

### CHAPTER III

#### Socialism and Communism

The term 'Socialism' is derived from the Latin word 'Socius' which means 'ally' or 'comrade'. On the other hand, the term 'Communism' has come from its root: the Latin word 'Communis' which means 'Common'. Today the Western thinkers use the term 'Socialism' as a wider sense of the term covering a whole series of diverging political opinions. On the other hand, 'Communism' brings to mind more or less orthodox forms of Marxism. However, at this stage I shall not concentrate my discussion to the difference between socialism and communism. But to be acquainted with the meaning of 'socialism' precisely, I like to quote Norman Thomas. He says :

"The truth is that socialism, like other great words such as christianity, has come to mean many and rather

different things to different men . . . . I should be willing as a beginning to accept the definition given in Webster's Unbridged International Socialism (is) a political and economic theory of social organism, the essential feature of social organisation, the essential feature of which is governmental control of economic activities to the end shall give way to co-operation and that the opportunities of life that competition and rewards of labour shall be equitably apportioned"<sup>1</sup>.

Socialism has a more than 2,000 year-long history as a political dream. The French Revolution has shown that revolutionary changes in society are possible. And it has done so in the name of Freedom, equality and fraternity. Socialist doctrines were advocated by Saint-Simon (1760-1825) in France, Fourier (1772-1837), Proudhon (1809-55), by Robert Owen (1771-1858) in Scotland. The view of socialism was formerly led by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in England. The views of socialism was modified and we find the views of Lenin, Stalin, and the versions of Trotsky, Tito, Mao Tse-tung, and Fidel Castro so on and so forth.

Socialist and Communist views are found even in ancient Greece. In Plato's 'Republic' we find communist ideals when he speaks of the ruling class having no property of its own. Be it noted that Plato's communism is more spiritual than economic. Early Christianity shows some socialist traits.

The Old Testament contains socialist ideas. Jesus Christ reached the principle of equality and he emphasised on man's brotherhood side by side with God's Fatherhood. We also find that Christians were against the idea of 'mine and thine'. Let us quote Ebenstein. To quote him :

"To the extent that socialism contains within itself an element of protest against social inequality - and no movement can call itself socialist unless it expresses that kind of protest -- it is as old as western civilization itself; both Greek and Jewish. Christian thought categorically reject the conception of wealth as the basis of the 'good life'<sup>2</sup>.

The French Revolution brought a social change bringing the concept of freedom, 'equality' and 'fraternity'. At the beginning of modern times Sir Thomas More was much influenced by Plato's 'Republic' and thereby he drew a picture of earthly paradise in the book entitled Utopia. On the other hand, the Italian Tommaso Campanella was also inspired by Plato. He also advocated of socialism and socialist ideas. More was grieved by the economic evils. More's Utopia contains clear description of the 16th century England. At that time privileged people of England enjoyed all the benefits of the social resources under the capitalist systems. More in his writing has talked about equal distribution of wealth. He also talked about complete control over production by

effective communist system. More was a humanist and he had no sympathy with the materialism. He satirized the social, political and economic evils of English. He marked the main evil in society. Evil was due to private property. He pictured a new regime of peace under a system of communism. More says :

"The increase of pasture, by which your sheep, which are naturally mild, and easily kept in order, may be said now to devour men, and unpeople, not only villages, but towns"<sup>3</sup>.

He said of the reorganisation of human society and social justice by the abolition of private property. All citizens of More's Utopia were equal before the law irrespective of social origin. His Utopia secured an honourable place in the literature of socialism due to advertisement of common ownership of all production. However, it was not possible for More to make him free from the prejudices of the class society in which he lived. Thus his view of socialism cannot be taken as valid in toto. However, we are passing to the view of Tommasa Campanella.

