the early socialist William Morris arguably had a deep concern for environmental matters. According to Marx, “Even an entire society, a nation, or all simultaneously existing societies taken together . . . are not owners of the earth. They are simply its possessors, its beneficiaries, and have to bequeath it in an improved state to succeeding generations.” Following the Russian Revolution, environmental scientists such as revolutionary Aleksandr Bogdanov and the Proletkult organisation made efforts to incorporate environmentalism into Bolshevism, and “integrate production with natural laws and limits” in the first decade of Soviet rule, before Joseph Stalin attacked ecologists and the science of ecology, purged environmentalists and promoted the pseudo-science of Trofim Lysenko. Likewise, Mao Zedong rejected environmentalism and believed that, based on the laws of historical materialism, all of nature must be put into the service of revolution.

From the 1970s onwards, environmentalism became an increasing concern of the left, with social movements and some unions campaigning over environmental issues. For example, the left-wing Builders Labourers Federation in Australia, led by the communist Jack Mundy, united with environmentalists to place Green Bans on environmentally destructive development projects. Some segments of the socialist and Marxist left consciously merged environmentalism and anti-capitalism into an eco-socialist ideology. Barry Commoner articulated a left-wing response to The Limits to Growth model that predicted catastrophic resource depletion and spurred environmentalism, postulating that capitalist technologies were chiefly responsible for environmental degradation, as opposed to population pressures. Environmental degradation can be seen as a class or equity issue, as environmental destruction disproportionately affects poorer communities and countries.

Several left-wing or socialist groupings have an overt environmental concern, whereas several green parties contain a strong socialist presence. For example, the Green Party of England and Wales features an eco-socialist group, Green Left, that was founded in June 2005 and whose members hold a number of influential positions within the party, including both the former Principal Speakers Siân Berry and Dr. Derek Wall, himself an eco-socialist and marxist academic. In Europe, some ‘Green-Left’ political parties combine traditional social-democratic values such as a desire for greater economic equality and workers rights with demands for environmental protection, such as the Nordic Green Left.

Well-known socialist Bolivian President Evo Morales has traced environmental degradation to consumerism. He has said “The Earth does not have enough for the North to live better and better, but it does have enough for all of us to live well.” James Hansen, Noam Chomsky, Raj Patel, Naomi Klein, The Yes Men, and Dennis Kucinich have had similar views.

In the 21st Century, questions about the environment have become increasingly politicized, with the Left generally accepting the findings of environmental scientists about global warming, and many on the Right disputing or rejecting those findings. The left is however divided over how to effectively and equitably reduce carbon emissions- the center-left often advocates a reliance on market measures such as emissions trading or a carbon tax, whilst those further to the left tend to support direct government regulation and intervention either alongside or
instead of market mechanisms.\textsuperscript{[73][74][75]}

**Anti-globalization and Third-worldism**

The Global Justice Movement, also known as the anti-globalisation or alter-globalization movement, protests against global trade agreements and the negative consequences they perceive to have for the poor and the environment. This movement is generally characterised as left-wing, although some on the right, Pat Buchanan for example, oppose globalization on nationalistic grounds. The Global Justice Movement does not oppose globalisation per se, on the contrary, it supports some forms of internationalism. Its main themes are the reforms (or abolition) of international institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, and the creation of an international social and environmental justice movement. It rejects the leadership of any political party, defining itself as a "movement of movements."

Third-worldism regards the inequality between developed, or First World countries, and the developing, or Third World countries as of key political importance. It supports national liberation movements against what it takes to be imperialism by capitalist nations. Key figures associated with Third-worldism include Frantz Fanon, Ahmed Ben Bella, Andre Gunder Frank, Samir Amin and Simon Malley. Among the New Left groups associated with Third Worldism were Monthly Review and the New Communist Movement.

Third worldism is closely connected with Pan-Africanism, Pan-Arabism, Maoism, African socialism and Latin American socialist trends. The Palestine Liberation Organization and the Sandinistas are or have been particular causes célèbres. Some left-wing groups in the developing world, such as the Zapatista Army of National Liberation in Mexico, the Abahlali baseMjondolo in South Africa, and the Naxalites in India, argue that the First-World left takes a racist and paternalistic attitude towards liberation movements in the Third-World. There is particular criticism of the role played by NGOs and the assumption by the Western Anti-globalization movement that they should seek to influence the politics of the Third World.

**Post-modernism**

Left-wing post-modernism opposes attempts to supply universal explanatory theories, including Marxism, deriding them as grand narratives. It views culture as a battleground, and via deconstruction seeks to undermine all pretensions to knowledge. Left-wing critics of post-modernism assert that cultural studies inflates the importance of culture by denying the existence of an independent reality.\textsuperscript{[76][77]}

In 1996, physicist Alan Sokal wrote a nonsensical article entitled "Transgressing the Boundaries: Toward a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity".\textsuperscript{[78]} The journal *Social Text* published the paper in its Spring/Summer 1996 issue, whereupon Sokal publicly revealed his hoax. While this action was interpreted as an attack upon leftism, Sokal, who was a committed supporter of the Sandinista movement in Nicaragua during the 1980s, intended it as a critique from within the Left.\textsuperscript{[79]} He said he was concerned about what he saw as the increasing prevalence on the left of "a particular kind of nonsense and sloppy thinking... that denies the existence of objective realities". He called into question the usefulness of such theories to the wider left movement saying he "never understood how deconstruction was meant to help the working class."\textsuperscript{[79]}
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Right-wing politics

In politics, the Right, right-wing and rightist generally refer to support for social order and social hierarchy, justified by an appeal to natural law or tradition.[1][2][3][4] The political terms Right and Left were coined during the French Revolution, and were a reference to where people sat in the French parliament. Those who sat to the right of the president's chair were broadly supportive of the institutions of Ancien Régime: the monarchy, the aristocracy and the established church. Use of the expression le droit (the right) became more prominent in France after the restoration of its monarchy in 1815, when it was applied to the Ultra-royalists.[9] Although in France it originally designated traditional conservatives and reactionaries, its meaning has been extended to include (particularly in English speaking countries) liberal conservatives, classical liberals, and libertarian conservatives, and it is also applied to Christian democrats and some nationalists.[8]

Some argue that right-wing politics is more loosely defined than left-wing politics, because it is to some extent a response to its leftist counterpart.[10] Economist Thomas Sowell wrote: "These opponents of the left may share no particular principle, much less a common agenda, and they can range from free-market libertarians to advocates of monarchy, theocracy, military dictatorship or innumerable other principles, systems and agendas."

History of the term

The political term right-wing originates from the French Revolution, when liberal deputies from the Third Estate generally sat to the left of the president's chair, a habit which began in the Estates General of 1789. The nobility, members of the Second Estate, generally sat to the right. In the successive legislative assemblies, monarchists who supported the Ancien Régime were commonly referred to as rightists, because they sat on the right side. A major figure on the right was Joseph de Maistre, who argued for an authoritarian form of conservatism. Throughout the 19th century, the main line dividing Left and Right in France was between supporters of the Republic and supporters of the Monarchy.[8] On the right, the Legitimists and Ultra-royalists held counter-revolutionary views, while the Orleanists hoped to create a constitutional monarchy under their preferred branch of the royal family, a brief reality after the 1830 July Revolution.

In Marxist analysis, the left, right, and center are often associated with socialism, conservatism, and liberalism.[12] Some historians and social scientists reduce political beliefs to class, with left, right, and center politicians representing the working, upper, and middle classes.[12] Seymour Martin Lipset for example takes modern political parties to be a consequence of "democratic class struggle".[13] Others draw attention to the role which religious, ethnic, and regional differences play in democratic politics.[14]

Louis Hartz argues that in US politics there were two main opposing groups, Whig and Democrat, which represented industrialists and agriculturalists, but because both accepted liberal principles, both were essentially centrist.[15] Russell Kirk claims that the American War of Independence was a conservative reaction, which sought to uphold traditional English liberties against what they took to be an abuse of power by the monarch.[16] In 1955 Seymour Martin Lipset coined the term radical right to describe those who opposed Statist social reforms and foreign interventionism.[17]

Friedrich Hayek suggests that it is incorrect to view the political spectrum as a line, with socialists on the left, conservatives on the right, and liberals in the middle. Instead each group pulls at the corner of a triangle. In the early Twentieth Century socialists pulled harder, and so the entire political spectrum shifted to the left. In the Anglosphere differences between conservatives and liberals are obscured by the fact that supporters of liberty defend established
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institutions, on the grounds that the tradition they inherited is liberal. Hayek claimed that explaining American politics in terms of European politics creates confusion, because radicals and socialists in America frequently call themselves liberals.\[18\]

Libertarians often reject being described as "left" or "right." Leonard Read claimed that these terms were "authoritarian".\[19\] According to Harry Browne "We should never define Libertarian positions in terms coined by liberals or conservatives – nor as some variant of their positions."\[20\] Walter Block also rejects these labels.\[21\]

Stephen Fisher in his *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Politics* asserts that in liberal democracies the political right oppose socialism and social democracy, and that right-wing parties include philosophies of conservatism, Christian democracy, liberalism, libertarianism, and nationalism. He claims that "extreme right parties (have included) elements of racism and fascism."\[22\]

### Varieties

The spectrum of right-wing politics ranges from centre-right to far right. By the late 19th century, the French political spectrum classified the center-right as Constitutional Monarchists, Orleanists, and Bonapartists, and the far right as Ultra-Royalists and Legitimists. The centre-right Gaullists in post-World War II France advocated considerable social spending on education and infrastructure development, as well as extensive economic regulation but a limited amount of the wealth redistribution measures more characteristic of social democracy.

A definition of the term "centre-right" is necessarily broad and approximate because political terms have varying meanings in different countries. Parties of the centre-right generally support liberal democracy, capitalism, the market economy (albeit with some limited government regulation), private property rights, the existence of the welfare state in some limited form, and opposition to socialism and communism. Such definitions generally include political parties that base their ideology and policies upon conservatism and economic liberalism.

The terms *far right* and *radical right* have been used by different people in conflicting ways.\[23\] The term *far right* is most often used to describe extreme nationalism, religious fundamentalism and sociopolitically "reactionary" groups, as well as the less readily categorized ideologies of fascism and Nazism.\[24\]\[25\]\[26\]\[27\] The BBC has called politician Pim Fortuyn's politics (Fortuynism) far right because of his policies on immigration and Muslims.\[28\] The term *far right* has been used by some, such as National Public Radio, to describe the rule of Augusto Pinochet in Chile.\[29\]\[30\] The US Department of Homeland Security defines right-wing extremism as hate groups who target racial, ethnic or religious minorities and may be dedicated to a single issue, such as eradicating homosexuals or barring the immigration of Hispanics.\[31\]

The phrase is also used to describe support for ethnic nationalism.\[32\]\[33\]\[34\]

### Positions

**Social stratification and social order**

Right-wing politics involves in varying degrees the rejection of egalitarian objectives of left-wing politics, claiming either that equality is artificial or that the imposition of social equality is detrimental to society.\[35\] Right-wing ideologies and movements support social order. The original French right wing was called "the party of order" and said that France needed a strong political leader to keep order.\[8\] Latin Conservatism, founded by Joseph de Maistre, is uncompromising in its belief in the need for order. Maistre, like Thomas Hobbes before him, supported absolutism as the only means of avoiding violent disorder. Maistre, who fled the French Revolution, became convinced that ultra-liberal ideas, particularly Rousseau's theory of a "general will", had led to the horrors of the French Revolution and the bloodshed of the Napoleonic Wars.

Maistre also objected to the quasi-secularism and self-indulgence of some late 18th and early 19th century monarchies, and believed that state and church must remain inseparable. The principles of Maistre's Latin
Conservatism were fully instituted in Spain under Francisco Franco. Religious fundamentalists have often supported the use of political power to enforce their religious beliefs. While traditional right-wing politics supports legal and moral authority over those who would challenge such authority, the "Libertarian Right," in contrast with the religious Right and the nationalist Right, is anti-authoritarian.

**Natural law and/or traditionalism**

Right-wing politics typically justifies a hierarchical society on the basis of natural law or tradition. To varying degrees, the Right rejects the egalitarian objectives of left-wing politics, claiming that the imposition of equality is detrimental to society.

Traditionalism has existed in various forms in the West since its beginning, however it was in the 18th century that modern traditionalist conservatism emerged and even then it was not until the mid-twentieth century in the United States that it was an organized intellectual force. Traditionalism was found in the writings of a group of U.S. university professors (labeled the "New Conservatives" by the popular press) who rejected the notions of individualism, liberalism, modernity, and social progress, promoted cultural and educational renewal, and revived interest in what T. S. Eliot referred to as "the permanent things" (those perennial truths which endure from age to age and those basic institutions that ground society such as the church, the family, the state, and community life.)

The term "family values" has had different meanings in different cultures. In the late 20th- and early 21st Centuries, the term has been frequently used in political debate, especially by social and religious conservatives, who believe that the world has seen a decline in family values since the end of the Second World War. The term has been used as a buzzword by right-wing parties such as the Republican Party in the United States, the Family First Party in Australia, the Conservative party in the United Kingdom and the Bharatiya Janata Party in India. Right-wing supporters of "family values" generally oppose abortion, euthanasia, homosexuality, and adultery. Leftists and feminists often accuse the right of supporting patriarchy and traditional, hierarchical gender roles.

**Nationalism**

In France, Nationalism was originally a left-wing and Republican ideology, as the French exception consisted in it being a Republican regime. Nationalism became a main trait of the right wing after the period of boulangisme and, moreover, of the far-right after the Dreyfus Affair. These right-wing nationalists endorsed ethnic nationalism and believed in defining a "true" national identity and defending it from elements deemed not part of the identity and corrupt. They also promoted Social Darwinism, applying the concept of "survival of the fittest" to nations and races. Right-wing nationalism was influenced by Romantic nationalism in which the state derives its political legitimacy as an organic consequence of the unity of those it governs. This includes, depending on the particular manner of practice, the language, race, culture, religion and customs of the "nation" in its primal sense of those who were "born" within its culture.

Linked with right-wing nationalism is cultural conservatism. Cultural conservatism supports the preservation of the heritage of a nation or culture.

**Economics**

Historically, the Right has advocated preserving the wealth and power of aristocrats and nobles. Reactionary right-wing politics involves the creation or promotion of a social hierarchy. Right-wing politics views social and economic hierarchies as either natural or normal and rejects attempts to remove such hierarchies. For example, right-wing politicians in France during the French Revolution opposed the removal of the monarchy and aristocratic privilege. Traditional rightists were uncomfortable with liberal capitalism. Particularly in continental Europe, many conservatives have been uncomfortable with the impact of capitalism upon culture and traditions. The conservative opposition to the French Revolution, the Enlightenment, and the development of individualistic liberalism as a political theory and as institutionalized social practices sought to retain traditional social hierarchies,
practices and institutions. There has also been a conservative protectionist opposition to certain types of international
capitalism. There are still right-wing movements, notably American paleoconservatives, that are often in opposition
to capitalist ethics and the effects they have on society as a whole, which they see as infringing upon or decaying
social traditions or hierarchies that are essential for social order. Conservative authoritarians and those on the far
right have supported corporatism.\[48\]

In modern times, most right-wing ideologies and movements support capitalism. In Europe, capitalists formed
alliances with the Right during their conflict with workers after 1848. In France, the right's support of capitalism can
be traced to the late 19th century.\[8\] The so-called neoliberal right, popularized by Ronald Reagan and Margaret
Thatcher, combines support for free markets, privatization, and deregulation with traditional rightist beliefs.\[40\]
Right-wing libertarianism (sometimes known as libertarian conservatism or conservative libertarianism) supports a
decentralized economy based on economic freedom, and advocates policies such as property rights, free markets and
free trade. Russell Kirk believed that freedom and property rights were interlinked.\[49\] Anthony Gregory has written
that right-wing, or conservative libertarianism, "can refer to any number of varying and at times mutually exclusive
political orientations." He listed some as: being "interested mainly in 'economic freedoms'"; following the
"conservative lifestyle of right-libertarians"; seeking "others to embrace their own conservative lifestyle";
considering big business "as a great victim of the state"; favoring a "strong national defense"; having "an Old Right
opposition to empire." He holds that the issue is not right or left but "whether a person sees the state as a major
hazard or just another institution to be reformed and directed toward a political goal."\[50\]

The Right often advocates equality of opportunities as an alternative to equality of outcome. Russell Kirk, a major
figure of American conservativism included "civilized society requires orders and classes" as one of the "canons" of
conservatism.\[49\] Western-style corporate capitalism but not full-fledged laissez-faire economics or individual
autonomy was adopted by reformist governments in Singapore and Taiwan during a period of authoritarian rule and
economic reform. These countries continue to venerate tradition in what has been described an "Asian model" of
capitalism.

**Populism**

Right-wing populism is a combination of ethno-nationalism with anti-elitist populist rhetoric and a radical critique of
existing political institutions. According to Margaret Canovan, a right-wing populist is "...a charismatic leader, using
the tactics of politicians' populism to go past the politicians and intellectual elite and appeal to the reactionary
sentiments of the populace, often buttressing his claim to speak for the people by the use of referendums."

There are elements of populism in traditionalist conservatism. While many traditionalist conservatives live in urban
centers, the countryside and the values of rural life are prized highly (sometimes even being romanticized, as in
pastoral poetry). The principles of agrarianism (i.e., preserving the small family farm, open land, the conservation of
natural resource, and stewardship of the land) are central to a traditionalist's understanding of rural life.

One example of right-wing populists were the Southern Agrarians of the United States. They bemoaned the
increasing loss of Southern identity and culture to industrialization. They believed that the traditional agrarian roots
of the United States, which dated back to the nation's founding in the 18th century, were important to its nature.
Their manifesto was a critique of the rapid industrialization and urbanization during the first few decades of the 20th
century in the southern United States. It posited an alternative based on a return to the more traditionally rural and
local culture, and agrarian American values. The group opposed the changes in the US that were leading it to become
more urban, national/international, and industrial. Because the book was published at the opening (1930) of what
would eventually become the Great Depression, some viewed it as particularly prescient. The book's stance was
anti-communist.
Religion

Government support for the majority religion has from the beginning of the movement been a major part of right-wing politics. The original French right wing supported the power of the Roman Catholic Church and opposed the secularization proposed by the anti-clerical forces of the Left.[8] Religious figures with right-wing views, as in the Roman Catholic Church after the French Revolution, typically called for the creation or restoration of the authority of religious institutions and the social hierarchy that was associated with religion.[51] Joseph de Maistre argued for the indirect authority of the Pope over temporal matters. According to Maistre, only governments founded upon a Christian constitution, implicit in the customs and institutions of all European societies but especially in Catholic European monarchies, could avoid the disorder and bloodshed that followed the implementation of rationalist political programs, as in the French Revolution.

The Christian right is a major political force in the West, supported by the Republican Party in the United States and by Christian Democratic parties in Europe. They generally support laws upholding religious values, and laws against illegal immigration.[52] Hindu nationalism has been a part of right-wing politics in India. A form of conservative populism, the movement has attracted not only privileged groups fearing encroachment on their dominant positions, but also "plebeian" and impoverished groups seeking recognition around a majoritarian rhetoric of cultural pride, order, and national strength.[53] Many Islamist groups have been associated with the right, such as the Great Union Party,[54] the Felicity Party[55] of Turkey and the Combatant Clergy Association/Association of Militant Clergy[56][57] and the Islamic Society of Engineers[58][59] of Iran.

Today many social and religious conservatives find themselves in opposition to scientific organizations over such topics as evolution and the global warming debate.[60][61][62][63][64][65]

Anti-communism

Early communist movements were at odds with the traditional monarchies that ruled over much of the European continent at the time. Many European monarchies outlawed the public expression of communist views, and the Communist Manifesto began "A spectre is haunting Europe," suggesting that monarchs feared for their thrones. Advocacy of communism was illegal in the Russian Empire, the German Empire and Austria-Hungary, the three most powerful monarchies in continental Europe prior to World War I. Many Monarchists (except Constitutional Monarchists) viewed inequality in wealth and political power as resulting from a divine natural order. By World War I however, in most European monarchies, the Divine Right of Kings had become discredited and replaced by liberal and nationalist movements. Most European monarchs became figureheads; elected governments held the real power. The most conservative European monarchy, the Russian Empire, was replaced by the communist Soviet Union. The Russian Revolution inspired a series of other communist revolutions across Europe in the years 1917–1922. Many of these, such as the German Revolution, were defeated by nationalist and monarchist military units.

The 1920s and 1930s saw the fading of traditional right-wing politics. The mantle of conservative anti-communism was taken up by the rising fascist movements on the one hand, and by American-inspired liberal conservatives on the other. When communist groups and political parties began appearing around the world, as in the Republic of China in the 1920s, their opponents were usually colonial authorities or local nationalist movements.

After World War II, communism became a global phenomenon, and anti-communism became an integral part of the domestic and foreign policies of the United States and its NATO allies. Conservatism in the post-war era abandoned its monarchist and aristocratic roots, focusing instead on patriotism, religion, and nationalism. Communists were also enemies of capitalism, portraying Wall Street as the oppressor of the masses. The United States made anti-communism the top priority of its foreign policy, and many American conservatives sought to combat what they saw as communist influence at home. This led to the adoption of a number of domestic policies that are collectively known under the term "McCarthyism". Throughout the Cold War, conservative governments in Asia, Africa, and Latin America turned to the United States for political and economic support.
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Neoclassical economics

Neoclassical economics is a term variously used for approaches to economics focusing on the determination of prices, outputs, and income distributions in markets through supply and demand, often mediated through a hypothesized maximization of utility by income-constrained individuals and of profits by cost-constrained firms employing available information and factors of production, in accordance with rational choice theory.[1] Neoclassical economics dominates microeconomics, and together with Keynesian economics forms the neoclassical synthesis, which dominates mainstream economics today. [2] There have been many critiques of neoclassical economics, often incorporated into newer versions of neoclassical theory as human awareness of economic criteria changes.

The term was originally introduced by Thorstein Veblen in 1900, in his Preconceptions of Economic Science, to distinguish marginalists in the tradition of Alfred Marshall from those in the Austrian School.[3][4][5]

“No attempt will here be made even to pass a verdict on the relative claims of the recognized two or three main “schools” of theory, beyond the somewhat obvious finding that, for the purpose in hand, the so-called Austrian school is scarcely distinguishable from the neo-classical, unless it be in the different distribution of emphasis. The divergence between the modernized classical views, on the one hand, and the historical and Marxist schools, on the other hand, is wider, so much so, indeed, as to bar out a consideration of the postulates of the latter under the same head of inquiry with the former.” - Veblen

It was later used by John Hicks, George Stigler, and others[6] to include the work of Carl Menger, William Stanley Jevons, John Bates Clark and many others.[4] Today it is usually used to refer to mainstream economics, although it has also been used as an umbrella term encompassing a number of other schools of thought,[7] notably excluding institutional economics, various historical schools of economics, and Marxian economics, in addition to various other heterodox approaches to economics.

Neoclassical economics is characterized by several assumptions common to many schools of economic thought. There is not a complete agreement on what is meant by neoclassical economics, and the result is a wide range of neoclassical approaches to various problem areas and domains—ranging from neoclassical theories of labor to neoclassical theories of demographic changes. As expressed by E. Roy Weintraub, neoclassical economics rests on three assumptions, although certain branches of neoclassical theory may have different approaches:[8]

1. People have rational preferences among outcomes that can be identified and associated with a value.
2. Individuals maximize utility and firms maximize profits.
3. People act independently on the basis of full and relevant information.

From these three assumptions, neoclassical economists have built a structure to understand the allocation of scarce resources among alternative ends—in fact understanding such allocation is often considered the definition of economics to neoclassical theorists. Here’s how William Stanley Jevons presented “the problem of Economics”.

"Given, a certain population, with various needs and powers of production, in possession of certain lands and other sources of material: required, the mode of employing their labour which will maximize the utility of their produce."[9]

From the basic assumptions of neoclassical economics comes a wide range of theories about various areas of economic activity. For example, profit maximization lies behind the neoclassical theory of the firm, while the derivation of demand curves leads to an understanding of consumer goods, and the supply curve allows an analysis
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of the factors of production. Utility maximization is the source for the neoclassical theory of consumption, the derivation of demand curves for consumer goods, and the derivation of labor supply curves and reservation demand. Market supply and demand are aggregated across firms and individuals. Their interactions determine equilibrium output and price. The market supply and demand for each factor of production is derived analogously to those for market final output to determine equilibrium income and the income distribution. Factor demand incorporates the marginal-productivity relationship of that factor in the output market.

Neoclassical economics emphasizes equilibria, where equilibria are the solutions of agent maximization problems. Regularities in economies are explained by methodological individualism, the position that economic phenomena can be explained by aggregating over the behavior of agents. The emphasis is on microeconomics. Institutions, which might be considered as prior to and conditioning individual behavior, are de-emphasized. Economic subjectivism accompanies these emphases. See also general equilibrium.

Origins

Classical economics, developed in the 18th and 19th centuries, included a value theory and distribution theory. The value of a product was thought to depend on the costs involved in producing that product. The explanation of costs in Classical economics was simultaneously an explanation of distribution. A landlord received rent, workers received wages, and a capitalist tenant farmer received profits on their investment. This classic approach included the work of Adam Smith and David Ricardo.

However, some economists gradually began emphasizing the perceived value of a good to the consumer. They proposed a theory that the value of a product was to be explained with differences in utility (usefulness) to the consumer. (In England, economists tended to conceptualize utility in keeping with the Utilitarianism of Jeremy Bentham and later of John Stuart Mill.)

The third step from political economy to economics was the introduction of marginalism and the proposition that economic actors made decisions based on margins. For example, a person decides to buy a second sandwich based on how full they are after the first one, a firm hires a new employee based on the expected increase in profits the employee will bring. This differs from the aggregate decision making of classical political economy in that it explains how vital goods such as water can be cheap, while luxuries can be expensive.

The Marginal Revolution

Neoclassical economics is frequently dated from William Stanley Jevons's *Theory of Political Economy* (1871), Carl Menger's *Principles of Economics* (1871), and Leon Walras's *Elements of Pure Economics* (1874–1877). These three economists have been said to have begun “the Marginal Revolution”. Historians of economics and economists have debated:

- Whether utility or marginalism was more essential to this revolution (whether the noun or the adjective in the phrase “marginal utility” is more important)
- Whether there was a revolutionary change of thought or merely a gradual development and change of emphasis from their predecessors
- Whether grouping these economists together disguises differences more important than their similarities.

In particular, Jevons saw his economics as an application and development of Jeremy Bentham's utilitarianism and never had a fully developed general equilibrium theory. Menger did not embrace this hedonic conception, explained diminishing marginal utility in terms of subjective prioritization of possible uses, and emphasized disequilibrium and the discrete; further Menger had an objection to the use of mathematics in economics, while the other two modeled their theories after 19th century mechanics. Walras' conception of utility, like that of Menger, was that of usefulness in general, rather than the hedonic conception of Bentham or of Mill; and Walras was more interested in the interaction of markets than in explaining the individual psyche.
Alfred Marshall's textbook, *Principles of Economics* (1890), was the dominant textbook in England a generation later. Marshall's influence extended elsewhere; Italians would compliment Maffeo Pantaleoni by calling him the "Marshall of Italy". Marshall thought classical economics attempted to explain prices by the cost of production. He asserted that earlier marginalists went too far in correcting this imbalance by overemphasizing utility and demand. Marshall thought that "We might as reasonably dispute whether it is the upper or the under blade of a pair of scissors that cuts a piece of paper, as whether value is governed by utility or cost of production".

Marshall explained price by the intersection of supply and demand curves. The introduction of different market "periods" was an important innovation of Marshall's:

- **Market period.** The goods produced for sale on the market are taken as given data, e.g. in a fish market. Prices quickly adjust to clear markets.
- **Short period.** Industrial capacity is taken as given. The level of output, the level of employment, the inputs of raw materials, and prices fluctuate to equate marginal cost and marginal revenue, where profits are maximized. Economic rents exist in short period equilibrium for fixed factors, and the rate of profit is not equated across sectors.
- **Long period.** The stock of capital goods, such as factories and machines, is not taken as given. Profit-maximizing equilibria determine both industrial capacity and the level at which it is operated.
- **Very long period.** Technology, population trends, habits and customs are not taken as given, but allowed to vary in very long period models.

Marshall took supply and demand as stable functions and extended supply and demand explanations of prices to all runs. He argued supply was easier to vary in longer runs, and thus became a more important determinant of price in the very long run.

**Further developments**

An important change in neoclassical economics occurred around 1933. Joan Robinson and Edward H. Chamberlin, with the near simultaneous publication of their respective books, *The Economics of Imperfect Competition* (1933) and *The Theory of Monopolistic Competition* (1933), introduced models of imperfect competition. Theories of market forms and industrial organization grew out of this work. They also emphasized certain tools, such as the marginal revenue curve.

Joan Robinson's work on imperfect competition, at least, was a response to certain problems of Marshallian partial equilibrium theory highlighted by Piero Sraffa. Anglo-American economists also responded to these problems by turning towards general equilibrium theory, developed on the European continent by Walras and Vilfredo Pareto. J. R. Hicks's *Value and Capital* (1939) was influential in introducing his English-speaking colleagues to these traditions. He, in turn, was influenced by the Austrian School economist Friedrich Hayek's move to the London School of Economics, where Hicks then studied.

These developments were accompanied by the introduction of new tools, such as indifference curves and the theory of ordinal utility. The level of mathematical sophistication of neoclassical economics increased. Paul Samuelson's *Foundations of Economic Analysis* (1947) contributed to this increase in mathematical modelling.

The interwar period in American economics has been argued to have been pluralistic, with neoclassical economics and institutionalism competing for allegiance. Frank Knight, an early Chicago school economist attempted to combine both schools. But this increase in mathematics was accompanied by greater dominance of neoclassical economics in Anglo-American universities after World War II.

Hicks' book, *Value and Capital* had two main parts. The second, which was arguably not immediately influential, presented a model of temporary equilibrium. Hicks was influenced directly by Hayek's notion of intertemporal coordination and paralleled by earlier work by Lindhal. This was part of an abandonment of disaggregated long run models. This trend probably reached its culmination with the Arrow-Debreu model of intertemporal equilibrium. The
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Arrow-Debreu model has canonical presentations in Gerard Debreu's *Theory of Value* (1959) and in Arrow and Hahn's "General Competitive Analysis" (1971).

Many of these developments were against the backdrop of improvements in both econometrics, that is the ability to measure prices and changes in goods and services, as well as their aggregate quantities, and in the creation of macroeconomics, or the study of whole economies. The attempt to combine neo-classical microeconomics and Keynesian macroeconomics would lead to the neoclassical synthesis\[18\] which has been the dominant paradigm of economic reasoning in English-speaking countries since the 1950s. Hicks and Samuelson were for example instrumental in mainstreaming Keynesian economics.

Macroeconomics influenced the neoclassical synthesis from the other direction, undermining foundations of classical economic theory such as Say's Law, and assumptions about political economy such as the necessity for a hard-money standard. These developments are reflected in neoclassical theory by the search for the occurrence in markets of the equilibrium conditions of Pareto optimality and self-sustainability.

**Criticisms**

Neoclassical economics is sometimes criticized for having a normative bias. In this view, it does not focus on explaining actual economies, but instead on describing a "utopia" in which Pareto optimality applies.

The assumption that individuals act rationally may be viewed as ignoring important aspects of human behavior. Many see the "economic man" as being quite different from real people. Many economists, even contemporaries, have criticized this model of economic man. Thorstein Veblen put it most sardonically. Neoclassical economics assumes a person to be,

"a lightning calculator of pleasures and pains, who oscillates like a homogeneous globule of desire of happiness under the impulse of stimuli that shift about the area, but leave him intact."\[19\]

Large corporations might perhaps come closer to the neoclassical ideal of profit maximization, but this is not necessarily viewed as desirable if this comes at the expense of neglect of wider social issues. The response to this is that neoclassical economics is descriptive and not normative. It addresses such problems with concepts of private versus social utility.

Problems exist with making the neoclassical general equilibrium theory compatible with an economy that develops over time and includes capital goods. This was explored in a major debate in the 1960s—the "Cambridge capital controversy"—about the validity of neoclassical economics, with an emphasis on the economic growth, capital, aggregate theory, and the marginal productivity theory of distribution. There were also internal attempts by neoclassical economists to extend the Arrow-Debreu model to disequilibrium investigations of stability and uniqueness. However a result known as the Sonnenschein-Mantel-Debreu theorem suggests that the assumptions that must be made to ensure that the equilibrium is stable and unique are quite restrictive.

Neoclassical economics is also often seen as relying too heavily on complex mathematical models, such as those used in general equilibrium theory, without enough regard to whether these actually describe the real economy. Many see an attempt to model a system as complex as a modern economy by a mathematical model as unrealistic and doomed to failure. A famous answer to this criticism is Milton Friedman's claim that theories should be judged by their ability to predict events rather than by the realism of their assumptions. Mathematical models also include those in game theory, linear programming, and econometrics. Critics of neoclassical economics are divided in those who think that highly mathematical method is inherently wrong and those who think that mathematical method is potentially good even if contemporary methods have problems.

The assumption of rational expectations which has been introduced in some more modern neoclassical models (sometimes also called new classical) can also be criticized on the grounds of realism.

In general, allegedly overly unrealistic assumptions are one of the most common criticisms towards neoclassical economics. It is fair to say that many (but not all) of these criticisms can only be directed towards a subset of the
neoclassical models (for example, there are many neoclassical models where unregulated markets fail to achieve Pareto-optimality and there has recently been an increased interest in modeling non-rational decision making).
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Keynesian economics

Keynesian economics ( /ˈkɛɪznɪən/ kayn-ən; also called Keynesianism and Keynesian theory) is a school of macroeconomic thought based on the ideas of 20th-century English economist John Maynard Keynes.

Keynesian economics argues that private sector decisions sometimes lead to inefficient macroeconomic outcomes and, therefore, advocates active policy responses by the public sector, including monetary policy actions by the central bank and fiscal policy actions by the government to stabilize output over the business cycle.[1] The theories forming the basis of Keynesian economics were first presented in The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money, published in 1936. The interpretations of Keynes are contentious and several schools of thought claim his legacy.

Keynesian economics advocates a mixed economy — predominantly private sector, but with a significant role of government and public sector — and served as the economic model during the later part of the Great Depression, World War II, and the post-war economic expansion (1945–1973), though it lost some influence following the stagflation of the 1970s. The advent of the global financial crisis in 2008 has caused a resurgence in Keynesian thought.[2]

Overview

According to Keynesian theory, some individually-rational microeconomic-level actions — if taken collectively by a large proportion of individuals and firms — can lead to inefficient aggregate macroeconomic outcomes, wherein the economy operates below its potential output and growth rate. Such a situation had previously been referred to by classical economists as a general glut. There was disagreement among classical economists on whether a general glut was possible. Keynes contended that a general glut would occur when aggregate demand for goods was insufficient, leading to an economic downturn resulting in losses of potential output due to unnecessarily high unemployment, which results from the defensive (or reactive) decisions of the producers. In such a situation, government policies could be used to increase aggregate demand, thus increasing economic activity and reducing unemployment and deflation. Most Keynesians advocate an activist stabilization policy to reduce the amplitude of the business cycle, which they rank among the most serious of economic problems. For example, when the unemployment rate is very high, a government can use a dose of expansionary monetary policy.

