



## Liberalism and/or socialism: tensions, exchanges and convergences from the 19th century to today

October 21 to 23, 2021

### Summary of Articles

---

#### **Social Liberal Tax Philosophies in Germany and America, c. 1880-1910**

Sven Altenburger

University of Göttingen - Georg-August-Universität Göttingen – Germany

#### **Summary**

The German influence on late 19th and early 20th century American political thought on taxation and political economy has been well explored by recent scholarship. Yet, thus far scholars have largely failed to address the political-philosophical substance and underpinnings of this transatlantic transfer of ideas as well as the larger socio-intellectual contexts. This paper addresses this desideratum by reconstructing and contextualising the political thought on taxation by four of the leading academics at the time, all of whom are regularly (though not exclusively) described as social liberals: Gustav von Schmoller and Adolph Wagner in the German case, and Richard T. Ely and Edwin R.A. Seligman in the American case. Schmoller and Wagner were the two main proponents of the German Historical School of Economics at the time; Ely and Seligman studied with them and their colleagues in Germany and became two of the most important American experts on taxation. I argue that the four thinkers all participated in broader German and America public-philosophical attempts – often joining socialist and liberal ideas – to reimagine the place and role of the individual in relation to the modern polity, as most crucially signified by the civic act of taxpaying. However, while Ely and Seligman drew heavily on Schmoller's and Wagner's work, they also attempted to transform their theories and ideas into more democratic directions. This crucially concerned the associative ethical justification of taxpaying that was entertained by all four thinkers. According to this justification, the social role and identity of modern citizenship ethically grounds specific noncontractual and non-voluntary obligations. (Such reasoning also gained in popularity in Britain and France at the time, not least in the context of the New Liberalism.) Furthermore, Ely and Seligman developed their highly influential case for extending direct forms of taxation through a critical engagement with Schmoller and Wagner. Both American thinkers championed direct taxes not only for their fiscal and redistributive potential (as is often assumed), but crucially also for their effects on modern active citizenship. Thus, by reconstructing and contrasting the ideas of these four thinkers, I gain insights into the philosophical arrangement, contextual variation, and policy implications of German and American social liberal thought on taxation around the turn of the twentieth century.

**Keywords:** Social liberalism, taxation, public finance, political economy, Germany, United States of America

---

# **Unnecessary Unhappiness as the Basis of a Popperian Critique of Socialism and Liberalism**

Sina Badiei

Université de Lausanne – Switzerland

Collège International de Philosophie (CIPH) – Collège International de Philosophie (CIPH) – France

## **Summary**

In this paper, I will try to analyze and advance further Karl Popper's criticism of socialist thought, especially in its Marxist version, and his critique of liberal thought, in particular the version found in two members of the Austrian school, Mises and Hayek.

The starting point of Popper's critique is the way Marx, Mises and Hayek analyze the nature of human needs. In Marx, the question of needs is analyzed mainly in terms of the interaction between needs and the satisfaction of needs, whereas in Mises and Hayek, it is analyzed from the point of view of the relationship between ends and means, or between supply and demand. Popper argues that the interaction or relationship between needs and their satisfaction, as well as the relationship between supply and demand, between ends and means, is a schema that can be applied, if formally conceived, to any type of need, demand or end, thus preventing the establishment of any hierarchy among needs. Failing to establish such hierarchies is problematic since it is only through such hierarchies that we can make a distinction between those needs the satisfaction of which would require active interventions by public authorities, and those needs the satisfaction of which would not be compatible with active interventions by the State and public institutions.

This problem can only be solved, according to Popper, by criticizing the post-utilitarian economic tradition, which analyzes the normative dispositions of individuals through the prism of two concepts: happiness and unhappiness, or more utility and less utility. I will rely on some of his insights to argue that introducing a demarcation between different kinds of needs, which would allow us to define more transparently the institutional framework of state interventions, cannot be done without adding a third concept to the set of concepts used in the post-utilitarian economic tradition: unnecessary suffering or unnecessary unhappiness.

**Keywords:** Socialism, Liberalism, Problem of Needs, Utilitarianism, Popperian Epistemology

---

## **Social Liberalism and the “Right” kind of Socialism**

David Boucher

Cardiff University – United Kingdom

University of Johannesburg – South Africa

## **Summary**

**Social Liberalism and the ‘Right’ kind of Socialism** The aim of this paper is to show how liberalism and socialism intersected at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries, resulting in a ‘social liberalism’ that was in crucial respects compatible with ‘practical’ or the ‘right’ kind of socialism. Progressive Liberals were cognisant of the fact that there were many types of socialism, and they rejected out of hand what they called ‘authoritarian socialism’. The test of the ‘right’ or true socialism for liberalism in the philosophical idealist tradition, including such writers as Caird, Jones and Anderson, was the degree to which it removed the hindrances to individual freedom. Significant degrees of government intervention were perfectly acceptable as long they assisted the individual in achieving his or her potential. The parameters of the terms of reference were sometimes encapsulated in the terms ‘collectivism versus libertarianism’, or socialism versus individualism. In this paper I will explore the attempted synthesis of socialism and individualism by some of the British idealists, and in addition exemplify what they meant by the right sort of socialism with reference to the example of R. H. Tawney.

**Keywords:** Collectivism, Individualism, libertarianism, British Idealism, New Liberalism

---

## **Is Socialism Back? A Review of Contemporary Economic Literature**

Emilio Canevali<sup>1</sup> and André Pedersen Ystehede<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Northumbria University – United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>Statistics Denmark – Denmark

### **Summary**

The paper deals with the recent resurgence of interest in the concept of “socialism” from an economic perspective. Given the extent of the possible meanings covered by this word, a general summary is provided on what “historical socialism” has been, drawing on János Kornai’s classical analysis. It follows a survey of the most significant contemporary proposals for a new model of socialism. Similarities and divergences of these projects with respect to the historical benchmark are assessed. Common features of the new blueprints are identified to point to likely directions of the research on these themes in the future.