Campanella is immortal even today for his renowned book City of the Sun. At this stage we like to take up the view of Campanella to be enlightened the socialism. Campanella, an Italian philosopher, in his book, City of Sun expressed

the hopes and interest of the masses. He protested against the exploitation and bondage of the masses. He said :

"In Naples there exist seventy thousand souls, and out of those scarcely ten or fifteen thousand do any work, and they are always lean from overwork and are getting weaker every-day. The rest become a prey to idleness, avarice, ill-health, lasciviousness, usury and other vices, and contaminate and corrupt very many families by holding them in servitude for their own use, by keeping them in poverty and slavishness and by imparting to them their own vices"<sup>4</sup>.

According to him, improvement in life would be possible through radical social reform, the abolition of private property and destruction of a social system where the minority group enjoys all the good things of life.

Moreover, he speaks of the principle of equality for all citizens. The humanism of Campanella was a bold innovation. The communist ideals of Campanella got no practical significance during that period. However, Campanella shows the terrible of power of private property to deform everything.

Ordinary middle class people in France revolted against feudalism. This is the effect of French revolution. During the latter period of the French revolution Baubef took important role in progressive movement. He clearly stated

that man of the privileged class would not voluntarily give up their power. So he felt the necessity of using force to control of the social system. He clearly stated that each and every abled person should be provided with the job, free education and health facilities.

Moreover, he is of opinion that dictatorship will have to follow after the victory of revolution till the democratic communism is set up. But it is irony of fate that he was awarded death sentence on guillotine as his revolt against the prevalent social system.

The eminent Utopian socialists like Saint - Simon, Fourier, Owen and others by their activities expressed humanist ideas and aspirations. They were not interested in political action. Their intention was to convert the people to the pressing need for a new social order. Saint Simon and Owen exposed the demerits of the capitalist system. They revealed the fact that those who created all values and those who did progress of the society by their labour were deprived of all the benefits. The ~~socialism of Fourier and Saint Simon~~ was imaginative and Utopia. Simon held the view that society should be reorganised. He also held the view that there should be co-operation between capital and labour. He also told that payment for work should be given on the capacity of work. Simon was against functionless property. He advocated for the establishment of industrial and productive farms. He

announced for communist dictatorship and he had no faith in the concept of liberty and popular sovereignty. To understand Simon more clearly I like to quote a line from Roy's Reasons, Romanticism and Revolution which is : "Before Marx, it was Saint-Simon who realised that only in the light of the analysis of its economic foundation could the historical importance and the possibilities of them modern industrial age be properly appraised"<sup>5</sup>.

In this connection, let me quote the declaration given by Simon on his death bed. Declaration is this :

"My whole life can be expressed in one thought : All men must be assured the freest development of their natural capacities"<sup>6</sup>.

In short we can mention Owen's socialist ideas in the following manner :

- (1) The aim of Govt. is to make the governed and the Governor happy.
- (2) Men are influenced by the environment and men are not basically bad. They are associated with the crimes for atmosphere of the surroundings.
- (3) Education can improve the lot of people.
- (4) A good social system depends on harmony and co-operation.

(5) Evils can be eradicated by cooperation of the Government Parliament, the church and the people.

On the otherhand, Fourier, the French Socialist, spoke of social disorders which are due to poverty and social inequality. He held the view that there should be no Government. Again, he was against the price system in capitalism.

Socialism had different forms and socialists were divided into different groups. In the 1st half of the 19th Century we find Robert Owen. Of the French socialists the names of Simon and Prodhon are associated. Socialism received a new form as a result of blend of French socialist ideas with the philosophy of the eminent German thinker, Hegel. This form of socialism is known as communism. Its founder is Karl Marx. Here, we should mention the name of Frederick Engels. The socialism of Marx is known as 'Marxism' but it is appropriate if it is designated "Marxism Engelim". The philosophy of Marx and Engel made socialism an exceptionally strong. We find in the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Engels that Fourier and Simon are Utopian socialists. But Marx and Engels are regarded as advocates of scientific socialism. It is to be noted that Robert Owen is known as democratic socialist. Marx and Engel's socialism is known as communism. Marx is generally regarded as the father of modern communist movement. He seeks to provide a

scientific explanation of nature and society. In this connection, I like to quote again from M.N.Roy's book which is as follows :

"As against the 'Utopia' of the forerunners of socialism, Marx offered his "scientific socialism". He criticised his predecessors because they had no knowledge of the proletariat; that they built out of their imagination fantastic pictures of a new social order that they appealed to morality; that, in short they did not have a philosophy of history"<sup>7</sup>.