Keynes argued that the solution to the Great Depression was to stimulate the economy ("inducement to invest") through some combination of two approaches: a reduction in interest rates and government investment in infrastructure. Investment by government injects income, which results in more spending in the general economy, which in turn stimulates more production and investment involving still more income and spending and so forth. The initial stimulation starts a cascade of events, whose total increase in economic activity is a multiple of the original investment.[3]

A central conclusion of Keynesian economics is that, in some situations, no strong automatic mechanism moves output and employment towards full employment levels. This conclusion conflicts with economic approaches that assume a strong general tendency towards equilibrium. In the 'neoclassical synthesis', which combines Keynesian macro concepts with a micro foundation, the conditions of general equilibrium allow for price adjustment to eventually achieve this goal. More broadly, Keynes saw his theory as a general theory, in which utilization of resources could be high or low, whereas previous economics focused on the particular case of full utilization.

The new classical macroeconomics movement, which began in the late 1960s and early 1970s, criticized Keynesian theories, while New Keynesian economics has sought to base Keynes' ideas on more rigorous theoretical foundations.

Some interpretations of Keynes have emphasized his stress on the international coordination of Keynesian policies, the need for international economic institutions, and the ways in which economic forces could lead to war or could
Promote peace.[4]

Precursors

Keynes' work was part of a long-running debate within economics over the existence and nature of general gluts. While a number of the policies Keynes advocated (the notable one being government deficit spending) and the theoretical ideas he proposed (effective demand, the multiplier, the paradox of thrift) were advanced by various authors in the 19th and early 20th centuries, Keynes' unique contribution was to provide a general theory of these, which proved acceptable to the political and economic establishments.

Schools

An intellectual precursor of Keynesian economics was underconsumption theory in classical economics, dating from such 19th-century economists as Thomas Malthus, the Birmingham School of Thomas Attwood,[5] and the American economists William Trufant Foster and Waddill Catchings, who were influential in the 1920s and 1930s. Underconsumptionists were, like Keynes after them, concerned with failure of aggregate demand to attain potential output, calling this "underconsumption" (focusing on the demand side), rather than "overproduction" (which would focus on the supply side), and advocating economic interventionism. Keynes specifically discussed underconsumption (which he wrote "under-consumption") in the General Theory, in Chapter 22, Section IV[6] and Chapter 23, Section VII[7].

Numerous concepts were developed earlier and independently of Keynes by the Stockholm school during the 1930s; these accomplishments were described in a 1937 article, published in response to the 1936 General Theory, sharing the Swedish discoveries.[8]

Concepts

The multiplier dates to work in the 1890s by the Australian economist Alfred De Lissa, the Danish economist Julius Wulff, and the German American economist Nicholas Johannsen,[9] the latter being cited in a footnote of Keynes.[10] Nicholas Johannsen also proposed a theory of effective demand in the 1890s.

The paradox of thrift was stated in 1892 by John M. Robertson in his The Fallacy of Savings, in earlier forms by mercantilist economists since the 16th century, and similar sentiments date to antiquity.[11][12]

Today these ideas, regardless of provenance, are referred to in academia under the rubric of "Keynesian economics", due to Keynes's role in consolidating, elaborating, and popularizing them.

Keynes and the classics

Keynes sought to distinguish his theories from and oppose them to "classical economics," by which he meant the economic theories of David Ricardo and his followers, including John Stuart Mill, Alfred Marshall, Francis Ysidro Edgeworth, and Arthur Cecil Pigou. A central tenet of the classical view, known as Say's law, states that "supply creates its own demand." Say's Law can be interpreted in two ways. First, the claim that the total value of output is equal to the sum of income earned in production is a result of a national income accounting identity, and is therefore indisputable. A second and stronger claim, however, that the "costs of output are always covered in the aggregate by the sale-proceeds resulting from demand" depends on how consumption and saving are linked to production and investment. In particular, Keynes argued that the second, strong form of Say's Law only holds if increases in individual savings exactly match an increase in aggregate investment.[13]

Keynes sought to develop a theory that would explain determinants of saving, consumption, investment and production. In that theory, the interaction of aggregate demand and aggregate supply determines the level of output and employment in the economy.
Because of what he considered the failure of the "Classical Theory" in the 1930s, Keynes firmly objects to its main theory—adjustments in prices would automatically make demand tend to the full employment level.

Neo-classical theory supports that the two main costs that shift demand and supply are labor and money. Through the distribution of the monetary policy, demand and supply can be adjusted. If there were more labor than demand for it, wages would fall until hiring began again. If there were too much saving, and not enough consumption, then interest rates would fall until people either cut their savings rate or started borrowing.

**Wages and spending**

During the Great Depression, the classical theory defined economic collapse as simply a lost incentive to produce, and the mass unemployment as a result of high and rigid real wages.

To Keynes, the determination of wages is more complicated. First, he argued that it is not real but nominal wages that are set in negotiations between employers and workers, as opposed to a barter relationship. Second, nominal wage cuts would be difficult to put into effect because of laws and wage contracts. Even classical economists admitted that these exist; unlike Keynes, they advocated abolishing minimum wages, unions, and long-term contracts, increasing labor-market flexibility. However, to Keynes, people will resist nominal wage reductions, even without unions, until they see other wages falling and a general fall of prices.

He also argued that to boost employment, real wages had to go down: Nominal wages would have to fall more than prices. However, doing so would reduce consumer demand, so that the aggregate demand for goods would drop. This would in turn reduce business sales revenues and expected profits. Investment in new plants and equipment—perhaps already discouraged by previous excesses—would then become more risky, less likely. Instead of raising business expectations, wage cuts could make matters much worse.

Further, if wages and prices were falling, people would start to expect them to fall. This could make the economy spiral downward as those who had money would simply wait as falling prices made it more valuable—rather than spending. As Irving Fisher argued in 1933, in his Debt-Deflation Theory of Great Depressions, deflation (falling prices) can make a depression deeper as falling prices and wages made pre-existing nominal debts more valuable in real terms.

**Excessive saving**

To Keynes, excessive saving, i.e. saving beyond planned investment, was a serious problem, encouraging recession or even depression. Excessive saving results if investment falls, perhaps due to falling consumer demand, over-investment in earlier years, or pessimistic business expectations, and if saving does not immediately fall in step, the economy would decline.

The classical economists argued that interest rates would fall due to the excess supply of "loanable funds". The first diagram, adapted from the only graph in The General Theory, shows this process. (For simplicity, other sources of the demand for or supply of funds are ignored here.) Assume that fixed investment in capital goods falls from "old I" to "new I" (step a). Second (step b), the resulting excess of saving causes interest-rate cuts, abolishing the excess supply: so again we have saving (S) equal to investment. The interest-rate (i) fall prevents that of production and employment.

Keynes had a complex argument against this laissez-faire response. The graph below summarizes his argument, assuming again that fixed investment falls (step A). First, saving does not fall much as interest rates fall, since the income and substitution effects of falling rates go in conflicting directions. Second, since planned fixed investment in
plant and equipment is based mostly on long-term expectations of future profitability, that spending does not rise much as interest rates fall. So $S$ and $I$ are drawn as steep (inelastic) in the graph. Given the inelasticity of both demand and supply, a large interest-rate fall is needed to close the saving/investment gap. As drawn, this requires a negative interest rate at equilibrium (where the new $I$ line would intersect the old $S$ line). However, this negative interest rate is not necessary to Keynes's argument.

Third, Keynes argued that saving and investment are not the main determinants of interest rates, especially in the short run. Instead, the supply of and the demand for the stock of money determine interest rates in the short run. (This is not drawn in the graph.) Neither changes quickly in response to excessive saving to allow fast interest-rate adjustment.

Finally, Keynes suggested that, because of fear of capital losses on assets besides money, there may be a "liquidity trap" setting a floor under which interest rates cannot fall. While in this trap, interest rates are so low that any increase in money supply will cause bond-holders (fearing rises in interest rates and hence capital losses on their bonds) to sell their bonds to attain money (liquidity). In the diagram, the equilibrium suggested by the new $I$ line and the old $S$ line cannot be reached, so that excess saving persists. Some (such as Paul Krugman) see this latter kind of liquidity trap as prevailing in Japan in the 1990s. Most economists agree that nominal interest rates cannot fall below zero. However, some economists (particularly those from the Chicago school) reject the existence of a liquidity trap. Even if the liquidity trap does not exist, there is a fourth (perhaps most important) element to Keynes's critique. Saving involves not spending all of one's income. Thus, it means insufficient demand for business output, unless it is balanced by other sources of demand, such as fixed investment. Therefore, excessive saving corresponds to an unwanted accumulation of inventories, or what classical economists called a general glut. This pile-up of unsold goods and materials encourages businesses to decrease both production and employment. This in turn lowers people's incomes—and saving, causing a leftward shift in the $S$ line in the diagram (step B). For Keynes, the fall in income did most of the job by ending excessive saving and allowing the loanable funds market to attain equilibrium. Instead of interest-rate adjustment solving the problem, a recession does so. Thus in the diagram, the interest-rate change is small.

Whereas the classical economists assumed that the level of output and income was constant and given at any one time (except for short-lived deviations), Keynes saw this as the key variable that adjusted to equate saving and investment.
Finally, a recession undermines the business incentive to engage in fixed investment. With falling incomes and demand for products, the desired demand for factories and equipment (not to mention housing) will fall. This accelerator effect would shift the I line to the left again, a change not shown in the diagram above. This recreates the problem of excessive saving and encourages the recession to continue.

In sum, to Keynes there is interaction between excess supplies in different markets, as unemployment in labor markets encourages excessive saving—and vice-versa. Rather than prices adjusting to attain equilibrium, the main story is one of quantity adjustment allowing recessions and possible attainment of underemployment equilibrium.

**Active fiscal policy**

As noted, the classicals wanted to balance the government budget. To Keynes, this would exacerbate the underlying problem: following either the expansionary policy or the contractionary policy would raise saving (broadly defined) and thus lower the demand for both products and labor. For example, Keynesians would advise tax cuts instead.[15] Keynes' ideas influenced Franklin D. Roosevelt's view that insufficient buying-power caused the Depression. During his presidency, Roosevelt adopted some aspects of Keynesian economics, especially after 1937, when, in the depths of the Depression, the United States suffered from recession yet again following fiscal contraction. But to many the true success of Keynesian policy can be seen at the onset of World War II, which provided a kick to the world economy, removed uncertainty, and forced the rebuilding of destroyed capital. Keynesian ideas became almost official in social-democratic Europe after the war and in the U.S. in the 1960s.

Keynes' theory suggested that active government policy could be effective in managing the economy. Rather than seeing unbalanced government budgets as wrong, Keynes advocated what has been called countercyclical fiscal policies, that is, policies that acted against the tide of the business cycle: deficit spending when a nation's economy suffers from recession or when recovery is long-delayed and unemployment is persistently high—and the suppression of inflation in boom times by either increasing taxes or cutting back on government outlays. He argued that governments should solve problems in the short run rather than waiting for market forces to do it in the long run, because, "in the long run, we are all dead."[16]

This contrasted with the classical and neoclassical economic analysis of fiscal policy. Fiscal stimulus (deficit spending) could actuate production. But, to these schools, there was no reason to believe that this stimulation would outrun the side-effects that "crowd out" private investment: first, it would increase the demand for labor and raise wages, hurting profitability; Second, a government deficit increases the stock of government bonds, reducing their market price and encouraging high interest rates, making it more expensive for business to finance fixed investment. Thus, efforts to stimulate the economy would be self-defeating.

The Keynesian response is that such fiscal policy is appropriate only when unemployment is persistently high, above the non-accelerating inflation rate of unemployment (NAIRU). In that case, crowding out is minimal. Further, private investment can be "crowded in": Fiscal stimulus raises the market for business output, raising cash flow and profitability, spurring business optimism. To Keynes, this accelerator effect meant that government and business could be complements rather than substitutes in this situation. Second, as the stimulus occurs, gross domestic product rises, raising the amount of saving, helping to finance the increase in fixed investment. Finally, government outlays need not always be wasteful: government investment in public goods that will not be provided by profit-seekers will encourage the private sector's growth. That is, government spending on such things as basic research, public health, education, and infrastructure could help the long-term growth of potential output.

In Keynes' theory, there must be significant slack in the labor market before fiscal expansion is justified. Both conservative and some neoliberal economists question this assumption, unless labor unions or the government "meddle" in the free market, creating persistent supply-side or classical unemployment. Their solution is to increase labor-market flexibility, e.g., by cutting wages, busting unions, and deregulating business.

Contrary to some critical characterizations of it, Keynesianism does not consist solely of deficit spending. Keynesianism recommends counter-cyclical policies.[17] An example of a counter-cyclical policy is raising taxes to
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cool the economy and to prevent inflation when there is abundant demand-side growth, and engaging in deficit
spending on labor-intensive infrastructure projects to stimulate employment and stabilize wages during economic
downturns. Classical economics, on the other hand, argues that one should cut taxes when there are budget surpluses,
and cut spending—or, less likely, increase taxes—during economic downturns. Keynesian economists believe that
adding to profits and incomes during boom cycles through tax cuts, and removing income and profits from the
economy through cuts in spending and/or increased taxes during downturns, tends to exacerbate the negative effects
of the business cycle. This effect is especially pronounced when the government controls a large fraction of the
economy, and is therefore one reason fiscal conservatives advocate a much smaller government.

"Multiplier effect" and interest rates

Two aspects of Keynes' model had implications for policy:

First, there is the "Keynesian multiplier", first developed by Richard F. Kahn in 1931. Exogenous increases in
spending, such as an increase in government outlays, increases total spending by a multiple of that increase. A
government could stimulate a great deal of new production with a modest outlay if:

1. The people who receive this money then spend most on consumption goods and save the rest.
2. This extra spending allows businesses to hire more people and pay them, which in turn allows a further increase
consumer spending.

This process continues. At each step, the increase in spending is smaller than in the previous step, so that the
multiplier process tapers off and allows the attainment of an equilibrium. This story is modified and moderated if we
move beyond a "closed economy" and bring in the role of taxation: The rise in imports and tax payments at each step
reduces the amount of induced consumer spending and the size of the multiplier effect.

Second, Keynes re-analyzed the effect of the interest rate on investment. In the classical model, the supply of funds
(saving) determined the amount of fixed business investment. That is, since all savings was placed in banks, and all
business investors in need of borrowed funds went to banks, the amount of savings determined the amount that was
available to invest. To Keynes, the amount of investment was determined independently by long-term profit
expectations and, to a lesser extent, the interest rate. The latter opens the possibility of regulating the economy
through money supply changes, via monetary policy. Under conditions such as the Great Depression, Keynes argued
that this approach would be relatively ineffective compared to fiscal policy. But, during more "normal" times,
monetary expansion can stimulate the economy.

Postwar Keynesianism

Keynes' ideas became widely accepted after WWII, and until the early 1970s, Keynesian economics provided the
main inspiration for economic policy makers in Western industrialized countries. Governments prepared high
quality economic statistics on an ongoing basis and tried to base their policies on the Keynesian theory that had
become the norm. In the early era of new liberalism and social democracy, most western capitalist countries enjoyed
low, stable unemployment and modest inflation, an era called the Golden Age of Capitalism.

In terms of policy, the twin tools of post-war Keynesian economics were fiscal policy and monetary policy. While
these are credited to Keynes, others, such as economic historian David Colander, argue that they are, rather, due to
the interpretation of Keynes by Abba Lerner in his theory of Functional Finance, and should instead be called
"Lernerian" rather than "Keynesian".[19]

Through the 1950s, moderate degrees of government demand leading industrial development, and use of fiscal and
monetary counter-cyclical policies continued, and reached a peak in the "go go" 1960s, where it seemed to many
Keynesians that prosperity was now permanent. In 1971, Republican US President Richard Nixon even proclaimed
"we are all Keynesians now".[20] However, with the oil shock of 1973, and the economic problems of the 1970s,
modern liberal economics began to fall out of favor. During this time, many economies experienced high and rising
unemployment, coupled with high and rising inflation, contradicting the Phillips curve's prediction. This stagflation meant that the simultaneous application of expansionary (anti-recession) and contractionary (anti-inflation) policies appeared to be necessary. This dilemma led to the end of the Keynesian near-consensus of the 1960s, and the rise throughout the 1970s of ideas based upon more classical analysis, including monetarism, supply-side economics, and new classical economics. At the same time, Keynesians began during the period to reorganize their thinking (some becoming associated with New Keynesian economics); one strategy, utilized also as a critique of the notably high unemployment and potentially disappointing GNP growth rates associated with the latter two theories by the mid-1980s, was to emphasize low unemployment and maximal economic growth at the cost of somewhat higher inflation (its consequences kept in check by indexing and other methods, and its overall rate kept lower and steadier by such potential policies as Martin Weitzman's share economy).

Multiple schools of economic thought that trace their legacy to Keynes currently exist, the notable ones being Neo-Keynesian economics, New Keynesian economics, and Post-Keynesian economics. Keynes' biographer Robert Skidelsky writes that the post-Keynesian school has remained closest to the spirit of Keynes' work in following his monetary theory and rejecting the neutrality of money.

In the postwar era, Keynesian analysis was combined with neoclassical economics to produce what is generally termed the "neoclassical synthesis", yielding Neo-Keynesian economics, which dominated mainstream macroeconomic thought. Though it was widely held that there was no strong automatic tendency to full employment, many believed that if government policy were used to ensure it, the economy would behave as neoclassical theory predicted. This post-war domination by Neo-Keynesian economics was broken during the stagflation of the 1970s. There was a lack of consensus among macroeconomists in the 1980s. However, the advent of New Keynesian economics in the 1990s, modified and provided microeconomic foundations for the neo-Keynesian theories. These modified models now dominate mainstream economics.

Post-Keynesian economists, on the other hand, reject the neoclassical synthesis and, in general, neoclassical economics applied to the macroeconomy. Post-Keynesian economics is a heterodox school that holds that both Neo-Keynesian economics and New Keynesian economics are incorrect, and a misinterpretation of Keynes' ideas. The Post-Keynesian school encompasses a variety of perspectives, but has been far less influential than the other more mainstream Keynesian schools.

**Main theories**

The two key theories of mainstream Keynesian economics are the IS-LM model of John Hicks and the Phillips curve; both of these are rejected by Post-Keynesians.

It was with John Hicks that Keynesian economics produced a clear model that policy-makers could use to attempt to understand and control economic activity. This model, the IS-LM model is nearly as influential as Keynes' original analysis in determining actual policy and economics education. It relates aggregate demand and employment to three exogenous quantities, i.e., the amount of money in circulation, the government budget, and the state of business expectations. This model was very popular with economists after World War II because it could be understood in terms of general equilibrium theory. This encouraged a much more static vision of macroeconomics than that described above.

The second main part of a Keynesian policy-maker's theoretical apparatus was the Phillips curve. This curve, which was more of an empirical observation than a theory, indicated that increased employment, and decreased unemployment, implied increased inflation. Keynes had only predicted that falling unemployment would cause a higher price, not a higher inflation rate. Thus, the economist could use the IS-LM model to predict, for example, that an increase in the money supply would raise output and employment—and then use the Phillips curve to predict an increase in inflation.
Criticisms

Monetarist criticisms
One school began in the late 1940s with Milton Friedman. Instead of rejecting macro-measurements and macro-models of the economy, the monetarist school embraced the techniques of treating the entire economy as having a supply and demand equilibrium. However, because of Irving Fisher's equation of exchange, they regarded inflation as solely being due to the variations in the money supply, rather than as being a consequence of aggregate demand. They argued that the "crowding out" effects discussed above would hobble or deprive fiscal policy of its positive effect. Instead, the focus should be on monetary policy, which was considered ineffective by early Keynesians.

Neoclassical criticisms
Beginning in the late 1950s neoclassical macroeconomists began to disagree with the methodology employed by Keynes and his successors. Keynesians emphasized the dependence of consumption on disposable income and, also, of investment on current profits and current cash flow. In addition, Keynesians posited a Phillips curve that tied nominal wage inflation to unemployment rate. To support these theories, Keynesians typically traced the logical foundations of their model (using introspection) and supported their assumptions with statistical evidence.[24] Neoclassical theorists demanded that macroeconomics be grounded on the same foundations as microeconomic theory, profit-maximizing firms and rational, utility-maximizing consumers.[24] The result of this shift in methodology produced several important divergences from Keynesian Macroeconomics:[24]
1. Independence of Consumption and current Income (life-cycle permanent income hypothesis)
2. Irrelevance of Current Profits to Investment (Modigliani-Miller theorem)
3. Long run independence of inflation and unemployment (natural rate of unemployment)
4. The inability of monetary policy to stabilize output (rational expectations)
5. Irrelevance of Taxes and Budget Deficits to Consumption (Ricardian Equivalence)

Austrian School criticisms
Austrian economist Friedrich Hayek criticized Keynesian economic policies for what he called their fundamentally collectivist approach, arguing that such theories encourage centralized planning, which leads to malinvestment of capital, which is the cause of business cycles. Hayek also argued that Keynes' study of the aggregate relations in an economy is fallacious, as recessions are caused by micro-economic factors. Hayek claimed that what starts as temporary governmental fixes usually become permanent and expanding government programs, which stifle the private sector and civil society.[25]

Other Austrian school economists have also attacked Keynesian economics. Henry Hazlitt criticized, paragraph by paragraph, Keynes' General Theory in The Failure of the New Economics.[26] Murray Rothbard accuses Keynesianism of having "its roots deep in medieval and mercantilist thought."[27]

New Classical Macroeconomics criticisms
Another influential school of thought was based on the Lucas critique of Keynesian economics. This called for greater consistency with microeconomic theory and rationality, and in particular emphasized the idea of rational expectations. Lucas and others argued that Keynesian economics required remarkably foolish and short-sighted behavior from people, which totally contradicted the economic understanding of their behavior at a micro level. New classical economics introduced a set of macroeconomic theories that were based on optimising microeconomic behavior. These models have been developed into the Real Business Cycle Theory, which argues that business cycle fluctuations can to a large extent be accounted for by real (in contrast to nominal) shocks.
Keynesian responses

The heart of the 'new Keynesian' view rests on microeconomic models that indicate that nominal wages and prices are "sticky," i.e., do not change easily or quickly with changes in supply and demand, so that quantity adjustment prevails. According to economist Paul Krugman, "while I regard the evidence for such stickiness as overwhelming, the assumption of at least temporarily rigid nominal prices is one of those things that works beautifully in practice but very badly in theory."[28] This integration is further spurred by the work of other economists that questions rational decision-making in a perfect information environment as a necessity for micro-economic theory. Imperfect decision-making such as that investigated by Joseph Stiglitz underlines the importance of management of risk in the economy.

Over time, many macroeconomists have returned to the IS-LM model and the Phillips curve as a first approximation of how an economy works. New versions of the Phillips curve, such as the "Triangle Model", allow for stagflation, since the curve can shift due to supply shocks or changes in built-in inflation. In the 1990s, the original ideas of "full employment" had been modified by the NAIRU doctrine, sometimes called the "natural rate of unemployment." NAIRU advocates suggest restraint in combating unemployment, in case accelerating inflation should result. However, it is unclear exactly what the value of the NAIRU should be—or whether it even exists.

The Crash of 2008 led to a revival of interest in and debate about Keynes. Keynes' biographer, Robert Skidelsky, wrote a book entitled Keynes: The Return of the Master.[29] Other books about Keynes published immediately following the Crash were generally favorable.[30]
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[19] "What eventually became known as textbook Keynesian policies were in many ways Lerner's interpretations of Keynes's policies, especially those expounded in *The Economics of Control* (1944) and later in *The Economics of Employment* (1951). . . . Textbook expositions of Keynesian policy naturally gravitated to the black and white 'Lernerian' policy of Functional Finance rather than the gray Keynesian policies. Thus, the vision that monetary and fiscal policy should be used as a balance wheel, which forms a key element in the textbook policy revolution, deserves to be called Lernerian rather than Keynesian." (Colander 1984, p. 1573)
Further reading

Neoclassical synthesis

Neoclassical synthesis is a postwar academic movement in economics that attempts to absorb the macroeconomic thought of John Maynard Keynes into the thought of neoclassical economics. Mainstream economics is largely dominated by the resulting synthesis, being largely Keynesian in macroeconomics and neoclassical in microeconomics.\[1\]

The theory was mainly developed by John Hicks, and popularized by the mathematical economist Paul Samuelson, who seems to have coined the term, and helped disseminate the "synthesis," partly through his technical writing and in his influential textbook, Economics.\[2\]\[3\] The process began soon after the publication of Keynes' General Theory with the IS/LM model first presented by John Hicks in a 1937 article.\[4\] It continued with adaptations of the supply and demand model of markets to Keynesian theory. It represents incentives and costs as playing a pervasive role in shaping decision making. An immediate example of this is the consumer theory of individual demand, which isolates how prices (as costs) and income affect quantity demanded.

Notes

Socialism

Socialism /ˈsoʊɪzm/ is an economic system characterized by social ownership or control of the means of production and cooperative management of the economy,[1] and a political philosophy advocating such a system. "Social ownership" may refer to any one of, or a combination of, the following: cooperative enterprises, common ownership, direct public ownership or autonomous state enterprises.[2] There are many variations of socialism and as such there is no single definition encapsulating all of socialism.[3] They differ in the type of social ownership they advocate, the degree to which they rely on markets versus planning, how management is to be organized within economic enterprises, and the role of the state in constructing socialism.[4]

A socialist economic system would consist of an organization of production to directly satisfy economic demands and human needs, so that goods and services would be produced directly for use instead of for private profit driven by the accumulation of capital, and accounting would be based on physical quantities, a common physical magnitude, or a direct measure of labour-time.[5][6] Distribution of output would be based on the principle of individual contribution.

As a political movement, socialism includes a diverse array of political philosophies, ranging from reformism to revolutionary socialism. Proponents of state socialism advocate for the nationalisation of the means of production, distribution and exchange as a strategy for implementing socialism. Social democrats advocate redistributive taxation in the form of social welfare and government regulation of capital within the framework of a market economy.[7] In contrast, anarchism and libertarian socialism propose direct worker's control of the means of production and oppose the use of state power to achieve such an arrangement, opposing both parliamentary politics and state ownership over the means of production.

Modern socialism originated from an 18th-century intellectual and working class political movement that criticised the effects of industrialisation and private property on society. In the early 19th-century, "socialism" referred to any concern for the social problems of capitalism regardless of the solution. However, by the late 19th-century, "socialism" had come to signify opposition to capitalism and advocacy for an alternative system based on some form of social ownership.[8] Utopian socialists such as Robert Owen (1771–1858) tried to found self-sustaining communes by secession from a capitalist society. Socialists inspired by the Soviet model of economic development, such as Marxist-Leninists, have advocated the creation of centrally planned economies directed by a single-party state that owns the means of production. Yugoslavian, Hungarian, East German and Chinese communist governments have instituted various forms of market socialism, combining co-operative and state ownership models with the free market exchange and free price system (but not free prices for the means of production).[9]

Philosophy

Further information: Socialist critique of capitalism

Socialists adhere to a diverse range of philosophical views. Marxian socialism is philosophically materialist as well as having at its centre a commitment to historical materialism. Many forms of socialist theory hold that human behaviour is largely shaped by the social environment. In particular, Marxism and socialists inspired by Marxist theory, holds that social mores, values, cultural traits and economic practices are social creations, and are not the result of an immutable natural law.[10] The ultimate goal for Marxist socialists is the emancipation of labour from alienating work. Marxists argue that freeing the individual from the necessity of performing alienating work in order to receive goods would allow people to pursue their own interests and develop their own talents without being coerced into performing labour for others. For Marxists, the stage of economic development in which this is possible is contingent upon advances in the productive capabilities of society.

Socialists generally argue that capitalism concentrates power and wealth within a small segment of society that controls the means of production and derives its wealth through a system of exploitation. This creates a stratified
society based on unequal social relations that fails to provide equal opportunities for every individual to maximize their potential, and does not utilise available technology and resources to their maximum potential in the interests of the public, and focuses on satisfying market-induced wants as opposed to human needs. Socialists argue that socialism would allow for wealth to be distributed based on how much one contributes to society, as opposed to how much capital one holds.

Socialists hold that capitalism is an illegitimate economic system, since it largely serves the interests of the owners of capital and involves the exploitation of other economic classes. As such, they wish to replace it completely or at least make substantial modifications to it, in order to create a more just society that would guarantee a certain basic standard of living. A primary goal of socialism is social equality and a distribution of wealth based on one's contribution to society, and an economic arrangement that would serve the interests of society as a whole.

Economics

The original conception of socialism was an economic system whereby production was organized in a way to directly produce goods and services for their use-value; the direct allocation of resources according to satisfy economic demands without financial calculation and the mobilization of the economy based on physical units as opposed to the economic laws of capitalism (see: Law of value), often entailing the end of capitalistic economic categories such as rent, interest, profit and money. The output generated by a socialist economy, that is, goods and services for consumption, would be distributed through markets. This is contrasted with capitalism, where production is carried out for profit, and thus based upon indirect allocation. In an ideal capitalism based on perfect competition, competitive pressures compel business enterprises to respond to the needs of consumers, so that the pursuit of profit approximates production for use through an indirect process (competitive pressures on private firms).

Market socialism refers to an array of different economic theories and systems that utilize the market mechanism to organize production and to allocate factor inputs among socially-owned enterprises, with the economic surplus (profits) accruing to society as a social dividend as opposed to private capital owners. Variations of market socialism include Libertarian proposals such as mutualism, and neoclassical economic models such as the Lange Model.

The ownership of the means of production can be based on direct ownership by the users of the productive property through worker cooperative; or commonly owned by all of society with management and control delegated to those who operate/use the means of production; or public ownership by a state apparatus. Public ownership may refer to the creation of state-owned enterprises, nationalisation or municipalisation. The fundamental feature of a socialist economy is that publicly owned, worker-run institutions produce goods and services in at least the commanding heights of the economy.

Management and control over the activities of enterprises is based on self-management and self-governance, with equal power-relations in the workplace to maximize occupational autonomy. A socialist form of organization would eliminate controlling hierarchies so that only a hierarchy based on technical knowledge in the workplace remains. Every member would have decision-making power in the firm and would be able to participate in establishing its overall policy objectives. The policies/goals would be carried out by the technical specialists that form the coordinating hierarchy of the firm, who would establish plans or directives for the work community to accomplish these goals.

"I am convinced there is only one way to eliminate (the) grave evils (of capitalism), namely through the establishment of a socialist economy, accompanied by an educational system which would be oriented toward social goals. In such an economy, the means of production are owned by society itself and are utilized in a planned fashion. A planned economy, which adjusts production to the needs of the community, would distribute the work to be done among all those able to work and would guarantee a livelihood to every man, woman, and child. The education of the individual, in addition to promoting his own innate abilities, would
attempt to develop in him a sense of responsibility for his fellow-men in place of the glorification of power and success in our present society.”

— Albert Einstein, Why Socialism?, 1949\[20\]

**Planned economy**

A planned economy combines public ownership of the means of production with centralised state planning. This model is usually associated with the centralised Soviet-style command economy. In a centrally planned economy, decisions regarding the quantity of goods and services to be produced are planned in advance by a planning agency. This type of economic system was often combined with a single-party political system, and is thus associated with the Communist states of the 20th century.

In the economy of the Soviet Union, state ownership of the means of production was combined with central planning, in relation to which goods and services were to be provided, how they were to be produced, the quantities, and the sale prices. Soviet economic planning was an alternative to allowing the market (supply and demand) to determine prices for producer and consumer goods. The Soviet economy utilized material balance accounting in order to balance the supply of available inputs with output targets, although this never totally replaced financial accounting. Although the Soviet economy was nominally a centrally-planned economy, in practice the plan was formulated on-the-go as information was collected and relayed from enterprises to planning ministries.

Socialist economists and political theorists have criticised the notion that the Soviet-style planned economies were socialist economies. They argue that the Soviet economy was structured upon the accumulation of capital and the extraction of surplus value from the working class by the planning agency in order to reinvest this surplus in new production – or to distribute to managers and senior officials, indicating the Soviet Union (and other Soviet-style economies) were state capitalist economies\[21\]. Other socialists have focused on the lack of self-management, the existence of financial calculation and a bureaucratic elite based on hierarchical and centralized powers of authority in the Soviet model, leading them to conclude that they were not socialist but either bureaucratic collectivism, state capitalism or deformed workers' states.

**Self-managed economy**

A self-managed decentralized economy is based upon autonomous self-regulating economic actors and a decentralized mechanism of allocation and decision-making. Historically, this manifested itself in proposals for worker-cooperatives and bottom-up planning through workplace democracy. A degree of self-management was practiced in the economic system of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which contrasts to the centralized planning of enterprises in Soviet-style planned economies.

One such system is the cooperative economy, a largely free market economy in which workers manage the firms and democratically determine remuneration levels and labour divisions. Productive resources would be legally owned by the cooperative and rented to the workers, who would enjoy usufruct rights.\[22\] Another form of decentralized planning is the use of cybernetics, or the use of computers to manage the allocation of economic inputs. The socialist-run government of Salvador Allende in Chile experimented with Project Cybersyn, a real-time information bridge between the government, state enterprises and consumers.\[23\] Another, more recent, variant is participatory economics, wherein the economy is planned by decentralised councils of workers and consumers. Workers would be remunerated solely according to effort and sacrifice, so that those engaged in dangerous, uncomfortable, and strenuous work would receive the highest incomes and could thereby work less.\[24\] A contemporary model for a self-managed, non-market socialism is Pat Devine's model of negotiated coordination. Negotiated coordination is based upon social ownership by those affected by the use of the assets involved, with decisions made by those at the most localized level of production.\[25\]

Michel Bauwens identifies the emergence of the open software movement and peer-to-peer production as a new, alternative mode of production to the capitalist economy and centrally-planned economy that is based on
collaborative self-management, common ownership of resources, and the production of use-values through the free cooperation of producers who have access to distributed capital.²⁶

Anarchist communism is a theory of anarchism which advocates the abolition of the state, private property, and capitalism in favor of common ownership of the means of production.²⁷²⁸ De-centralized planning is associated with the political movements of social anarchism, anarcho-communism, Trotskyism, council communism, left communism and democratic socialism.

**State-directed economy**

A state-directed economy is a system where either the state or worker cooperatives own the means of production, but economic activity is directed to some degree by a government agency or planning ministry through coordinating mechanisms such as indicative planning and dirigisme. This differs from a centralised planned economy (or a command economy) in that micro-economic decision making, such as quantity to be produced and output requirements, are left to managers and workers in the state and cooperative enterprises rather than being mandated by a comprehensive economic plan from a centralised planning board. However, the state will plan long-term strategic investment and seek to coordinate at least some aspects of production. It is possible for a state-directed economy to have elements of both a market and planned economy. For example, investment decisions may be semi-planned by the state, but decisions regarding production may be determined by the market mechanism.

State-directed socialism can also refer to technocratic socialism; economic systems that rely on technocratic management over the means of production and economic policy.