**Keywords:** Economic Planning, Economics Publishing, János Kornai, Political Economy, Socialism

---

## **Liberal Socialism, Empirical Idealism: The Labour Party and the International Order from 1900 to 1939**

Niaz Cary-Pernon

Études montpelliéraines du monde anglophone – Université Paul-Valéry - Montpellier 3 : EA741 – France

### **Summary**

The Labour Party’s ideology has mainly been studied through British domestic issues,[1] and international history scholars have often explored Labour’s foreign policy as a separate research area with its specific time periods. The latter scenario is exemplified by the analysis of the Attlee years. Furthermore, studies have generally put emphasis on two aspects of Labour’s reactions to Britain’s external relations: socialist foreign policy measures Labour advocated or implemented,[2]and the conception of a world-view permeated by the Conservative Party’s or the Liberal Party’s principles.[3] The notions of bipartisanship or internationalism tend to exhibit the pragmatic method[4] adopted by the Labour Party, regularly highlighting that the latter failed to build a coherent foreign policy position.[5] Using Mark Bevir’s interpretive approach[6] –a major difference in the vast literature on UK foreign policy– and focusing on the period between the emergence of the Labour Party at the beginning of the twentieth century and the outbreak of World War II, this paper argues that Labour’s world politics was shaped by international order “dilemmas”,[7] which led to the promotion of a system of normative values. The paper examines the debates on the constitution of an international society or community, addressing dialogues with other prevailing ideologies offering their approaches to foreign policy issues, namely capitalism and liberalism. The aim consists in establishing the “webs of traditions and beliefs” [8] resulting from these debates by evaluating their interactions with the ideas asserted by liberalism. It will thus analyse how ideas were incorporated into a system of thought gradually developed by various factions within the Labour Party. The webs can be characterized by liberal normativity and democratic socialism based on idealism as well as empiricism.

References among others:

Henry Matthew Drucker, *Ethos and Doctrine in the Labour Party* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1979); Maurice Chrétien, ed., *Le Socialisme à la britannique : penseurs du vingtième siècle* (Paris : Economica, 2002).

For instance, Jonathan Schneer, *Labour's Conscience: The Labour Left, 1945-1951* (Boston: Unwin Hyman, 1988); Kevin Jeffreys, *The Labour Party since 1945* (London: Macmillan, 1993); Peter Hennessy, *Never Again: Britain, 1945-1951* (London: Vintage, 1993).

Rhiannon Vickers, *The Labour Party and the World*, 2 volumes (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2003); Ray M. Douglas, *The Labour Party: Nationalism and Internationalism, 1939-1951* (London: Routledge, 2004); Paul Corthorn and Jonathan Davis, eds., *The*

*British and the Wider World: Domestic Politics, Internationalism and Foreign Policy* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2008).

Peter Mangold, *Success and Failure in British Foreign Policy: Evaluating the Record, 1900-2000* (Oxford: St Antony's College, 2001), 1-21.

For instance, Frederick S. Northedge, *British Foreign Policy: The Process of Readjustment, 1945-1961* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1962); John Saville, *The Politics of Continuity: British Foreign Policy and the Labour Government, 1945-1946* (London: Verso, 1993); Michael Blackwell, *Clinging to Grandeur: British Attitudes and Foreign Policy in the Aftermath of the Second World War* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1993).

Mark Bevir, "Une approche interprétative de la gouvernance", *Revue française de science politique* 63, nos 3-4 (2013), 603-623.

Ibid., 613. Ibid.

**Keywords:** Labour Party, democratic socialism, normativity, liberalism, idealism, empiricism

---

## Socialism and Liberalism: A Series of Debatable Hypotheses

Cornelius Crowley,

Professeur émérite de civilisation britannique, Université Paris Nanterre - France

### Summary

*Socialism* and *Liberalism* designate two political projects that emerged in the epoch whose customary (and still useful) designation is *modernity*. While both terms have an inevitable economic and material component (as with all political categories), neither implies the subjection of the thinking of the political to the order of a strictly economic determination and necessity. Each postulates an autonomy, relative but real, of the political. A relative autonomy which in many ways did however serve purposes of dissimulating the actual materiality of power relations in the production of wealth, the extraction of labour, the extraction of planetary resources.

If for each of the two terms, *socialism*, *liberalism*, we acknowledge a genealogy which is longer than that of a recent epoch of (European) expansive modernity, the resonance of either term, in the early decades of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, is to be measured against the general field of the political as characterized by the (historically recent) emergence of a consciousness of political agency both more massive in its invocations - *general will*, *the people*, *class and class consciousness*- and more specific in its pointing to what is singular - *the "enlightened" and thus discretionary, non-submissive liberty of a free agent or subject*. These two parallel emergences animate the political stage in the epoch which follows after the late 18th century revolutions, most notably and crucially the French revolutionary moment and its ultimate confinement and impasse, 1789-1815.

By way of their specific and defining options, *socialism* and *liberalism* would seem to involve the preferential foregrounding of *one* of the three defining principles that were to be forged into a coherent matrix for the institutionalized forms of government and the interactional order of lived lives: *liberté, égalité, fraternité*: such was the revolutionary promise. Along with the antithetical terms of an anti-modern reactionary dynamic that is also proper to the modern epoch -*closed community, ethnic nationhood, ultramontane confessionality* (to be pitted against the liberational unmooring of destinies), the terms of the revolutionary triptych are to be numbered among the defining features of the ideal-type of a fractious and unstable modernity, for the qualification of an epoch now perhaps at an end.

Regarding the articulations between *socialism* and *liberalism*, the hypotheses we can formulate are endlessly debatable. This is simply because, superficially, the terms would seem to be antinomies: if one starts out from the social and the common, one risks failing to encounter the realm of liberty (other than as a recalcitrant antagonism). And if one starts out from the foregrounded liberty of an atomized subject, one risks failing to encounter or comprehend the conditioning order of the social.