Marx and Engels advocated dialectical materialism which was interpreted by Lenin and Stalin. Communism came in the limelight about a century ago as an anticapitalist movements with an economic, political movements with an economic, political and social programme. It is to be noted that dialectical materialism is allied to empiricism. Again, Marxists are opposed to the Divine Law as the moral standard because they are atheists. Marxists are naturalists. We know that feudal system was replaced by the capitalist system. Moreover, capitalist system can be replaced by the socialist system.

Lenin says, "The Marxian doctrine is complete and harmonious and provides man with an integral world conception. ... It is the legitimate successor to the best that was created by mankind in the 19th century in the shape of German

philosophy, English political economy and French socialism"<sup>8</sup>.

Both Marx and Engels were against the evils of capitalism. They are regarded as the high priests of proletariat socialism or communism. Marx in collaboration with Engels released the Communist Manifesto in 1948.

"The friendship and collaboration of Marx and Engels is almost if not quite unique in literary history. Marx was by no means easy to get on with, and Engels devotion was after sorely tried by the former's importancies concerning money matters, and his callous disregard of Engels feelings; his willingness to forgive much and to play second fiddle to Marx can not be explained by his complete devotion to communism"<sup>9</sup>. Marx was intimately connected with the working class movement in Europe and as such he could study social and economic phenomena of his life time scientifically. So the communistic philosophy does not merely reflect the personal views, it reveals the actual laws of nature. The philosophy of communism is the philosophy of proletariat. And the first and foremost concern is to emancipate the proletariat from the economic shackles. The communist manifesto has really stated that the capitalist class will not voluntarily admit the need of change, so capitalism must be overthrown by force to bring social change. Marx says that history is a continuous process of social evolution. In human society this process will be found in the form of class conflict. In the opinion of Marx the fate of the proletariats depends on

evolution and reconstruction of a new society. The capitalist exploits the labour class depriving their legal right. The capitalist will not go away from exploiting the workers. So labour movement in a capitalist society is a must to control over the mechanism of production and state. There is no other alternative. Moreover, Marx says that after the rule of proletariat, it will become easy to chalkout the schemes of social reforms and general welfare. It has also been said that industries and agriculture will be used for the good of society. Marx has also said that capitalism will be destroyed by the capitalists themselves and not by professional revolutionaries. Marx says, "We are ruthless and want no consideration from the bourgeoisie. When our time comes, revolutionary terrorism will not be sugar-coated,

There is but one way of simplifying, shortening, and concentrating the death agony of the old society as well as the bloody labor of world's new birth.-- Revolutionary Terror"<sup>10</sup>,

Marx has marked that in the capitalist system, capital is in the hands of a few persons and the 'have nots' are being exploited progressively. Wealth is not only in the hands of industrial capitalists, it is also in the hands of landlords. The exploited persons will overthrow both the landlords and industrial capitalists. Time will come when when proletariat will pick out the capitalist and establish

a dictatorship.

"The proletariat is that class of society, whose means of livelihood entirely depend on the sale of its labour and not on the profits derived from capital; whose weal and woe, whose life and death, whose whole existence depend upon the demand for labour, depend upon the alterations of good times and bad, upon the fluctuations, which are the outcome of unbridled competition"<sup>11</sup>.

However, Marx said of a classless society and he boldly said that ultimately the state would wither away. The dictatorship of the proletariat will bring about social and economic justice. Man will not be exploited by others. Here, we like to mention the view of state of Marx and some other concepts.

In the Marxist philosophy the concept of 'surplus value' is an important concept. Marx is of opinion that sole creator of value is the labour. There are four elements of production, namely, land, labour, capital and organisation. Among these only labour is a variable element, and others are constant. Necessary values and surplus values are produced by the labours, necessary value is equal to the wage which the worker gets in exchange of labour. On other hand, surplus value is the profit of the capitalist.