In western Europe, particularly in the period after World War II, many socialist and social democratic parties in government implemented what became known as mixed economies, some of which included a degree of state-directed economic activity. In the biography of the 1945 UK Labour Party Prime Minister Clement Attlee, Francis Beckett states: "the government... wanted what would become known as a mixed economy".²⁹ Beckett also states that "Everyone called the 1945 government 'socialist'.” These governments nationalised major and economically vital industries while permitting a free market to continue in the rest. These were most often monopolistic or infrastructural industries like mail, railways, power and other utilities. In some instances a number of small, competing and often relatively poorly financed companies in the same sector were nationalised to form one government monopoly for the purpose of competent management, of economic rescue (in the UK, British Leyland, Rolls-Royce), or of competing on the world market.

Nationalisation in the UK was achieved through compulsory purchase of the industry (i.e. with compensation). British Aerospace was a combination of major aircraft companies British Aircraft Corporation, Hawker Siddeley and others. British Shipbuilders was a combination of the major shipbuilding companies including Cammell Laird, Govan Shipbuilders, Swan Hunter, and Yarrow Shipbuilders; the nationalisation of the coal mines in 1947 created a coal board charged with running the coal industry commercially so as to be able to meet the interest payable on the bonds which the former mine owners' shares had been converted into.³⁰³¹

**Market socialism**

Market socialism consists of publicly owned or cooperatively owned enterprises operating in a market economy. It is a system that utilizes the market and monetary prices for the allocation and accounting of the means of production, thereby retaining the process of capital accumulation. The profit generated would be used to directly remunerate employees or finance public institutions.³² In state-oriented forms of market socialism, in which state enterprises attempt to maximise profit, the profits can be used to fund government programs and services through a social dividend, eliminating or greatly diminishing the need for various forms of taxation that exist in capitalist systems. The neoclassical economist Leon Walras believed that a socialist economy based on state ownership of land and natural resources would provide a means of public finance to make income taxes unnecessary.³³ Yugoslavia implemented a market socialist economy based on cooperatives and worker self-management.
The current economic system in China is formally titled Socialist market economy with Chinese characteristics. It combines a large state sector that comprises the 'commanding heights' of the economy, which are guaranteed their public ownership status by law, with a private sector mainly engaged in commodity production and light industry responsible from anywhere between 33% to over 70% of GDP generated in 2005. However by 2005 these market-oriented reforms, including privatization, virtually halted and were partially reversed. The current Chinese economy consists of 150 corporatized state enterprises that report directly to China's central government. By 2008, these state-owned corporations had become increasingly dynamic and generated large increases in revenue for the state, resulting in a state-sector led recovery during the 2009 financial crises while accounting for most of China's economic growth.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has adopted a similar model after the Doi Moi economic renovation, but slightly differs from the Chinese model in that the Vietnamese government retains firm control over the state sector and strategic industries, but allows for private-sector activity in commodity production. However, the lack of self-management in economic enterprises and the increasing role of privatization suggests that these economies actually represent state capitalism instead of genuine market socialism.

**Social and Political theory**

Marxist and non-Marxist social theorists agree that socialism developed in reaction to modern industrial capitalism, but disagree on the nature of their relationship. In this context, socialism has been used to refer to a political movement, a political philosophy and a hypothetical form of society these movements aim to achieve. As a result, in a political context socialism has come to refer to the strategy (for achieving a socialist society) or policies promoted by socialist organisations and socialist political parties; all of which have no connection to socialism as a socioeconomic system.

**Marxism**

In the most influential of all socialist theories, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels believed the consciousness of those who earn a wage or salary (the "working class" in the broadest Marxist sense) would be molded by their "conditions" of "wage-slavery", leading to a tendency to seek their freedom or "emancipation" by overthrowing ownership of the means of production by capitalists. For Marx and Engels, conditions determine consciousness and ending the role of the capitalist class leads eventually to a classless society in which the state would wither away.

Marx wrote: "It is not the consciousness of [people] that determines their existence, but their social existence that determines their consciousness." The Marxist conception of socialism is that of a specific historical phase that will displace capitalism and precede communism. The major characteristics of socialism (particularly as conceived by Marx and Engels after the Paris Commune of 1871) are that the proletariat will control the means of production through a workers' state erected by the workers in their interests. Economic activity would still be organised through the use of incentive systems and social classes would still exist, but to a lesser and diminishing extent than under capitalism.

For orthodox Marxists, socialism is the lower stage of communism based on the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his contribution" while upper stage communism is based on the principle of "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need"; the upper stage becoming possible only after the socialist stage further develops economic efficiency and the automation of production has led to a superabundance of goods and services.
Marx argued that the material productive forces (in industry and commerce) brought into existence by capitalism predicated a cooperative society since production had become a mass social, collective activity of the working class to create commodities but with private ownership (the relations of production or property relations). This conflict between collective effort in large factories and private ownership would bring about a conscious desire in the working class to establish collective ownership commensurate with the collective efforts their daily experience. 

"At a certain stage of development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production or – this merely expresses the same thing in legal terms – with the property relations within the framework of which they have operated hitherto. Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure."[46] A socialist society based on democratic cooperation thus arises. Eventually the state, associated with all previous societies which are divided into classes for the purpose of suppressing the oppressed classes, withers away.

By contrast, Émile Durkheim posits that socialism is rooted in the desire to bring the state closer to the realm of individual activity, in countering the anomic of a capitalist society, considering that socialism "simply represented a system in which moral principles discovered by scientific sociology could be applied". Durkheim could be considered a modern social democrat for advocating social reforms, but rejecting the creation of a socialist society.[47]

Che Guevara sought socialism based on the rural peasantry rather than the urban working class, attempting to inspire the peasants of Bolivia by his own example into a change of consciousness. Guevara said in 1965:

Socialism cannot exist without a change in consciousness resulting in a new fraternal attitude toward humanity, both at an individual level, within the societies where socialism is being built or has been built, and on a world scale, with regard to all peoples suffering from imperialist oppression.[48]

In the middle of the 20th century, socialist intellectuals retained considerable influence in European philosophy. Eros and Civilisation (1955), by Herbert Marcuse, explicitly attempted to merge Marxism with Freudianism. The social science of Marxist structuralism had a significant influence on the socialist New Left in the 1960s and the 1970s.

**Utopian versus scientific**

The distinction between "utopian" and "scientific" socialism was first explicitly made by Friedrich Engels in Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, which contrasted the "utopian pictures of ideal social conditions" of social reformers with the Marxian concept of scientific socialism. Scientific socialism begins with the examination of social and economic phenomena—the empirical study of real processes in society and history.

For Marxists, the development of capitalism in western Europe provided a material basis for the possibility of bringing about socialism because, according to the Communist Manifesto, "What the bourgeoisie produces above all is its own grave diggers",[49] namely the working class, which must become conscious of the historical objectives set it by society.

Eduard Bernstein revised this theory to suggest that society is inevitably moving toward socialism, bringing in a mechanical and teleological element to Marxism and initiating the concept of evolutionary socialism. Thorstein Veblen saw socialism as an immediate stage in an ongoing evolutionary process in economics that would result from the natural decay of the system of business enterprise; in contrast to Marx, he did not believe it would be the result of political struggle or revolution by the working class and did not believe it to be the ultimate goal of humanity.[50]

Utopian socialists establish a set of ideals or goals and present socialism as an alternative to capitalism, with subjectively better attributes. Examples of this form of socialism include Robert Owen's New Harmony community.
**Reform versus revolution**

Reformists, such as classical social democrats, believe that a socialist system can be achieved by reforming capitalism. Socialism, in their view, can be reached through the existing political system by electing socialists to political office to implement economic reforms.

Revolutionary socialism holds that such methods will fail because the state ultimately acts in the interests of the capitalist class, and a socialist party will either be subsumed by the capitalist system or find itself unable to implement fundamental reforms. Revolutionary socialists believe that revolution is the only means to establish a new socio-economic system. Among revolutionary socialists, Leninists or Trotskyists advocate the creation of a democratic centralist revolutionary party to lead the working class in the overthrow of the capitalist state.

"Revolution" is not necessarily defined by revolutionary socialists as violent insurrection, but as a thorough and rapid change. Revolutionary syndicalists argue that revolutionary trade or industrial unions, as opposed to the state or workers' councils, are the only means to establish socialism.

Other theorists, such as Joseph Schumpeter, Thorstein Veblen and some of the Utopian socialists, believed that socialism would form naturally and spontaneously without, or with very limited, political action as the capitalist economic system decays into obsolescence.

**Socialism from above or below**

*Socialism from above* refers to the viewpoint that reforms or revolutions for socialism will come from, or be led by, higher status members of society who desire a more rational, efficient economic system. Claude Henri de Saint-Simon, and later evolutionary economist Thorstein Veblen, believed that socialism would be the result of innovative engineers, scientists and technicians who want to organise society and the economy in a rational fashion, instead of the working-class. Social democracy is often advocated by intellectuals and the middle-class, as well as the working class segments of the population. *Socialism from below* refers to the position that socialism can only come from, and be led by, popular solidarity and political action from the lower classes, such as the working class and lower-middle class. Proponents of socialism from below — such as syndicalists and orthodox Marxists — often liken socialism from above to elitism and/or Stalinism.

**Allocation of resources**

Resource allocation is the subject of intense debate between market socialists and proponents of economic planning.

Many socialists advocate de-centralized participatory planning, where economic decision-making is based on self-management and self-governance and a democratic manner from the bottom-up without any directing central authority. Leon Trotsky held the view that central planners, regardless of their intellectual capacity, operated without the input and participation of the millions of people who participate in the economy and understand/respond to local economic conditions; such central planners would be unable to effectively coordinate all economic activity.

On the other hand, Leninists and some State socialists advocate directive planning where directives are passed down from higher planning authorities to enterprise managers, who in turn give orders to workers.

**Equality of opportunity versus equality of outcome**

Proponents of *equality of opportunity* advocate a society in which there are equal opportunities and life chances for all individuals to maximise their potentials and attain positions in society. This would be made possible by equal access to the necessities of life. *Equality of outcome* refers to a state where everyone receives equal amounts of rewards and an equal level of power in decision-making, with the belief that all roles in society are necessary and therefore none should be rewarded more than others. This view is shared by some communal utopian socialists and Marxists and social democrats.anarcho-communists.
Politics

The major socialist political movements are described below. Independent socialist theorists, utopian socialist authors, and academic supporters of socialism may not be represented in these movements. Some political groups have called themselves socialist while holding views that some consider antithetical to socialism. The term socialist has also been used by some politicians on the political right as an epithet against certain individuals who do not consider themselves to be socialists, and against policies that are not considered socialist by their proponents.

There are many variations of socialism and as such there is no single definition encapsulating all of socialism. However there have been common elements identified by scholars. Angelo S. Rappoport in his Dictionary of Socialism (1924) analyzed forty definitions of socialism to conclude that common elements of socialism include: general criticisms of the social effects of private ownership and control of capital - as being the cause of poverty, low wages, unemployment, economic and social inequality, and a lack of economic security; a general view that the solution to these problems is a form of collective control over the means of production, distribution and exchange (the degree and means of control vary amongst socialist movements); agreement that the outcome of this collective control should be a society based upon social justice, including social equality, economic protection of people, and should provide a more satisfying life for most people. Bhikhu Parekh in The Concepts of Socialism (1975) identifies four core principles of socialism and particularly socialist society: sociality, social responsibility, cooperation, and planning. Michael Freeden in his study Ideologies and Political Theory (1996) states that all socialists share five themes: the first is that socialism posits that society is more than a mere collection of individuals; second, that it considers human welfare a desirable objective; third, that it considers humans by nature to be active and productive; fourth, it holds the belief of human equality; and fifth, that history is progressive and will create positive change on the condition that humans work to achieve such change.

Anarchism

Anarchism features the political philosophy which holds the state to be undesirable, unnecessary, and harmful, that the state cannot be used to establish a socialist economy and proposes a political alternative based on federated decentralized autonomous communities. It includes proponents of both individualist anarchism and social anarchism. Mutualists advocate free-market socialism, collectivist anarchists workers cooperatives and salaries based on the amount of time contributed to production, anarcho-communists advocate a direct transition from capitalism to libertarian communism and anarcho-syndicalists workers direct action and the general strike.

Democratic socialism

Modern democratic socialism is a broad political movement that seeks to propagate the ideals of socialism within the context of a democratic system. Many democratic socialists support social democracy as a road to reform of the current system, but others support more revolutionary tactics to establish socialist goals. Conversely, modern social democracy emphasises a program of gradual legislative reform of capitalism in order to make it more equitable and humane, while the theoretical end goal of building a socialist society is either completely forgotten or redefined in a pro-capitalist way. The two movements are widely similar both in terminology and in ideology, although there are a few key differences.

Democratic socialism generally refers to any political movement that seeks to establish an economy based on economic democracy by and for the working class. Democratic socialists oppose democratic centralism and the revolutionary vanguard party of Leninism. Democratic socialism is difficult to define, and groups of scholars have radically different definitions for the term. Some definitions simply refer to all forms of socialism that follow an electoral, reformist or evolutionary path to socialism, rather than a revolutionary one.
Leninism
Leninism promotes the creation of a vanguard party, led by professional revolutionaries, to lead the working class in the conquest of the state. They believe that socialism will not arise spontaneously through the natural decay of capitalism, and that workers by themselves are unable to organize and develop socialist consciousness, therefore requiring the leadership of a revolutionary vanguard. After taking power, Leninists seek to create a socialist state in which the working class would be in power, which they see as being essential for laying the foundations for a transitional withering of the state towards communism (Stateless society). Leninism branched into Marxism-Leninism, Trotskyism, Stalinism and Maoism.

Libertarian socialism
Libertarian socialism is a non-hierarchical, non-bureaucratic, stateless society without private property in the means of production. Libertarian socialists oppose all coercive forms of social organization, promote free association in place of government, and oppose the coercive social relations of capitalism, such as wage labor. They oppose hierarchical leadership structures, such as vanguard parties, and most are opposed to using the state to create socialism. Currents within libertarian socialism include Marxist tendencies such as left communism, council communism and autonomism, as well as non-Marxist movements such as Left anarchism, Communalism, Participism, and Inclusive Democracy.

Social democracy
Traditional social democrats advocated the creation of socialism through political reforms by operating within the existing political system of capitalism. The social democratic movement sought to elect socialists to political office to implement reforms. The modern social democratic movement has abandoned the goal of moving toward a socialist economy and instead advocates for social reforms to improve capitalism, such as a welfare state and unemployment benefits. It is best demonstrated by the economic format which has been used in Sweden, Denmark, Norway, and Finland in the past few decades. This approach been called the Nordic model.

Syndicalism
Syndicalism is a social movement that operates through industrial trade unions and rejects state socialism, or the use of the state to build socialism. Syndicalists advocate a socialist economy based on federated unions or syndicates of workers who own and manage the means of production.

History
The term socialism is attributed to Pierre Leroux, and to Marie Roch Louis Reybaud; and in Britain to Robert Owen in 1827, father of the cooperative movement. Socialist models and ideas espousing common or public ownership have existed since antiquity. Mazdak, a Persian communal proto-socialist, instituted communal possessions and advocated the public good. And it has been claimed, though controversially, that there were elements of socialist thought in the politics of classical Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle.

The first advocates of socialism favoured social levelling in order to create a meritocratic or technocratic society based upon individual talent. Count Henri de Saint-Simon is regarded as the first individual to coin the term socialism. Saint-Simon was fascinated by the enormous potential of science and technology and advocated a socialist society that would eliminate the disorderly aspects of capitalism and would be based upon equal opportunities. He advocated the creation of a society in which each person was ranked according to his or her capacities and rewarded according to his or her work. The key focus of Simon's socialism was on administrative efficiency and industrialism, and a belief that science was the key to progress.
This was accompanied by a desire to implement a rationally organised economy based on planning and geared towards large-scale scientific and material progress,\(^1\) and thus embodied a desire for a more directed or planned economy. Other early socialist thinkers, such as Thomas Hodgkin and Charles Hall, based their ideas on David Ricardo's economic theories. They reasoned that the equilibrium value of commodities approximated to prices charged by the producer when those commodities were in elastic supply, and that these producer prices corresponded to the embodied labour – the cost of the labour (essentially the wages paid) that was required to produce the commodities. The Ricardian socialists viewed profit, interest and rent as deductions from this exchange-value.\(^66\)

West European social critics, including Robert Owen, Charles Fourier, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Louis Blanc, Charles Hall and Saint-Simon, were the first modern socialists who criticised the excessive poverty and inequality of the Industrial Revolution. They advocated reform, with some such as Robert Owen advocating the transformation of society to small communities without private property. Robert Owen's contribution to modern socialism was his understanding that actions and characteristics of individuals were largely determined by the social environment they were raised in and exposed to.\(^65\) On the other hand Charles Fourier advocated phalansteres which were communities that respected individual desires (including sexual preferences), affinities and creativity and saw that work has to be made enjoyable for people.\(^67\) The ideas of Owen and Fourier were tried in practice in numerous intentional communities around Europe and the American continent in the mid-19th century.

Linguistically, the contemporary connotation of the words *socialism* and *communism* accorded with the adherents' and opponents' cultural attitude towards religion. In Christian Europe, of the two, communism was believed the atheist way of life. In Protestant England, the word *communism* was too culturally and aurally close to the Roman Catholic *communion rite*, hence English atheists denoted themselves socialists.\(^68\)

Friedrich Engels argued that in 1848, at the time when the *Communist Manifesto* was published, "socialism was respectable on the continent, while communism was not." The Owenites in England and the Fourierists in France were considered "respectable" socialists, while working-class movements that "proclaimed the necessity of total social change" denoted themselves communists. This latter branch of socialism produced the communist work of Étienne Cabet in France and Wilhelm Weitling in Germany.\(^69\)

**Etymology**

The term "socialism" was created by Henri de Saint-Simon, a founder of utopian socialism. The term "socialism" was created to contrast against the liberal doctrine of "individualism".\(^70\) The original socialists condemned liberal individualism as failing to address social concerns of poverty, social oppression, and gross inequality of wealth.\(^70\) They viewed liberal individualism as degenerating society into supporting selfish egoism and that harmed community life through promoting a society based on competition.\(^70\) They presented socialism as an alternative to liberal individualism, that advocated a society based on cooperation.\(^70\)
First International and Second International

The International Workingmen's Association (IWA), also known as the First International, was founded in London in 1864. The IWA held a preliminary conference in 1865, and had its first congress at Geneva in 1866. Due to the wide variety of philosophies present in the First International, there was conflict from the start. The first objections to Marx's came from the Mutualists who opposed communism and statism. However, shortly after Mikhail Bakunin and his followers (called Collectivists while in the International) joined in 1868, the First International became polarised into two camps, with Marx and Bakunin as their respective figureheads[71] The clearest differences between the groups emerged over their proposed strategies for achieving their visions of socialism. The First International became the first major international forum for the promulgation of socialist ideas.

As the ideas of Marx and Engels took on flesh, particularly in central Europe, socialists sought to unite in an international organisation. In 1889, on the centennial of the French Revolution of 1789, the Second International was founded, with 384 delegates from 20 countries representing about 300 labour and socialist organizations.[72] It was termed the "Socialist International" and Engels was elected honorary president at the third congress in 1893. Anarchists were ejected and not allowed in mainly because of the pressure from marxists.[73]

Revolutions of 1917–1936


"If Socialism can only be realized when the intellectual development of all the people permits it, then we shall not see Socialism for at least five hundred years."

— Vladimir Lenin, November 1917[74]

By 1917, the patriotism of World War I changed into political radicalism in most of Europe, the United States, and Australia. In February 1917, revolution exploded in Russia. Workers, soldiers and peasants established soviets (councils), the monarchy fell, and a provisional government convoked pending the election of a constituent assembly.

In April of that year, Vladimir Lenin arrived in Russia from Switzerland, calling for "All power to the soviets." In October, his party, the Bolsheviks, won support of most soviets at the second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, while
he and Leon Trotsky simultaneously led the October Revolution. As a matter of political pragmatism, Lenin reversed Marx's order of economics over politics, allowing for a political revolution led by a vanguard party of professional revolutionaries rather than a spontaneous establishment of socialist institutions led by a spontaneous uprising of the working class as predicted by Karl Marx. On 25 January 1918, at the Petrograd Soviet, Lenin declared "Long live the world socialist revolution!" He proposed an immediate armistice on all fronts, and transferred the land of the landed proprietors, the crown and the monasteries to the peasant committees without compensation.

On 26 January 1918, the day after assuming executive power, Lenin wrote Draft Regulations on Workers' Control, which granted workers control of businesses with more than five workers and office employees, and access to all books, documents and stocks, and whose decisions were to be "binding upon the owners of the enterprises". Governing through the elected soviets, and in alliance with the peasant-based Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Bolshevik government began nationalising banks, industry, and disavowed the national debts of the deposed Romanov royal régime. It sued for peace, withdrawing from World War I, and convoked a Constituent Assembly in which the peasant Socialist-Revolutionary Party (SR) won a majority.

The Constituent Assembly elected Socialist-Revolutionary leader Victor Chernov President of a Russian republic, but rejected the Bolshevik proposal that it endorse the Soviet decrees on land, peace and workers' control, and acknowledge the power of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. The next day, the Bolsheviks declared that the assembly was elected on outdated party lists, and the All-Russian Central Executive Committee of the Soviets dissolved it.

The Bolshevik Russian Revolution of January 1918 engendered Communist parties worldwide, and their concomitant revolutions of 1917-23. Few Communists doubted that the Russian success of socialism depended upon successful, working-class socialist revolutions in developed capitalist countries. In 1919, Lenin and Trotsky organised the world's Communist parties into a new international association of workers – the Communist International, (Comintern), also called the Third International.

By 1920, the Red Army, under its commander Trotsky, had largely defeated the royalist White Armies. In 1921, War Communism was ended and, under the New Economic Policy (NEP), private ownership was allowed for small and medium peasant enterprises. While industry remained largely state-controlled, Lenin acknowledged that the NEP was a necessary capitalist measure for a country unripe for socialism. Profiteering returned in the form of "NEP men" and rich peasants (Kulaks) gained power in the countryside.

In 1922, the fourth congress of the Communist International took up the policy of the United Front, urging Communists to work with rank and file Social Democrats while remaining critical of their leaders, whom they criticised for betraying the working class by supporting the war efforts of their respective capitalist classes. For their part, the social democrats pointed to the dislocation caused by revolution, and later, the growing authoritarianism of the Communist Parties. When the Communist Party of Great Britain applied to affiliate to the Labour Party in 1920 it was turned down.

In 1923, on seeing the Soviet State's growing coercive power, the dying Lenin said Russia had reverted to "a bourgeois tsarist machine... barely varnished with socialism." After Lenin's death in January 1924, the
Socialism

Communist Party of the Soviet Union — then increasingly under the control of Joseph Stalin — rejected the theory that socialism could not be built solely in the Soviet Union, in favour of the concept of *Socialism in One Country*. Despite the marginalised Left Opposition's demand for the restoration of Soviet democracy, Stalin developed a bureaucratic, authoritarian government, that was condemned by democratic socialists, anarchists and Trotskyists for undermining the initial socialist ideals of the Bolshevik Russian Revolution.[87][88]

The Russian Revolution of October 1917 brought about the definitive ideological division between Communists as denoted with a capital "С" on the one hand and other communist and socialist trends such as anarcho-communists and social democrats, on the other. The Left Opposition in the Soviet Union gave rise to Trotskyism which was to remain isolated and insignificant for another fifty years, except in Sri Lanka where Trotskyism gained the majority and the pro-Moscow wing was expelled from the Communist Party.

**After World War II**

In 1951, British Health Minister Aneurin Bevan expressed the view that, "It is probably true that Western Europe would have gone socialist after the war if Soviet behaviour had not given it too grim a visage. Soviet Communism and Socialism are not yet sufficiently distinguished in many minds."[89]

In 1951, the Socialist International was re-founded by the European social democratic parties. It declared: "Communism has split the International Labour Movement and has set back the realisation of Socialism in many countries for decades... Communism falsely claims a share in the Socialist tradition. In fact it has distorted that tradition beyond recognition. It has built up a rigid theology which is incompatible with the critical spirit of Marxism."[90]

In the postwar years, socialism became increasingly influential throughout the so-called Third World. Countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America frequently nationalised industries held by foreign owners. The Soviet Union had become a superpower through its adoption of a planned economy, albeit at enormous human cost. This achievement seemed hugely impressive from the outside, and convinced many nationalists in the former colonies, not necessarily communists or even socialists, of the virtues of state planning and state-guided models of social development. This was later to have important consequences in countries like China, India and Egypt, which tried to import some aspects of the Soviet model.

**Social democrats in power**

The Australian Labor Party, the first social democratic labour party in the world, was formed in 1891. In 1904, Australians elected the first Labor Party prime minister in the world: Chris Watson. In 1945, the British Labour Party, led by Clement Attlee, was elected to office based upon a radical socialist programme. Social Democratic parties dominated post-war politics in countries such as France, Italy, Czechoslovakia, Belgium and Norway. In Sweden, the Social Democratic Party held power from 1936 to 1976, 1982 to 1991, and 1994 to 2006. At one point, France claimed to be the world's most state-controlled capitalist country. The nationalised public utilities included Charbonnages de France (CDF), Electricité de France (EDF), Gaz de France (GDF), Air France, Banque de France, and Régie Nationale des Usines Renault.[91] Post-World War II social democratic governments introduced social reform and wealth redistribution via state welfare and taxation.
United Kingdom

In the UK, the Labour Party was influenced by the British social reformer William Beveridge, who had identified five "Giant Evils" afflicting the working class of the pre-war period: "want" (poverty), disease, "ignorance" (lack of access to education), "squalor" (poor housing), and "idleness" (unemployment). Unemployment benefits, national insurance and state pensions were introduced by the 1945 Labour government. Aneurin Bevan, who had introduced the Labour Party's National Health Service in 1948, criticised the Attlee government for not progressing further, demanding economic planning and criticising the implementation of nationalisation for not empowering the workers with democratic control of operations.

The UK Labour Government nationalised major public utilities such as mines, gas, coal, electricity, rail, iron, steel, and the Bank of England. British Petroleum, privatised in 1987, was officially nationalised in 1951, and there was further government intervention during the 1974–79 Labour Government. Anthony Crosland said that in 1956, 25 per cent of British industry was nationalised, and that public employees, including those in nationalised industries, constituted a similar percentage of the country's total employed population. The Labour government, however, did not seek to end capitalism, and the "government had not the smallest intention of bringing in the 'common ownership of the means of production, distribution, and exchange'". Labour re-nationalised steel (1967, British Steel) after the Conservatives denationalised it, and nationalised car production (1976, British Leyland). In 1977, major aircraft companies and shipbuilding were nationalised.

The National Health Service provided taxpayer-funded health care to everyone, free at the point of service. Ellen Wilkinson, Minister for Education, introduced taxpayer-funded milk in schools, saying, in a 1946 Labour Party conference: "Free milk will be provided in Hoxton and Shoreditch, in Eton and Harrow. What more social equality can you have than that?" Clement Attlee's biographer argued that this policy "contributed enormously to the defeat of childhood illnesses resulting from bad diet. Generations of poor children grew up stronger and healthier, because of this one, small, and inexpensive act of generosity, by the Attlee government".

The "Nordic model"

The Nordic model refers to the economic and social models of the Nordic countries (Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and Finland). This particular adaptation of the mixed market economy is characterised by more generous welfare states (relative to other developed countries), which are aimed specifically at enhancing individual autonomy, ensuring the universal provision of basic human rights and stabilising the economy. It is distinguished from other welfare states with similar goals by its emphasis on maximising labour force participation, promoting gender equality, egalitarian and extensive benefit levels, large magnitude of redistribution, and liberal use of expansionary fiscal policy. This has included high degrees of labour union membership. In 2008, labour union density was 67.5% in Finland, 67.6% in Denmark, and 68.3% in Sweden. In comparison, union membership was 11.9% in the United States and 7.7% in France. The Nordic Model, however, is not a single model with specific components or rules; each of the Nordic countries has its own economic and social models, sometimes with large differences from its neighbours.
Socialism

Social democrats adopt free market policies

Many social democratic parties, particularly after the Cold war, adopted neoliberal-based market policies that include privatization, liberalization, deregulation and financialization; resulting in the abandonment of pursuing the development of moderate socialism in favor of market liberalism. Despite the name, these pro-capitalist policies are radically different from the many non-capitalist free-market socialist theories that have existed throughout history.

In 1959, the German Social Democratic Party adopted the Godesberg Program, rejecting class struggle and Marxism. In 1980, with the rise of conservative neoliberal politicians such as Ronald Reagan in the U.S., Margaret Thatcher in Britain and Brian Mulroney, in Canada, the Western, welfare state was attacked from within. Monetarists and neoliberalism attacked social welfare systems as impediments to private entrepreneurship at public expense.

In the 1980s and 1990s, western European socialists were pressured to reconcile their socialist economic programmes with a free-market-based communal European economy. In the UK, the Labour Party leader Neil Kinnock made a passionate and public attack against the party's Militant Tendency at a Labour Party conference, and repudiated the demands of the defeated striking miners after the 1984–1985 strike against pit closures. In 1989, at Stockholm, the 18th Congress of the Socialist International adopted a new Declaration of Principles, saying:

Democratic socialism is an international movement for freedom, social justice, and solidarity. Its goal is to achieve a peaceful world where these basic values can be enhanced and where each individual can live a meaningful life with the full development of his or her personality and talents, and with the guarantee of human and civil rights in a democratic framework of society.\[102\]

In the 1990s, released from the Left's pressure, the British Labour Party, under Tony Blair, posited policies based upon the free market economy to deliver public services via private contractors. In 1995, the Labour Party re-defined its stance on socialism by re-wording clause IV of its constitution, effectively rejecting socialism by removing any and all references to public, direct worker or municipal ownership of the means of production. In 1995, the British Labour Party revised its political aims: "The Labour Party is a democratic socialist party. It believes that, by the strength of our common endeavour we achieve more than we achieve alone, so as to create, for each of us, the means to realise our true potential, and, for all of us, a community in which power, wealth, and opportunity are in the hands of the many, not the few."\[103\]

The objectives of the Party of European Socialists, the European Parliament's socialist bloc, are now "to pursue international aims in respect of the principles on which the European Union is based, namely principles of freedom, equality, solidarity, democracy, respect of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, and respect for the Rule of Law." As a result, today, the rallying cry of the French Revolution – "Egalité, Liberté, Fraternité" – which overthrew absolutism and ushered industrialization into French society, are promoted as essential socialist values.\[104\]

Early 2000s

Those who championed socialism in its various Marxist and class struggle forms sought out other arenas than the parties of social democracy at the turn of the 21st century. Anti-capitalism and anti-globalization movements rose to prominence particularly through events such as the opposition to the WTO meeting of 1999 in Seattle. Socialist-inspired groups played an important role in these new movements, which nevertheless embraced much broader layers of the population, and were championed by figures such as Noam Chomsky. The 2003 invasion of Iraq led to a significant anti-war movement in which socialists argued their case.

The Financial crisis of 2007–2010 led to mainstream discussions as to whether "Marx was right".\[105\]\[106\] Time magazine ran an article 'Rethinking Marx' and put Karl Marx on the cover of its European edition in a special for the 28 January 2009 Davos meeting.\[107\]\[108\] A Globescan BBC poll on the twentieth anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall (2009) found that 23% of respondents believe capitalism is "fatally flawed and a different economic system is needed", with that figure rising to over 40% of the population in France; while a majority of respondents including over 50% of Americans believe capitalism "has problems that can be addressed through regulation and
reform”. Of the 27 countries polled, majorities in 22 of them expressed support for governments to distribute wealth more evenly.[109]

Africa

African socialism has been and continues to be a major ideology around the continent. Julius Nyerere was inspired by Fabian socialist ideals.[110] He was a firm believer in rural Africans and their traditions and ujamaa, a system of collectivisation that according to Nyerere was present before European imperialism. Essentially he believed Africans were already socialists. Other African socialists include Jomo Kenyatta, Kenneth Kaunda, and Kwame Nkrumah. Fela Kuti was inspired by socialism and called for a democratic African republic. In South Africa the African National Congress (ANC) abandoned its partial socialist allegiances after taking power, and followed a standard neoliberal route. From 2005 through to 2007, the country was wracked by many thousands of protests from poor communities. One of these gave rise to a mass movement of shack dwellers, Abahlali baseMjondolo that, despite major police suppression, continues to advocate for popular people’s planning and against the creation of a market economy in land and housing. Today many African countries have been accused of being exploited under neoliberal economics.[111]

Asia

The People's Republic of China, North Korea, Laos and Vietnam are Asian countries remaining from the wave of Marxism-Leninist implemented socialism in the 20th century. States with socialist economies have largely moved away from centralised economic planning in the 21st century, placing a greater emphasis on markets. Forms include the Chinese socialist market economy and the Vietnamese socialist-oriented market economy. They utilise state-owned corporate management models as opposed to modeling socialist enterprise on traditional management styles employed by government agencies.

In the People's Republic of China, the Chinese Communist Party has led a transition from the command economy of the Mao period to an economic program they term the socialist market economy or "socialism with Chinese characteristics". Under Deng Xiaoping, the leadership of China embarked upon a programme of market-based reform that was more sweeping than had been Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's perestroika program of the late 1980s. Deng's programme, however, maintained state ownership rights over land, state or cooperative ownership of much of the heavy industrial and manufacturing sectors and state influence in the banking and financial sectors.

Elsewhere in Asia, some elected socialist parties and communist parties remain prominent, particularly in India and Nepal. The Communist Party of Nepal in particular calls for multi-party democracy, social equality, and economic prosperity.[112] In Singapore, a majority of the GDP is still generated from the state sector comprising government-linked companies.[113] In Japan, there has been a resurgent interest in the Japanese Communist Party among workers and youth.[114][115] In Malaysia, the Socialist Party of Malaysia got its first Member of Parliament, Dr. Jeyakumar Devaraj, after the 2008 general election.
Europe
In Europe, the socialist Left Party in Germany grew in popularity due to dissatisfaction with the increasingly neoliberal policies of the SPD, becoming the fourth biggest party in parliament in the general election on 27 September 2009. Communist candidate Dimitris Christofias won a crucial presidential runoff in Cyprus, defeating his conservative rival with a majority of 53%. In Greece, in the general election on 4 October 2009, the Panhellenic Socialist Movement (PASOK) won the elections with 43.92% of the votes, the Communist KKE got 7.5% and the new Socialist grouping, (Syriza or "Coalition of the Radical Left"), won 4.6% or 361,000 votes.

In Ireland, in the 2009 European election, Joe Higgins of the Socialist Party took one of three seats in the capital Dublin European constituency. In Denmark, the Socialist People's Party (SF or Socialist Party for short) more than doubled its parliamentary representation to 23 seats from 11, making it the fourth largest party. In 2011, the socialist parties of Social Democrats, Socialist People's Party and the Danish Social Liberal Part formed government, after a slight victory over the liberal parties. They were led by Helle Thorning-Schmidt, and had the Red-Green Alliance as a supporting party.

In the UK, the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers put forward a slate of candidates in the 2009 European Parliament elections under the banner of No to the EU – Yes to Democracy, a broad left-wing alter-globalisation coalition involving socialist groups such as the Socialist Party, aiming to offer an alternative to the "anti-foreigner" and pro-business policies of the UK Independence Party. In the following May 2010 UK general election, the Trade Unionist and Socialist Coalition, launched in January 2010 and backed by Bob Crow, the leader of the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers union (RMT), other union leaders and the Socialist Party among other socialist groups, stood against Labour in 40 constituencies.