But there must be a way out of an impasse which is above all symptomatic of the poverty of programmatic formulation.

The reconnection of the two terms, *socialism* and *liberalism*, must start out from the reflection on their divergence, insofar as the latter is an effect, both deplorable and comprehensible, stemming from the dark resonance of a 20<sup>th</sup> century European (continental?) history and of its global extensions. The divergent destinies of the two principles tends to play through our minds when we try to establish a perspective on *what has been* and on what is now before us, the condition of future agency.

The divergence (which for a brief moment had appeared consummated, in the victory of the world order of liberalism following the collapse of the Soviet communist bloc between 1989 and 1991) has, over a much longer period, been discursively played out in a series of partial, often intentional and interested miscomprehensions. And also played out in the very fabric of our lives, into which has recently been woven the dynamic of technical innovation constitutive of recent or “late” capitalism, coupled with the post-Fordist work practices and globally interconnected and differentialized consumption practices thus facilitated. (Though there is nothing crucially or uniquely new in the articulation between global interconnection and differentialization of inputs and rewards).

What is new today is the inescapable awareness of our shared destinies and sustainable commonality.

For a time -for as long as a short-term and narrow focus on the territories of “advanced” capitalist societies was feasible-, the idea that capitalism was the systemic concomitant of freedom (to quote the title of Milton Friedman’s tract) implied that it could at last be appropriated and established as the sole *horizon indépassable* of humanity.

Now, in a profoundly changed current environment for political agency and political imagination, the renewed articulation between *socialism* and *liberalism* is both necessary and possible, against a common horizon of vulnerability, against what is now sensed to be our final and defining condition, one more elementary and planetary than the historical stand-off between a capitalist order and a state-communist order; far more conditional, in the elementary sense, than the intra-discursive antimony between a *socialist* order of what is common and a *liberal* foregrounding of what is specific and non-alienable.

Such a renewed articulation between *socialism* and *liberalism* requires a number of analytic and discursive revisions. Notably for procedures that are marked by an ongoing prudence in what is programmed. In that way, agency and political responsibility can be weaned out of the modern fascination with an imperious and toxic “narrative reason” (Jean-Pierre Faye), through which could be facilitated the indulgence of pointing to *what is to be done* by way of the signaling of a specific and localizable agent onto which can be projected the burden of all that has gone wrong, all that is “out of joint”, but which the agent of historical change has the capacity to “put right”, through the elementary gesture of stigmatization and exclusion.

Responsibility in the present can neither be a facile allocation of blame as to where it all went wrong nor a foregrounding of the sufficiency of any restricted or local sense of what is common -exclusive therefore to a nation or to a confessional affiliation, to a specific community of language or culture.

Or indeed to any commonality of human exceptionality?

It is the partial and restricted comprehension of the commonality of destiny which has blighted and preempted the comprehension of the concomitance between the regulative reason of the social and the regulative reason of the liberal. (Not least by way of the implicit or explicit virility of a rhetoric of political agency and of discursive programming, which till now has tended to foster a political order within which the polarities of the liberal and the social have been projected as antinomies, to be tactically drawn upon in the service of presumptions that have been consubstantially androcentric.

Comprehended in terms of the actual conditions of living -both material and symbolic- there is however a latent and intimate awareness that the relation between the polarities of the liberal and the social is one of necessary co-implication.

And in this respect, in terms of our present circumstances, there remain certain elements to be delved into within an avowedly insular mode of political reflection, promoted and drawn upon within a local and very British articulation between socialism and liberalism. An inquiry into British traditions of socialism and liberalism can be of help in defining the present and future conditions for ongoing agency. Such a heritage remains the effect of a saving insularity, part of a political tradition calling for a sober assessment, but which is also instructive, in terms of its achievements and in terms of its complacency, its blithe indifferent to the larger conditions which presided over its own empowerment.

Honoré de Balzac, *Les Paysans* (1844), publication posthume 1855. Jean-Pierre Faye, *Langages totalitaires*, Hermann, 1972.

*La raison narrative*, Paris, Balland, Metaphora, 1990.

Muriel Fabre-Magnan, *L’institution de la liberté*, PUF, 2018. Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, 1962.

Stéphane Guy, *Genèse du travaillisme britannique, La philosophie de l’histoire des Fabiens*, Michel Houdiard Éditeur, 2019.

Thomas Mann, *Der Zauberberg* (1924), La Montagne magique, traduction, annotations et postface de Claire de Oliveira, Fayard, 2016.

Émile Zola, *Rome*, 1896.

---

## **Exploring the relationship between liberalism and socialism in Britain's NHS**

Louise Dalingwater

Sorbonne Université – Laboratoire HDEA, Faculté de Lettres – France

### **Summary**

In 1979, with the arrival in Great Britain of the New Right government led by Margaret Thatcher, neoliberal policy emerged as a key feature of government policy owing to the belief that market exchange itself had become an ethic guiding all action, including public action (Harvey, 2007). The introduction of market methods in the NHS and the increasing contracting out to the private sector has led some commentators to fear “the creeping privatisation” of the NHS (Heath, 1994, Pollock, 2004, Calvoski & Calnan, 2019). However, since the onset of the Covid-19 epidemic, certain observers have contended that there has been a reversal of neoliberal policy with a significant expansion of public spending and the retreat of many market-oriented policies. This conceptual paper is thus particularly interested in the clear paradox which exists in the NHS of an essentially socialist project, a universal health system which has remained free at the point of use since its inception in 1948, and the introduction of free market policies which have guided the approach to public health care delivery since the 1980s.