According to Marx, the state came into existence when the private property came into force. Again, according to Marx, state is the creation of capitalist. When the property originated, the owners of the property wanted a political machinery to protect the property and to exploit the property-less class. So the state emerged. State is neither a result of social contract nor a divine creation, State is changeable. Marx points out that labour is only the source of value. From the surplus value capitalists get their profit. It is exploitation. State is the instrument of capitalist class.

Das Kapital gives a picture of the sufferings of the landless agricultural workers and factory workers. It predicts and welcomes that there will be down-fall of capitalism through the advent of socialism. There is a large social class of the proletarians who seek emancipation. But the capitalists, strive to increase their property. So there will come class-struggle between the haves and the have-nots. This struggle will create economic crisis and when this crisis will reach its peak then there will be occurrence of revolution. At that time the proletariat will capture the state and thereby overthrow the capitalists.

Marx has brought a new era in the history. He will remain immortal in mind of all for his contribution. In spite of this, the critics put forward some objections against Marx. So we find later on Marxism was modified by the social

thinkers such as Lenin, Stalin, Trotsky and so on. Here, we like to mention in short some pitfalls raised by the opponents of Marxism.

First, Marx has put much emphasis on economic factor for the development of the individual of the country. But he has given no significance of other factors such as, political conditions, religion, language, art and science. Thus we find that Marx put much emphasis on economic factor and non-emphasis on other factors. Historical changes depict that his view is erroneous. Moreover, man's actions, according to Marx, are determined by the economic forces, is not acceptable for it denies human freedom.

Secondly, Marx says that the state is an instrument of oppression and exploitation. But this is not acceptable. Modern state thinks for the welfare of the citizens. Thus Marx's view seems not to be acceptable.

Thirdly, according to Marx, state will ultimately wither away. Can this view be accepted? Our answer is negative. This is possible only in imagination not in reality. Detailed discussion will be made later on.

For obvious reason we do not like to mention other defects of different concept enunciated by Marx. However, it may be said boldly that Marxian concepts has already been changed through the change of society. It will be shown

later on.

Lastly, I like to quote John Strachey who observes :  
 "There was nothing basically wrong with Marx's economic insight. It was political insight which was at fault"<sup>12</sup>.

We have discussed two types of socialism, viz., Utopian socialism and scientific socialism. The former is mild and evolutionary whereas the later is violent and revolutionary. Be it noted that scientific socialism in short is called communism. At this stage we like to depict the difference between ~~two~~ types of socialism mentioned above.

According to Engels, socialist theories are Utopian whereas only Marxism is scientific socialism. Utopian socialism regards socialism as a moral ideas but scientific socialism predict the fall of capitalism and the coming of socialism on a scientific basis. Further, Utopian socialism bases the socialist programme on moral principles which have universal validity. But scientific socialism denies universally valid moral principles. Socialism does not preach the hymn of hate and fanaticism but communism preaches the hymn of hate and fanaticism. Again, socialism uses the state as a device to realise human welfare. But communism holds that state must wither away. Lastly it may be mentioned that socialism gives religious toleration but communism does not. Thus it is palpable that there are differences between socialism and communism.

In Germany and Russia Marxism could establish itself. Russia established a Communist Government in 1917. The success of Bolshevism revolution in November, 1917 was possible for the leadership of Lenin. Lenin's view differs from Marx in many respects. An analysis of the events which took place in Soviet Russia and East European countries leads to some far-reaching conclusions. Their conclusions are as follows :

- 1) The Bolshevism ushered in by Lenin in Soviet Russia is a deformed socialism, and not socialism as envisaged by Marx.
- 2) A relentlessly oppressive totalitarianism was established there which masqueraded in the guise of socialism.
- 3) To protect and maintain this superimposed socialism on recalcitrant people it was necessary (a) to establish the tight network of internal security police to terrorize and liquidate, if necessary, the people and (b) to follow a very militant foreign policy.
- 4) As a necessary precondition of 3(a) and 3(b) it is inevitable for the political leaders to plough back the lion's share of the economic wealth of the society garnered through the nationalisation of the means of production to the heavy industries and armament industries.