In France, the Revolutionary Communist League (LCR) candidate in the 2007 presidential election, Olivier Besancenot, received 1,498,581 votes, 4.08%, double that of the Communist candidate. The LCR abolished itself in 2009 to initiate a broad anti-capitalist party, the New Anticapitalist Party, whose stated aim is to "build a new socialist, democratic perspective for the twenty-first century".

Latin America
"Every factory must be a school to educate, like Che Guevara said, to produce not only briquettes, steel, and aluminum, but also, above all, the new man and woman, the new society, the socialist society."
— Hugo Chávez, at a May 2009 socialist transformation workshop

Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega, Bolivian President Evo Morales, and Ecuadorian president Rafael Correa refer to their political programmes as socialist. Chávez has adopted the term socialism of the 21st century. After winning re-election in December 2006, Chávez said, "Now more than ever, I am obliged to move Venezuela's path towards socialism."

"Pink tide" is a term being used in contemporary 21st century political analysis in the media and elsewhere to describe the perception that Leftist ideology in general, and Left-wing politics in particular, are increasingly influential in Latin America.
**North America**

In Canada, the social democratic New Democratic Party shows signs of growing after winning 102/308 seats (up from 37) in the 2011 Canadian federal election.

Socialist parties in the United States reached their zenith in the early 20th century, but currently active parties and organizations include the Socialist Party USA, the Socialist Workers Party and the Democratic Socialists of America, the latter having approximately 10,000 members.[135]

**Criticism of socialism**

Economic liberals, pro-capitalist libertarians and classical liberals see private property of the means of production and the market exchange as natural entities or moral rights, which are central to their conceptions of freedom and liberty, and thus perceive public ownership of the means of production, cooperatives and economic planning as infringements upon liberty. Some of the primary criticisms of socialism are distorted or absent price signals, reduced incentives, reduced prosperity, feasibility, and its social and political effects.[144][145][146][147][148][149]

Critics from the neoclassical school of economics criticize state-ownership and centralization of capital on the grounds that there is a lack of incentive in state institutions to act on information as efficiently as capitalist firms do because they lack hard budget constraints, resulting in reduced overall economic welfare for society.[150] Economists of the Austrian school argue that socialist systems based on economic planning are unfeasible because they lack the information to perform economic calculation in the first place, due to a lack of price signals and a free price system, which they argue are required for rational economic calculation.[151]
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Democratic socialism is a description used by various historians to describe the ideal of socialism in an established democracy. The term is also used by Socialist movements and organizations to emphasize the democratic character of their political orientation. Democratic socialism is contrasted with political movements that resort to authoritarian means to achieve a transition to socialism, instead advocating for the immediate creation of decentralized economic democracy from the grassroots level, undertaken by and for the working class itself. Specifically, it is a term used to distinguish between socialists who favor a grassroots-level, spontaneous revolution or gradualism over Leninism — organized revolution instigated and directed by an overarching Vanguard party that operates on the basis of democratic centralism.

The term is sometimes used synonymously with "social democracy", but social democrats need not accept this label, and many self-identified democratic socialists oppose contemporary social democracy because social democracy retains the capitalist mode of production.\[[1]\]

Definition

Democratic socialism is difficult to define, and groups of scholars have radically different definitions for the term. Some definitions simply refer to all forms of socialism that follow an electoral, reformist or evolutionary path to socialism, rather than a revolutionary one.\[[2]\] Often, this definition is invoked to distinguish democratic socialism from communism, as in Donald Busky's *Democratic Socialism: A Global Survey*,\[[3]\] Jim Tomlinson's *Democratic Socialism and Economic Policy: The Attlee Years, 1945-1951*, Norman Thomas *Democratic Socialism: a new appraisal* or Roy Hattersley's *Choose Freedom: The Future of Democratic Socialism*.

But for those who use the term in this way, the scope of the term "socialism" itself can be very vague, and include forms of socialism compatible with capitalism. For example, Robert M. Page, a Reader in Democratic Socialism and Social Policy at the University of Birmingham, writes about "transformative democratic socialism" to refer to the
politics of the Clement Attlee government (a strong welfare state, fiscal redistribution, some nationalisation) and "revisionist democratic socialism", as developed by Anthony Crosland and Harold Wilson:

The most influential revisionist Labour thinker, Anthony Crosland..., contended that a more "benevolent" form of capitalism had emerged since the [Second World War] ... According to Crosland, it was now possible to achieve greater equality in society without the need for "fundamental" economic transformation. For Crosland, a more meaningful form of equality could be achieved if the growth dividend derived from effective management of the economy was invested in "pro-poor" public services rather than through fiscal redistribution. Indeed, some proponents of market socialism see the latter as a form of democratic socialism.

A variant of this set of definitions is Joseph Schumpeter's argument, set out in Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy (1941), that liberal democracies were evolving from "liberal capitalism" into democratic socialism, with the growth of workers' self-management, industrial democracy and regulatory institutions.

In contrast, other definitions of democratic socialism sharply distinguish it from social democracy. For example, Peter Hain classifies democratic socialism, along with libertarian socialism, as a form of anti-authoritarian "socialism from below" (using the term popularised by Hal Draper), in contrast to Stalinism and social democracy, variants of authoritarian state socialism. For Hain, this democratic/authoritarian divide is more important than the revolutionary/reformist divide. In this definition, it is the active participation of the population as a whole, and workers in particular, in the management of economy that characterises democratic socialism, while nationalisation and economic planning (whether controlled by an elected government or not) are characteristic of state socialism. A similar, but more complex, argument is made by Nicos Poulantzas.

Other definitions fall between the first and second set, seeing democratic socialism as a specific political tradition closely related to and overlapping with social democracy. For example, Bogdan Denitch, in Democratic Socialism, defines it as proposing a radical reorganization of the socio-economic order through public ownership, workers' control of the labor process and redistributive tax policies. Robert G. Picard similarly describes a democratic socialist tradition of thought including Eduard Bernstein, Karl Kautsky, Evan Durbin and Michael Harrington.

The term democratic socialism can be used in a third way, to refer to a version of the Soviet model that was reformed in a democratic way. For example, Mikhail Gorbachev described perestroika as building a "new, humane and democratic socialism". Consequently, some former Communist parties have rebranded themselves as democratic socialist, as with the Party of Democratic Socialism in Germany.

Hal Draper uses the term "revolutionary-democratic socialism" as a type of socialism from below in his The Two Souls of Socialism. He writes: "the leading spokesman in the Second International of a revolutionary-democratic Socialism-from-Below [was] Rosa Luxemburg, who so emphatically put her faith and hope in the spontaneous struggle of a free working class that the myth-makers invented for her a 'theory of spontaneity'". Similarly, about Eugene Debs, he writes: "Debsian socialism' evoked a tremendous response from the heart of the people, but Debs had no successor as a tribune of revolutionary-democratic socialism.

Justification of democratic socialism can be found in the works of social philosophers like Charles Taylor and Axel Honneth, among others. Honneth has put forward the view that political and economic ideologies have a social basis, that is, they originate from intersubjective communication between members of a society. Honneth criticises the liberal state because it assumes that principles of individual liberty and private property are a historical and abstract, when, in fact, they evolved from a specific social discourse on human activity. Contra liberal individualism, Honneth has emphasised the inter-subjective dependence between humans; that is, our well-being depends on recognising others and being recognised by them. Democratic socialism, with its emphasis on social collectivism, could be seen as a way of safeguarding this dependency.

In recent years, some have suggested replacing "democratic" with "participatory" upon seeing the reduction of the former to parliamentarism.
History

Forerunners and formative influences

Fenner Brockway, a leading British democratic socialist of the Independent Labour Party, wrote in his book *Britain's First Socialists*:

The Levellers were pioneers of political democracy and the sovereignty of the people; the Agitators were the pioneers of participatory control by the ranks at their workplace; and the Diggers were pioneers of communal ownership, cooperation and egalitarianism. All three equate to democratic socialism.\[15\]

The tradition of the Diggers and the Levellers was continued in the period described by EP Thompson in *The Making of the English Working Class* by Jacobin groups like the London Corresponding Society and by polemists such as Thomas Paine. Their concern for both democracy and social justice marks them out as key precursors of democratic socialism.\[16\]

The term "socialist" was first used in English in the British *Cooperative Magazine* in 1827\[17\] and came to be associated with the followers of the Welsh reformer Robert Owen, such as the Rochdale Pioneers who founded the co-operative movement. Owen's followers again stressed both participatory democracy and economic socialisation, in the form of consumer co-operatives, credit unions and mutual aid societies. The Chartists similarly combined a working class politics with a call for greater democracy. Many countries have this.

The British moral philosopher John Stuart Mill also came to advocate a form of economic socialism within a liberal context. In later editions of his *Principles of Political Economy* (1848), Mill would argue that "as far as economic theory was concerned, there is nothing in principle in economic theory that precludes an economic order based on socialist policies".\[18\][19]

In North America, Henry George promoted the Single Tax Movement, which sought a form of democratic socialism via progressive taxation, with tax only on natural resources. George remained an advocate of the free market for the allocation of all other goods and services.\[20\]

Modern democratic socialism

Democratic socialism became a prominent movement at the end of the 19th century. In the US, Eugene V. Debs, one of the most famous American socialists, led a movement centered around democratic socialism and made five bids for President, once in 1900 as candidate of the Social Democratic Party and then four more times on the ticket of the Socialist Party of America.\[21\] The socialist industrial unionism of Daniel DeLeon in the United States represented another strain of early democratic socialism in this period. It favored a form of government based on industrial unions, but which also sought to establish this government after winning at the ballot box.\[22\]
In Britain, the democratic socialist tradition was represented in particular by the William Morris' Socialist League, and in the 1880s by the Fabian Society, and later the Independent Labour Party (ILP) founded by Keir Hardie in the 1890s, of which George Orwell would later be a prominent member. In other parts of Europe, many democratic socialist parties were united in the International Working Union of Socialist Parties (the "Two and a Half International") in the early 1920s and in the London Bureau (the "Three and a Half International") in the 1930s. These internationals sought to steer a course between the social democrats of the Second International, who were seen as insufficiently socialist (and had been compromised by their support for World War I), and the perceived anti-democratic Third International. The key movements within the Two and a Half International were the ILP and the Austromarxists, and the main forces in the Three and a Half International were the ILP and the Workers' Party of Marxist Unification (POUM) of Spain.

In America, a similar tradition continued to flourish in Debs' Socialist Party of America, especially under the leadership of Norman Thomas. Senator Bernie Sanders from Vermont is a self-described democratic socialist, and is the only self-described socialist to ever be elected to the United States Senate.

In the early 1920s, the guild socialism of G. D. H. Cole attempted to envision a socialist alternative to Soviet-style authoritarianism, while council communism articulated democratic socialist positions in several respects, notably through renouncing the vanguard role of the revolutionary party and holding that the system of the Soviet Union was not authentically socialist.

In Italy, the Italian Democratic Socialist Party broke away from the Italian Socialist Party in 1947, when this latter joined the Soviet-funded Italian Communist Party to prepare the decisive general election of 1948. Despite remaining a minor party in Italian Parliament for fifty years, its leader Giuseppe Saragat became President of Italy in 1964.

During India's freedom movement, many figures on the left of the Indian National Congress organized themselves as the Congress Socialist Party. Their politics, and those of the early and intermediate periods of Jayapraaksh Narayan's career, combined a commitment to the socialist transformation of society with a principled opposition to the one-party authoritarianism they perceived in the Stalinist revolutionary model. This political current continued in the Praja Socialist Party, the later Janata Party and the current Samajwadi Party. In Pakistan, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto introduced the concept of democratic socialism, and the Pakistan Peoples Party remained one of the prominent supporter for the socialist democratic policies in the country. Pakistan Socialist Party and Pakistan Social Democratic Party, together with PPP, committed to the socialist transformations and reforms with an opposition to one-party dictatorship and authoritarianism.

In the Middle East, the biggest democratic socialist party is the Organization of Iranian People's Fedaian (Majority). The folkesocialisme or people's socialism that emerged as a vital current of the left in Scandinavia beginning in the 1950s could be characterized as a democratic socialism in the same vein. Former Swedish prime minister Olof Palme is an important proponent of democratic socialism.
Notable democratic socialists

- Clement Attlee
- Salvador Allende
- Farshad Bashir
- Tony Benn
- Zulfikar Ali Bhutto
- Harry van Bommel
- Rómulo Betancourt
- Léon Blum
- Leonel Brizola
- Eugene V. Debs
- Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva
- John Dewey
- Tommy Douglas
- Jean Jaurès
- Agnes Kant
- Helen Keller
- Naomi Klein
- Tiny Kox
- Ken Livingstone
- Michael Manley
- Jan Marijnissen
- George Orwell
- Olof Palme
- Emile Roemer
- Bertrand Russell
- Ronald van Raak
- Bernie Sanders
- Norman Thomas
- Cornel West
- Howard Zinn
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Classical economics

Classical economics is widely regarded as the first modern school of economic thought. Its major developers include Adam Smith, Jean-Baptiste Say, David Ricardo, Thomas Malthus and John Stuart Mill.

Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations in 1776 is usually considered to mark the beginning of classical economics. The school was active into the mid 19th century and was followed by neoclassical economics in Britain beginning around 1870, or, in Marx's definition by "vulgar political economy" from the 1830s. The definition of classical economics is debated, particularly the period 1830–70 and the connection to neoclassical economics. The term "classical economics" was coined by Karl Marx to refer to Ricardian economics -- the economics of David Ricardo and James Mill and their predecessors -- but usage was subsequently extended to include the followers of Ricardo.\[1\]

History

The classical economists produced their "magnificent dynamics"\[2\] during a period in which capitalism was emerging from feudalism and in which the industrial revolution was leading to vast changes in society. These changes raised the question of how a society could be organized around a system in which every individual sought his or her own (monetary) gain. Classical political economy is popularly associated with the idea that free markets can regulate themselves.\[3\]

Classical economists and their immediate predecessors reoriented economics away from an analysis of the ruler's personal interests to broader national interests. Adam Smith, and also physiocrat Francois Quesnay, for example, identified the wealth of a nation with the yearly national income, instead of the king's treasury. Smith saw this income as produced by labour, land, and capital. With property rights to land and capital held by individuals, the national income is divided up between labourers, landlords, and capitalists in the form of wages, rent, and interest or profits.

Modern legacy

Classical economics is generally agreed (but see section 5 below) to have developed into neoclassical economics -- as the name suggests -- or to at least be most closely represented in the modern age by neoclassical economics, and many of its ideas remain fundamental in economics. Other ideas, however, have either disappeared from neoclassical discourse or been replaced by Keynesian economics in the Keynesian revolution and neoclassical synthesis. Some classical ideas are represented in various schools of heterodox economics, notably Marxian economics -- Marx being a contemporary of the classical economists and their immediate successors -- and Austrian economics, which split from neoclassical economics in the late 19th century.
Classical economics

Classical theories of growth and development

Analyzing the growth in the wealth of nations and advocating policies to promote such growth was a major focus of classical economists. John Hicks & Samuel Hollander,[4] Nicholas Kaldor,[5] Luigi L. Pasinetti,[6][7] and Paul A. Samuelson[8][9] have presented formal models as part of their respective interpretations of classical political economy.

Value theory

Classical economists developed a theory of value, or price, to investigate economic dynamics. William Petty introduced a fundamental distinction between market price and natural price to facilitate the portrayal of regularities in prices. Market prices are jostled by many transient influences that are difficult to theorize about at any abstract level. Natural prices, according to Petty, Smith, and Ricardo, for example, capture systematic and persistent forces operating at a point in time. Market prices always tend toward natural prices in a process that Smith described as somewhat similar to gravitational attraction.

The theory of what determined natural prices varied within the Classical school. Petty tried to develop a par between land and labour and had what might be called a land-and-labour theory of value. Smith confined the labour theory of value to a mythical pre-capitalist past. Others may interpret Smith believed in value as derived from labour.[10] He stated that natural prices were the sum of natural rates of wages, profits (including interest on capital and wages of superintendence) and rent. Ricardo also had what might be described as a cost of production theory of value. He criticized Smith for describing rent as price-determining, instead of price-determined, and saw the labour theory of value as a good approximation.

Some historians of economic thought, in particular, Sraffian economists,[11][12] see the classical theory of prices as determined from three givens:

1. The level of outputs at the level of Smith's "effectual demand",
2. technology, and
3. wages.

From these givens, one can rigorously derive a theory of value. But neither Ricardo nor Marx, the most rigorous investigators of the theory of value during the Classical period, developed this theory fully. Those who reconstruct the theory of value in this manner see the determinants of natural prices as being explained by the Classical economists from within the theory of economics, albeit at a lower level of abstraction. For example, the theory of wages was closely connected to the theory of population. The Classical economists took the theory of the determinants of the level and growth of population as part of Political Economy. Since then, the theory of population has been seen as part of Demography. In contrast to the Classical theory, the determinants of the neoclassical theory value:

1. tastes
2. technology, and
3. endowments

are seen as exogenous to neoclassical economics.

Classical economics tended to stress the benefits of trade. Its theory of value was largely displaced by marginalist schools of thought which sees "use value" as deriving from the marginal utility that consumers finds in a good, and "exchange value" (i.e. natural price) as determined by the marginal opportunity- or disutility-cost of the inputs that make up the product. Ironically, considering the attachment of many classical economists to the free market, the largest school of economic thought that still adheres to classical form is the Marxian school.
Monetary theory

British classical economists in the 19th century had a well-developed controversy between the Banking and the Currency school. This parallels recent debates between proponents of the theory of endogeneous money, such as Nicholas Kaldor, and monetarists, such as Milton Friedman. Monetarists and members of the currency school argued that banks can and should control the supply of money. According to their theories, inflation is caused by banks issuing an excessive supply of money. According to proponents of the theory of endogenous money, the supply of money automatically adjusts to the demand, and banks can only control the terms (e.g., the rate of interest) on which loans are made.

Debates on the definition of classical economics

The theory of value is currently a contested subject. One issue is whether classical economics is a forerunner of neoclassical economics or a school of thought that had a distinct theory of value, distribution, and growth.

Sraffians, who emphasize the discontinuity thesis, see classical economics as extending from Petty's work in the 17th century to the break-up of the Ricardian system around 1830. The period between 1830 and the 1870s would then be dominated by "vulgar political economy", as Karl Marx characterized it. Sraffians argue that: the wages fund theory; Senior's abstinence theory of interest, which puts the return to capital on the same level as returns to land and labour; the explanation of equilibrium prices by well-behaved supply and demand functions; and Say's law, are not necessary or essential elements of the classical theory of value and distribution.

Perhaps Schumpeter's view that John Stuart Mill put forth a half-way house between classical and neoclassical economics is consistent with this view.

Sraffians generally see Marx as having rediscovered and restated the logic of classical economics, albeit for his own purposes. Others, such as Schumpeter, think of Marx as a follower of Ricardo. Even Samuel Hollander has recently explained that there is a textual basis in the classical economists for Marx's reading, although he does argue that it is an extremely narrow set of texts.

Another position is that neoclassical economics is essentially continuous with classical economics. To scholars promoting this view, there is no hard and fast line between classical and neoclassical economics. There may be shifts of emphasis, such as between the long run and the short run and between supply and demand, but the neoclassical concepts are to be found confused or in embryo in classical economics. To these economists, there is only one theory of value and distribution. Alfred Marshall is a well-known promoter of this view. Samuel Hollander is probably its best current proponent.

Still another position sees two threads simultaneously being developed in classical economics. In this view, neoclassical economics is a development of certain exoteric (popular) views in Adam Smith. Ricardo was a sport, developing certain esoteric (known by only the select) views in Adam Smith. This view can be found in W. Stanley Jevons, who referred to Ricardo as something like "that able, but wrong-headed man" who put economics on the "wrong track". One can also find this view in Maurice Dobb's *Theories of Value and Distribution Since Adam Smith: Ideology and Economic Theory* (1973), as well as in Karl Marx's *Theories of Surplus Value*.

The above does not exhaust the possibilities. John Maynard Keynes thought of classical economics as starting with Ricardo and being ended by the publication of Keynes' *General Theory of Employment Interest and Money*. The defining criterion of classical economics, on this view, is Say's law.

One difficulty in these debates is that the participants are frequently arguing about whether there is a non-neoclassical theory that should be reconstructed and applied today to describe capitalist economies. Some, such as Terry Peach, see classical economics as of antiquarian interest.

Sometimes the definition of classical economics is expanded to include the earlier 17th century English economist William Petty and the contemporary early 19th century German economist Johann Heinrich von Thünen.
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Localism (politics)

Localism describes a range of political philosophies which prioritize the local. Generally, localism supports local production and consumption of goods, local control of government, and promotion of local history, local culture and local identity. Localism can be contrasted with regionalism and centralized government, with its opposite being found in the unitary state.

History

Localists assert that throughout the world's history, most social and economic institutions have been scaled at the local level, as opposed to regional, inter-regional, or global (basically until the late 19th-early 20th centuries). Only with imperialism and the industrial revolution did local scales become denigrated. Most proponents of localism position themselves as defending aspects of this earlier way of life; the phrase “relocalization” is often used in this sense.

In the 20th Century, localism drew heavily on the writings of Leopold Kohr, E.F. Schumacher, Wendell Berry, and Kirkpatrick Sale, among others. More generally, localism draws on a wide range of movements and concerns and it proposes that by re-localizing democratic and economic relationships to the local level, social, economic and environmental problems will be more definable and solutions more easily created. These include anarchism, bioregionalism, environmentalism, the Greens, and more specific concerns about food, monetary policy and education. Political parties of all persuasions have also occasionally favored the devolution of power to local authorities. In this vein Alan Milburn, a Labour Party MP, has spoken of "making services more locally accountable, devolving more power to local communities and, in the process, forging a modern relationship between the state, citizens and services" [1]

Beginning in the 1980s, a particularly visible strain of localism in the United States was a movement to buy locally produced products. This movement originated with organic farming and likely gained impetus because of growing dissatisfaction with organic certification and the failing economic model of industrial agriculture for small farmers. While the advocates of local consumption draw on protectionist arguments, they also appealed primarily to an environmental argument: that pollution caused by transporting goods was a major externality in a global economy, and one that "localvores" could greatly diminish. Also, environmental issues can be addressed when decision making power is held by those affected by the issues instead of power sources that do not understand the needs of local communities.

Localism as a Political Philosophy

In the early 21st century, localists have frequently found themselves aligned with critics of globalisation. Variants of localism are prevalent within the Green movement. According to an article in the International Socialism Journal, localism of this sort seeks to "answer to the problems created by globalisation" with "calls to minimise international trade and to seek to establish economies based on 'local' self-sufficiency only." [2]

Some Localists believe that society should be organised politically along community lines, with each community being free to conduct its own business in whatever fashion its people see fit. The size of these communities is defined such that their members are both familiar and dependent on each other — a size something along the lines of a small town or village.

In reference to Localism Edward Goldsmith, former editor of The Ecologist magazine, claims that "The problems facing the world today can only be solved by restoring the functioning of those natural systems which once satisfied our needs, i.e. by fully exploiting those incomparable resources which are individual people, families, communities and ecosystems, which together make up the biosphere or real world." [3]
Thomas "Tip" O'Neill, a longtime Speaker of the House in the U.S. Congress, once famously declared that "All politics is local"[4]. He eventually wrote a book by that name: *All Politics Is Local: And Other Rules of the Game*.

**Localism and concern for the third world**

Many localists are concerned with the problems of the development of the third world. Many advocate that third world countries should aim to rely on their own goods and services in order to escape from what they see are the unfair trade relations with the developed world. George Monbiot claims this idea does not recognise the fact that, though Third world countries often get a raw deal in trade relations, not trading at all would be a significant blow because the countries need the revenue generated by trade.[5]

Some localists are also against immigration from poor countries to rich ones. One of the problems they claim results from such immigration is the drain on the intellectual resources of poor countries, so called brain drain. For example, in the past decade Bulgaria is estimated to have lost more than 50,000 qualified scientists and skilled workers through emigration every year. About one fifth of them were highly educated specialists in chemistry, biology, medicine and physics.[6][7]

**International relations**

Some Localists are against political intervention and peace keeping measures. They believe that Communities should find solutions to their own problems and in their own time, in what ever fashion they decide. They believe that all societies are capable of achieving long term peace once given the opportunity to do so.

**Localist activism**

Localism usually describes social measures or trends which emphasise or value local and small-scale phenomena. This is in contrast to large, all-encompassing frameworks for action or belief. Localism can therefore be contrasted with globalisation. Localism can be geographical, but often it is not.

Examples of localism are:

- The slow food movement, using diverse, seasonal, natural food in reaction to multinational merchandising of food which is uniform, produced using industrial methods, and called fast food.
- The Interactive Local Media movement as evidenced by:
  - The Kelsey Group [8]
  - West Seattle Blog [9]
  - New Haven Independent [10]
  - The Batavian [11]
  - Baristanet [12]
  - Village Soup [13]
  - Mod Mobilian [14]
  - PlaceBlogger [15]
- Localism in media to support a diverse news media in the face of increasing corporate control. The FCC is using this term when seeking input on its rules and states that "promoting localism is a key goal of the Commission’s media ownership rules."[16]
- Tertiary government where small community councils make relevant decisions, with some degree of independence from local or national government.
- Workers councils, where the employees of a particular workplace discuss and negotiate with their employer, rather have this done by a national union which may be remote from local issues.
• Postmodernism can be seen as a sort of cultural localism, where accepted cultural values may be ignored in favour of people creating their own criteria of value.
• Federalism and devolution are examples of politically localistic movements.

• Religion (Protestant):
  • Exclusive localism holds that there can't be more than one legitimate institutionally visible church at one given location, the variation of which varies but is usually held to be either a city or a neighbourhood.
  • Localism is more generally the congregationalist idea that each local church should be autonomous, only extended to reject any formal association of churches. It is specially relevant among Baptists, where localists reject the forming of Conventions.

• Religion (churches of Christ):
  • The congregationalist idea of local autonomy is a cornerstone of restoration movement fellowships that identify as churches of Christ or Independent Christian Churches/Churches of Christ. Founders of the movement declared their independence from various denominations, seeking a fresh start to restore the New Testament church, and abandoning creeds. The names "Church of Christ," "Christian Church" and "Disciples of Christ" were adopted by the movement because they believed these terms to be biblical and not man made.
  • A converging of Christians across denominational lines in search of a return to a hypothesized original, "pre-denominational" Christianity. Participants in this movement sought to base doctrine and practice on the Bible alone, rather than recognizing the traditional councils and denominational hierarchies that had come to define Christianity since the 1st century AD. Members of the Churches of Christ believe that Jesus founded only one church, that the current divisions between Christians are not God's will, and that the only basis for restoring Christian unity is the Bible. They typically prefer to be known simply as "Christians", without any further religious or denominational identification. They see themselves as recreating the New Testament church established by Christ.

• Churches of Christ generally share these theological beliefs:
  • Refusal to hold to any formalized creeds or statements of faith, preferring instead a reliance on the Bible alone for doctrine and practice.
  • Autonomous, congregational church organization without denominational oversight.
  • Local governance by a plurality of male elders.
  • One of the largest divisions within churches of Christ was due to controversy of foreign missionary work. Opponents of what they dubbed "Institutionalism" argued against it both as a drain on local congregations and as sinful if done in cooperation with other congregations. This belief extended to cooperative support of orphanages, homes, large-scale radio and TV programs and ministries.
  • The Restoration Movement is so averse to association with other congregations that they renounce the term "protestant"; distancing their churches from any association to any denomination; even one they would have to "protest" and evolve from.
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Protectionism

Protectionism is the economic policy of restraining trade between states through methods such as tariffs on imported goods, restrictive quotas, and a variety of other government regulations designed to allow (according to proponents) "fair competition" between imports and goods and services produced domestically.

This policy contrasts with free trade, where government barriers to trade are kept to a minimum. In recent years, it has become closely aligned with anti-globalization. The term is mostly used in the context of economics, where protectionism refers to policies or doctrines which protect businesses and workers within a country by restricting or regulating trade with foreign nations.

History

Historically, protectionism was associated with economic theories such as mercantilism (that believed that it is beneficial to maintain a positive trade balance), and import substitution. During that time, Adam Smith famously warned against the "interested sophistry" of industry, seeking to gain advantage at the cost of the consumers.[1]

Most mainstream economists agree that protectionism is harmful in that its costs outweigh the benefits and that it impedes economic growth.[2][3] Economics Nobel prize winner and trade theorist Paul Krugman once famously stated, "If there were an Economist's Creed, it would surely contain the affirmations 'I understand the Principle of Comparative Advantage' and 'I advocate Free Trade'."[4]

Recent examples of protectionism in developed countries are typically motivated by the desire to protect the livelihoods of individuals in politically important domestic industries. Whereas formerly mostly blue-collar jobs were being lost from developed countries to foreign competition, in recent years there has been a renewed discussion of protectionism due to offshore outsourcing and the loss of white-collar jobs.

However, there is a very strong revisionist argument of what is called the "real" history of free trade. Cambridge University Professor Ha-Joon Chang argues that virtually all developed countries today promoted their national industries through protectionism. Chang points to the significantly high tariffs of the UK, the US and other countries during their process of industrialization. Besides, these countries that used protectionist policies during their growth are trying to "kick away the ladder" from developing countries.[5] In the words of 19th century German economist, Friedrich List:

“It is a very common clever device that when anyone has attained the summit of greatness, he kicks away the ladder by which he has climbed up, in order to deprive others of the means of climbing up after him. In this lies the secret of the cosmopolitical doctrine of Adam Smith, and of the cosmopolitical tendencies of his great contemporary William Pitt, and of all his successors in the British Government administrations. Any nation which by means of protective duties and restrictions on navigation has raised her manufacturing power and her
navigation to such a degree of development that no other nation can sustain free competition with her, can do nothing wiser than to throw away these ladders of her greatness, to preach to other nations the benefits of free trade, and to declare in penitent tones that she has hitherto wandered in the paths of error, and has now for the first time succeeded in discovering the truth.  

Protectionism in the US

Free trade and protectionism are regional issues. Although less of an issue than slavery, differences in trade between the two regions contributed to the Civil War and remain a point of national difference even today.

Historically, southern slave holding states, because of their low cost manual labor, had little perceived need for mechanization, and supported having the right to purchase manufactured goods from any nation. Thus they called themselves free traders.

Northern states, on the other hand, sought to develop a manufacturing capacity, and successfully raised tariffs to allow nascent Northern manufacturers to compete with British competitors. Beginning with the "Report on Manufactures," by the first US Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, advocating tariffs to help protect infant industries, including bounties (subsidies) derived in part from those tariffs, the United States became the leading nation opposed to "free trade" theory. Throughout the 19th century, leading US statesmen, including Senator Henry Clay, continued Hamilton's themes within the Whig Party under the name "American System."

The opposed Southern Democratic Party contested several elections throughout the 1830s, 1840s, and 1850s in part over the issue of the tariff and protection of industry. However, Southern Democrats were never as strong in the US House as the more populated North. The Northern Whigs sought and got higher protective tariffs, over the bitter resistance of the South. One Southern state precipitated what was called the nullification crisis over the issue of tariffs, arguing that states had the right to ignore federal laws.

Mostly over the issue of abolition and other scandals, the Whigs would ultimately collapse, leaving a void which the fledgling Republican Party, led by Abraham Lincoln, would fill. Lincoln, who called himself a "Henry Clay tariff Whig", strongly opposed free trade. He implemented a 44 percent tariff during the Civil War in part to pay for the building of the Union-Pacific Railroad, the war effort, and to protect American industry.

This support for Northern industry was ultimately successful. By President Lincoln's term, the northern manufacturing states had ten times the GDP of the South. Armed with this economic advantage, the North was easily able to starve the South of weapons through a near total blockade, while at the same time was able to supply its own army with everything from heavy artillery to repeating Henry rifles.

With the North winning the Civil War, Republican dominance was assured over the Southern Democrats. Republicans continued to dominate American politics until around the early 20th century. President William McKinley stated the United States' stance under the Republican Party as thus:

"Under free trade the trader is the master and the producer the slave. Protection is but the law of nature, the law of self-preservation, of self-development, of securing the highest and best destiny of the race of man. [It is said] that protection is immoral.... Why, if protection builds up and elevates 63,000,000 [the U.S. population] of people, the influence of those 63,000,000 of people elevates the rest of the world. We cannot take a step in the pathway of progress without benefiting mankind everywhere. Well, they say, 'Buy where you can buy the cheapest'.... Of course, that applies to labor as to everything else. Let me give you a maxim that is a thousand times better than that, and it is the protection maxim: 'Buy where you can pay the easiest.' And that spot of earth is where labor wins its highest rewards."[9]

President Ulysses S. Grant further echoes that in his quote here:

"For centuries England has relied on protection, has carried it to extremes and has obtained satisfactory results from it. There is no doubt that it is to this system that it owes its present strength. After two centuries, England has found it convenient to adopt free trade because it thinks that protection can no longer offer it anything.
Very well then, Gentlemen, my knowledge of our country leads me to believe that within 200 years, when America has gotten out of protection all that it can offer, it too will adopt free trade.¹

Southern Democrats gradually rebuilt their party and allied themselves with Northern Progressives. They had many differences but both were staunchly opposed to the great corporate trusts that had built up. This marriage of convenience to face a common enemy reinvigorated the Democratic Party, which catapulted back into power.

Northern Progressives sought free trade to undermine the power base of Republicans; Woodrow Wilson would admit as much in a speech to Congress. Woodrow Wilson's ideological understudy, Franklin Roosevelt, would essentially blame the Great Depression upon the protectionist policies exemplified by the previous Republican President, Herbert Hoover.

**Protectionist policies**

A variety of policies have been used to achieve protectionist goals. These include:

1. **Tariffs**: Typically, tariffs (or taxes) are imposed on imported goods. Tariff rates usually vary according to the type of goods imported. Import tariffs will increase the cost to importers, and increase the price of imported goods in the local markets, thus lowering the quantity of goods imported. Tariffs may also be imposed on exports, and in an economy with floating exchange rates, export tariffs have similar effects as import tariffs. However, since export tariffs are often perceived as 'hurting' local industries, while import tariffs are perceived as 'helping' local industries, export tariffs are seldom implemented.

2. **Import quotas**: To reduce the quantity and therefore increase the market price of imported goods. The economic effects of an import quota is similar to that of a tariff, except that the tax revenue gain from a tariff will instead be distributed to those who receive import licenses. Economists often suggest that import licenses be auctioned to the highest bidder, or that import quotas be replaced by an equivalent tariff.

3. **Administrative barriers**: Countries are sometimes accused of using their various administrative rules (e.g. regarding food safety, environmental standards, electrical safety, etc.) as a way to introduce barriers to imports.

4. **Anti-dumping legislation**: Supporters of anti-dumping laws argue that they prevent "dumping" of cheaper foreign goods that would cause local firms to close down. However, in practice, anti-dumping laws are usually used to impose trade tariffs on foreign exporters.

5. **Direct subsidies**: Government subsidies (in the form of lump-sum payments or cheap loans) are sometimes given to local firms that cannot compete well against imports. These subsidies are purported to "protect" local jobs, and to help local firms adjust to the world markets.

6. **Export subsidies**: Export subsidies are often used by governments to increase exports. Export subsidies are the opposite of export tariffs, exporters are paid a percentage of the value of their exports. Export subsidies increase the amount of trade, and in a country with floating exchange rates, have effects similar to import subsidies.