**Keywords:** National Health Service (NHS), liberalism, neoliberalism, socialism, free market policies, New Right

---

## **Individual, Free Association and Common Ownership: A Political Identity for the British Co-operative Movement**

François Deblangy

Équipe de Recherche Interdisciplinaire sur les Aires Culturelles  
Université de Rouen Normandie : EA4705 – France

### **Summary**

Cooperatism is a historical social movement whose political categorisation is still a riddle if ever there was one. This is particularly true in the forms it took in Great Britain. Unlike the trade-union and labour movements cooperatism has always been the subject of divergent if not antagonistic political claims. In nearly two centuries of history, the pre-dominance of Christian or ethical socialist thinkers has barely waned, from Robert Owen to Ernest Bader, through George Holyoake and the many liberal and radical activists involved in the co-operative movement right from the first half of the 19th century, including in the setting-up of productive co-operatives. Yet, in its productive application the contributions of trade-union and Marxist socialist forces are just as noteworthy even though this type of co-operation has always been underdeveloped. Indeed, the domination of consumer co-operatives as opposed to worker co-operatives only makes the British experiment more indicative of both the unremitting tensions and convergences between liberalism and socialism. At the same time, the power of the British co-operative movement allowed it to challenge the main political parties. The peculiarity of the situation in Great Britain can also be assessed by the history of the Co-operative Party (1917), which is officially affiliated neither to the Labour nor to the Liberal Party. Although it is undeniably closer to the former, they did not hesitate to oppose partially but fiercely the nationalisation programme of the Attlee government and the “State socialism” implied.

Based on a thorough review of the works of the theorists of the British co-operative movement and a historical perspective of its political life, this critical study aims at shining a light on the actual or alleged porosity between socialism and liberalism regarding democratic participation, ownership or emancipation. A further analysis of

political manifestoes and parliamentary debates provides an alternative stance – a modern and controversial one – on these blurred lines, especially during the revival of the co-operative organisational models of the 1970s.

About the author

François Deblangy is a Ph.D. student in British modern history at Rouen University, France. His research work focuses on social movements, economic history and public policies. He is currently writing a Ph.D. thesis under the supervision of Pr. John Mullen about the history of worker co-operatives in Great Britain. François Deblangy is also a member of the Co-Operative Researchers' NETwork founded by Olga Kuznetsova (Manchester Metropolitan University) and Tony Webster (Northumbria University).

**Keywords:** Cooperative, Labour, Socialism, Liberalism

---

## **Is Social Liberalism Possible? New Liberalism and the Problem of Opposing Political Concepts**

Lukasz Duleba

European New School of Digital Studies/Collegium Polonicum – Pologne

### **Summary**

In his critical reflections of the situation in France after 1848, Karl Marx recognized that spiritus movens of the capitalist state is the class struggle. Through the ideological besotting bourgeoisie governed the middle class and guided the anger on the working class. In this perspective, the basic myth of social existence is the concept of fraternité which stands in opposition to the idea of the relations in the capitalist state. Marx wrote in "The Class Struggles in France": "the petty bourgeois saw with horror that by striking down the workers they had delivered themselves without resistance into the hands of their creditors" (Marx 1895).

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the dilemma of class struggle in the works of social liberals, who acknowledged Marxists' description of the capitalist state but disagreed with normative political propositions. The question here is how New Liberals answer the question over class conflict. For Leonard T. Hobhouse idea of liberal socialism have to recognize two conditions: democratic structure and acknowledge individuality of the people (Hobhouse 2006, 83–84). But is it possible to connect opposing political concepts? It seems that for the answer two New Liberal thinkers seek different responses. John A. Hobson was ready to limit individual freedom for the common needs (Townshend 1990, 100). At the same time, Hobhouse believed to spread individual freedom and simultaneously achieve social solidarity (Weiler 1972, 146–47).

Hobhouse, Leonard Trelawny. 2006. "Liberalism." In *Liberalism and Other Writings*, ed. James Meadowcroft. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, Karl. 1895. "The Class Struggles in France, 1848 to 1850." <https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1struggles-france/ch02.htm> (May 6, 2021).

Townshend, Jules. 1990. J.A. Hobson. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Weiler, Peter. 1972. "The New Liberalism of L. T. Hobhouse." *Victorian Studies* 16(2): 141–61.

**Keywords:** New Liberalism, social liberalism, L.T. Hobhouse, J.A. Hobson

---

## **The Epistemology of Regulation: Liberal Economists and State Power in Vienna, 1927–1938**

Max Ehrenfreund  
Harvard University – USA

### **Summary**

Twentieth-century states have used diverse forms of expertise to quantify, interpret, and regulate economic systems. This paper is about how economic expertise came to be regarded as neutral and objective – neither liberal, nor socialist. At one time, expertise was politically suspect. According to the interwar Austrian school of economics, the state’s synoptic representations of the complex social world created an illusion of knowledge, tempting those in power to intervene in private life. Nonetheless, economists in this school produced expert knowledge for use by the Austrian state. Ludwig von Mises was among the founders of the Austrian Institute for Business-Cycle Research. His student Oskar Morgenstern became the institute’s director in 1931. The institute adopted quantitative methods that promised to expand state power, such as the calculation of price indices and the production of a graphical “barometer” of the business cycle. The two economists responded differently to their experiences as experts. Mises became increasingly radical in his critique of mathematics and statistics. By contrast, Morgenstern justified the use of quantitative expertise by the state, developing an authoritarian theory of objectivity. Rejecting his teacher’s antithesis between planned and unplanned, socialist and liberal forms of government, he argued for an intermediate space occupied by the objective expert, whose independence was protected by a powerful dictator.

**Keywords:** business cycle, neoliberalism, history of science, interwar, Central Europe

---

## **Liberalisms and Socialisms: Recalibrating Some Analytical Criteria**

Michael Freeden  
University of Oxford

### **Summary**

Interpreting the liberalism/socialism nexus as a problem of boundaries that have become blurred, or as a set of overlapping issues, can be deceptive for three reasons. First, addressing those ideologies macroscopically in the singular conceals the many variants that always nest under such labels. Referring to liberalisms and socialisms in the plural may offer a more reliable point d’appui. Second, the tendency to approach liberalism and socialism as adjacent entities on a linear spectrum distorts the micro-morphologies of either, so that on any number of themes the space between their concepts can narrow or expand and, moreover, do so at different speeds over time. Third, the clusters under discussion may share several components and shed others, but what is crucial is the relative (and constantly fluctuating) weight each component possesses in the assemblage in which it is located, alongside some telling absences. All those features relate also to mutations in temporality, emotion, and performativity that require constant consideration in any comparative study.