5) As a result production of consumer goods required by common men suffered heavily.

6) Shortage of consumer goods gives rise to the corruption and special advantages to key position holder leaders and their Cadre.

7) Leaders shun idealism and become opportunists with proneness to indulge in criminal activities as and when necessary and, with this end in view allowed free entry of lumpen force into administration for suppressing disident voice by naked force.

These above informative conclusions are, to us, not simply a matter of pastime like the witnessing a commercial Hindi Film. Rather they are to be viewed with serious concern. For the events which occurred in U.S.S.R. and East European countries from second decade to 8th decade of 20th century in all likelihood repeat themselves in these countries where the present social situations are similar to a great extent to social situations that were prevalent in pre-revolutionary Russia in 1971.

Following the path marked out by Hegel in his philosophy of History, Marx holds that a backward country or nation sees the reflection of its futures in the actual social reality of an advanced nation or country. Pre-revolutionary Russia was a pre-bourgeoisie society, so is India to-day. Despite

installation of a number of steel plants and other heavy industries and some significant achievements in the arena of hitechs, Indian Economy is basically an agrarian capitalism and as such is unable upto now to reach the level of industrial capitalism of developed countries. Caste barrier, religion generated social rules, demanding unconditional conformity tolerance legally deviant acts as of no consequence admission of ex cathedra utterances of religious and political leaders and absence of a sharp line of demarcation between matters ecclesiastical and matters secular in the behaviour of political leaders go a long way to show the feudal characteristics of Indian society.

Equality, Fraternity and liberty - the three pillars of bourgeois society - are yet to dig in their roots deep into the mental soil of Indian people. It is therefore evident that bourgeois society is yet to emerge in India. The super-imposed democratic form of the Government is as much shaky as the ubiquitous spread of feudal mentality among Indian people throughout the length and breadth of the country. In post independence era India is plunging deeper and deeper into feudal mentality of which regionalism and secessionism are dependable indicators. Likewise in post revolutionary era Russia sank deeper and deeper dark middle age of which the existence of "cheka" is a sure indicator.

Bourgeois capitalist society is a precondition of

socialist society. These who take political cudgel to destroy bourgeoisie in India are those who try to put the clock back by their efforts to replace bourgeoisie capitalist democracy by feudal form of polity. Zamindari system is simply an indicator of feudalism and is not its foundation. Foundation of feudalism is Agrarian economy. Hence to think that with the abolition of zamindari system one abolished feudalism and ushered in a new form of society is to hoodwink oneself. Study of history as a science is not prevalent in India. Otherwise we would not be so blinded by doctrinal dustraising as to be unable to see the natural course of history of Indian society, and would be able to see that the solution of the problem lies in delineating accurately the nature of the problem. It is evident from a study of history that Stalin destroyed the bourgeoisie ideals of liberty, fraternity, equality in Russia, liquidated two million dissidents and established a reign of terror. But we are also remember that Hitler in Germany and Moussolini in Italy also destroyed the same bourgeoisie ideals liberty, fraternity and equality. They also like Stalin usurped power to rule the society in the name of establishing socialism, and to continue in power as well as to consolidate it against any challenger each of them built a militant cadre. This cadre does not differ from the guards of the middle age either in terms of ideal or in social status. Like them in India to-day their prototype called 'mastan' has come into

existence. Marx hated most of this "master" or lumpen proletariat and this is his greatest difference from Bakunin. For these are the bribe-taking protectors of the usurper of power. In today's India the green brigade, the lohit sena, the Bajrang Dal, the G.N.L.F. activities are all the birds of the same feather and as such as equally dangerous for Indian Democracy.