7. **Exchange rate manipulation**: A government may intervene in the foreign exchange market to lower the value of its currency by selling its currency in the foreign exchange market. Doing so will raise the cost of imports and lower the cost of exports, leading to an improvement in its trade balance. However, such a policy is only effective in the short run, as it will most likely lead to inflation in the country, which will in turn raise the cost of exports, and reduce the relative price of imports.

8. **International patent systems**: There is an argument for viewing national patent systems as a cloak for protectionist trade policies at a national level. Two strands of this argument exist: one when patents held by one country form part of a system of exploitable relative advantage in trade negotiations against another, and a second where adhering to a worldwide system of patents confers "good citizenship" status despite 'de facto protectionism'. Peter Drahos explains that "States realized that patent systems could be used to cloak protectionist strategies. There were also reputational advantages for states to be seen to be sticking to intellectual property systems. One could attend the various revisions of the Paris and Berne conventions, participate in the cosmopolitan moral dialogue about the need to protect the fruits of authorial labor and inventive genius...knowing all the while that one's
Protectionism

In the modern trade arena many other initiatives besides tariffs have been called protectionist. For example, some commentators, such as Jagdish Bhagwati, see developed countries efforts in imposing their own labor or environmental standards as protectionism. Also, the imposition of restrictive certification procedures on imports are seen in this light.

Further, others point out that free trade agreements often have protectionist provisions such as intellectual property, copyright, and patent restrictions that benefit large corporations. These provisions restrict trade in music, movies, pharmaceuticals, software, and other manufactured items to high cost producers with quotas from low cost producers set to zero.

Arguments for protectionism

Protectionists believe that there is a legitimate need for government restrictions on free trade in order to protect their country’s economy and its people’s standard of living.

Comparative advantage has lost its legitimacy

Comparative advantage is used by most economists as a basis for their support of free trade policies. Opponents of these policies argue that comparative advantage has lost its legitimacy in a globally integrated world in which capital is free to move internationally. Herman Daly, a leading voice in the discipline of ecological economics, emphasizes that although Ricardo's theory of comparative advantage is one of the most elegant theories in economics, its application to the present day is illogical: "Free capital mobility totally undercuts Ricardo's comparative advantage argument for free trade in goods, because that argument is explicitly and essentially premised on capital (and other factors) being immobile between nations. Under the new global economy, capital tends simply to flow to wherever costs are lowest—that is, to pursue absolute advantage. Protectionists would point to the building of plants and shifting of production to Mexico by American companies such as GE, GM, and Hershey Chocolate as proof of this argument.

The Comparative Advantage argument is also premised on full employment. According to the Wikipedia entry on Comparative Advantage, “if one or other of the economies has less than full employment of factors of production, then this excess capacity must usually be used up before the comparative advantage reasoning can be applied”. Protectionists believe that it is therefore erroneous to base trade policy on the principle of Comparative Advantage in those countries that suffer from significant unemployment or underemployment.

Domestic tax policies can favor foreign goods

Protectionists believe that allowing foreign goods to enter domestic markets without being subject to tariffs or other forms of taxation, leads to a situation where domestic goods are at a disadvantage, a kind of reverse protectionism. By ruling out revenue tariffs on foreign products, governments must rely solely on domestic taxation to provide its revenue, which falls disproportionately on domestic manufacturing. As Paul Craig Roberts notes: "[Foreign discrimination of US products] is reinforced by the US tax system, which imposes no appreciable tax burden on foreign goods and services sold in the US but imposes a heavy tax burden on US producers of goods and services regardless of whether they are sold within the US or exported to other countries. Protectionists argue that this reverse protectionism is most clearly seen and most detrimental to those countries (such as the US) that do not participate in the Value Added Tax (VAT) system. This is a system which generates revenues from taxation on the sale of goods and services, whether foreign or domestic. Protectionists argue that a country that does not participate is at a distinct disadvantage when trading with a country that does. That the final selling price of
a product from a non-participating country sold in a country with a VAT tax must bear not only the tax burden of the country of origin, but also a portion of the tax burden of the country where it is being sold. Conversely, the selling price of a product made in a participating country and sold in a country that does not participate, bears no part of the tax burden of the country in which it is sold (as do the domestic products it is competing with). Moreover, the participating country rebates VAT taxes collected in the manufacture of a product if that product is sold in a non-participating country. This allows exporters of goods from participating countries to reduce the price of products sold in non-participating countries.

Protectionists believe that governments should address this inequity, if not by adopting a VAT tax, then by at least imposing compensating taxes (tariffs) on imports.

**Infant industry argument**

Protectionists believe that infant industries must be protected in order to allow them to grow to a point where they can fairly compete with the larger mature industries established in foreign countries. They believe that without this protection, infant industries will die before they reach a size and age where economies of scale, industrial infrastructure, and skill in manufacturing have progressed sufficiently allow the industry to compete in the global market.

**Unrestricted trade undercuts domestic policies for social good**

Most industrialized governments have long held that laissez-faire capitalism creates social evils that harm its citizens. To protect those citizens, these governments have enacted laws that restrict what companies can and can not do in pursuit of profit. Examples are laws regarding:

- child labor
- collective bargaining
- competition (antitrust)
- environmental protection
- equal opportunity
- intellectual property
- minimum wage
- occupational safety and health

Protectionists argue that these laws place an economic burden on domestic companies bound by them that put those companies at a disadvantage when they compete, both domestically and abroad, with goods and services produced by companies unfettered by such restrictions. They argue that governments have a responsibility to protect their corporations as well as their citizens when putting its companies at a competitive disadvantage by enacting laws for social good. Otherwise, they believe that these laws end up destroying domestic companies and ultimately hurting the citizens these laws were designed to protect.

**Arguments against protectionism**

Protectionism is frequently criticized by mainstream economists as harming the people it is meant to help. Most mainstream economists instead support free trade.\[1\][4\] Economic theory, under the principle of comparative advantage, shows that the gains from free trade outweigh any losses as free trade creates more jobs than it destroys because it allows countries to specialize in the production of goods and services in which they have a comparative advantage.\[16\] Protectionism results in deadweight loss; this loss to overall welfare gives no-one any benefit, unlike in a free market, where there is no such total loss. According to economist Stephen P. Magee, the benefits of free trade outweigh the losses by as much as 100 to 1.\[17\]
Most economists, including Nobel prize winners Milton Friedman and Paul Krugman, believe that free trade helps workers in developing countries, even though they are not subject to the stringent health and labour standards of developed countries. This is because "the growth of manufacturing — and of the myriad other jobs that the new export sector creates — has a ripple effect throughout the economy" that creates competition among producers, lifting wages and living conditions.[18] Economists have suggested that those who support protectionism ostensibly to further the interests of workers in least developed countries are in fact being disingenuous, seeking only to protect jobs in developed countries.[19] Additionally, workers in the least developed countries only accept jobs if they are the best on offer, as all mutually consensual exchanges must be of benefit to both sides, else they wouldn't be entered into freely. That they accept low-paying jobs from companies in developed countries shows that their other employment prospects are worse. A letter reprinted in the May 2010 edition of Econ Journal Watch identifies a similar sentiment against protectionism from sixteen British economists at the beginning of the 20th century.[20]

Alan Greenspan, former chair of the American Federal Reserve, has criticized protectionist proposals as leading "to an atrophy of our competitive ability. ... If the protectionist route is followed, newer, more efficient industries will have less scope to expand, and overall output and economic welfare will suffer."[21]

Protectionism has also been accused of being one of the major causes of war. Proponents of this theory point to the constant warfare in the 17th and 18th centuries among European countries whose governments were predominantly mercantilist and protectionist, the American Revolution, which came about ostensibly due to British tariffs and taxes, as well as the protective policies preceding both World War I and World War II. According to Frederic Bastiat, "When goods cannot cross borders, armies will."

Free trade promotes equal access to domestic resources (human, natural, capital, etc.) for domestic participants and foreign participants alike. Some thinkers extend that under free trade, citizens of participating countries deserve equal access to resources and social welfare (labor laws, education, etc.). Visa entrance policies tend to discourage free reallocation between many countries, and encourage it with others. High freedom and mobility has been shown to lead to far greater development than aid programs in many cases, for example eastern European countries in the European Union. In other words visa entrance requirements are a form of local protectionism.

**Current world trends**

Since the end of World War II, it has been the stated policy of most First World countries to eliminate protectionism through free trade policies enforced by international treaties and organizations such as the World Trade Organization. Certain policies of First World governments have been criticized as protectionist, however, such as the Common Agricultural Policy[22] in the European Union, longstanding agricultural subsidies and proposed "Buy American" provisions[23] in economic recovery packages in the United States.

The current round of trade talks by the World Trade Organization is the Doha Development Round and the last session of talks in Geneva, Switzerland led to an impasse. The leaders' statement in the G20 meeting in London in early 2009 included a promise to continue the Doha Round.

**Protectionism after the 2008 financial crisis**

Heads of the G20 meeting in London on 2 April 2009 pledged "We will not repeat the historic mistakes of protectionism of previous eras". Adherence to this pledge is monitored by the Global Trade Alert[24], providing up-to-date information and informed commentary to help ensure that the G20 pledge is met by maintaining confidence in the world trading system, deterring beggar-thy-neighbour acts, and preserving the contribution that exports could play in the future recovery of the world economy. Although they were reiterating what they had already committed to, last November in Washington, 17 of these 20 countries were reported by the World Bank as having imposed trade restrictive measures since then. In its report, the World Bank says most of the world's major economies are resorting to protectionist measures as the global economic slowdown begins to bite. Economists who have examined the impact of new trade-restrictive measures using detailed bilaterally monthly trade statistics
estimated that new measures taken through late 2009 were distorting global merchandise trade by 1/4 to 1/2 percent (about $50 billion a year).\[25]\n
**New US incoming airmail compliance**

Despite pledges to abstain from protectionism, the US has imposed a new 'security check' on all international airmail entering the US that weighs over 453 grams from November 2010. In addition to the 48 hour delay on all such airmail, compliance fees have been shifted onto the international postal services. Effectively this is protectionism under the guise of ‘aviation security’. For example,

- Australia - an additional $9AUD is charged in Australia for the cost of compliance making the posting of most small items to the US uneconomical.\[26]\n- Thailand - ban on all parcels to the US weighing over 453 grams until February 2011.\[27]\n
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Libertarianism

Libertarianism has been variously defined by sources. It is the political philosophy that holds individuals own themselves and thus have property rights in external things, or any political philosophy which approximates this view.\[^{1}\] It may also be defined as the political philosophy that holds individual liberty as the basic moral principle of society. Libertarianism includes diverse beliefs, all advocating strict limits to government activity and sharing the goal of maximizing individual liberty and political freedom.

Philosopher Roderick T. Long defines libertarianism as "any political position that advocates a radical redistribution of power from the coercive state to voluntary associations of free individuals", whether "voluntary association" takes the form of the free market or of communal co-operatives.\[^{2}\] According to the U.S. Libertarian Party, libertarianism is the advocacy of a government that is funded voluntarily and limited to protecting individuals from coercion and violence.\[^{3}\] Woodcock, an intellectual historian of anarchism, defines libertarianism as a critical individualist social philosophy, aimed at transforming society by reform or revolution, that fundamentally doubts authority.\[^{4}\]

Overview

Libertarian schools of thought differ over the degree to which the state should be reduced. Anarchistic schools advocate complete elimination of the state. Minarchist schools advocate a state which is limited to protecting its citizens from aggression, theft, breach of contract, and fraud. Some minarchist libertarians accept minimal public assistance for the poor.\[^{5}\] Additionally, some schools are supportive of private property rights in the ownership of unappropriated land and natural resources while others reject such private ownership and often support common ownership instead.\[^{6}\][7][8] Another distinction can be made among libertarians who support private ownership and those that support common ownership of the means of production; the former generally supporting a capitalist economy, the latter a socialist economic system. In some parts of the world, the term "libertarianism" is synonymous with Left anarchism.\[^{9}\]

Libertarians can broadly be characterized as holding four ethical views: consequentialism, deontological theories, contractarianism, and class-struggle normative beliefs. The main divide is between consequentialist libertarianism—which is support for a large degree of "liberty" because it leads to favorable consequences, such as prosperity or efficiency—and deontological libertarianism (also known as "rights-theorist libertarianism," "natural rights libertarianism," or "libertarian moralism"), which is a philosophy based on belief in moral self-ownership and opposition to "initiation of force" and fraud.\[^{10}\][11] Others combine a hybrid of consequentialist and deontologist
Another view, contractarian libertarianism, holds that any legitimate authority of government derives not from the consent of the governed, but from contract or mutual agreement, though this can be seen as reducible to consequentialism or deontologism depending on what grounds contracts are justified. Some Libertarian Socialists with backgrounds influenced by Marxism reject deontological and consequential approaches and use normative class-struggle methodologies rooted in Hegelian thought to justify direct action in pursuit of liberty.

In the United States, the term libertarian is commonly associated with those who have conservative positions on economic issues and liberal positions on social issues. This is based on the common meanings of "conservative" and "liberal" in the United States.

Philosopher Roderick T. Long defines libertarianism as "any political position that advocates a radical redistribution of power from the coercive state to voluntary associations of free individuals", whether "voluntary association" takes the form of the free market or of communal co-operatives.

**Etymology**

The use of the word "libertarian" to describe a set of political positions can be tracked to the French cognate, libertaire, which was coined in 1857 by French anarchist Joseph Déjacque who used the term to distinguish his libertarian communist approach from the mutualism advocated by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. Hence libertarian has been used by some as a synonym for left-wing anarchism since the 1890s. Libertarian socialists, such as Noam Chomsky and Colin Ward, assert that many still consider the term libertarianism a synonym of anarchism in countries other than the US.

**History**

**Origins**

During the 18th century Age of Enlightenment, "liberal" ideas flourished in Europe and North America. Libertarians of various schools were influenced by classical liberal ideas. The term libertarian in a metaphysical or philosophical sense was first used by late-Enlightenment free-thinkers to refer to those who believed in free will, as opposed to determinism. The first recorded use was in 1789 by William Belsham in a discussion of free will and in opposition to "necessitarian" (or determinist) views.

The first anarchist journal to use the term "libertarian" was La Libertaire, Journal du Mouvement Social, published in New York City between 1858 and 1861 by French anarcho-communist Joseph Déjacque. The next recorded use of the term was in Europe, when "libertarian communism" was used at a French regional anarchist Congress at Le Havre (16-22 November, 1880). January the following year saw a French manifesto issued on "Libertarian or Anarchist Communism." Finally, 1895 saw leading anarchists Sébastien Faure and Louise Michel publish La Libertaire in France. The word stems from the French word libertaire, and was used to evade the French ban on anarchist publications. In this tradition, the term "libertarianism" in "libertarian socialism" is generally used as a synonym for anarchism, which some say is the original meaning of the term; hence "libertarian socialism" is equivalent to "socialist anarchism" to these scholars. In the context of the European socialist movement, libertarian has conventionally been used to describe those who opposed state socialism, such as Mikhail Bakunin. The association of socialism with libertarianism predates that of capitalism, and many anti-authoritarians still decry what they see as a mistaken association of capitalism with libertarianism in the United States.
Twentieth century

During the early 20th century modern liberalism in the United States began to take a more state-oriented approach to economic regulation. While conservatism in Europe continued to mean conserving hierarchical class structures through state control of society and the economy, some conservatives in the United States began to refer to conserving traditions of liberty. This was especially true of the Old Right, which opposed the New Deal and U.S. military interventions in World War I and World War II. Those who held to the earlier liberal views began to call themselves market liberals, classic liberals or libertarians to distinguish themselves. The Austrian School of economics, influenced by Frédéric Bastiat and later by Ludwig von Mises, also had an impact on what is now right-libertarianism.

In the 1950s many with "Old Right" or classical liberal beliefs in the United States began to describe themselves as "libertarian." Arizona United States Senator Barry Goldwater's right-libertarian leaning challenge to authority also influenced the US libertarian movement.[27]

During the 1960s, the Vietnam War divided right-libertarians, anarchist libertarians, and conservatives. Right-libertarians and left-libertarians opposed to the war joined the draft resistance and peace movements and began founding their own publications, like Murray Rothbard's The Libertarian Forum[28] and organizations like the Radical Libertarian Alliance[29] and the Society for Individual Liberty.[30]

In 1971, a small group of Americans led by David Nolan formed the U.S. Libertarian Party. Attracting former Democrats, Republicans and independents, the party has run a presidential candidate every election year since 1972. Over the years, dozens of capitalism-supporting libertarian political parties have been formed worldwide. Educational organizations like the Center for Libertarian Studies and the Cato Institute were formed in the 1970s, and others have been created since then.

Right-libertarianism gained a significant measure of recognition in academia with the publication of Harvard University professor Robert Nozick's Anarchy, State, and Utopia in 1974. The book won a National Book Award in 1975.[31][32] Nozick disavowed some of his theory late in life.[33] Academics as well as proponents of the free market perspectives note that free-market capitalist libertarianism has been successfully propagated beyond the United States since the 1970s via think tanks and political parties.[34]

Libertarian philosophies

See also Category:Libertarianism by form.

Libertarian philosophies can be divided on three principal questions: whether the morality of actions are determined consequentially or deontologically, whether or not private property is legitimate, and whether or not the state is legitimate.

Consequentialist / deontological distinction

Consequentialist libertarians defend liberty on the grounds that its consequences are preferable to the products of less-free societies.[35] Deontological libertarians hold that libertarians must defend liberty on principle because aggression and violent coercion are fundamentally immoral, regardless of consequences.[36]

Propertarian / non-propertarian distinction

Non-propertarian libertarian philosophies hold that liberty is the absence of any form authority and assert that a society based on freedom and equality can be achieved through abolishing authoritarian institutions that control certain means of production and subordinate the majority to an owning class or political and economic elite.[37] Implicitly, it rejects any authority of private property and thus holds that it is not legitimate for someone to claim private ownership of any resources to the detriment of others.[38][39][40][41] Libertarian socialism is a group of political philosophies that promote a non-hierarchical, non-bureaucratic, stateless society without private property in
the means of production. The term libertarian socialism is also used to differentiate this philosophy from state socialism or as a synonym for anarchism. Libertarian socialists generally place their hopes in decentralized means of direct democracy such as libertarian municipalism, citizens’ assemblies, trade unions and workers’ councils.

Propertarian libertarian philosophies define liberty as non-aggression, or the state in which no person or group aggresses against any other person or group, where aggression is defined as the violation of private property. This philosophy, implicitly, recognizes as the sole source of legitimate authority private property. Propertarian libertarians hold that an order of private property is the only one that is both ethical and leads to the best possible outcomes. They generally support the free-market, and are not opposed to any concentration of power (monopolies) provided it is brought about through non-coercive means.

**Statist / anarchistic distinction**

Libertarians differ on the degree up to which the state can be reduced. Some favor the existence of states and see them as necessary while others favor stateless societies and view the state as being undesirable, unnecessary, and harmful.

Supporters of government argue that having defense and courts controlled by the market is an inherent miscarriage of justice because it turns justice into a commodity, thereby conflating justice with economic power. Detractors argue that having defense and courts controlled by the state is both immoral and an inefficient means of achieving both justice and security. Libertarians socialists hold that liberty is incompatible with state action based on a class struggle analysis of the state.

**Influential Libertarian Philosophers**

*See also Category:Libertarian theorists*

- Émile Armand - one of the most influential individualist anarchists of the early 20th century
- Mikhail Bakunin - one of the main theorists of collectivist anarchism and a major influence on the development of Left-libertarianism
- Frédéric Bastiat - one of the leading economists of the 19th century and creator of the concept of opportunity cost
- Murray Bookchin - the founder of libertarian municipalism and a leading theorist of the social ecology movement
- Milton Friedman - Nobel Prize-winning economist, notable for his contributions to monetarism
- William Godwin - the first modern proponent of anarchism, whose political views are outlined in his book *Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and its Influence on Modern Morals and Manners*
- Friedrich Hayek - Nobel Prize-winning Austrian School economist, notable for his work on the Austrian business cycle theory and the economic calculation problem
- Hans-Hermann Hoppe - created extensive work on discourse ethics
- Ludwig von Mises - Austrian School economist, notable for his work on praxeology
- Robert Nozick - political philosopher and author of *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*
- Pierre-Joseph Proudhon - the first self-described anarchist and founder of mutualism
- Ayn Rand - the creator of the philosophy of Objectivism
- Murray Rothbard - the founder of anarcho-capitalism and a leading Austrian school economist
- Max Stirner - founder of egoist anarchism
- Henry David Thoreau - one of the leading philosophers of American Transcendentalism and anarcho-pacifism
- Benjamin Tucker - a leading theorist of individualist anarchism in the 19th century
- Josiah Warren - the first known American anarchist and author of the first anarchist periodical *The Peaceful Revolutionist*
Libertarianism

Libertarian groups and movements
Since the 1950s, many American libertarian organizations have adopted a free market, capitalist stance; these include the Center for Libertarian Studies, the Cato Institute, the Foundation for Economic Education (FEE), the International Society for Individual Liberty (ISIL) and the Ludwig von Mises Institute. Libertarians are prominent in the Tea Party. The activist Free State Project, formed in 2001, works to bring 20,000 libertarians to New Hampshire to influence state policy. Less successful similar projects include the Free West Alliance and Free State Wyoming. Numerous socialist and anarchist libertarian groups existed during the twentieth century, like Libertarian League in America, Libertarian Youth in Spain or the Libertarian Socialist Organisation in Australia.[56][57][58] Contemporary examples include the CIB Unicobas union in Italy, Alternative liberaire in France, The Emancipatory Left caucus in The Left party in Germany, Libertarian Communist Organization in France and Argentine Libertarian Federation in Argentine. Scholars have also typified the European "new social movements" as that "family' of left-libertarian movements in...France, Germany, the Netherlands, and Switzerland."[59]

Libertarian political parties
See: Category:Libertarian parties
A number of countries have libertarian parties that run candidates for political office. In the United States, the Libertarian Party of the United States was formed in 1972. The Libertarian Party is the third largest American political party, with over 225,000 registered voters in the 35 states that allow registration as a libertarian and has hundreds of party candidates elected or appointed to public office, and has run thousands for office.[63] In the Netherlands there is the Libertarische Partij.[64] In Turkey, two political parties self-identify as libertarian socialist: Freedom and Solidarity Party and Equality and Democracy Party.[65]

Criticisms
See main article: Criticism of libertarianism
Critics of libertarianism include deontological criticisms and consequentialist criticisms.
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Green politics

Green politics is a political ideology that aims for the creation of an ecologically sustainable society rooted in environmentalism, social liberalism, and grassroots democracy.\[^1\] It began taking shape in the western world in the 1970s; since then Green parties have developed and established themselves in many countries across the globe, and have achieved some electoral success.

The political term Green, a translation of the German Grün, was coined by die Grünen, a Green party formed in the late 1970s. The term political ecology is sometimes used in Europe and in academic circles.

Supporters of Green politics, called Greens, share many ideas with the ecology, conservation, environmentalism, feminism, and peace movements. In addition to democracy and ecological issues, green politics is concerned with civil liberties, social justice, nonviolence and tends to support Social progressivism. However, as the 'Green' ideology expanded, there also came into separate existence green movements on the political right in the form of green conservatism and eco-capitalism.

The Green ideology has connections with various other ecocentric political ideologies, including ecosocialism, ecoanarchism, ecofeminism and ecofascism, but to what extent these can be seen as forms of Green politics is a matter of debate.\[^2\]

History

Influences

Adherents to green politics tend to consider it to be part of a 'higher' worldview and not simply a political ideology. Green politics draws its ethical stance from a variety of sources, from the values of indigenous peoples, to the ethics of Gandhi, Spinoza and Uexküll. These people influenced green thought in their advocacy of long-term "seventh generation" foresight, and on the personal responsibility of every individual to make moral choices.

Of course, unease about adverse consequences of human actions on nature predates the modern concept of "environmentalism". Social commentators as far apart as ancient Rome and China complained of air, water and noise pollution.\[^3\]

The philosophical roots of environmentalism can be traced back to enlightenment thinkers such as Rousseau in France and, later, the author and naturalist Thoreau in America. Organised environmentalism began in late 19th Century Europe and the United States as a reaction to the Industrial Revolution with its emphasis on unbridled economic expansion.\[^4\]

“Green politics” first began as conservation movements, such as the Sierra Club, founded in San Francisco in 1892. Left-green platforms of the form that make up the green parties today draw terminology from the science of ecology, and policy from environmentalism, deep ecology, feminism, pacifism, anarchism, libertarian socialism, social democracy, eco-socialism, and social ecology. In the 1970s, as these movements grew in influence, green politics arose as a new philosophy which synthesized their goals. In some far-right and fascist parties, nationalism has on occasion been tied into a sort of green politics which promotes environmentalism as a form of pride in the
"motherland" according a minority of authors.\[^{[5][6]}\]

**Early Development**

The first political party to be created with its basis in environmental issues was the United Tasmania Group, founded in Australia in March 1972 to fight against deforestation and the creation of a dam that would damage Lake Pedder; whilst it only gained three percent in state elections, it had, according to Derek Wall, "inspired the creation of Green parties all over the world."\[^{[8]}\] In May 1972, a meeting at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, launched the **Values Party**, the world's first countrywide green party to contest Parliamentary seats nationally.\[^{[9]}\] A year later in 1973, Europe's first green party, the UK's Ecology Party, came into existence.

The German Green Party was not the first Green Party in Europe to have members elected nationally but the impression was created that they had been, because they attracted the most media attention: The German Greens, contended in their first national election in 1980. They started as a provisional coalition of civic groups and political campaigns which, together, felt their interests were not expressed by the conventional parties. After contesting the 1979 Euro elections they held a conference which identified Four Pillars of the Green Party which all groups in the original alliance could agree as the basis of a common Party platform: welding these groups together as a single Party. This statement of principles has since been utilised by many Green Parties around the world. It was this party that first coined the term "Green" ("Grün" in German) and adopted the sunflower symbol. In the 1983 federal election, the Greens won 27 seats in the Bundestag.

**Further developments**

The first Canadian foray into green politics took place in the Maritimes when 11 independent candidates (including one in Montreal and one in Toronto) ran in the 1980 federal election under the banner of the Small Party. (Current Green Party of Canada leader Elizabeth May was the instigator and one of the candidates). Inspired by Schumacher's Small is Beautiful, the Small Party candidates ran for the expressed purpose of putting forward an anti-nuclear platform in that election. It was not registered as an official party, but some participants in that effort went on to form the Green Party of Canada in 1983 (the Ontario Greens and British Columbia Greens were also formed that year).\[^{[10]}\]

In Finland, in 1995, the Green League became the first European Green party to form part of a state-level Cabinet. The German Greens followed, forming a government with the Social Democratic Party of Germany (the "Red-Green Alliance") from 1998 to 2005. In 2001, they reached an agreement to end reliance on nuclear power in Germany, and agreed to remain in coalition and support the German government of Chancellor Gerhard Schröder in the 2001 Afghan War. This put them at odds with many Greens worldwide but demonstrated also that they were capable of difficult political tradeoffs.

In Latvia, Indulis Emsis, leader of the Green party and part of the Union of Greens and Farmers, an alliance of a Nordic agrarian party and a Green party, was Prime Minister of Latvia for ten months in 2004, making him the first Green politician to lead a country in the history of the world. In the German state of Baden-Württemburg, the Green party is the leader of the coalition with the Social Democrats since the Baden-Württemberg state election, 2011.
Core tenets

According to Derek Wall, a prominent British Green proponent, there are four pillars that define Green politics: ecology, social justice, grassroots democracy and non-violence.\[1\]

In 1984, the Green Committees of Correspondence in the United States expanded the Four Pillars into Ten Key Values which, in addition to the Four Pillars mentioned above, include:

- Decentralization
- Community-based economics
- Post-patriarchal values (later translated to Feminism)
- Respect for diversity
- Global responsibility
- Future focus

In 2001, the Global Greens were organized as an international Green movement. The Global Greens Charter identified six guiding principles:

- Ecological wisdom
- Social justice
- Participatory democracy
- Nonviolence
- Sustainability
- Respect for diversity

Economics

Green economics focuses on the importance of the health of the biosphere to human well-being. Consequently, most Greens distrust conventional capitalism, as it tends to emphasize economic growth while ignoring ecological health; the "full cost" of economic growth often includes damage to the biosphere, which is unacceptable according to green politics. Green economics considers such growth to be "uneconomic growth"—material increase that nonetheless lowers overall quality of life.

Some Greens refer to productivism, consumerism and scientism as "grey", as contrasted with "green", economic views. "Grey" implies age, concrete, and lifelessness.

Therefore, adherents to green politics advocate economic policies designed to safeguard the environment. Greens want governments to stop subsidizing companies that waste resources or pollute the natural world, subsidies that Greens refer to as "dirty subsidies". Some currents of green politics place automobile and agribusiness subsidies in this category, as they may harm human health. On the contrary, Greens look to a green tax shift that will encourage both producers and consumers to make ecologically friendly choices.

Green economics is on the whole anti-globalist. Economic globalization is considered a threat to well-being, which will replace natural environments and local cultures with a single trade economy, termed the global economic monoculture.

Since green economics emphasizes biospheric health, an issue outside the traditional left-right spectrum, different currents within green politics incorporate ideas from socialism and capitalism. Greens on the Left are often identified as Eco-socialists, who merge ecology and environmentalism with socialism and Marxism and blame the capitalist system for environmental degradation, social injustice, inequality and conflict. Eco-capitalists, on the other hand, believe that the free market system, with some modification, is capable of addressing ecological problems. This belief is documented in the business experiences of eco-capitalists in the book, The Gort Cloud that describes the gort cloud as the green community that supports eco-friendly businesses.
Participatory democracy

Since the beginning, green politics has emphasized local, grassroots-level political activity and decision-making. According to its adherents, it is crucial that citizens play a direct role in the decisions that influence their lives and their environment. Therefore, green politics seeks to increase the role of deliberative democracy, based on direct citizen involvement and consensus decision making, wherever it is feasible.

Green politics also encourages political action on the individual level, such as ethical consumerism, or buying things that are made according to environmentally ethical standards. Indeed, many green parties emphasize individual and grassroots action at the local and regional levels over electoral politics. Historically, green parties have grown at the local level, gradually gaining influence and spreading to regional or provincial politics, only entering the national arena when there is a strong network of local support.

In addition, many Greens believe that governments should not levy taxes against strictly local production and trade. Some Greens advocate new ways of organizing authority to increase local control, including urban secession and bioregional democracy.

Other issues

Green politics on the whole is opposed to nuclear power and the buildup of persistent organic pollutants, supporting adherence to the precautionary principle, by which technologies are rejected unless they can be proven to not cause significant harm to the health of living things or the biosphere. In Germany and Sweden programs have been initiated to shut down all nuclear plants (known as nuclear power phase-out). But, on 5 February 2009, the Swedish Government announced an agreement allowing for the replacement of existing reactors, effectively ending the phase-out policy. And, on 6 September 2010, the German Federal Environment Norbert Röttgen and the Economy Ministers Rainer Brüderle announced an agreement for 12 more years operation of 17 nuclear plants.

In the spirit of nonviolence, Green politics opposes the War on Terrorism and the curtailment of civil rights, focusing instead on nurturing deliberative democracy in war-torn regions and the construction of a civil society with an increased role for women.

Although Greens in the United States "call for an end to the 'War on Drugs'" and "for decriminalization of victimless crimes", they also call for developing "a firm approach to law enforcement that directly addresses violent crime, including trafficking in hard drugs". Green platforms generally favor tariffs on fossil fuels, restricting genetically modified organisms, and protections for ecoregions or communities. In keeping with their commitment to the preservation of diversity, greens are often committed to the maintenance and protection of indigenous communities, languages, and traditions. An example of this is the Irish Green Party's commitment to the preservation of the Irish Language.
Organization

Local movements
Green ideology emphasizes participatory democracy and the principle of "thinking globally, acting locally". As such, the ideal Green Party is thought to grow from the bottom up, from neighborhood to municipal to (eco-)regional to national levels. The goal is rule by a consensus decision making process.

Strong local coalitions are considered a pre-requisite to higher-level electoral breakthroughs. Historically, the growth of Green parties has been sparked by a single issue where Greens can appeal to ordinary citizens’ concerns. In Germany, for example, the Greens' early opposition to nuclear power won them their first successes in the federal elections.

Global organization
There is a growing level of global cooperation between Green parties. Global gatherings of Green Parties now happen. The first Planetary Meeting of Greens was held 30–31 May 1992, in Rio de Janeiro, immediately preceding the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held there. More than 200 Greens from 28 nations attended. The first formal Global Greens Gathering took place in Canberra, in 2001, with more than 800 Greens from 72 countries in attendance. The second Global Green Congress was held in São Paulo, Brazil, in May 2008, when 75 parties were represented.

Global Green networking dates back to 1990. Following the Planetary Meeting of Greens in Rio de Janeiro, a Global Green Steering Committee was created, consisting of two seats for each continent. In 1993 this Global Steering Committee met in Mexico City and authorized the creation of a Global Green Network including a Global Green Calendar, Global Green Bulletin, and Global Green Directory. The Directory was issued in several editions in the next years. In 1996, 69 Green Parties from around the world signed a common declaration opposing French nuclear testing in the South Pacific, the first statement of global greens on a current issue. A second statement was issued in December 1997, concerning the Kyoto climate change treaty.[14]

At the 2001 Canberra Global Gathering delegates for Green Parties from 72 countries decided upon a Global Greens Charter which proposes six key principles. Over time, each Green Party can discuss this and organize itself to approve it, some by using it in the local press, some by translating it for their web site, some by incorporating it into their manifesto, some by incorporating it into their constitution. [15] This process is taking place gradually, with online dialogue enabling parties to say where they are up to with this process. [16]

The Gatherings also agree on organizational matters. The first Gathering voted unanimously to set up the Global Green Network (GGN). The GGN is composed of three representatives from each Green Party. A companion organization was set up by the same resolution: Global Green Coordination (GGC). This is composed of three representatives from each Federation (Africa, Europe, The Americas, Asia/Pacific, see below). Discussion of the planned organization took place in several Green Parties prior to the Canberra meeting. [17] The GGC communicates chiefly by email. Any agreement by it has to be by unanimity of its members. It may identify possible global campaigns to propose to Green Parties world wide. The GGC may endorse statements by individual Green Parties. For example, it endorsed a statement by the US Green Party on the Israel-Palestine conflict.[18]

Thirdly, Global Green Gatherings are an opportunity for informal networking, from which joint campaigning may arise. For example, a campaign to protect the New Caledonian coral reef, by getting it nominated for World Heritage Status: a joint campaign by the New Caledonia Green Party, New Caledonian indigenous leaders, the French Green Party, and the Australian Greens. [19] Another example concerns Ingrid Betancourt, the leader of the Green Party in Colombia, the Green Oxygen Party (Partido Verde Oxígeno). Ingrid Betancourt and the party's Campaign Manager, Claire Rojas, were kidnapped by a hard-line faction of FARC on 7 March 2002, while travelling in FARC-controlled territory. Betancourt had spoken at the Canberra Gathering, making many friends. As a result, Green Parties all over the world have organized, pressing their governments to bring pressure to bear. For example, Green Parties in
African countries, Austria, Canada, Brazil, Peru, Mexico, France, Scotland, Sweden and other countries have launched campaigns calling for Betancourt's release. Bob Brown, the leader of the Australian Greens, went to Colombia, as did an envoy from the European Federation, Alain Lipietz, who issued a report.[20] The four Federations of Green Parties issued a message to FARC.[21] Ingrid Betancourt was rescued by the Colombian military in Operation Jaque in 2008. However, the efforts of the Green Parties shows their potential to unite and campaign jointly.[22]

**Global Green meetings**

Separately from the Global Green Gatherings, *Global Green Meetings* take place. For instance, one took place on the fringe of the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg. Green Parties attended from Australia, Taiwan, Korea, South Africa, Mauritius, Uganda, Cameroon, Republic of Cyprus, Italy, France, Belgium, Germany, Finland, Sweden, Norway, the USA, Mexico and Chile.