---



## **John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor on the Emancipation of Women: Between Liberalism and Socialism**

Virginie Gouverneur

BETA-UHA (Mulhouse) – BETA University of Strasbourg – France

### **Summary**

Mill and Taylor, famous spiritual and intellectual partners of the Victorian era, have both co-written philosophical and economic texts and written personal essays on the emancipation of women. In secondary literature, Taylor is often presented as defending more radical ideas than Mill, notably because of his attraction to socialism (Pujol, 1992; Hayek, 2015). This distinction seems exaggerated, however, if we compare their respective approaches to the emancipation of women. Mill developed an interest in the ideas defended by the French Saint-Simonians before his meeting with Taylor in the early 1830s. They already underlie his critique of the institution of marriage, formulated in his *Essay on Marriage* (Mill, 1832) (Forget, 2003). The mark of Taylor's ideas is particularly visible in a chapter of *Principles of Political Economy* (Mill, 1848) dedicated to the evolution of relations between capitalists and hired labourers over the long term, and which defends the idea, taken up by Taylor in *Enfranchisement of Women* (Taylor, 1851), that the relations of masters and dependents or servants prevailing between the classes and the sexes must give way to a partnership of equals. An idea that will reappear in a significantly different form in Mill's *The Subjection of Women* about the appropriate form of family relations based on justice (Mill, 1869). On reading these different texts, it appears that in Mill as in Taylor – this is the thesis defended here – liberalism provides the general framework for the treatment of the question of the emancipation of women, within which are included socialist ideas as Mill and Taylor interpret them. Their arguments in favor of the emancipation of women are thus particularly revealing of the way in which each of them links liberalism and socialism. Through the analysis of these arguments, the article aims to both clarify and compare these attempts at articulation between two a priori irreconcilable doctrines.

**Keywords:** John Stuart Mill, Harriet Taylor Mill, Liberalism, Socialism, class and sex, inequalities between men and women

---

## **Liberal Socialism**

Juliette Grange

Interactions Culturelles et Discursives – Université de Tours : EA6297 – France

### **Summary**

The so-called utopian socialism (Owen, Saint-Simon, Leroux, Fourier...) is partly constituted on a liberal basis (among others a discussion of Bentham and English political economy). For it, the individual now pursues his interests through association or cooperation, of which the industrial workshop is the model. The conception that Durkheim and Jaurès would develop later in the century, is part of a continuity and associates political liberalism (the inalienable rights of the individual as theorized by B. Constant) and socialism within the French republican framework.

Today the Italian theorist Carlo Rosselli is trying to redefine liberal socialism from a more contemporary perspective.

**Keywords:** socialism, liberalism, utopian socialism, Saint, Simon, French republicanism, liberal socialism, Durkheim, Jaurès, association, cooperation

---

## **J.A. Hobson’s epistemic “re-statement of democracy”**

Janusz Grygieńć

<sup>1</sup>Nicolaus Copernicus University [Torun'] – Pologne

### **Summary**

Epistemic democracy is among the most debated concepts in contemporary democratic theory (Cohen 1986, Estlund 2008, Landemore 2013). Scholars contributing to the debate often seek epistemic justifications of popular participation of citizens in decision-making processes, including decisions of a technical nature. They look to the work of John Dewey (Anderson 2006; Knight and Johnson 2011, Peter 2008), Walter Lippmann (Mirowski 2020), William James, C.S. Peirce (Misak 2000; Talisse 2005), Adam Smith, and F.A. Hayek (Koppl 2019), among others, for inspiration. In my paper, I want to explore whether one could look for such an inspiration in the New Liberal thought, especially in J.A. Hobson’s writings (Allett 1981, Freedon 1978). I want to focus on Hobson’s account of a referendum and the role of expertise in political decision-making. I will examine whether Hobson’s political organicism implies a particular vision of the relationship between experts and laypeople and how this vision could contribute to contemporary philosophical debates.

**Keywords:** J.A. Hobson, epistemic democracy, expertise, epistocracy, political participation

---

## **What concept of freedom in Sismondi? An analysis in the light of social justice theories**

Herrade Igersheim Ragip Ege and Rodolphe Dos Santos Ferreira  
Bureau d’économie théorique et appliquée (BETA) – université de Strasbourg, CNRS : UMR7522,  
Université Nancy II – P E G E 61 avenue de la Forêt Noire 67085 STRASBOURG CEDEX, France

### **Summary**

A recent stream of literature is interested in the question of the conceptual links between certain 19th century thinkers and theories of social justice (Cunliffe and Erreygers 1999, Frobert 2014, Lutz and Baujard 2019). Our proposal is part of this literature by interrogating the concept of freedom at work in the thought of Jean-Charles-Léonard Simonde De Sismondi (1773-1842), an author who, among those who criticized Political Economy and were later called ‘socialists’, can be considered as the most informed about the analytical content of this new social science.