Communist Party of India was founded towards the end of 1920. It is found that Keshab Ch. Sen and Dadabhai Naorji were contemporaries of Karl Marx. On the other hand, Gopal Krishna Gokhale and Lokamanya Tilak were contemporaries of Lenin. During this period we do not find socialistic thought in India though those great scholars dedicated themselves to the welfare for the poor class of people. Syed Nazrul Islam, Muzaffer Ahmed and A.K. Fazlul Haque were influenced by the believers in communism at a certain phase of their lives and they had desire to spread communism in India.

The idea of communism was spread in Europe by Marx and Engel in the 19th century. It gradually spread in the third world countries for the emancipation for the oppressed class of people. The British rule was to plunder of India. It destroyed local industries, common ownership and the village communities. It also neglected the responsibilities of public works. Again, it played a positive role by causing social revolution in India. England's mission was to destroy

the normal atmosphere and to stop regenerating of production.

Marx says :

"India became the battle field in the contest of the industrial interest on the one side, and on the moneyocracy and oligarchy on the other"<sup>13</sup>. Lenin also clearly described the pattern of British exploitation of India.

In 1920 Roy attended the Second World Congress of the Communist International at Moscow being invited by Lenin. He represented the Marxian Communist Party, not represented India. It can be said : "If Gurudev Tagore was the artistic conscience of India and Mahatma Gandhi has moral conscience M.N. Roy was indeed the intellectual conscience of India"<sup>14</sup>.

In Roy's life we find three phases. At the 1st phases he was a revolutionary. At the second phases he was a Marxist. During this phase he was engaged in active communist movement first in Mexico and then in Russia, China and India. At the final stage he was a Radical Humanist and he went beyond communism. In 1919 Roy went to Mexico and at that time he came in contact with Michael Borodin. He was converted to Marxism. M.N. Roy believed that there cannot be political freedom without economic liberation, and social justice. It is found that Lenin considered that Gandhi was playing a progressive role in India. But according to M.N. Roy, Gandhi was a mediaeval reactionary. In 1922 M.N. Roy in collaboration

with Abani Mukherjee published India in Transition. At the end of 1922 Roy published his book entitled India's Problem and Its Solutions — In India in Transition — M.N. Roy gave a detailed analysis of India's class structure. He said that India was moving from feudalism to capitalism.

M.N. Roy was the first Indian Communist who gave detailed analysis of Gandhi from a Marxian angle. M.N. Roy says, "as a philosophy, Marxism is the outcome of the development of thought from the dawn of history, therefore, it is the heritage of humanity, it is the ideological equipment belonging to everybody for a better world"<sup>15</sup>. Roy regarded Marx as a humanist and a lover of freedom. But he is of opinion that moral ground of Marxism is weak.

According to Marx, 'Man is the root of mankind'. First there is man then comes mankind. The individual is prior to society. Marx was a humanist. Similarly Roy was a humanist. Roy pointed out that Marx dehumanised humanity. He clearly stated that communism could be nothing more than a state capitalism. Roy showed many inconsistencies of different concepts given by Marx. Finding that Marxist philosophy is outdated in many respects. Roy transcended communism and thereby he formulated his thesis of New Humanism. In this connection, I like to quote Wadia which is as follows :

"Humanism was always at the back of Roy's mind even when he was a communist"<sup>16</sup>.

Before closing our discussion we like to quote a few lines from the book of M.N. Roy's MEMOIRS which run thus :

"It was during the closing years of the war that Roy's restless and over-inquisitive mind began to realize the inadequacies of Marxism and communism. The victory of the democratic forces was by then assured. The danger of Fascism was averted. The fear that Hitler and his fascist henchmen might ever run Europe and enslave the world was set at rest. The time had come to think of what might happen after the end of the war. Roy had already prophesied that the world would revolve around two poles, the United States of America and Soviet Russia. It was necessary to avoid conflict between the two poles if peace was to be preserved and if people were to be enabled to advance in the direction of progress and prosperity. Neither capitalism nor communism was the answer to the situation. Capitalism has already proved its bankruptcy. Communism had also falsified all hopes. On the other hand communism held out the threat of a civil war on the national as well as on the international plane. It was necessary therefore to go beyond communism and evolve an ideology, a political structure and social institutions which would ensure freedom as well as equality, security

as well as free scope for development. Thinking along these lines Roy arrived at the Philosophy of New Humanism<sup>17</sup>.