The Global Green Meeting discussed the situation of Green Parties on the African continent; heard a report from Mike Feinstein, former Mayor of Santa Monica, about setting up a web site of the GGN; discussed procedures for the better working of the GGC; and decided two topics on which the Global Greens could issue statements in the near future: Iraq and the 2003 WTO meeting in Cancun.

**Green federations**

The member parties of the Global Greens are organised into four continental federations:

- Federation of Green Parties of Africa
- Federation of the Green Parties of the Americas / Federación de los Partidos Verdes de las Américas
- Asia-Pacific Green Network
- European Federation of Green Parties


**Currents**

Green politics is usually said to include the green anarchism, eco-anarchism, anti-nuclear and peace movements – although these often claim not to be aligned with any party. Some claim it also includes feminism, pacifism and the animal rights movements. Some Greens support policy measures to empower women, especially mothers; to oppose war and de-escalate conflicts and stop proliferating technologies useful in conflict or likely to lead to conflict, and Great Ape personhood.

Greens on the Left adhere to eco-socialism, an ideology that combines ecology, environmentalism, socialism and Marxism to criticise the capitalist system as the cause of ecological crises, social exclusion, inequality and conflict. Many Green Parties are not avowedly eco-socialist but most Green Parties around the world have or have had a large Eco-socialist membership. This has led some on the right to refer to Greens as "watermelons" – green on the outside, red on the inside.[23]

Despite this stereotype, some centrist Greens follow more geo-libertarian views which emphasize natural capitalism – and shifting taxes away from value created by labor or service and charging instead for human consumption of the wealth created by the natural world. Greens may view the processes by which living beings compete for mates, homes, and food, ecology, and the cognitive and political sciences very differently. These differences tend to drive debate on ethics, formation of policy, and the public resolution of these differences in leadership races. There is no single *Green Ethic*. 
Notes

[11] Roussopolous, Dimitrios (1993), Political ecology: beyond environmentalism, Montreal: Black Rose Books, p. 114, ISBN 1895431808, “Not surprisingly the colours green and yellow are used widely in the symbols of ecologists, the former evoking vegetation and the latter the sun. The sunflower, a popular symbol, embodies both colours, and turns towards the sun, the source of renewable energy. The bicycle is another important icon as bicycle transportation is regarded as one of the means to re-humanise society.”
[18] 04.10.02: Global Greens on Israeli-Palestinian Conflict (http://www.greenpartyus.org/press/pr_04_10_02.html)
[21] (http://www.web.greens.org/~cls/gp/to-farc-ep)
[22] Devuelve a Ingrid Viva (http://www.providence.edu/polisci/affigne/free_ingrid.htm)
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Local food

Local food or the local food movement is a "collaborative effort to build more locally based, self-reliant food economies - one in which sustainable food production, processing, distribution, and consumption is integrated to enhance the economic, environmental and social health of a particular place."[1] It is part of the concept of local purchasing and local economies; a preference to buy locally produced goods and services rather than those produced by corporatized institutions.

It is not solely a geographical concept. A United States Department of Agriculture publication explains local food as "related to the distance between food producers and consumers," as well as "defined in terms of social and supply chain characteristics."[2]

Local food systems

The term "Food System" refers to how food is produced and reaches consumers, and why we eat what we do. It subsumes the terms 'food chain' and 'food economy', which are both too narrowly linear and/or economic. The food system can be broken down to three basic components: Biological, Economic/political, and Social/cultural. The Biological refers to the organic processes of food production; the Economic/political refers to institutional moderation of different group's participation in and control of the system, and the Social/cultural refers to the "personal relations, community values, and cultural relations which affect peoples use of food."[3]

Local food systems are an alternative to the global corporate models where producers and consumers are separated through a chain of processors/manufacturers, shippers and retailers. They "are complex networks of relationships between actors including producers, distributors, retailers and consumers grounded in a particular place. These systems are the unit of measure by which participants in local food movements are working to increase food security and ensure the economic, ecological and social sustainability of communities."[4]

Definitions of "local"

There is no single definition of "local" or 'local food systems' in terms of the geographic distance between production and consumption. But defining 'local' based on marketing arrangements, such as farmers selling directly to consumers at regional farmers’ markets or to schools, is well recognized.[5] There are "a number of different definitions for local [that] have been used or recorded by researchers assessing local food systems [and] most [are] informed by political or geographic boundaries. Among the more widely circulated and popular defining parameters is the concept of food miles, which has been suggested for policy recommendations."[6] In 2008 Congress passed H.R.2419,
which amended the "Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act". In the amendment "locally" and "regionally" are grouped together and are defined as

"(I) the locality or region in which the final product is marketed, so that the total distance that the product is transported is less than 400 miles from the origin of the product; or "(II) the State in which the product is produced.

—Bill Text - 110th Congress (2007-2008) - THOMAS (Library of Congress [7])

In May 2010 the USDA acknowledged this definition in an informational leaflet.[8]

The concept of "local" is also seen in terms of ecology, where food production is considered from the perspective of a basic ecological unit defined by its climate, soil, watershed, species and local agrisystems, a unit also called an ecoregion or a foodshed. The concept of the foodshed is similar to that of a watershed; it is an area where food is grown and eaten.

**Contemporary local food market**

The USDA included statistics about the growing local food market in the leaflet released in May 2010. The statistics are as follows; "Direct-to-consumer marketing amounted to $1.2 billion in current dollar sales in 2007, according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture, compared with $551 million in 1997. Direct-to-consumer sales accounted for 0.4 percent of total agricultural sales in 2007, up from 0.3 percent in 1997. If nonedible products are excluded from total agricultural sales, direct-to-consumer sales accounted for 0.8 percent of agricultural sales in 2007. The number of farmers' markets rose to 5,274 in 2009, up from 2,756 in 1998 and 1,755 in 1994, according to USDA's Agricultural Marketing Service. In 2005, there were 1,144 community-supported agriculture organizations (CSAs) in operation, up from 400 in 2001 and 2 in 1986, according to a study by the nonprofit, nongovernmental organization National Center for Appropriate Technology. In early 2010, estimates exceeded 1,400, but the number could be much larger. The number of farm to school programs, which use local farms as food suppliers for school meals programs, increased to 2,095 in 2009, up from 400 in 2004 and 2 in the 1996-97 school year, according to the National Farm to School Network. Data from the 2005 School Nutrition and Dietary Assessment Survey, sponsored by USDA's Food and Nutrition Service, showed that 14 percent of school districts participated in Farm to School programs, and 16 percent reported having guidelines for purchasing locally grown produce."[9]

Networks of local farmers and producers are now collaborating together in the UK, Europe as well as in Canada and the US to provide an on-line farmers market to customers. In this way, more consumers can now buy locally even on-line when they cannot attend a local farmers market. This also provides local farmers and producers another route to market and keeps overheads low as website costs are shared.

Examples of this are: Tastes of Anglia [10] in the UK, BALLE [11] (Business Alliance for Local Living Economies), and the 30 Mile Meal Project [12] in the US.

Supermarkets are beginning to tap into the local foods market as well. Walmart announced plans in 2008 to spend $400 million during that year on locally grown produce[13] Wegman's, a 71-store chain across the northeast, has purchased local foods for over 20 years as well. In their case, the produce manager in each store controls the influx of local foods-the relationships with the local farms are not centrally controlled.[14] A recent study led by Miguel Gomez, a professor of Applied Economics and Management at Cornell University and supported by the Atkinson Center for a Sustainable Future found that in many instances, the supermarket supply chain did much better in terms of food miles and fuel consumption for each pound compared to farmers markets. It suggests that selling local foods through supermarkets may be more economically viable and sustainable than through farmers markets.[15]
**Locavore and invasivore**

Those who prefer to eat locally grown/produced food sometimes call themselves **locavores** or **localvores**.\(^{[16]}\) This term began circulation around August 2005 in the San Francisco--area when a number of "foodies" launched a website, Locavores.com, after being inspired by the book "Coming Home to Eat" by ecologist Gary Paul Nabham. More recently, an "invasivore" movement has emerged as a subset of the locavore movement, which encourages the consumption of nonindigenous invasive species with the intent of controlling harmful populations.\(^{[17]}[18]\)

**Local food campaigns**

**North Carolina 10% Campaign**

Launched in late 2009, North Carolina’s 10% campaign is aimed at stimulating economic development, creating jobs and promoting North Carolina's agricultural offerings.\(^{[19]}\) The campaign is a partnership between the The Center for Environmental Farming Systems, (CEFS) with support from N.C. Cooperative Extension and the Golden LEAF Foundation. More than 4,400 individuals and 427 businesses, including 76 restaurants, have signed on to the campaign through the website http://www.nc10percent.com/a as they have pledged to spend 10 percent of their food budget on locally-sourced foods. Participants receive weekly emails prompting them to record how much they have spent on local food that week. Currently the campaign reports that more than $10 million has been recorded by participants. "The $10 million mark is a true testament to the commitment of our agricultural community and the quality of North Carolina-grown products."\(^{[20]}\)

The North Carolina Center for Environmental farming estimates that if all North Carolinians allocated 10% of their food expenditures on locally produced food then $3.5 billion would be generated for the state’s economy. Brunswick, Cabarrus, Chatham, Guilford, Forsyth, Onslow and Rockingham counties have adopted resolutions in support of the campaign. Stores are advertising local products with buy-local food labels. CEFS co-director, Nancy Creamer explains the following: "North Carolina is uniquely positioned to capitalize on the increased consumer demand for locally produced foods …Agriculture is the backbone of our economy. The state’s climate, soils and coastal resources support production of a wide variety of produce, meats, fish and seafood."\(^{[21]}\)

**References**

External links

- Global List of Local Food Systems related Organizations on WiserEarth (http://www.wiserearth.org/organization/limitToMasterid/339/limitToType/aof)
- *The Ontario Table, is a local culinary guide, character study of a soil, a region, a terrain, a people, a cuisine, even of a place in time. (http://www.ontariotable.com)
Communitarianism

Communitarianism is an ideology that emphasizes the connection between the individual and the community. That community may be the family unit, but it can also be understood in a far wider sense of personal interaction, of geographical location, or of shared history.

Terminology

Though the term communitarianism is of 20th-century origin, it is derived from the 1840s term communitarian, which was coined by Goodwyn Barmby to refer to one who was a member or advocate of a communalist society. The modern use of the term is a redefinition of the original sense. Many communitarians trace their philosophy to earlier thinkers. The term is primarily used in two senses:

- **Philosophical communitarianism** considers classical liberalism to be ontologically and epistemologically incoherent, and opposes it on those grounds. Unlike classical liberalism, which construes communities as originating from the voluntary acts of pre-community individuals, it emphasizes the role of the community in defining and shaping individuals. Communitarians believe that the value of community is not sufficiently recognized in liberal theories of justice.

- **Ideological communitarianism** is characterized as a radical centrist ideology that is sometimes marked by leftism on economic issues and moralism or conservatism on social issues. This usage was coined recently. When the term is capitalized, it usually refers to the Responsive Communitarian movement of Amitai Etzioni and other philosophers.

Origins

Communitarianism has been traced back to early monasticism, but in the twentieth century began to be formulated as a philosophy by Dorothy Day and the Catholic Worker movement. In an early article the Catholic Worker clarified the dogma of the Mystical Body of Christ as the basis for the movement's communitarianism. Communitarianism is also related to the personalist philosophy of Emmanuel Mounier.

Later secular communitarians began from analysis of classical republicanism, focusing on ancient Greek and Classicist writers. Since the beginnings of the 1990s they incorporated the post-modern concept of civil society into their philosophy. Soon, due to work of Robert Putnam, they started to treat Tocqueville as a main theoretician of civil society and their primary ancestor. Thus they engaged in a direct clash with neo-liberal theory since Tocqueville was a liberal, not a republican theorist, giving new impetus to their work.[1]

Philosophical communitarianism

Communitarianism in philosophy, like other schools of thought in contemporary political philosophy, can be defined by its response to John Rawls' *A Theory of Justice*. Communitarians criticize the image Rawls presents of humans as atomistic individuals.

Communitarians claim values and beliefs are formed in public space, in which debate takes place. Both linguistic and non-linguistic traditions are communicated to children and form the backdrop against which individuals formulate and understand beliefs. The dependence of the individual upon community members is typically meant as descriptive. It does not mean that individuals should accept majority beliefs. Rather, if an individual rejects a majority belief, such as the historic belief that slavery is acceptable, he or she will do so for reasons that make sense within the community (for example, the Judeo-Christian conception of the *imago Dei*, or reasons deriving from secular Enlightenment humanism) rather than simply any reason at all. In this sense, the rejection of a single majority belief relies on other majority beliefs.
The following authors have communitarian tendencies in the philosophical sense, but have all taken pains to distance themselves from the political ideology known as communitarianism, which is discussed further below:

- Alasdair MacIntyre – *After Virtue*
- Michael Sandel – *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*
- Charles Taylor – *Sources of the Self*
- Michael Walzer – *Spheres of Justice*
- Christos Yannaras – A Greek philosopher and theologian whose ideas tend to view communitarianism from a theological and ontological perspective.

**Ideological communitarianism**

**Communitarian political philosophy**

**Social capital**

Beginning in the late 20th century, many authors began to observe a deterioration in the social networks of the United States. In the book *Bowling Alone*, Robert Putnam observed that nearly every form of civic organization has undergone drops in membership exemplified by the fact that, while more people are bowling than in the 1950s, there are fewer bowling leagues. In recent years Putnam has revised this argument.

This results in a decline in "social capital", described by Putnam as "the collective value of all 'social networks' and the inclinations that arise from these networks to do things for each other". According to Putnam and his followers, social capital is a key component to building and maintaining democracy.

Communitarians seek to bolster social capital and the institutions of civil society. The Responsive Communitarian Platform described it thus:

"Many social goals . . . require partnership between public and private groups. Though government should not seek to replace local communities, it may need to empower them by strategies of support, including revenue-sharing and technical assistance. There is a great need for study and experimentation with creative use of the structures of civil society, and public-private cooperation, especially where the delivery of health, educational and social services are concerned."

**Positive rights**

Central to the communitarian philosophy is the concept of positive rights, which are rights or guarantees to certain things. These may include state subsidized education, state subsidized housing, a safe and clean environment, universal health care, and even the right to a job with the concomitant obligation of the government or individuals to provide one. To this end, communitarians generally support social security programs, public works programs, and laws limiting such things as pollution.

A common objection is that by providing such rights, communitarians violate the negative rights of the citizens; rights to not have something done for you. For example, taxation to pay for such programs as described above dispossesses individuals of property. Proponents of positive rights, by attributing the protection of negative rights to the society rather than the government, respond that individuals would not have any rights in the absence of societies—a central tenet of communitarianism—and thus have a personal responsibility to give something back to it. Some have viewed this as a negation of natural rights. However, what is or is not a "natural right" is a source of contention in modern politics, as well as historically; for example, whether or not universal health care, private property or protection from polluters can be considered a birthright.

Alternatively, some agree that negative rights may be violated by a government action, but argue that it is justifiable if the positive rights protected outweigh the negative rights lost. In the same vein, supporters of positive rights further argue that negative rights are irrelevant in their absence. Moreover, some communitarians "experience this
less as a case of being used for others' ends and more as a way of contributing to the purposes of a community I regard as my own”[3]

**Comparison to other political philosophies**

Communitarianism cannot be classified as being wholly left or right, and many theorists claim to represent a sort of radical center. Progressives in the American sense or social democrats in the European sense generally share the communitarian position on issues relating to the economy, such as the need for environmental protection and public education, but not on cultural issues. Communitarians and conservatives generally agree on cultural issues, such as support for character education and faith-based programs, but communitarians do not support the laissez-faire capitalism generally embraced by American conservatives.

**Authoritarianism**

Some people have argued[4] that communitarianism's focus on social cohesion raises similarities with nationalistic communism, or various forms of authoritarianism, although supporters contend that there are substantial differences between communitarianism and authoritarianism, and that communitarianism has very little in common with Communism, which they see as not really valuing individual liberty at all.

Authoritarian governments often embrace extremist ideologies and rule with brute force, accompanied with severe restrictions on personal freedom, political and civil rights. Authoritarian governments are overt about the role of the government as director and commander. Civil society and democracy are not generally characteristic of authoritarian regimes. For the most part, communitarians emphasize the use of non-governmental organizations, such as private businesses, churches, non-profits, or labor unions, in furthering their goals.

**Communitarian movement**

The modern communitarian movement was first articulated by the Responsive Communitarian Platform, written in the United States by a group of ethicists, activists, and social scientists including Amitai Etzioni, Mary Ann Glendon, and William Galston.

The Communitarian Network, founded in 1993 by Amitai Etzioni, is the best-known group advocating communitarianism. One of the network's many initiatives to reach out to a broader public is the transnational project Diversity within Unity, which advocates a communitarian approach towards immigration and minority rights in today's diversifying societies. The project is endorsed by a diverse and international group of supporters, including former Dutch prime-minister Jan-Peter Balkenende from the Christian Democratic Appeal; Rita Süssmuth from the Christian Democratic Union; the Hungarian dissident and philosopher György Bence; British political scholar David Miller; and others.[5]

A think tank called the Institute for Communitarian Policy Studies is also directed by Etzioni. Other voices of communitarianism include Don Eberly, director of the Civil Society Project and Robert Putnam.
Influence in the United States

Reflecting the dominance of liberal and conservative politics in the United States, no major party and few elected officials advocate communitarianism. Thus there is no consensus on individual policies, but some that most communitarians endorse have been enacted.

It is quite possible that the United States' right-libertarian ideological underpinnings have suppressed major communitarian factions from emerging.[6] Communitarians are often easily villainized as those seeking big governments and nanny states.

President Bill Clinton was open about his support for much of Amitai Etzioni's philosophy, though whether this reflected on his actual policy program is debatable. It has also been suggested that the "compassionate conservatism" espoused by President Bush during his 2000 presidential campaign was a form of conservative communitarian thinking, though he too did not implement it in his policy program. Cited policies have included economic and rhetorical support for education, volunteerism, and community programs, as well as a social emphasis on promoting families, character education, traditional values, and faith-based projects.

Dana Milbank, writing in the Washington Post, remarked of modern communitarians, "There is still no such thing as a card-carrying communitarian, and therefore no consensus on policies. Some, such as John DiIulio and outside Bush adviser Marvin Olasky, favor religious solutions for communities, while others, like Etzioni and Galston, prefer secular approaches."[7]

In August 2011, the libertarian Reason Magazine worked with the Rupe organization to survey 1,200 Americans by telephone. The Reason-Rupe poll found that "Americans cannot easily be bundled into either the 'liberal' or 'conservative' groups". Specifically, 28% expressed conservative views, 24% expressed libertarian views, 20% expressed communitarian views, and 28% expressed liberal views. The margin of error was ±3.[8]

A similar Gallup survey in 2011 included possible centrist/moderate responses. That poll reported that 17% expressed conservative views, 22% expressed libertarian views, 20% expressed communitarian views, 17% expressed centrist views, and 24% expressed liberal views. The organization used the terminology "the bigger the better" to describe communitarianism.[8]
Communitarianism

Criticisms

Liberal theorists such as Simon Caney[9] disagree that philosophical communitarianism has any interesting criticisms to make of liberalism. They reject the communitarian charges that liberalism neglects the value of community, and holds an "atomized" or asocial view of the self. If they are correct in this, then communitarian doctrine reduces to little more than traditionalism and cultural moral relativism.

According to Peter Sutch the principal criticisms of communitarianism are:

1. That communitarianism leads necessarily to moral relativism.
2. That this relativism leads necessarily to a re-endorsement of the status quo in international politics, and
3. That such a position relies upon a discredited ontological argument that posits the foundational status of the community or state.[10]

However, he goes on to show that such arguments cannot be leveled against the particular communitarian theories of Michael Walzer and Mervyn Frost.

Opposition

• Bruce Frohnen - author of The New Communitarians and the Crisis of Modern Liberalism (1996)

Notes

[10] Peter Sutch, Ethics, Justice, and International Relations, p.62

Further reading

External links

• Sourcewatch (http://www.sourcewatch.org/wiki.phtml?title=Communitarianism)
• Communitarianism (http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/communitarianism) entry by Daniel Bell in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy
• "Communitarianism" (http://www.infed.org/biblio/communitarianism.htm), Infed Encyclopedia.
• Robert Putnam, Communitarianism (http://discover.npr.org/features/feature.jhtml?wId=1118012), National Public Radio, February 5, 2001: "The term 'Third Way' was used to describe President Clinton's form of liberalism. Now 'Communitarianism' is being used in the same way to describe President Bush's form of conservatism. They're both an attempt to create a middle ground...an alternative to the liberal-conservative paradigm."
• Civil Practices Network (http://www.cpn.org/tools/dictionary/communitarian.html)

Anarchism

Anarchism is generally defined as the political philosophy which holds the state to be undesirable, unnecessary, and harmful,
1 2 or alternatively as opposing authority and hierarchical organization in the conduct of human relations.3 4 5 6 7 8 Proponents of anarchism, known as "anarchists", advocate stateless societies based on non-hierarchical9 10 voluntary associations.11 12

There are many types and traditions of anarchism, not all of which are mutually exclusive. Anarchist schools of thought can differ fundamentally, supporting anything from extreme individualism to complete collectivism.12

Strains of anarchism have been divided into the categories of social and individualist anarchism or similar dual classifications.14 15 Anarchism is often considered to be a radical left-wing ideology,16 17 and much of anarchist economics and anarchist legal philosophy reflect anti-statist interpretations of communism, collectivism, syndicalism or participatory economics. However, anarchism has always included an individualist strain supporting a market economy and private property, or morally unrestrained egoism.18 19 20 Some individualist anarchists are also socialists or communists21 22 while some anarcho-communists are also individualists.23 24

Anarchism as a social movement has regularly endured fluctuations in popularity. The central tendency of anarchism as a mass social movement has been represented by anarcho-communism and anarcho-syndicalism, with individualist anarchism being primarily a literary phenomenon25 which nevertheless did have an impact on the bigger currents26 and individualists also participated in large anarchist organizations.27 28 Most anarchists oppose all forms of aggression, supporting self-defense or non-violence (anarcho-pacifism),29 30 while others have supported the use of some coercive measures, including violent revolution and propaganda of the deed, on the path to an anarchist society.31

Etymology and terminology

For more information, see Anarchist terminology.

The term anarchism derives from the Greek ἄναρχος, anarchos, meaning "without rulers",32 33 from the prefix ἄν- (an-, "without") + ἀρχή (archē, "sovereignty, realm, magistracy")34 + -ισμός (-ismos, from the suffix -ιζειν, -izein "-izing"). There is some ambiguity with the use of the terms "libertarianism" and "libertarian" in writings about anarchism. Since the 1890s from France,35 the term "libertarianism" has often been used as a synonym for anarchism36 and was used almost exclusively in this sense until the 1950s in the United States;37 its use as a synonym is still common outside the United States.38 Accordingly, "libertarian socialism" is sometimes used as a synonym for socialist anarchism,39 40 to distinguish it from "individualist libertarianism" (individualist anarchism).
On the other hand, some use "libertarianism" to refer to individualistic free-market philosophy only, referring to free-market anarchism as "libertarian anarchism".\[41][42]

**History**

**Origins**

The earliest\[44\] anarchist themes can be found in the 6th century BC, among the works of Taoist philosopher Laozi,\[43\] and in later centuries by Zhuangzi and Bao Jingyan.\[45\] Zhuangzi's philosophy has been described by various sources as anarchist\[46][47][48][49][50]\ Zhuangzi wrote, "A petty thief is put in jail. A great brigand becomes a ruler of a Nation."\[51\] Diogenes of Sinope and the Cynics, their contemporary Zeno of Citium, the founder of Stoicism, also introduced similar topics.\[43][52\] Jesus is sometimes considered the first anarchist in the Christian anarchist tradition. Georges Lechartier wrote that "The true founder of anarchy was Jesus Christ and ... the first anarchist society was that of the apostles."\[53\] Such a distinction reverberates subversive religious conceptions like the aforementioned seemingly anarchistic Taoist teachings and that of other anti-authoritarian religious traditions creating a complex relationship regarding the question as to whether or not anarchism and religion are compatible. This is exemplified when the glorification of the state is viewed as a form of sinful idolatry.\[54][55\]

The radical Protestant christian Gerrard Winstanley and his group the Diggers are cited by various authors as proposing anarchist social measures in the 17th century in England.\[56][57][58\] The term "anarchist" first entered the English language in 1642, during the English Civil War, as a term of abuse, used by Royalists against their Roundhead opponents.\[59\] By the time of the French Revolution some, such as the Enragés, began to use the term positively,\[60\] in opposition to Jacobin centralisation of power, seeing "revolutionary government" as oxymoronic.\[59\] By the turn of the 19th century, the English word "anarchism" had lost its initial negative connotation.\[59\]

Modern anarchism sprang from the secular or religious thought of the Enlightenment, particularly Jean-Jacques Rousseau's arguments for the moral centrality of freedom.\[61\] From this climate William Godwin developed what many consider the first expression of modern anarchist thought.\[62\] Godwin was, according to Peter Kropotkin, "the first to formulate the political and economical conceptions of anarchism, even though he did not give that name to the ideas developed in his work,"\[43\] while Godwin attached his anarchist ideas to an early Edmund Burke.\[63\]

Benjamin Tucker instead credits Josiah Warren, an American who promoted stateless and voluntary communities where all goods and services were private, with being "the first man to expound and formulate the doctrine now known as Anarchism."\[64\] The first to describe himself as an anarchist was Pierre-Joseph Proudhon,\[59\] a French philosopher and politician, which led some to call him the founder of modern anarchist theory.\[65\]

The anarcho-communist Joseph Déjacque was the first person to describe himself as "libertarian".\[66\] Unlike Proudhon, he argued that, "it is not the product of his or her labor that the worker has a right to, but to the satisfaction of his or her needs, whatever may be their nature."\[67\]
The First International

In Europe, harsh reaction followed the revolutions of 1848, during which ten countries had experienced brief or long-term social upheaval as groups carried out nationalist uprisings. After most of these attempts at systematic change ended in failure, conservative elements took advantage of the divided groups of socialists, anarchists, liberals, and nationalists, to prevent further revolt.\[^{68}\] In 1864 the International Workingmen's Association (sometimes called the "First International") united diverse revolutionary currents including French followers of Proudhon,\[^{69}\] Blanquists, Philadelphes, English trade unionists, socialists and social democrats.

Due to its links to active workers' movements, the International became a significant organization. Karl Marx became a leading figure in the International and a member of its General Council. Proudhon's followers, the mutualists, opposed Marx's state socialism, advocating political abstentionism and small property holdings.\[^{70}\][\(^{71}\)]

In 1868, following their unsuccessful participation in the League of Peace and Freedom (LPF), Russian revolutionary Mikhail Bakunin and his collectivist anarchist associates joined the First International (which had decided not to get involved with the LPF).\[^{72}\] They allied themselves with the federalist socialist sections of the International,\[^{73}\] who advocated the revolutionary overthrow of the state and the collectivization of property.

At first, the collectivists worked with the Marxists to push the First International in a more revolutionary socialist direction. Subsequently, the International became polarised into two camps, with Marx and Bakunin as their respective figureheads.\[^{74}\] Bakunin characterised Marx's ideas as centralist and predicted that, if a Marxist party came to power, its leaders would simply take the place of the ruling class they had fought against.\[^{75}\][\(^{76}\)]

In 1872, the conflict climaxed with a final split between the two groups at the Hague Congress, where Bakunin and James Guillaume were expelled from the International and its headquarters were transferred to New York. In response, the federalist sections formed their own International at the St. Imier Congress, adopting a revolutionary anarchist program.\[^{77}\]

Organized labor

The anti-authoritarian sections of the First International were the precursors of the anarcho-syndicalists, seeking to "replace the privilege and authority of the State" with the "free and spontaneous organization of labor."\[^{78}\] In 1886, the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions (FOTLU) of the United States and Canada unanimously set 1 May 1886, as the date by which the eight-hour work day would become standard.\[^{79}\]

In response, unions across the United States prepared a general strike in support of the event.\[^{79}\] On 3 May, in Chicago, a fight broke out when strikebreakers attempted to cross the picket line, and two workers died when police opened fire upon the crowd.\[^{80}\] The next day, 4 May, anarchists staged a rally at Chicago's Haymarket Square.\[^{81}\] A bomb was thrown by an unknown party near the conclusion of the rally, killing an officer.\[^{82}\] In the ensuing panic, police opened fire on the crowd and each other.\[^{83}\] Seven police officers and at least four workers were killed.\[^{84}\]

Eight anarchists directly and indirectly related to the organisers of the rally were arrested and charged with the murder of the deceased officer. The men became international political celebrities among the labour movement. Four of the men were executed and a fifth committed suicide prior to his own execution. The incident became known as...
the Haymarket affair, and was a setback for the labour movement and the struggle for the eight hour day. In 1890 a second attempt, this time international in scope, to organise for the eight hour day was made. The event also had the secondary purpose of memorializing workers killed as a result of the Haymarket affair. Although it had initially been conceived as a once-off event, by the following year the celebration of International Workers’ Day on May Day had become firmly established as an international worker’s holiday.

In 1907, the International Anarchist Congress of Amsterdam gathered delegates from 14 different countries, among which important figures of the anarchist movement, including Errico Malatesta, Pierre Monatte, Luigi Fabbri, Benoît Broutchoux, Emma Goldman, Rudolf Rocker, and Christiaan Cornelissen. Various themes were treated during the Congress, in particular concerning the organisation of the anarchist movement, popular education issues, the general strike or antimilitarism. A central debate concerned the relation between anarchism and syndicalism (or trade unionism). Malatesta and Monatte were in particular disagreement themselves on this issue, as the latter thought that syndicalism was revolutionary and would create the conditions of a social revolution, while Malatesta did not consider syndicalism by itself sufficient. He thought that the trade-union movement was reformist and even conservative, citing as essentially bourgeois and anti-worker the phenomenon of professional union officials. Malatesta warned that the syndicalists aims were in perpetuating syndicalism itself, whereas anarchists must always have anarchy as their end and consequently refrain from committing to any particular method of achieving it.

The Spanish Workers Federation in 1881 was the first major anarcho-syndicalist movement; anarchist trade union federations were of special importance in Spain. The most successful was the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (National Confederation of Labour: CNT), founded in 1910. Before the 1940s, the CNT was the major force in Spanish working class politics, attracting 1.58 million members at one point and playing a major role in the Spanish Civil War. The CNT was affiliated with the International Workers Association, a federation of anarcho-syndicalist trade unions founded in 1922, with delegates representing two million workers from 15 countries in Europe and Latin America. In Latin America in particular "The anarchists quickly became active in organizing craft and industrial workers throughout South and Central America, and until the early 1920s most of the trade unions in Mexico, Brazil, Peru, Chile, and Argentina were anarcho-syndicalist in general outlook; the prestige of the Spanish C.N.T. as a revolutionary organization was undoubtedly to a great extent responsible for this situation. The largest and most militant of these organizations was the Federación Obrera Regional Argentina...it grew quickly to a membership of nearly a quarter of a million, which dwarfed the rival socialdemocratic unions."
Propaganda of the deed and illegalism

Some anarchists, such as Johann Most, advocated publicizing violent acts of retaliation against counter-revolutionaries because "we preach not only action in and for itself, but also action as propaganda."\[89\] By the 1880s, the slogan "propaganda of the deed" had begun to be used both within and outside of the anarchist movement to refer to individual bombings, regicides and tyrannicides. From 1905 onwards, the Russian counterparts of these anti-syndicalist anarchist-communists became partisans of economic terrorism and illegal 'expropriations'.\[90\] Illegalism as a practice emerged and within it "The acts of the anarchist bombers and assassins ("propaganda by the deed") and the anarchist burglars ("individual reappropriation") expressed their desperation and their personal, violent rejection of an intolerable society. Moreover, they were clearly meant to be exemplary, invitations to revolt."\[91\] France's Bonnot Gang was the most famous group to embrace illegalism.

However, as soon as 1887, important figures in the anarchist movement distanced themselves from such individual acts. Peter Kropotkin thus wrote that year in *Le Révolté* that "a structure based on centuries of history cannot be destroyed with a few kilos of dynamite".\[92\] A variety of anarchists advocated the abandonment of these sorts of tactics in favor of collective revolutionary action, for example through the trade union movement. The anarcho-syndicalist, Fernand Pelloutier, argued in 1895 for renewed anarchist involvement in the labor movement on the basis that anarchism could do very well without "the individual dynamiter."\[93\]

State repression (including the infamous 1894 French *lois scélérates*) of the anarchist and labor movements following the few successful bombings and assassinations may have contributed to the abandonment of these kinds of tactics, although reciprocally state repression, in the first place, may have played a role in these isolated acts. The dismemberment of the French socialist movement, into many groups and, following the suppression of the 1871 Paris Commune, the execution and exile of many *communards* to penal colonies, favored individualist political expression and acts.\[94\]

Numerous heads of state were assassinated between 1881 and 1914 by members of the anarchist movement. For example, U.S. President McKinley's assassin Leon Czolgosz claimed to have been influenced by anarchist and feminist Emma Goldman. Bombings were associated in the media with anarchists because international terrorism arose during this time period with the widespread distribution of dynamite. This image remains to this day.

Propaganda of the deed was abandoned by the vast majority of the anarchist movement after World War I (1914–1918) and the 1917 October Revolution.
Russian Revolution and other uprisings of the 1910s

Anarchists participated alongside the Bolsheviks in both February and October revolutions, and were initially enthusiastic about the Bolshevik revolution.[95] However, following a political falling out with the Bolsheviks by the anarchists and other left-wing opposition, a conflict that culminated in the 1921 Kronstadt rebellion which the new government repressed. Anarchists in central Russia were either imprisoned, driven underground or joined the victorious Bolsheviks; the anarchists from Petrograd and Moscow fled to the Ukraine.[96] There, in the Free Territory, they fought in the civil war against the Whites (a grouping of monarchists and other opponents of the October Revolution) and then the Bolsheviks as part of the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine led by Nestor Makhno, who established an anarchist society in the region for a number of months.