Two specificities of Sismondi’s thought will be of particular interest and will be compared to concepts commonly used in theories of social justice. The first is the question of freedom in terms of the opportunity to access the existence of one’s choice. For Sismondi, the purpose of Political Economy is happiness, a concept that is omnipresent throughout his reflections: “The science of government is therefore the science of making men happy; and as happiness is composed of various elements, it can be defined as ‘the knowledge of the means of procuring for the people the greatest mass of liberty, security, tranquillity, and virtue; of wealth, health, and strength, which they can simultaneously enjoy’ (Sismondi, *De la Richesse Commerciale*, 1803, *Œuvres Economiques Complètes*, *Economica*, 2012, Vol. II, 5). A few years later, in view of the situation in England, he would reaffirm this view even more strongly: “The study I have made of England has confirmed me in my *New Principles*. I have seen in this surprising country, which seems to be undergoing a great experiment for the instruction of the rest of the world, production increasing while enjoyment decreases. The mass of the nation seems to forget there, as well as the philosophers, that the increase of wealth is not the aim of the economy of political economy, but the means it has to procure the happiness of all [...]. Has not England, by forgetting men for things, sacrificed the end to the means?” (Sismondi, *Nouveaux Principes d’économie politique*, 1827; *Œuvres Economiques Complètes*, *Economica*, 2015, Vol.V, 4-7). Rather than an analysis in terms of happiness per se, it seems to us therefore that Sismondi’s thought should be understood more in terms of freedom of access to happiness. In other words, Sismondi’s work would ultimately resemble a theory of equality of opportunity close to those advocated by modern theorists of social justice (Rawls, Sen, Roemer...).

The second axis of our analysis will be to examine further the question of economic freedom (and its opposite, economic oppression), which is particularly studied by Sismondi and which is closely associated for him with the distance that takes place in modern times between employer and employee, in contrast to ancient times: "As long as the head of the family worked himself with his children and his slaves, the condition of the latter was less harsh. Their master felt himself to be of the same nature as them and experienced the same needs, the same fatigue, he sought the same pleasures and knew from his own experience that he would obtain little work from the man he would feed badly" (Sismondi, *Economie Politique*, 1817, *Œuvres Economiques Complètes*, Economica, 2015, Vol.IV, 63). Now, in modern times, "never has more absolute power been given to man over man, and never has it been exercised more harshly. It is of the life and death of thousands of individuals, men, women and children, that the industrial leader decides in his counter, by adding up figures; and he decides without anger as well as without compassion, without knowing his victims, without seeing them, without even knowing their number" (Sismondi, *Etudes sur les constitutions des peuples libres*, 1836-38, *Œuvres Economiques Complètes*, Economica, 2018, Vol.VI, 178). This ever more pronounced distancing of the employer from his employee, this ever more abstracted becoming of the exploitative relationship between the capitalist and the worker which characterises the historical evolution of European societies, deeply surprises Sismondi. It seems to us that a close link can be established between this analysis of the author with the pairs of freedom that are the freedom of the Ancients and the freedom of the Moderns (Constant, 1819) on the one hand, and negative freedom and positive freedom (Berlin 1958) on the other hand, knowing that these two pairs are strongly present and invoked by many theorists of social justice (Igersheim 2013).

**Keywords:** Sismondi, freedom, social justice

---

## **Commons, Property Rights, and Liberalism. Is it Possible a "Non-Proprietary", Socialist Individualism?**

Alessandro Le Donne  
University of Genoa – Italie

### **Summary**

As is known, common good equilibria do not lead to efficient results, because a specific variable (i. e., market price), which allows setting up a theory of rational action, does not exist in this case. According to mainstream policy analyses, the only solution to ensure efficiency would be the exogenous (public) action to allocate property rights, whereas Elinor Ostrom has suggested original alternative solutions to the puzzle. In our paper, we put forward a possible way to deal with commons and property rights in the light of Classical – Marxian political economy. Namely, we find that a contribution of Sraffa could open an interesting view. In a note now available, Sraffa underlines the relevance of the historical contextualization to discuss and understand human nature. Indeed, by re-reading the materialist anthropology of Marx, integrated with the proposal of Sraffa, the basic lines of a theory of human agency and interaction, completely different from the liberal, neoclassical methodological individualism, emerge. In the first paragraph, we present preliminary observations on Sraffa's methodology. Then (paragraph 2) we refer to both "the" young" and the "late" Marx, and Gramsci's thought, to give elements for the historical contextualisation of human behaviour, neither deterministic nor mechanistic, with crucial elements of unpredictability. In the third paragraph, we examine the difficulty to reconcile the "property" approach with the "comunitarian" approach, and ask whether its roots would lie, in Marxian language, in the contradiction between "civil" and "political" society. Indeed, it is the concrete condition, under which the agents operate, that makes the management of common goods difficult. In the fourth paragraph, we conclude that the Marxian – Gramscian perspective provides a specific kind of individualism, which casts light on the complex relationship between good and human being in a non-proprietary logic, accounting for social inequality and different empowerment of individuals.

**Keywords:** Sraffa, Common Goods, Marx, Gramsci

---

## **“Liberty versus socialism”: the US Republican Party and the politics of anti-socialism, 1933–1950**

Robert Mason

University of Edinburgh – United Kingdom and University of Helsinki – Finland

### **Summary**

For the 1950 midterm campaigns, the Republican Party adopted the slogan of “Liberty versus socialism” as the focus of its politicians’ attacks on their Democratic rivals. The slogan revealed the confidence that many Republicans possessed – especially at a time, domestically, of heightened anti-communism and, internationally, of new success for Western Europe’s social democrats – in the electoral promise of the charge that the Democratic Party’s liberal agenda was a form of socialism. That confidence proved misplaced; such rhetoric about a drift to socialism was powerful in mobilising rank-and-file activists within the Republican Party but it failed to boost the party’s fortunes among voters as a whole. Although it is an electoral strategy in the era of McCarthyism that historians generally view the relationship between the Republican Party and the politics of anti-socialism, this paper explores the extent to which an alarmed analysis about connections between democratic liberalism and non-democratic socialism informed the party’s development during the 1930s and the 1940s. In private, leading Republicans analysed Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal and, still more, Harry Truman’s Fair Deal, the paper shows, still more darkly than their shrill anti-socialism rhetoric suggested. These projects, they believed, amounted to a wholesale assault on the capitalist system that had been central to the American experience. Of yet more concern among Republicans, the nation’s political system was fragile, they believed, in face of what they saw as the demagogic appeals of those who were, even, would-be dictators. This analysis informed not only the liberty-versus-socialism rhetoric but also a policy emphasis on a traditional understanding of the Constitution. The paper demonstrates, then, that even though socialism was at the margins of US politics during this period, anti-socialism significantly informed the development of modern American conservatism.