Late M.N. Roy with a clear political foresight envisaged all these developments, and filling in gaps in Marxian Socialism he developed the concept of New or Radical Humanism.

He preached the concept of partyless democracy for existence of party means (1) Corruption, (2) Control of party by a political bureaucracy within it which will control the party by muscle power and will stifle every dissenting voice within the party. (3) Placing of the interest of the party and through it individual interests of the members of the gang wielding muscle power above the interest of the country.

He showed unerringly that those political leaders who preach relentlessly of the necessity of guaranteeing freedom of speech and expression and existence of dissenting opinions, once they come into power, will ride roughshod over freedom of speech and dissenting voice in the name of unity and security of the country.

He pointed out that existence of the party system is a contradiction in terms. Party system implies the existence of more parties than one and admission of the existence of one party only in the political system of a country is like the admission of the existence of a being with limitless

power who is incapable of creating a power superior to himself.

Man's emancipation depends on all round development. Development includes economic development, social development, anthropological development etc. Economic development depends on per capita income and economic growth. Again, development means modernization and modernization requires social and structural change of society. It is also to be noted that for the third world countries modernization means westernization. Today we say of human resource development. There is need of holistic use for human development. And the holistinc use includes social, political, cultural economic development etc. For Indian there is need of rural development. This has been pointed out by Mahatma Gandhi and M.N.Roy. However, development depends on planners, implementing agency and conscience of the individuals. Roy has clearly and explicitly stated of the moral development. Moral development depends on education. In Roy's discussion we find that he has given much ~~more~~ emphasis on education.

In this chapter we have discussed socialism and communism. Both the 'isms' say of this equality and justice. In socialism there must be justice, and justice requiring proper distribution, we may say that distribution without justice is capitalism. And socialism came against capitalism. Here, it seems that it is necessary to deal with the

principle of justice and distribution. Equality and fraternity depend on the principle of justice and distribution. Now the questions are : (a) What is justice ?, (b) What is meant by distribution ? and (c) How can they bring equality and fraternity ?

What is justice ? The root idea of the term 'jus' is the idea of joining or fitting. It is the idea of a 'bond' or 'tie'. Primarily joining means joining between man and man. Secondly it may be said that 'just' and 'justice' are connected between value and value. There are different types of values such as value of liberty, there is the value of equality, there is the value of fraternity. Justice is the synthesiser of political values. The word 'justice' is related to or associated with religion, nature, economics and ethics. Thus we may say that there is religious justice, natural justice, economic justice and ethical justice.

Justice, we may say, controls the general distribution of rights and different principles of their distribution. "It is, in a word, general right ordering of human relations in, and by, the association of the state. As such, it gives to each person rights, as his share in whole system, and it thus 'adjusts' person to person"<sup>18</sup>.

The state acts by general principles viz., Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity. It is observed that justice is

recognised and enforced by the state. Moreover, it is said that justice comes first and then comes rules of liberty, equality and fraternity. Naturally we must be acquainted with the meaning of the terms 'liberty', 'equality' and 'fraternity'. Discussions with these meanings are given below.

The word 'liberty' has many meanings rather than one. The word 'liberty' is derived from the Latin word 'Liber'. Different political thinkers have defined the term 'liberty' differently. There is no universally acceptable definition of the term 'liberty'. According to the declaration of the Rights of Man adopted by the French revolutionaries in 1789, "Liberty consists on the power to do everything that does not injure another." However, liberty in India upholds the dignity of the human personality.