Expelled American anarchists Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman were amongst those agitating in response to Bolshevik policy and the suppression of the Kronstadt uprising, before they left Russia. Both wrote accounts of their experiences in Russia, criticizing the amount of control the Bolsheviks exercised. For them, Bakunin's predictions about the consequences of Marxist rule that the rulers of the new "socialist" Marxist state would become a new elite had proved all too true.[75][97]

The victory of the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution and the resulting Russian Civil War did serious damage to anarchist movements internationally. Many workers and activists saw Bolshevik success as setting an example; Communist parties grew at the expense of anarchism and other socialist movements. In France and the United States, for example, members of the major syndicalist movements of the CGT and IWW left the organizations and joined the Communist International.[98]

The revolutionary wave of 1917–23 saw the active participation of anarchists in varying degrees of protagonism. In the German uprising known as the Bavarian Soviet Republic the anarchists Gustav Landauer, Silvio Gesell and Erich Mühsam had important leadership positions within the revolutionary councilist structures.[99][100] In the Italian events known as the biennio rosso the anarcho-syndicalist trade union Unione Sindacale Italiana "grew to 800,000 members and the influence of the Italian Anarchist Union (20,000 members plus Umanita Nova, its daily paper) grew accordingly...Anarchists were the first to suggest occupying workplaces.[101] In the Mexican Revolution the Mexican Liberal Party was established and during the early 1910s it lead a series of military offensives leading to the conquest and occupation of certain towns and districts in Baja California with the leadership of anarcho-communist Ricardo Flores Magón.[102]

In Paris, the Dielo Truda group of Russian anarchist exiles, which included Nestor Makhno, concluded that anarchists needed to develop new forms of organisation in response to the structures of Bolshevism. Their 1926 manifesto, called the Organizational Platform of the General Union of Anarchists (Draft).[103] was supported. Platformist groups active today include the Workers Solidarity Movement in Ireland and the North Eastern Federation of Anarchist Communists of North America. Synthesis anarchism emerged as an organizational alternative to platformism which tries to join anarchists of different tendencies under the principles of anarchism without adjectives.[104] In the 1920s this form found as its main proponents Volin and Sebastien Faure.[104] It is the main principle behind the anarchist federations grouped around the contemporary global International of Anarchist Federations.[104]
Fight against fascism, the Spanish revolution and World War II

In the 1920s and 1930s, the rise of fascism in Europe transformed anarchism's conflict with the state. Italy saw the first struggles between anarchists and fascists. Italian anarchists played a key role in the anti-fascist organisation *Arditi del Popolo*, which was strongest in areas with anarchist traditions, and achieved some success in their activism, such as repelling Blackshirts in the anarchist stronghold of Parma in August 1922. The veteran Italian anarchist, Luigi Fabbri, was one of the first critical theorists of fascism, describing it as "the preventive counter-revolution." In France, where the far right leagues came close to insurrection in the February 1934 riots, anarchists divided over a united front policy. In Spain, the CNT initially refused to join a popular front electoral alliance, and abstention by CNT supporters led to a right wing election victory. But in 1936, the CNT changed its policy and anarchist votes helped bring the popular front back to power. Months later, the former ruling class responded with an attempted coup causing the Spanish Civil War (1936–1939). In response to the army rebellion, an anarchist-inspired movement of peasants and workers, supported by armed militias, took control of Barcelona and of large areas of rural Spain where they collectivised the land. But even before the fascist victory in 1939, the anarchists were losing ground in a bitter struggle with the Stalinists, who controlled the distribution of military aid to the Republican cause from the Soviet Union. Stalinist-led troops suppressed the collectives and persecuted both dissident Marxists and anarchists. Anarchists in France and Italy were active in the Resistance during World War II.

Post-war years

Anarchism sought to reorganize itself after the war. The Mexican Anarchist Federation was established on 1945 after the Anarchist Federation of the Center united with the Anarchist Federation of the Federal District. In the early 1940s Antifascist International Solidarity and Federation of Anarchist Groups of Cuba merge into the large national organization Asociación Libertaria de Cuba (Cuban Libertarian Association). From 1944 to 1947, the Bulgarian Anarchist Communist Federation reemerges as part of a factory and workplace committee movement, but is repressed by the new Communist regime. In 1945 in France the Fédération Anarchiste is established and the also synthesist Federazione Anarchica Italiana is founded in Italy. Korean anarchists form the League of Free Social Constructors in September 1945 and in 1946 the Japanese Anarchist Federation is founded. An International Anarchist Congress with delegates from across Europe is held in Paris in May 1948. In 1955 the Anarcho-Communist Federation of Argentina renames itself as the Argentine Libertarian Federation.

Anarchism continued to be influential in important literary and intellectual personalities of the time such as Albert Camus, Herbert Read, Paul Goodman, Dwight Macdonald, Allen Ginsberg, George Woodcock, Julian Beck and the French Surrealist group led by André Breton which now openly embraced anarchism and collaborated in the Fédération Anarchiste. Anarcho-pacifism became influential in the Anti-nuclear movement and anti war movements of the time as can be seen in the activism and writings of the English anarchist member of Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament Alex Comfort or the similar activism of the American catholic anarcho-pacifist Ammon Hennacy. Anarcho-pacifism became a "basis for a critique of militarism on both sides of the Cold War." The resurgence of anarchist ideas during this period is well documented in Robert Graham's Anarchism: A Documentary History of Libertarian Ideas, *Volume Two: The Emergence of the New Anarchism (1939-1977).*
Contemporary anarchism

A surge of popular interest in anarchism occurred in western nations during the 1960s and 1970s. Anarchism was influential in the Counterculture of the 1960s and anarchists actively participated in the late sixties students and workers revolts. In 1968 in Carrara, Italy the International of Anarchist Federations was founded during an international anarchist conference held there in 1968 by the three existing European federations of France, the Italian and the Iberian Anarchist Federation as well as the Bulgarian federation in French exile.

In the United Kingdom in the 1970s this was associated with the punk rock movement, as exemplified by bands such as Crass and the Sex Pistols. The housing and employment crisis in most of Western Europe led to the formation of communes and squatter movements like that of Barcelona, Spain. In Denmark, squatters occupied a disused military base and declared the Freetown Christiania, an autonomous haven in central Copenhagen.

Since the revival of anarchism in the mid 20th century, a number of new movements and schools of thought emerged. Although feminist tendencies have always been a part of the anarchist movement in the form of anarcha-feminism, they returned with vigour during the second wave of feminism in the 1960s. The American Civil Rights Movement and the movement against the war in Vietnam also contributed to the revival of North American anarchism. European anarchism of the late 20th century drew much of its strength from the labour movement, and both have incorporated animal rights activism. Anarchist anthropologist David Graeber and anarchist historian Andrej Grubacic have posited a rupture between generations of anarchism, with those "who often still have not shaken the sectarian habits" of the 19th century contrasted with the younger activists who are "much more informed, among other elements, by indigenous, feminist, ecological and cultural-critical ideas", and who by the turn of the 21st century formed "by far the majority" of anarchists.

Around the turn of the 21st century, anarchism grew in popularity and influence as part of the anti-war, anti-capitalist, and anti-globalisation movements. Anarchists became known for their involvement in protests against the meetings of the World Trade Organization (WTO), Group of Eight, and the World Economic Forum. Some anarchist factions at these protests engaged in rioting, property destruction, and violent confrontations with police. These actions were precipitated by ad hoc, leaderless, anonymous cadres known as black blocs; other organisational tactics pioneered in this time include security culture, affinity groups and the use of decentralised technologies such as the internet. A significant event of this period was the confrontations at WTO conference in Seattle in 1999.

International anarchist federations in existence include the International of Anarchist Federations, the International Workers’ Association, and International Libertarian Solidarity. The largest organised anarchist movement today is in Spain, in the form of the Confederación General del Trabajo (CGT) and the CNT. CGT membership was estimated to be around 100,000 for 2003. Other active syndicalist movements include in Sweden the Central Organisation of the Workers of Sweden and the Swedish Anarcho-syndicalist Youth Federation; the CNT-AIT in France; the Union Sindicale Italiana in Italy; in the US Workers Solidarity Alliance and the UK Solidarity Federation. The revolutionary industrial unionist Industrial Workers of the World, claiming 2,000 paying members, and the International Workers Association, an anarcho-syndicalist successor to the First International, also remain active.
Anarchism

Anarchist schools of thought

Anarchist schools of thought had been generally grouped in two main historical traditions, individualist anarchism and social anarchism, which have some different origins, values and evolution.\[2]\[14]\[134] The individualist wing of anarchism emphasises negative liberty, i.e. opposition to state or social control over the individual, while those in the social wing emphasise positive liberty to achieve one's potential and argue that humans have needs that society ought to fulfill, "recognizing equality of entitlement".\[135] In a chronological and theoretical sense, there are classical — those created throughout the 19th century — and post-classical anarchist schools — those created since the mid-20th century and after.

Beyond the specific factions of anarchist thought is philosophical anarchism, which embodies the theoretical stance that the state lacks moral legitimacy without accepting the imperative of revolution to eliminate it. A component especially of individualist anarchism\[136]\[137] philosophical anarchism may accept the existence of a minimal state as unfortunate, and usually temporary, "necessary evil" but argue that citizens do not have a moral obligation to obey the state when its laws conflict with individual autonomy.\[138] One reaction against sectarianism within the anarchist milieu was "anarchism without adjectives", a call for toleration first adopted by Fernando Tarrida del Mármol in 1889 in response to the "bitter debates" of anarchist theory at the time.\[139] In abandoning the hyphenated anarchisms (i.e. collectivist-, communist-, mutualist- and individualist-anarchism), it sought to emphasise the anti-authoritarian beliefs common to all anarchist schools of thought.\[140]

Mutualism

Mutualism began in 18th century English and French labour movements before taking an anarchist form associated with Pierre-Joseph Proudhon in France and others in the United States.\[141] Proudhon proposed spontaneous order, whereby organization emerges without central authority, a "positivearchy" where order arises when everybody does "what he wishes and only what he wishes"\[142] and where "business transactions alone produce the social order."\[143] Despite some of his radical claims, it is important to recognize that Proudhon distinguished between ideal political possibilities and practical governance. For this reason, much in contrast to some of his theoretical statements concerning ultimate spontaneous self-governance, Proudhon was heavily involved in French parliamentary politics and allied himself not with Anarchist but Socialist factions of workers movements and, in addition to advocating state-protected charters for worker-owned cooperatives, promoted certain nationalization schemes during his life of public service.

Mutualist anarchism is concerned with reciprocity, free association, voluntary contract, federation, and credit and currency reform. According to William Batchelder Greene, each worker in the mutualist system would receive "just and exact pay for his work; services equivalent in cost being exchangeable for services equivalent in cost, without profit or discount."\[144] Mutualism has been retrospectively characterised as ideologically situated between individualist and collectivist forms of anarchism.\[145] Proudhon first characterised his goal as a "third form of society, the synthesis of communism and property."\[146]
Individualist anarchism

Individualist anarchism refers to several traditions of thought within the anarchist movement that emphasize the individual and their will over any kinds of external determinants such as groups, society, traditions, and ideological systems. Individualist anarchism is not a single philosophy but refers to a group of individualistic philosophies that sometimes are in conflict.

In 1793, William Godwin, who has often been cited as the first anarchist, wrote Political Justice, which some consider to be the first expression of anarchism. Godwin, a philosophical anarchist, from a rationalist and utilitarian basis opposed revolutionary action and saw a minimal state as a present "necessary evil" that would become increasingly irrelevant and powerless by the gradual spread of knowledge. Godwin advocated individualism, proposing that all cooperation in labour be eliminated on the premise that this would be most conducive with the general good.

An influential form of individualist anarchism, called "egoism," or egoist anarchism, was expounded by one of the earliest and best-known proponents of individualist anarchism, the German Max Stirner. Stirner's The Ego and Its Own, published in 1844, is a founding text of the philosophy. According to Stirner, the only limitation on the rights of the individual is their power to obtain what they desire, without regard for God, state, or morality. To Stirner, rights were spooks in the mind, and he held that society does not exist but "the individuals are its reality." Stirner advocated self-assertion and foresaw unions of egoists, non-systematic associations continually renewed by all parties' support through an act of will, which Stirner proposed as a form of organization in place of the state. Egoist anarchists claim that egoism will foster genuine and spontaneous union between individuals. "Egoism" has inspired many interpretations of Stirner's philosophy. It was re-discovered and promoted by German philosophical anarchist and LGBT activist John Henry Mackay.

Josiah Warren is widely regarded as the first American anarchist and the four-page weekly paper he edited during 1833, The Peaceful Revolutionist, was the first anarchist periodical published. For American anarchist historian Eunice Minette Schuster "It is apparent...that Proudhonian Anarchism was to be found in the United States at least as early as 1848 and that it was not conscious of its affinity to the Individualist Anarchism of Josiah Warren and Stephen Pearl Andrews...William B. Greene presented this Proudhonian Mutualism in its purest and most systematic form." Henry David Thoreau (1817–1862) was an important early influence in individualist anarchist thought in the United States and Europe. Thoreau was an American author, poet, naturalist, tax resister, development critic, surveyor, historian, philosopher, and leading transcendentalist. He is best known for his books Walden, a reflection upon simple living in natural surroundings, and his essay, Civil Disobedience, an argument for individual resistance to civil government in moral opposition to an unjust state. Later Benjamin Tucker fused Stirner's egoism with the economics of Warren and Proudhon in his eclectic influential publication Liberty.

From these early influences individualist anarchism in different countries attracted a small but diverse following of bohemian artists and intellectuals, free love and birth control advocates (see Anarchism and issues related to love and sex), individualist naturists nudists (see anarcho-naturism), freethought and anti-clearical activists as well as young anarchist outlaws in what came to be known as illegalism and individual reclamation (see European individualist anarchism and individualist anarchism in France). These authors and activists included Oscar Wilde, Emile Armand, Han Ryner, Henri Zisly, Renzo Novatore, Miguel Gimenez Igualada, Adolf Brand and Lev Chernyi among others.
Social anarchism calls for a system with public ownership of means of production and democratic control of all organizations, without any government authority or coercion. It is the largest school of thought in anarchism. Social anarchism rejects private property, seeing it as a source of social inequality, and emphasises cooperation and mutual aid.

Collectivist anarchism, also referred to as "revolutionary socialism" or a form of such, is a revolutionary form of anarchism, commonly associated with Mikhail Bakunin and Johann Most. Collectivist anarchists oppose all private ownership of the means of production, instead advocating that ownership be collectivised. This was to be achieved through violent revolution, first starting with a small cohesive group through acts of violence, or "propaganda by the deed", which would inspire the workers as a whole to revolt and forcibly collectivise the means of production.

However, collectivization was not to be extended to the distribution of income, as workers would be paid according to time worked, rather than receiving goods being distributed "according to need" as in anarcho-communism. This position was criticised by anarchist communists as effectively "uphold[ing] the wages system". Collectivist anarchism arose contemporaneously with Marxism but opposed the Marxist dictatorship of the proletariat, despite the stated Marxist goal of a collectivist stateless society. Anarchist, communist and collectivist ideas are not mutually exclusive; although the collectivist anarchists advocated compensation for labour, some held out the possibility of a post-revolutionary transition to a communist system of distribution according to need.

Anarcho-communism developed out of radical socialist currents after the French revolution but was first formulated as such in the Italian section of the First International. The theoretical work of Peter Kropotkin and Errico Malatesta took importance later as it expanded and developed pro-organizationalist and insurrectionary anti-organizationalist sections. Anarchist communism proposes that the freest form of social organisation would be a society composed of self-managing communes with collective use of the means of production, organised democratically, and related to other communes through federation. While some anarchist communists favour direct democracy, others feel that its majoritarianism can impede individual liberty and favour consensus democracy instead. In anarchist communism, as money would be abolished, individuals would not receive direct compensation for labour (through sharing of profits or payment) but would have free access to the resources and surplus of the commune. Anarchist communism does not always have a communitarian philosophy. Some forms of anarchist communism such as insurrectionary anarchism are egoist and strongly influenced by radical individualism, believing anarcho-communism is the best social system for the realization of individual freedom. Most anarcho-communists view anarcho-communism as a way of reconciling the opposition between the individual and society.

In the early 20th century, anarcho-syndicalism arose as a distinct school of thought within anarchism. With greater focus on the labour movement than previous forms of anarchism, syndicalism posits radical trade unions as a potential force for revolutionary social change, replacing capitalism and the state with a new society, democratically self-managed by the workers. It is often combined with other branches of anarchism, and anarcho-syndicalists often subscribe to anarchist communist or collectivist anarchist economic systems. An early leading anarcho-syndicalist thinker was Rudolf Rocker, whose 1938 pamphlet *Anarchosyndicalism* outlined a view of the...
movement's origin, aims and importance to the future of labour.\[197]\[198]

**Post-classical currents**

Anarchism continues to generate many philosophies and movements, at times eclectic, drawing upon various sources, and syncretic, combining disparate and contrary concepts to create new philosophical approaches. Since the revival of anarchism in the United States in the 1960s,\[129\] a number of new movements and schools have emerged.\[199\] Anarcho-capitalism developed from radical anti-state libertarianism and individualist anarchism, drawing from Austrian School economics, study of law and economics and public choice theory,\[200\] while the burgeoning feminist and environmentalist movements also produced anarchist offshoots.

Anarcha-feminism developed as a synthesis of radical feminism and anarchism that views patriarchy (male domination over women) as a fundamental manifestation of compulsory government. It was inspired by the late 19th century writings of early feminist anarchists such as Lucy Parsons, Emma Goldman, Voltairine de Cleyre, and Dora Marsden. Anarcha-feminists, like other radical feminists, criticise and advocate the abolition of traditional conceptions of family, education and gender roles. Green anarchism (or eco-anarchism)\[201\] is a school of thought within anarchism which puts an emphasis on environmental issues,\[202\] with an important precedent in anarcho-naturalism\[169\][203][204] and whose main contemporary currents are anarcho-primitivism and social ecology. Anarcho-pacifism is a tendency which rejects the use of violence in the struggle for social change.\[29\][30\] It developed "mostly in the Netherlands, Britain, and the United States, before and during the Second World War".\[30\] Christian anarchism is a movement in political theology that combines anarchism and Christianity.\[205\] Its main proponents included Leo Tolstoy, Dorothy Day, Ammon Hennacy, and Jacques Ellul.

Post-left anarchy is a tendency which seeks to distance itself from traditional left-wing politics and to escape the confines of ideology in general. Post-anarchism is a theoretical move towards a synthesis of classical anarchist theory and poststructuralist thought drawing from diverse ideas including post-modernism, autonomist marxism, post-left anarchy, situationism and postcolonialism.

Another recent form of anarchism critical of formal anarchist movements is insurrectionary anarchism,\[206\] which advocates informal organization and active resistance to the state; its proponents include Wolfi Landstreicher and Alfredo M. Bonanno.
Topics of interest

Intersecting and overlapping between various schools of thought, certain topics of interest and internal disputes have proven perennial within anarchist theory.

Free love

An important current within anarchism is free love.[207] Free love advocates sometimes traced their roots back to Josiah Warren and to experimental communities, viewed sexual freedom as a clear, direct expression of an individual's self-ownership. Free love particularly stressed women's rights since most sexual laws discriminated against women: for example, marriage laws and anti-birth control measures.[166] The most important American free love journal was *Lucifer the Lightbearer* (1883–1907) edited by Moses Harman and Lois Waisbrooker,[208] but also there existed Ezra Heywood and Angela Heywood's *The Word* (1872–1890, 1892–1893).[166] *Free Society* (1895–1897 as *The Firebrand*; 1897-1904 as *Free Society*) was a major anarchist newspaper in the United States at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries.[209] The publication advocated free love and women's rights, and critiqued "Comstockery" -- censorship of sexual information. Also M. E. Lazarus was an important American individualist anarchist who promoted free love.[166]

In New York City's Greenwich Village, bohemian feminists and socialists advocated self-realisation and pleasure for women (and also men) in the here and now. They encouraged playing with sexual roles and sexuality,[210] and the openly bisexual radical Edna St. Vincent Millay and the lesbian anarchist Margaret Anderson were prominent among them. Discussion groups organised by the Villagers were frequented by Emma Goldman, among others. Magnus Hirschfeld noted in 1923 that Goldman "has campaigned boldly and steadfastly for individual rights, and especially for those deprived of their rights. Thus it came about that she was the first and only woman, indeed the first and only American, to take up the defense of homosexual love before the general public."[211] In fact, before Goldman, heterosexual anarchist Robert Reitzel (1849–1898) spoke positively of homosexuality from the beginning of the 1890s in his Detroit-based German language journal *Der arme Teufel*. In Argentina anarcha-feminist Virginia Bolten published the newspaper called *La Voz de la Mujer* (English: *The Woman's Voice*), which was published nine times in Rosario between 8 January 1896 and 1 January 1897, and was revived, briefly, in 1901.[212]

In Europe the main propagandist of free love within individualist anarchism was Emile Armand.[213] He proposed the concept of *la camaraderie amoureuse* to speak of free love as the possibility of voluntary sexual encounter between consenting adults. He was also a consistent proponent of polyamory.[213] In Germany the stirnerists Adolf Brand and John Henry Mackay were pioneering campaigners for the acceptance of male bisexuality and homosexuality.

More recently, the British anarcho-pacifist Alex Comfort gained notoriety during the sexual revolution for writing the bestseller sex manual *The Joy of Sex*. The issue of free love has a dedicated treatment in the work of French anarcho-hedonist philosopher Michel Onfray in such works as *Théorie du corps amoureux : pour une érotique solaire* (2000) and *L'invention du plaisir : fragments cyréaniques* (2002).
Libertarian education and freethought

For English anarchist William Godwin education was "the main means by which change would be achieved." Godwin saw that the main goal of education should be the promotion of happiness. For Godwin education had to have "A respect for the child’s autonomy which precluded any form of coercion", "A pedagogy that respected this and sought to build on the child's own motivation and initiatives" and "A concern about the child's capacity to resist an ideology transmitted through the school." In his Political Justice he criticizes state sponsored schooling "on account of its obvious alliance with national government". Early American anarchist Josiah Warren advanced alternative education experiences in the libertarian communities he established. Max Stirner wrote in 1842 a long essay on education called The False Principle of our Education. In it Stirner names his educational principle "personalist," explaining that self-understanding consists in hourly self-creation. Education for him is to create “free men, sovereign characters,” by which he means "eternal characters...who are therefore eternal because they form themselves each moment".

In the United States "freethought was a basically anti-christian, anti-clerical movement, whose purpose was to make the individual politically and spiritually free to decide for himself on religious matters. A number of contributors to Liberty (anarchist publication) were prominent figures in both freethought and anarchism. The individualist anarchist George MacDonald was a co-editor of Freethought and, for a time, The Truth Seeker. E.C. Walker was co-editor of the excellent free-thought / free love journal Lucifer, the Light-Bearer. "Many of the anarchists were ardent freethinkers; reprints from freethought papers such as Lucifer, the Light-Bearer, Freethought and The Truth Seeker appeared in Liberty...The church was viewed as a common ally of the state and as a repressive force in and of itself."

In 1901, Catalan anarchist and free-thinker Francesc Ferrer i Guàrdia established "modern" or progressive schools in Barcelona in defiance of an educational system controlled by the Catholic Church. The schools' stated goal was to "educate the working class in a rational, secular and non-coercive setting". Fiercely anti-clerical, Ferrer believed in "freedom in education", education free from the authority of church and state. Murray Bookchin wrote: "This period [1890s] was the heyday of libertarian schools and pedagogical projects in all areas of the country where Anarchists exercised some degree of influence. Perhaps the best-known effort in this field was Francisco Ferrer's Modern School (Escuela Moderna), a project which exercised a considerable influence on Catalan education and on experimental techniques of teaching generally. La Escuela Moderna, and Ferrer's ideas generally, formed the inspiration for a series of Modern Schools in the United States, Cuba, South America and London. The first of these was started in New York City in 1911. It also inspired the Italian newspaper Università popolare, founded in 1901. Russian christian anarchist Leo Tolstoy established a school for peasant children on his estate. Tolstoy's educational experiments were short-lived due to harassment by the Tsarist secret police. Tolstoy established a conceptual difference between education and culture. He thought that "Education is the tendency of one man to make another just like himself... Education is culture under restraint, culture is free. [Education is] when the teaching is forced upon the pupil, and when then instruction is exclusive, that is when only those subjects are taught which the educator regards as necessary". For him "without compulsion, education was transformed into culture".

A more recent libertarian tradition on education is that of unschooling and the free school in which child-led activity replaces pedagogic approaches. Experiments in Germany led to A. S. Neill finding what became Summerhill School in 1921. Summerhill is often cited as an example of anarchism in practice. However, although Summerhill and other free schools are radically libertarian, they differ in principle from those of Ferrer by not advocating an overtly political class struggle-approach. In addition to organizing schools according to libertarian
principles, anarchists have also questioned the concept of schooling per se. The term deschooling was popularized by Ivan Illich, who argued that the school as an institution is dysfunctional for self-determined learning and serves the creation of a consumer society instead.[226]

**Internal issues and debates**

Anarchism is a philosophy which embodies many diverse attitudes, tendencies and schools of thought; as such, disagreement over questions of values, ideology and tactics is common. The compatibility of capitalism,[227] nationalism and religion with anarchism is widely disputed. Similarly, anarchism enjoys complex relationships with ideologies such as Marxism, communism and capitalism. Anarchists may be motivated by humanism, divine authority, enlightened self-interest, veganism or any number of alternative ethical doctrines. Phenomena such as civilization, technology (e.g. within anarcho-primitivism and insurrectionary anarchism), and the democratic process may be sharply criticized within some anarchist tendencies and simultaneously lauded in others.

On a tactical level, while propaganda of the deed was a tactic used by anarchists in the 19th century (e.g. the Nihilist movement), some contemporary anarchists espouse alternative direct action methods such as nonviolence, counter-economics and anti-state cryptography to bring about an anarchist society. About the scope of an anarchist society, some anarchists advocate a global one, while others do so by local ones.[228] The diversity in anarchism has led to widely different use of identical terms among different anarchist traditions, which has led to many definitional concerns in anarchist theory.

**Criticisms**

Criticisms of anarchism include moral criticisms, consequentialist criticisms, and the criticism that anarchism could not be maintained.
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[203] "Anarchism and the different Naturist views have always been related." "Anarchism - Naturism, Naturvism" by Carlos Ortega at Asociacion para el Desarrollo Naturista de la Comunidad de Madrid. Published on Revista ADN. Winter 2003 (http://www.naturismo.org/adn/ediciones/2003/invierno/7e.html)

[204] EL NATURISMO LIBERTARIO EN LA PENÍNSULA IBÉRICA (1890-1939) by Jose Maria Rosello (http://www.solobrera.org/pdfs/cuaderno4.pdf#search="Antonia MaymÃºn")


[214] "william godwin and informal education" by infed (http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-good.htm)


[216] "Where utopian projectors starting with Plato entertained the idea of creating an ideal species through eugenics and education and a set of universally valid institutions inculcating shared identities, Warren wanted to dissolve such identities in a solution of individual self-sovereignty. His educational experiments, for example, possibly under the influence of the Swiss educational theorist Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (via Owen), emphasized - as we would expect - the nurturing of the independence and the conscience of individual children, not the inculcation of pre-conceived values. "Introduction of The Practical Anarchist: Writings of Josiah Warren" by Crispin Sartwell (http://informatics.ca/ainfos00232.html). Ainfos.ca. 2006-07-19. Retrieved 2010-09-20.


[221] "The Emergence of Compulsory Schooling and Anarchist Resistance" by Matt Hern (http://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/HTML/Matt_Hern_The_Emergence_of_Compulsory_Schooling_and_Anarchist_Resistance.html)
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External links

- Infoshop.org (http://www.infoshop.org/) - the largest online collection of news and information about anarchism.
- Anarchism (http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p0038x9t) on In Our Time at the BBC. (listen now (http://www.bbc.co.uk/iplayer/console/p0038x9t/In_Our_Time_Anarchism))
- "An Anarchist FAQ Webpage" (http://www.infoshop.org/page/AnAnarchistFAQ) – An Anarchist FAQ
- Anarchist Theory FAQ (http://www.gmu.edu/departments/economics/bcaplan/anarfaq.htm) – by Bryan Caplan
- The Anarchist Library (http://www.theanarchistlibrary.org/) large online library with texts from anarchist authors
- Anarchism: A Bibliography (http://www.ditext.com/anarchism/)
- Anarchy Archives (http://dwardmac.pitzer.edu/Anarchist_Archives/) – information relating to famous anarchists including their writings (see Anarchy Archives).
- KateSharpleyLibrary.net (http://www.katesharpleylibrary.net/) – website of the Kate Sharpley Library, containing many historical documents pertaining to anarchism
- They Lie We Die (http://www.theyliewedie.org/ressources/biblio/index-en.php) – anarchist virtual library containing 768 books, booklets and texts
Communism

Communism is a social, political and economic ideology that aims at the establishment of a classless, moneyless, stateless and revolutionary socialist society structured upon common ownership of the means of production. This movement, in its Marxist-Leninist interpretations, significantly influenced the history of the 20th century, which saw intense rivalry between the "socialist world" (socialist states ruled by Communist parties) and the "western world" (countries with market economies and Liberal democratic government), culminating in the Cold War between the Eastern bloc and the "Free World".

In Marxist theory, communism is a specific stage of historical development that inevitably emerges from the development of the productive forces that leads to a superabundance of material wealth, allowing for distribution based on need and social relations based on freely associated individuals.[1][2] The exact definition of communism varies, and it is often mistakenly, in general political discourse, used interchangeably with socialism; however, Marxist theory contends that socialism is just a transitional stage on the road to communism. Leninists revised this theory by introducing the notion of a vanguard party to lead the proletarian revolution and to hold all political power after the revolution, "in the name of the workers" and with worker participation, in a transitional stage between capitalism and socialism.

Communists such as council communists and non-Marxist libertarian communists and anarcho-communist oppose the idea of a vanguard party and a transition stage, and advocate for the construction of full communism to begin immediately upon the abolition of capitalism. There is a very wide range of theories amongst those particular communists in regards to how to build the types of institutions that would replace the various economic engines (such as food distribution, education, and hospitals) as they exist under capitalist systems—or even whether to do so at all. Some of these communists have specific plans for the types of administrative bodies that would replace the current ones, while always qualifying that these bodies would be decentralised and worker-owned, just as they currently are within the activist movements themselves. Others have no concrete set of post-revolutionary blueprints at all, claiming instead that they simply trust that the world's workers and poor will figure out proper modes of distribution and wide-scale production, and also coordination, entirely on their own, without the need for any structured "replacements" for capitalist state-based control.

In the modern lexicon of what many sociologists and political commentators refer to as the "political mainstream", communism is often used to refer to the policies of states run by communist parties, regardless of the practical content of the actual economic system they may preside over. Examples of this include the policies of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam where the economic system incorporates "doi moi", the People's Republic of China (PRC, or simply "China") where the economic system incorporates "socialist market economy", and the economic system of the Soviet Union which was described as "state capitalist" by non-Leninist socialists and later by communists who increasingly opposed the post-Stalin era Soviet model as it progressed over the course of the 20th century (e.g. Maoists, Trotskyists and libertarian communists)—and even at one point by Vladimir Lenin himself.[3]

Etymology and terminology

Communism comes from the Latin word communis, which means "shared" or "belong to all".[4][5]

In the schema of historical materialism, communism is the idea of a free society with no division or alienation, where mankind is free from oppression and scarcity. A communist society would have no governments, countries, or class divisions. In Marxist theory, the dictatorship of the proletariat is the intermediate system between capitalism and communism, when the government is in the process of changing the means of ownership from privatism to collective ownership.[6] In political science, the term "communism" is sometimes used to refer to communist states, a form of government in which the state operates under a one-party system and declares allegiance to Marxism-Leninism or a derivative thereof.
In modern usage, the word "communism" is still often used to refer to the policies of self-declared socialist governments comprising one-party states which were single legal political party systems operating under centrally planned economies and a state ownership of the means of production, with the state, in turn, claiming that it represented the interests of the working classes. A significant sector of the modern communist movement alleges that these states never made an attempt to transition to a communist society, while others even argue that they never achieved a legitimate socialism. Most of these governments based their ideology on Marxism-Leninism, but they did not call the system they had set up "communism", nor did they even necessarily claim at all times that the ideology was the sole driving force behind their policies: Mao Zedong, for example, pursued New Democracy, and Lenin in the early 1920s enacted war communism; later, the Vietnamese enacted doi moi, and the Chinese switched to socialism with Chinese characteristics. The governments labeled by other governments as "communist" generally claimed that they had set up a transitional socialist system. This system is sometimes referred to as state socialism or by other similar names.

"Pure communism" is a term sometimes used to refer to the stage in history after socialism, although just as many communists use simply the term "communism" to refer to that stage. The classless, stateless society that is meant to characterise this communism is one where decisions on what to produce and what policies to pursue are made in the best interests of the whole of society—a sort of "of, by, and for the working class", rather than a rich class controlling the wealth and everyone else working for them on a wage basis. In this communism the interests of every member of society is given equal weight to the next, in the practical decision-making process in both the political and economic spheres of life. Karl Marx, as well as some other communist philosophers, deliberately never provided a detailed description as to how communism would function as a social system, nor the precise ways in which the working class could or should rise up, nor any other material specifics of exactly how to get to communism from capitalism. In the Communist Manifesto, Marx does lay out a 10-point plan advising the redistribution of land and production to begin the transition to communism, but he ensured that even this was very general and all-encompassing. It has always been presumed that Marx intended these theories to read this way specifically so that later theorists in specific situations could adapt communism to their own localities and conditions.

Theory

According to communist theory, the only way to abolish capitalist inequalities is to have the proletariat (working class), who collectively constitute the main producer of wealth in society, and who are perpetually exploited and marginalised by the bourgeoisie (wealthy class), to overthrow the capitalist system in a wide-ranging social revolution.[7] The revolution, in the theory of most individuals and groups espousing communist revolution, usually involves an armed rebellion. The revolution espoused can be explained by theorists in many different ways, and usually depends on the environment in which the particular communism theory originates. For example, the Chinese Revolution involved military combat between the Chinese Red and the Chinese Nationalist Armies, while the Vietnamese Revolution was characterised by guerilla warfare between the heavily-backed Vietnam People's Army and various Western armies, culminating in the Vietnam War which ended in 1975. Meanwhile, the Cuban Revolution was essentially a coup that did not involve intensive wide-scale military conflict between Fulgencio Batista's soldiers and those of Fidel Castro and Che Guevara. In fact, Castro initially did not believe that a vanguard party was necessary in Cuba's case, a view boosted by Batista's unpopularity at the time of the actual armed conflict between the two sides. Regardless of the specific form a communist revolution takes, its aim is for the working class to replace the exploiter class as the ruling class to establish a society without class divisions, called socialism, as a prelude to attempting to achieve the final stage of communism.[8]
History

"Communism differs from all previous movements in that it overturns the basis of all earlier relations of production and intercourse, and for the first time consciously treats all natural premises as the creatures of hitherto existing men, strips them of their natural character and subjugates them to the power of the united individuals."

— Karl Marx, The German Ideology, 1845

Early communism

Further information: Primitive communism, Religious communism, and Utopian socialism

The origins of communism are debatable, and there are various historical groups, as well as theorists, whose beliefs have been subsequently described as communist. German philosopher Karl Marx saw primitive communism as the original, hunter-gatherer state of humankind from which it arose. For Marx, only after humanity was capable of producing surplus, did private property develop. The idea of a classless society first emerged in Ancient Greece. Plato in his The Republic described it as a state where people shared all their property, wives, and children: "The private and individual is altogether banished from life and things which are by nature private, such as eyes and ears and hands, have become common, and in some way see and hear and act in common, and all men express praise and fell joy and sorrow on the same occasions."