**Keywords:** États, Unis, conservatisme, Parti républicain

---

## **Liberty and Society Before Liberalism and Socialism: On Adam Smith**

Ecem Okan<sup>1</sup> and Trevor Shelley<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Université de Lorraine – Université de Lorraine, Université de Lorraine – France

<sup>2</sup>Arizona State University – USA

### **Summary**

As with any great work, Adam Smith’s *Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* begets alternate and competing interpretations. However, as a text that apparently fathered the discipline of economics, it is itself often used as an instrument in partisan and political battles. Disentangling the text’s genuine intentions from its ideological uses (and abuses) is no easy matter, for to some extent politicians, public figures, influential thinkers and scholars cannot but read Smith’s work from where they themselves stand on the political spectrum. Smith’s early revolutionary and subversive reputation in the after-math of the French Revolution was gradually obscured by his “conservatism” (Rothschild 1992), though attempts to reclaim him as a forerunner of the left persisted through the second half of the twentieth century. Against his frequent portrayal as a free marketeer (Hayek 1960, Buchanan 1975, Otteson 2002, Smith 2006), Smith has been associated with proto-Marxism (Meek 1967, Reisman 1974, Pack 1991, Rothbard 1995), and with egalitarianism and social justice (Fleischacker 2004, McLean 2006, Sen 2009).

We argue, however, that such ideological taxonomizing remains confined to ideology itself. Smith neither thought of himself according to the categories of liberalism or conservatism or socialism, or any such “ism”-all such

ideologies being “mutually exclusive and hence offer[ing] clear-cut alternative choices” (Freeden 2003:79). Smith’s work addresses itself to the complexity of human life, and while his broad social science framework (Hill 2016: 322) sought to understand human structures, he did not offer anything so “clear-cut” as to neatly fit one alternative or another. In order to shed light on the derivative relationship between liberalism and socialism, this paper sets out to understand what Smith means by liberty and society and how these concepts are related to each other in his work. According to Smith, society-amounting to more than a mere exchange of services between individuals-can only truly prosper “upon the liberal plan of equality, liberty and justice” (WN IV.ix.3) in which the particular interest of any social class is not politically privileged, unlike in the mercantile system. Broadening the analytical perspective beyond the government-market dichotomy might also help us to reassess the relationship between two commonly conflated concepts, capitalism and liberalism.

#### References

- James M. Buchanan, 2000 [1975]. *The Limits of Liberty: Between Anarchy and Leviathan*. Indianapolis: Liberty Fund.
- Samuel Fleischacker, 2004. *On Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations: A Philosophical Companion*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Michael Freeden, 2003. *Ideology: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Friedrich A. Hayek, 2011 [1960]. *The Constitution of Liberty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lisa Hill, 2016. “Adam Smith and Political Theory” in Ryan P. Hanley (ed.), *Adam Smith: His Life, Thought, and Legacy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. Pp. 321-339.
- Ian McLean 2006. *Adam Smith, Radical and Egalitarian: An interpretation for the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ronald L. Meek, 1967. “The Scottish contribution to Marxist sociology” in *Economics and Ideology and other essays. Studies in the development of economic thought*. London: Chapman and Hall. Pp. 34-51.
- James R. Otteson, 2002. *Adam Smith’s Marketplace of Life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spencer J. Pack, 1991. *Capitalism as a moral system, Adam Smith’s critique of the free market economy*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.
- David A. Reisman, 1976. *Adam Smith’s sociological economics*, London: Croom Helm.
- Murray Rothbard 1995. *An Austrian Perspective on the History of Economic Thought, 2 vols*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Emma Rothschild, 1992. “Adam Smith and Conservative Economics,” *Economic History Review*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 74–96.
- Craig Smith, 2006. *Adam Smith’s Political Philosophy: The Invisible Hand and Spontaneous Order*. London: Routledge.
- 

## **Socialism and social liberalism: The state as a distinguishing feature?**

Françoise Orazi

PU civilisation britannique

DEMA, Faculté des langues, Lyon 2

Laboratoire Triangle UMR 5206 France

### **Summary**

Are social liberalism and liberal socialism two of a kind or are they essentially distinct? This presentation looks at the theoretical elements that can help provide an answer to this question. While the elements that are usually taken to be markers of their identity (the economy, the state) may not provide the needed insight, it examines whether it is possible to reveal congruence or difference through a study of core concepts.

---

## **From Physiocracy to Liberal Socialism: Silvio Gesell's *Freiwirtschaft's* Third Way**

Simon Papaud

LEFMI – UPJV Université Picardie Jules Verne, Université Lumière-Lyon 2, Triangle – France

Triangle : action, discours, pensée politique et économique – École Normale Supérieure - Lyon, Université Lumière - Lyon 2, Université Jean Monnet [Saint-Etienne], Sciences Po Lyon - Institut d'études politiques de Lyon, Université de Lyon, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique : UMR5206 – France

### **Summary**

Free economy, or *Freiwirtschaft*, was structured as a political movement in the German-speaking countries in the 1910's. Silvio Gesell, a German tradesman and thinker, managed to unite advocates of a socialization of the land (inspired by Henry George's proposals) and of the monetary system (inspired by Proudhon's ideas). These two fundamental reforms would, according to Gesell and his followers, complete the Manchesterian ideal, and thus establish "true", free socialism - in opposition to the Marxists' communist ideals. Both claimed heir to Proudhon's libertarian socialism and fierce advocate of free trade, Gesell thus tried to draw a third way between capitalism and communist socialism - a way that was supposed to end worker's exploitation and the domination of the idle classes whilst guaranteeing individual freedom and property. Gesell's *Natural Economic Order* (1916) seems to have inspired and influenced not only an author such as Keynes, who doesn't hide his sympathies for Gesell, but also champions of a more orthodox liberalism, like Irving Fisher, Maurice Allais or the ordoliberal thinkers of the Freiburg school.