We find different categories of liberty, namely, (1) Natural liberty, (2) Civil liberty, (3) Political liberty, (4) Economic liberty, and (5) National liberty. Natural liberty means unrestrained freedom. Its existence is found when there was not emergence of the state of society. Civil liberty, according to Barker, consists of physical freedom, intellectual freedom and practical freedom. Political liberty includes the right to vote, the right to stand for election, the right to express political opinions and criticize the Government. Economic liberty belongs to

person in his capacity of a worker. Finally, national liberty is synonymous with full independence. We have mentioned different categories of liberty. Each and every category of liberty depends on justice. Thus without justice there cannot be liberty, so the concept of justice is an important concept in the study of political science.

The term "equality" has different meanings. In a wider sense we may include political equality, social equality, civil equality, economic equality under equality. In a narrower sense, by equality we may mean political equality. Equality is necessary for social justice. It is deeply related to liberty. If there is no liberty, there cannot be equality. So, they are closely related to each other. If there is inequality, injustice occurs.

There are many conditions for equality. They are :

- (1) Each person should be provided with adequate opportunity for development of his personality.
- (2) No special privileges are to be given to any person.
- (3) Equal distribution of rights among all members.

The Declaration of Rights of Man (1789) mentions four rights under equality : "the right to be treated equally with others, and on the same footing as others in the eye of the law and in all legislative acts; the right to be treated

equally with others in matters of justice and in courts of law; the right to be treated equally with others in matters of taxation so that each man pays the same proportion of his means as is paid by the others; and finally the right to be treated as equally admissible with others to public honours and offices of employment"<sup>19</sup>.

There are different kinds of equality. Bryce has mentioned four types of equality. They are : (1) Civil, (2) Political, (3) Social, and (4) Natural. Again, we find that Barker has mentioned two types of equality viz., Legal and Social. Civil equality says that there must be equality to all before the law. Political equality announces that each citizen must have equal political rights. The constitution of India speaks of the political equality. Social equality expresses that there should be no social differences among the people considering race, education, class and creed. The Indian constitution explicitly declares the social equality. But at present a group of people are trying to create chaos and bringing the communalism into fore.

Each type of equality is necessary for the progress of the state. There cannot be liberty without equality. Again, without justice there cannot be equality. So, justice is the necessary precondition for liberty. The aim of socialism or communism is bringing liberty, equality and fraternity.

Without justice there cannot be liberty, equality and fraternity. So justice is sine qua non of socialism or communism.

Let us now deal with the concept of "fraternity". The word 'fraternity' generally used to denote emotion rather than principle. It denotes international or cosmopolitan emotion. Barker writes : "The usage of revolutionary France has given the name of fraternity to the principle which leads to the distribution of this common equipment for common enjoyment"<sup>20</sup>. If there is no justice i.e. mal-distribution, there cannot be fraternity. So fraternity requires justice.

## NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. Norman Thomas, *Modern Political Thought*, 1960, p.636.
2. Eberstein, *Today's Isms*, 1958, p.194.
3. Thomas More, *Utopia*, In : *Ideal Empires and Republics*, p.139.
4. Campanella, *City of the Sun*, In : *Ideal Empires and Republics*, pp.293, 94.
5. M.N.Roy, *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution*, p.484.
6. *Ibid.*, p.405.
7. *Ibid.*, p.405.
8. Lenin, *Selected works*, Vol. Part I, pp.75,6.
9. L.W.Lancaster, *Masters of Political Thought*, Vol.III, 1959, p.161.
10. Robert Ergans *Donald G.Roher in Europe since Waterloo*, p.107.
11. L.W.Lancaster, *Master of Political Thought*, Vol.III, p.178.

12. John Strachey, Contemporary Capitalism, p.151.
13. Karl Marx, The East India Company - Its History and Results, Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, The First Indian War of Independence 1857-1859, p.28.
14. J.B.H.Wadia, M.N.Roy, The Man, p.4.
15. M.N.Roy, New orientation, p.166.
16. J.B.H.Wadia, M.N.Roy, The Man, p.93.
17. M.N.Roy, Memoirs, p.500.
18. Ernest Barker, Principles of Social and Political Theory, p.167.
19. Ibid., p.280.
20. Ibid., p.142.