In the history of Western thought, certain elements of the idea of a society based on common ownership of property can be traced back to ancient times. Examples include the Spartacus slave revolt in Rome. The 5th century Mazdak movement in what is now Iran has been described as "communistic" for challenging the enormous privileges of the noble classes and the clergy, criticizing the institution of private property and for striving for an egalitarian society.

At one time or another, various small communist communities existed, generally under the inspiration of Scripture. In the medieval Christian church, for example, some monastic communities and religious orders shared their land and other property (see Religious and Christian communism). These groups often believed that concern with private property was a distraction from religious service to God and neighbour.

Communist thought has also been traced back to the work of 16th century English writer Thomas More. In his treatise Utopia (1516), More portrayed a society based on common ownership of property, whose rulers administered it through the application of reason. In the 17th century, communist thought surfaced again in England. In England, a Puritan religious group known as the "Diggers" advocated the abolition of private ownership of land. Eduard Bernstein, in his 1895 Cromwell and Communism argued that several groupings in the English Civil War, especially the Diggers espoused clear communistic, agrarian ideals, and that Oliver Cromwell's attitude to these groups was at best ambivalent and often hostile. Criticism of the idea of private property continued into the Age of Enlightenment of the 18th century, through such thinkers as Jean Jacques Rousseau in France. Later, following the upheaval of the French Revolution, communism emerged as a political doctrine. François Noël Babeuf, in particular, espoused the goals of common ownership of land and total economic and political equality among citizens.
Various social reformers in the early 19th century founded communities based on common ownership. But unlike many previous communist communities, they replaced the religious emphasis with a rational and philanthropic basis. Notable among them were Robert Owen, who founded New Harmony in Indiana (1825), and Charles Fourier, whose followers organized other settlements in the United States such as Brook Farm (1841–47). Later in the 19th century, Karl Marx described these social reformers as "utopian socialists" to contrast them with his program of "scientific socialism" (a term coined by Friedrich Engels). Other writers described by Marx as "utopian socialists" included Saint-Simon.

In its modern form, communism grew out of the socialist movement of 19th century Europe. As the Industrial Revolution advanced, socialist critics blamed capitalism for the misery of the proletariat—a new class of urban factory workers who laboured under often-hazardous conditions. Foremost among these critics were Marx and his associate Friedrich Engels. In 1848, Marx and Engels offered a new definition of communism and popularized the term in their famous pamphlet *The Communist Manifesto*. Engels, who lived in Manchester, observed the organization of the Chartist movement (see *History of British socialism*), while Marx departed from his university comrades to meet the proletariat in France and Germany.

**Growth of modern communism**

In the late 19th century, Russian Marxism developed a distinct character. The first major figure of Russian Marxism was Georgi Plekhanov. Underlying the work of Plekhanov was the assumption that Russia, less urbanized and industrialized than Western Europe, had many years to go before society would be ready for proletarian revolution to occur, and a transitional period of a bourgeois democratic regime would be required to replace Tsarism with a socialist and later communist society. (EB)

In Russia, the 1917 October Revolution was the first time any party with an avowedly Marxist orientation, in this case the Bolshevik Party, seized state power. The assumption of state power by the Bolsheviks generated a great deal of practical and theoretical debate within the Marxist movement. Marx predicted that socialism and communism would be built upon foundations laid by the most advanced capitalist development. Russia, however, was one of the poorest countries in Europe with an enormous, largely illiterate peasantry and a minority of industrial workers. Marx had explicitly stated that Russia might be able to skip the stage of bourgeois capitalism. Other socialists also believed that a Russian revolution could be the precursor of workers' revolutions in the West.

The moderate Mensheviks opposed Lenin's Bolshevik plan for socialist revolution before capitalism was more fully developed. The Bolsheviks' successful rise to power was based upon the slogans such as "Peace, bread, and land" which tapped the massive public desire for an end to Russian involvement in the First World War, the peasants' demand for land reform, and popular support for the Soviets. The usage of the terms "communism" and "socialism" shifted after 1917, when the Bolsheviks changed their name to *Communist Party* and installed a single party regime devoted to the implementation of socialist policies under Leninism. The Second International had dissolved in 1916 over national divisions, as the separate national parties that composed it did not maintain a unified front against the war, instead generally supporting their respective nation's role. Lenin thus created the Third International (Comintern) in 1919 and sent the 'Twenty-one Conditions, which included democratic centralism, to all European socialist parties willing to adhere. In France, for example, the majority of the French Section of the Workers' International (SFIO) party split in 1921 to form the French Section of the Communist International (SFIC). Henceforth, the term "Communism" was applied to the objective of the parties
Communism

founded under the umbrella of the Comintern. Their program called for the unifying of workers of the world for revolution, which would be followed by the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat as well as the development of a socialist economy. Ultimately, if their program held, there would develop a harmonious classless society, with the withering away of the state.

During the Russian Civil War (1918–1922), the Bolsheviks nationalized all productive property and imposed a policy of war communism, which put factories and railroads under strict government control, collected and rationed food, and introduced some bourgeois management of industry. After three years of war and the 1921 Kronstadt rebellion, Lenin declared the New Economic Policy (NEP) in 1921, which was to give a "limited place for a limited time to capitalism." The NEP lasted until 1928, when Joseph Stalin achieved party leadership, and the introduction of the first Five Year Plan spelled the end of it. Following the Russian Civil War, the Bolsheviks, in 1922, formed the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), or Soviet Union, from the former Russian Empire.

Following Lenin's democratic centralism, the communist parties were organized on a hierarchical basis, with active cells of members as the broad base; they were made up only of elite cadres approved by higher members of the party as being reliable and completely subject to party discipline.[21]

Following World War II, Communists consolidated power in Central and Eastern Europe, and in 1949, the Communist Party of China (CPC), led by Mao Zedong, established the People's Republic of China, which would follow its own ideological path of Communist development following the Sino-Soviet split. Cuba, North Korea, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Angola, and Mozambique were among the other countries in the Third World that adopted or imposed a Communist government at some point. By the early 1980s almost one-third of the world's population lived in Communist states, including the former Soviet Union and PRC.

Communist states such as the Soviet Union and PRC succeeded in becoming industrial and technological powers, challenging the capitalists' powers in the arms race and space race.

Socialist countries within the Marxist-Leninist or Maoist definition in 1980. Color-coding indicates communist alignment with the Soviet Union (red), China (yellow), or independent status (black).
Cold War years

By virtue of the Soviet Union's victory in the Second World War in 1945, the Red Army occupied nations not only in Central and Eastern Europe, but also in East Asia; consequently, communism as a movement spread to many new countries. This expansion of communism both in Europe and Asia gave rise to a few different branches of its own, such as Maoism.\[22\]

Communism had been vastly strengthened by the winning of many new nations into the sphere of Soviet influence and strength in Central and Eastern Europe. Governments modelled on Soviet Communism took power with Soviet assistance in Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Poland, Hungary and Romania. A Communist government was also created under Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia, but Tito's independent policies led to the expulsion of Yugoslavia from the Cominform, which had replaced the Comintern. Titism, a new branch in the world Communist movement, was labelled "deviationist". Albania also became an independent Communist nation after World War II.\[23\]

By 1950, the Chinese Communists held all of Mainland China, thus controlling the most populous nation in the world. Other areas where rising Communist strength provoked dissension and in some cases led to actual fighting through conventional and guerrilla warfare include the Korean War, Laos, many nations of the Middle East and Africa, and notably succeeded in the case of the Vietnam War against the military power of the United States and its allies. With varying degrees of success, Communists attempted to unite with nationalist and socialist forces against what they saw as Western imperialism in these poor countries.

Fear of communism

With the exception of the contribution in World War II by the Soviet Union, China, and the Italian resistance movement, communism was seen as a rival, and a threat to western democracies and capitalism for most of the 20th century.\[24\] This rivalry peaked during the Cold War, as the world's two remaining superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, polarized most of the world into two camps of nations. This was characterized in the West as The Free World vs. Behind the Iron Curtain. It supported the spread of their respective economic and political systems (capitalism and communism) and strengthened their military powers. As a result, the camps developed new weapon systems, stockpiled nuclear weapons, and competed in space exploration.

Near the beginning of the Cold War, on February 9, 1950, Senator Joseph McCarthy from Wisconsin accused 205 Americans working in the State Department of being "card-carrying communists".\[25\] The fear of communism in the U.S. spurred McCarthyism, aggressive investigations and the red-baiting, blacklisting, jailing and deportation of persons suspected of following communist or other left-wing ideologies. Many famous actors and writers were placed on a blacklist from 1950 to 1954, which meant they would not be hired and would be subject to public disdain.\[24\]

USSR postage stamp depicting the communist state launching the first artificial satellite Sputnik 1.

A 1947 propaganda book published by the Catechetical Guild Educational Society warning of the dangers of a communist revolution.
After the dissolution of the Soviet Union

Further information: List of far-left parties with parliamentary representation

In 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev became leader of the Soviet Union and relaxed central control, in accordance with reform policies of glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring). The Soviet Union did not intervene as Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary all abandoned Communist rule by 1990. In 1991, the Soviet Union dissolved.

By the beginning of the 21st century, states controlled by communist parties under a single-party system include the People's Republic of China, Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, and informally North Korea. Communist parties, or their descendant parties, remain politically important in many countries. President Dimitris Christofias of Cyprus is a member of the Progressive Party of Working People, but the country is not run under single-party rule. In South Africa, the Communist Party is a partner in the ANC-led government. In India, communists lead the governments of three states, with a combined population of more than 115 million. In Nepal, communists hold a majority in the parliament. In Brazil, the PCdoB is a part of the parliamentary coalition led by the ruling democratic socialist Workers’ Party and is represented in the executive cabinet of Dilma Rousseff.

The People's Republic of China has reassessed many aspects of the Maoist legacy; it, along with Laos, Vietnam, and, to a lesser degree Cuba, has reduced state control of the economy in order to stimulate growth. Chinese economic reforms started in 1978 under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping; since then, China has managed to bring down the poverty rate from 53% in the Mao era to just 6% in 2001. The People's Republic of China runs Special Economic Zones dedicated to market-oriented enterprise, free from central government control. Several other communist states have also attempted to implement market-based reforms, including Vietnam.

Theories within Marxism as to why communism in Central and Eastern Europe was not achieved after socialist revolutions pointed to such elements as the pressure of external capitalist states, the relative backwardness of the societies in which the revolutions occurred, and the emergence of a bureaucratic stratum or class that arrested or diverted the transition press in its own interests. (Scott and Marshall, 2005) Marxist critics of the Soviet Union, most notably Trotsky, referred to the Soviet system, along with other Communist states, as "degenerated" or "deformed workers' states", arguing that the Soviet system fell far short of Marx's communist ideal and he claimed the working class was politically dispossessed. The ruling stratum of the Soviet Union was held to be a bureaucratic caste, but not a new ruling class, despite their political control. Anarchists who adhere to Participatory economics claim that the Soviet Union became dominated by powerful intellectual elites who in a capitalist system crown the proletariat's labour on behalf of the bourgeoisie.

Non-Marxists, in contrast, have often applied the term to any society ruled by a communist party and to any party aspiring to create a society similar to such existing nation-states. In the social sciences, societies ruled by communist parties are distinct for their single party control and their socialist economic bases. While some social and political scientists applied the concept of "totalitarianism" to these societies, others identified possibilities for independent political activity within them, and stressed their continued evolution up to the point of the dissolution of the Soviet Union and its allies in Central Europe during the late 1980s and early 1990s.
Communism

Marxist schools of communism

Communism is the riddle of history solved, and it knows itself to be this solution.

—Karl Marx, 1844

Variations to the communist movement have developed, each based upon the ideas of different political theorists, usually as additions or interpretations of various forms of Marxism, the collective philosophies of the German philosopher Karl Marx. Marxism-Leninism is the synthesis of Vladimir Lenin's contributions to Marxism, such as how a revolutionary party should be organised; Trotskyism is Leon Trotsky's conception of Marxism, influenced by Lenin, and meanwhile, Maoism is Mao Zedong's interpretation of Marxism to suit the conditions of China at that time, and is fairly heavy on the need for agrarian worker support as the engine for the revolution, rather than workers in the urban areas, which were still very small at that point.

Self-identified communists hold a variety of views, including Marxism-Leninism, Trotskyism, council communism, Luxemburgism, anarchist communism, Christian communism, and various currents of left communism. However, the offshoots of the Marxist-Leninist interpretations of Marxism are the best-known of these and had been a driving force in international relations during the last quarter of the 19th century and most of the 20th century up to around 1989 and what historians refer to as "the collapse of communism." However, other forms of communism worldwide continue to exist in the ideologies of various individual labor movement trade unions worldwide, particularly in Europe and the Third World, and also in communist parties that continue to espouse the ultimate need for communist revolution.

Most communists today tend to agree that the remaining communist states, such as China, Vietnam and especially North Korea (which has replaced Marxism-Leninism with Juche as its official ideology), have nothing to do with communism, whether as practised currently within leftist resistance movements and parties, or in terms of the ideologies and programmes held by those movements.

A diverse range of theories persist amongst prominent globally known people such as Slavoj Zizek, Michael Parenti, Alain Badiou and other radical left thinkers who proclaim themselves communists; they and others like them are examples of present-day well-known figures in the modern communist movement.
Marxism

Like other socialists, Marx and Engels sought an end to capitalism and the systems which they perceived to be responsible for the exploitation of workers. Whereas earlier socialists often favored longer-term social reform, Marx and Engels believed that popular revolution was all but inevitable, and the only path to socialism and communism.

According to the Marxist argument for communism, the main characteristic of human life in class society is alienation; and communism is desirable because it entails the full realization of human freedom.[38] Marx here follows Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in conceiving freedom not merely as an absence of restraints but as action with content.[39] According to Marx, communism's outlook on freedom was based on an agent, obstacle, and goal. The agent is the common/working people; the obstacles are class divisions, economic inequalities, unequal life-chances, and false consciousness; and the goal is the fulfilment of human needs including satisfying work, and fair share of the product.[40][41]

They believed that communism allowed people to do what they want, but also put humans in such conditions and such relations with one another that they would not wish to exploit, or have any need to. Whereas for Hegel the unfolding of this ethical life in history is mainly driven by the realm of ideas, for Marx, communism emerged from material forces, particularly the development of the means of production.[39]

Marxism holds that a process of class conflict and revolutionary struggle will result in victory for the proletariat and the establishment of a communist society in which private property and ownership is abolished over time and the means of production and subsistence belong to the community. (Private property and ownership, in this context, means ownerships of the means of production, not private possessions).[42] Marx himself wrote little about life under communism, giving only the most general indication as to what constituted a communist society. It is clear that it entails abundance in which there is little limit to the projects that humans may undertake. In the popular slogan that was adopted by the communist movement, communism was a world in which each gave according to their abilities, and received according to their needs. The German Ideology (1845) was one of Marx's few writings to elaborate on the communist future:

"In communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic."[43]

Marx's lasting vision was to add this vision to a theory of how society was moving in a law-governed way towards communism, and, with some tension, a political theory that explained why revolutionary activity was required to bring it about.[39]

In the late 19th century, the terms "socialism" and "communism" were often used interchangeably. However, Marx and Engels argued that communism would not emerge from capitalism in a fully developed state, but would pass through a "first phase" in which most productive property was owned in common, but with some class differences remaining. The "first phase" would eventually evolve into a "higher phase" in which class differences were eliminated, and a state was no longer needed. Lenin frequently used the term "socialism" to refer to Marx and Engels' supposed "first phase" of communism and used the term "communism" interchangeably with Marx and Engels' "higher phase" of communism.[44]
These later aspects, particularly as developed by Vladimir Lenin, provided the underpinning for the mobilizing features of 20th century communist parties.

**Marxism-Leninism**

Leninism is the political movement developed by Vladimir Lenin, which has become the foundation for the organizational structure of most major communist parties. Leninists advocate the creation of a vanguard party led by professional revolutionaries in order to lead the working class revolution. Leninists believe that socialism will not arise spontaneously through the natural decay of capitalism and that workers are unable to organize and develop socialist consciousness without the guidance of the Vanguard party. After taking power, Vanguard parties seek to create a socialist state dominated by the Vanguard party in order to direct social development and defend against counterrevolutionary insurrection. The mode of industrial organization championed by Leninism and Marxism-Leninism is the capitalist model of scientific management pioneered by Fredrick Taylor.

Marxism-Leninism is a version of Leninism merged with classical Marxism adopted by the Soviet Union and most communist parties across the world today. It was heralded as a possibility of building communism via a massive program of industrialization and collectivisation. Despite the fall of the Soviet Union and the 'Eastern Bloc' (meaning communist countries of Eastern and Central Europe), many communist parties of the world today still lay claim to uphold the Marxist-Leninist banner. Marxism-Leninism expands on Marxists thoughts by bringing the theories to what Lenin and other Communists considered, the age of capitalist imperialism, and a renewed focus on party building, the development of a socialist state, and democratic centralism as an organizational principle.

Lenin adapted Marx's urban revolution to Russia's agricultural conditions, sparking the "revolutionary nationalism of the poor".[45] The pamphlet *What is to be Done?* (1902), proposed that the (urban) proletariat can successfully achieve revolutionary consciousness only under the leadership of a vanguard party of professional revolutionaries—who can achieve aims only with internal democratic centralism in the party; tactical and ideological policy decisions are agreed via democracy, and every member must support and promote the agreed party policy.

To wit, capitalism can be overthrown only with revolution—because attempts to reform capitalism from within (Fabianism) and from without (democratic socialism) will fail because of its inherent contradictions. The purpose of a Leninist revolutionary vanguard party is the forceful deposition of the incumbent government; assume power (as agent of the proletariat) and establish a dictatorship of the proletariat government. Moreover, as the government, the vanguard party must educate the proletariat—to dispel the societal false consciousness of religion and nationalism that are culturally instilled by the bourgeoisie in facilitating exploitation. The dictatorship of the proletariat is governed with a de-centralized direct democracy practised via soviets (councils) where the workers exercise political power (cf. soviet democracy); the fifth chapter of *State & Revolution*, describes it:

"... the dictatorship of the proletariat—i.e. the organisation of the vanguard of the oppressed as the ruling class for the purpose of crushing the oppressors. ... An immense expansion of democracy, which for the first time becomes democracy for the poor, democracy for the people, and not democracy for the rich: ... and suppression by force, i.e. exclusion from democracy, for the exploiters and oppressors of the people—this is the change which democracy undergoes during the transition from capitalism to communism."[46]

The Bolshevik government was hostile to nationalism, especially to Russian nationalism, the "Great Russian chauvinism", as an obstacle to establishing the proletarian dictatorship.[47] The revolutionary elements of Leninism—the disciplined vanguard party, a dictatorship of the proletariat, and class war.
Stalinism

Stalinism was the political system of the Soviet Union and the countries within the Soviet sphere of influence during the leadership of Joseph Stalin. The term usually defines the style of a government rather than an ideology. The ideology was officially Marxism-Leninism theory, reflecting that Stalin himself was not a theoretician, in contrast to Marx and Lenin, and prided himself on maintaining the legacy of Lenin as a founding father for the Soviet Union and the future Socialist world. Stalinism is an interpretation of their ideas, and a certain political regime claiming to apply those ideas in ways fitting the changing needs of Soviet society, as with the transition from "socialism at a snail's pace" in the mid-twenties to the rapid industrialization of the Five-Year Plans.

The main contributions of Stalin to communist theory were:

- The groundwork for the Soviet policy concerning nationalities, laid in Stalin's 1913 work *Marxism and the National Question*, praised by Lenin.
- Socialism in One Country, stating that communists should attain socialism in their own country as a prelude to internationalising.
- The theory of aggravation of the class struggle along with the development of socialism, a theoretical base supporting the repression of political opponents as necessary.

Trotskyism

Trotskyism is the branch of Marxism that was developed by Leon Trotsky. It supports the theory of permanent revolution and world revolution instead of the two stage theory and socialism in one country. It supported proletarian internationalism and another Communist revolution in the Soviet Union, which, under the leadership of Stalin, Trotsky claimed had become a degenerated worker's state, rather than the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Trotsky and his supporters organized into the Left Opposition and their platform became known as Trotskyism. Stalin eventually succeeded in gaining control of the Soviet regime and Trotskyist attempts to remove Stalin from power resulted in Trotsky's exile from the Soviet Union in 1929. During Trotsky's exile, world communism fractured into two distinct branches: Marxism-Leninism and Trotskyism. Trotsky later founded the Fourth International, a Trotskyist rival to the Comintern, in 1938.

Trotskyist ideas have continually found a modest echo among political movements in some countries in Latin America and Asia, especially in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia and Sri Lanka. Many Trotskyist organizations are also active in more stable, developed countries in North America and Western Europe. Trotsky's politics differed sharply from those of Stalin and Mao, most importantly in declaring the need for an international proletarian revolution (rather than socialism in one country) and unwavering support for a true dictatorship of the proletariat based on democratic principles.

However, as a whole, Trotsky's theories and attitudes were never accepted in worldwide mainstream Communist circles after Trotsky's expulsion, either within or outside of the Soviet bloc. This remained the case even after the Secret Speech and subsequent events critics claim exposed the fallibility of Stalin.
Maoism

Maoism is the Marxist-Leninist trend of Communism associated with Mao Zedong and was mostly practiced within China. Khrushchev's reforms heightened ideological differences between China and the Soviet Union, which became increasingly apparent in the 1960s. Parties and groups that supported the Communist Party of China (CPC) in their criticism against the new Soviet leadership proclaimed themselves as 'anti-revisionist' and denounced the CPSU and the parties aligned with it as revisionist "capitalist-roaders." The Sino-Soviet Split resulted in divisions amongst communist parties around the world. Notably, the Party of Labour of Albania sided with the People's Republic of China. Effectively, the CPC under Mao's leadership became the rallying forces of a parallel international Communist tendency.

Definitions of Maoism vary. Within the Chinese context, Maoism can refer to Mao's belief in the mobilization of the masses, particularly in large-scale political movements; it can also refer to the egalitarianism that was seen during Mao's era as opposed to the free-market ideology of Deng Xiaoping; some scholars additionally define personality cults and political sloganeering as "Maoist" practices. Contemporary Maoists in China criticize the social inequalities created by a capitalist and 'revisionist' Communist party.

Others

Prachanda Path

Prachanda Path refers to the ideological line of the Unified Communist Party of Nepal. This thought is an extension of Marxism, Leninism and Maoism, totally based on home-ground politics of Nepal. The doctrine came into existence after it was realized that the ideology of Marxism, Leninism and Maoism could not be practiced completely as it was done in the past. And an ideology suitable, based on the ground reality of Nepalese politics was adopted by the party.

Hoxhaism

Another variant of anti-revisionist Marxism-Leninism appeared after the ideological row between the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania in 1978. The Albanians rallied a new separate international tendency, which would demarcate itself by a strict defence of the legacy of Joseph Stalin and fierce criticism of virtually all other Communist groupings as revisionism. Critical of the United States, the Soviet Union, and China, Enver Hoxha declared the latter two to be social-imperialist and condemned the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia by withdrawing from the Warsaw Pact in response. Hoxha declared Albania to be the world's only Marxist-Leninist state after 1978. The Albanians were able to win over a large share of the Maoists, mainly in Latin America such as the Popular Liberation Army, but also had a significant international following in general. This tendency has occasionally been labelled as 'Hoxhaism' after him.

After the fall of the Communist government in Albania, the pro-Albanian parties are grouped around an international conference and the publication 'Unity and Struggle'.

Titoism

Elements of Titoism are characterized by policies and practices based on the principle that in each country, the means of attaining ultimate communist goals must be dictated by the conditions of that particular country, rather than by a pattern set in another country. During Tito's era, this specifically meant that the communist goal should be pursued independently of (and often in opposition to) the policies of the Soviet Union. The term was originally meant as a pejorative, and was labelled by Moscow as a heresy during the period of tensions between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia known as the Informbiro period from 1948 to 1955.

Unlike the rest of Central and Eastern Europe, which fell under Stalin's influence post–World War II, Yugoslavia, due to the strong leadership of Marshal Tito and the fact that the Yugoslav Partisans liberated Yugoslavia with only
limited help from the Red Army, remained independent from Moscow. It became the only country in the Balkans to resist pressure from Moscow to join the Warsaw Pact and remained "socialist, but independent" until the collapse of Soviet socialism in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Throughout his time in office, Tito prided himself on Yugoslavia's independence from Russia, with Yugoslavia never accepting full membership of the Comecon and Tito's open rejection of many aspects of Stalinism as the most obvious manifestations of this.

**Eurocommunism**

Eurocommunism was a trend in the 1970s and 1980s within various Western European communist parties to develop a theory and practice of social transformation that was more relevant in a Western European democracy and less aligned to the influence or control of the Soviet Union. Parties such as the Italian Communist Party (PCI), the French Communist Party (PCF), and the Communist Party of Spain (PCE), were politically active and electorally significant in their respective countries).

The main theoretical foundation of Eurocommunism was Antonio Gramsci's writing about Marxist theory which questioned the sectarianism of the Left and encouraged communist parties to develop social alliances to win *hegemonic* support for social reforms. Eurocommunist parties expressed their fidelity to democratic institutions more clearly than before and attempted to widen their appeal by embracing public sector middle-class workers, new social movements such as feminism and gay liberation and more publicly questioning the Soviet Union. Early inspirations can also be found in the Austromarxism and its seeking of a "third" democratic "way" to socialism.

**Libertarian and non-Leninist forms of Marxism**

Libertarian Marxism refers to a broad scope of economic and political philosophies that emphasize the anti-authoritarian aspects of Marxism. Early currents of libertarian Marxism, known as left communism, emerged in opposition to Marxism–Leninism and its derivatives, such as Stalinism, Maoism, and Trotskyism. Libertarian Marxism is also critical of reformist positions, such as those held by social democrats. Libertarian Marxist currents often draw from Marx and Engels' later works, specifically the *Grundrisse* and *The Civil War in France*, emphasizing the Marxist belief in the ability of the working class to forge its own destiny without the need for a revolutionary party or state to mediate or aid its liberation. Along with anarchism, Libertarian Marxism is one of the main currents of libertarian socialism.

Libertarian Marxism includes such currents as Luxemburgism, council communism, left communism, *Socialisme ou Barbarie*, the Johnson-Forest tendency, world socialism, Lettrism/Situationism and operaismo/autonomism, and New Left. Libertarian Marxism has often had a strong influence on both post-left and social anarchists. Notable theorists of libertarian Marxism have included Anton Pannekoek, Raya Dunayevskaya, CLR James, Antonio Negri, Cornelius Castoriadis, Maurice Brinton, Guy Debord, Daniel Guérin, Ernesto Screpanti and Raoul Vaneigem.

**Council communism**

Council communism is a far-left movement originating in Germany and the Netherlands in the 1920s. Its primary organization was the Communist Workers Party of Germany (KAPD). Council communism continues today as a theoretical and activist position within both left-wing Marxism and libertarian socialism.

The central argument of council communism, in contrast to those of social democracy and Leninist Communism, is that democratic workers' councils arising in the factories and municipalities are the natural form of working class organisation and governmental power. This view is opposed to both the reformist and the Leninist ideologies, with their stress on, respectively, parliaments and institutional government (i.e., by applying social reforms), on the one hand, and vanguard parties and participative democratic centralism on the other).

The core principle of council communism is that the government and the economy should be managed by workers' councils composed of delegates elected at workplaces and recallable at any moment. As such, council communists oppose state-run authoritarian "State socialism"/"State capitalism". They also oppose the idea of a "revolutionary
party”, since council communists believe that a revolution led by a party will necessarily produce a party dictatorship. Council communists support a worker's democracy, which they want to produce through a federation of workers' councils.

**Left communism**

Left communism is the range of communist viewpoints held by the communist left, which criticizes the political ideas of the Bolsheviks at certain periods, from a position that is asserted to be more authentically Marxist and proletarian than the views of Leninism held by the Communist International after its first and during its second congress.

Left Communists see themselves to the left of Leninists (whom they tend to see as 'left of capital', not socialists), anarchist communists (some of whom they consider internationalist socialists) as well as some other revolutionary socialist tendencies (for example De Leonists, who they tend to see as being internationalist socialists only in limited instances).

Although she died before left communism became a distinct tendency, Rosa Luxemburg has heavily influenced most left communists, both politically and theoretically. Proponents of left communism have included Amadeo Bordiga, Herman Gorter, Anton Pannekoek, Otto Rühle, Karl Korsch, Sylvia Pankhurst and Paul Mattick.

Prominent left communist groups existing today include the International Communist Party, the International Communist Current and the Internationalist Communist Tendency.

**Situationist International**

The Situationist International was a restricted group of international revolutionaries founded in 1957, and which had its peak in its influence on the unprecedented general wildcat strikes of May 1968 in France.

With their ideas rooted in Marxism and the 20th century European artistic avant-gardes, they advocated experiences of life being alternative to those admitted by the capitalist order, for the fulfillment of human primitive desires and the pursuing of a superior passional quality. For this purpose they suggested and experimented with the construction of situations, namely the setting up of environments favorable for the fulfillment of such desires. Using methods drawn from the arts, they developed a series of experimental fields of study for the construction of such situations, like unitary urbanism and psychogeography.

They fought against the main obstacle on the fulfillment of such superior passional living, identified by them in advanced capitalism. Their theoretical work peaked on the highly influential book *The Society of the Spectacle* by Guy Debord. Debord argued in 1967 that spectacular features like mass media and advertising have a central role in an advanced capitalist society, which is to show a fake reality in order to mask the real capitalist degradation of human life. To overthrow such a system, the Situationist International supported the May '68 revolts, and asked the workers to occupy the factories and to run them with direct democracy, through workers' councils composed by instantly revocable delegates.

After publishing in the last issue of the magazine an analysis of the May 1968 revolts, and the strategies that will need to be adopted in future revolutions,[57] the SI was dissolved in 1972.[58]
**Autonomism**

Autonomism refers to a set of left-wing political and social movements and theories close to the socialist movement. As an identifiable theoretical system it first emerged in Italy in the 1960s from workerist (operaismo) communism. Later, post-Marxist and anarchist tendencies became significant after influence from the Situationists, the failure of Italian far-left movements in the 1970s, and the emergence of a number of important theorists including Antonio Negri, who had contributed to the 1969 founding of *Potere Operaio*, Mario Tronti, Paolo Virno, etc.

Through translations made available by Danilo Montaldi and others, the Italian autonomists drew upon previous activist research in the United States by the Johnson-Forest Tendency and in France by the group Socialisme ou Barbarie.

It influenced the German and Dutch Autonomen, the worldwide Social Centre movement, and today is influential in Italy, France, and to a lesser extent the English-speaking countries. Those who describe themselves as autonomists now vary from Marxists to post-structuralists and anarchists. The Autonomist Marxist and Autonomen movements provided inspiration to some on the revolutionary left in English speaking countries, particularly among anarchists, many of whom have adopted autonomous tactics. Some English-speaking anarchists even describe themselves as Autonomists. The Italian operaismo movement also influenced Marxist academics such as Harry Cleaver, John Holloway, Steve Wright, and Nick Dyer-Witheford.

**Non-Marxist schools of communism**

The dominant forms of communism are based on Marxism, but non-Marxist versions of communism (such as Christian communism and anarchist communism) also exist.

**Anarcho-communism**

Anarchist communism (also known as libertarian communism) is a theory of anarchism which advocates the abolition of the state, private property, and capitalism in favour of common ownership of the means of production, direct democracy and a horizontal network of voluntary associations and workers' councils with production and consumption based on the guiding principle: "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need".

Anarchist-communism differs from marxism rejecting its view about the need for a State Socialism phase before building communism. The main anarcho-communist theorist Peter Kropotkin argued that a revolutionary society should “transform itself immediately into a communist society,” that is, should go immediately into what Marx had regarded as the "more advanced," completed, phase of communism. In this way it tries to avoid the reappearance of "class divisions and the need for a state to oversee everything".

Some forms of anarchist communism such as insurrectionary anarchism are egoist and strongly influenced by radical individualism, believing that anarchist communism does not require a communitarian nature at all. Most anarcho-communists view anarcho-communism as a way of reconciling the opposition between the individual and
To date in human history, the best known examples of an anarchist communist society, established around the ideas as they exist today, that received worldwide attention and knowledge in the historical canon, are the anarchist territories during the Spanish Revolution and the Free Territory during the Russian Revolution. Through the efforts and influence of the Spanish Anarchists during the Spanish Revolution within the Spanish Civil War, starting in 1936 anarchist communism existed in most of Aragon, parts of the Levante and Andalusia, as well as in the stronghold of Anarchist Catalonia before being brutally crushed by the combined forces of the authoritarian regime that won the war, Hitler, Mussolini, Spanish Communist Party repression (backed by the USSR) as well as economic and armaments blockades from the capitalist countries and the Spanish Republic itself. During the Russian Revolution, anarchists such as Nestor Makhno worked to create and defend—through the Revolutionary Insurrectionary Army of Ukraine—anarchist communism in the Free Territory of the Ukraine from 1919 before being conquered by the Bolsheviks in 1921.

Christian communism

Christian communism is a form of religious communism centred on Christianity. It is a theological and political theory based upon the view that the teachings of Jesus Christ urge Christians to support communism as the ideal social system. Christian communists trace the origins of their practice to teachings in the New Testament, such as this one from Acts of the Apostles at chapter 2 and verses 42, 44, and 45:

42 And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and in fellowship ... 44 And all that believed were together, and had all things in common; 45 And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. (King James Version)

Christian communism can be seen as a radical form of Christian socialism. Also, because many Christian communists have formed independent stateless communes in the past, there is also a link between Christian communism and Christian anarchism. Christian communists may not agree with various parts of Marxism, but they share some of the political goals of Marxists, for example replacing capitalism with socialism, which should in turn be followed by communism at a later point in the future. However, Christian communists sometimes disagree with Marxists (and particularly with Leninists) on the way a socialist or communist society should be organized.

Criticism

Some people have criticised socialism and by extension communism, stating that the two systems have distorted or absent price signals,[70][71] slow or stagnant technological advance,[72] reduced incentives,[73][74][75] reduced prosperity,[76][77] reduced feasibility,[70][71][72] reduced incentives,[70][71][72] reduced incentives,[70][71][72] reduced incentives,[70][71][72] reduced incentives,[70][71][72] reduced incentives,[70][71][72] reduced incentives,[70][71][72] and its social and political effects.[78][79][80][81][82][83]

Part of this criticism extends to the policies adopted by one-party states ruled by communist parties (known as "communist states"). Some scholars are specially focused on their human rights records which are claimed to be responsible for famines, purges and warfare resulting in deaths far in excess of previous empires, capitalist or other regimes.[84][85][86] The Council of Europe in Resolution 1481 and international declarations such as the Prague Declaration on European Conscience and Communism and the Declaration on Crimes of Communism have condemned some of the actions that resulted in these deaths as crimes.

Stéphane Courtois argues that Communism and National Socialism are slightly different totalitarian systems, and that communism is responsible for the murder of almost 100 million people in the 20th century,[87] but two of the main Black Book's contributors, Nicolas Werth and Jean-Louis Margolin, disagreed and publicly disassociated
themselves from Courtois’s statements.[88]
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