At the foundation of this unusual position in the History of ideas, we find the problem of the place occupied in liberal political thought by the monetary system and the property of land - these two fundamental institutions of economic life. Could capitalist exploitation be ended by putting an end to the private character of these "fictitious commodities"? From the French Physiocrats to Keynes, through the Gesellian *Freiwirtschaft*, this communication tries to analyze the implications of such a medium position between Marxist socialism and economic liberalism.

**Keywords:** Proudhon Money Land Physiocracy Gesell *Freiwirtschaft*

---

## **Britain's social and economic policies under Tony Blair and the influence of Anthony Giddens: The Third Way or the art of swinging between progressive change and conservative values?**

Lovatiana Raveloarison\*

### **Summary**

The political history of the twentieth century has been marked by a dichotomy between capitalism and socialism. Likewise, the economic systems in the most developed countries have been divided between those who advocate the free market and economic liberalism and those who put forward state intervention. In the United Kingdom, the search for a compromise on a Third Way between free market and state intervention, sometimes called "liberal socialism", was embodied by Tony Blair. The expression "The Third Way" was first coined by Anthony Giddens, Tony Blair's political advisor. However, the search for a third way was not new because it was encapsulated in Harold MacMillan's book "The Middle Way", published in 1938. As Anthony Giddens puts it, the Third Way is "the renewal of social democracy". As a sort of compromise between the State and the market, the Third Way policies are set within an economy which defends social values in a liberal and capitalist framework. Consequently, the policies carried out must tackle inequalities and pursue some social justice goals.

This paper explores how the British Third Way sets a perfect example of such an interaction between socialism and liberalism. It is based on the theoretical approach of new liberalism or social democracy's thinkers. Professor Peter Clarke analysed this link and delved into the writings of Graham Wallas, Hobbouse, Hobson and J.L. and Barbara Hammond. In the *Great Society*, Graham Wallas pointed out the issue of an unequal society and the reduction of poverty. Hobbouse who underlined his theory on social harmony, pleaded for the need to reconcile socialism and liberalism values. Hobson explored the theory on unequal distribution of wealth and put into

perspective liberalism and the Welfare State. John and Barbara Hammond examined the issue of social inequality linked to the industrial revolution. The notion of “Social justice” which had remained implicit throughout those writings, were subsequently theorized by John Rawls.

To fully grasp the issue on the interaction between socialism and liberalism, it is important to raise the question as to why the search for an equal society is a key dimension in new liberalism and in social democracy values. In the same way, social and economic policies and the pursuit of social justice are at the core of the British Third Way. This paper deals with sources published during New Labour’s time in office from 1997 to 2007. Moreover, the paper is an attempt to bring to light how Tony Blair came to be the main politician who best embodied liberal socialism. Did he set up measures for a more equal society and did he manage to fix liberalism-induced inequality?

**\*Lovatiana RAVELOARISON** holds a PhD in Studies on the English-Speaking World from New Sorbonne University. She is the author of a thesis on the implications of the European Employment Strategy in the United Kingdom (1997-2017) defended in April 2019 and written under the supervision of Professor Pauline Schnapper. Her academic interests lie at the intersection between political, economic, and social studies. Her research mainly focuses on UK economic and social policies, the UK employment and labour market, UK lifelong learning and education policies.

---

## **The Conservatives’ representation of Liberalism through the mirror image of Socialism (in parliamentary discourse)**

Stéphane Revillet

Université de Bourgogne-Franche-Comté – France

### **Summary**

This paper aims to analyse the way the Conservatives have represented socialism and liberalism in the Westminster parliamentary debates since John Major (especially during Prime Minister’s Question Time). Since Margaret Thatcher’s adoption of neo-liberal policies the conservative MPs and leaders have relentlessly depicted socialism as a threat to the country, both from an economic and social perspective. In their view, socialism is the arch-enemy to fight against, it is associated with regimes that would kill democracy and freedom in the UK. Its principles rely on hypercentralisation, authoritarianism and North Korea communism, Stalinism... For the Conservatives the Labour Party embodies socialism and must be targeted as the enemy. Among many other things, the Labour party is constantly accused of wanting to renationalise private companies, to disincentivize people from working, to borrow too much money, to support the Social Chapter, to mimic bankrupt socialist countries...

The Conservatives’ strategy is to create a clear-cut ideological divide between their group and their political opponents. While reviling Socialism the Conservatives promote their own liberal policies as the only possible path away from serfdom to “freedom and choice”. The conservative leaders will pose as the saviours of the country in the face of ‘evil socialism’. This narrative heavily relies on a symbolic representation of two worlds. For Murray Edelman symbols are used to (over)simplify the message and thus turning ideologies into symbolic objects that make it much easier for people to treat concepts as things. The objectified political lines are then easy to identify and understand.

But what happens when those objectified ideological lines do no longer run in intrinsically opposed ways? What becomes of the narratives of opposing ideologies? While Tony Blair defended his new “stakeholding society” programme at the dispatch box in the late 90s, the conservative party was about to adopt a more progressive liberal rhetoric to help them move away from their reputation of being “the nasty party”, and in the process both parties repudiated part of their ideological credo.

**Keywords:** Liberalism, Socialism, Conservative party, parliamentary debates, ideology, symbols

---

## **“Liberalism and / or Socialism?” The Wrong Question?**

Scott Scheall

College of Integrative Sciences and Arts, Arizona State University – USA

### **Summary**

Political questions are typically framed in normative terms, in terms of the political actions that we (or our political representatives) “ought” to take or, alternatively, in terms of the political philosophies that “should” inform our political actions. “Should we be liberals or socialists, or should we (somehow) combine liberalism and socialism?” Such questions are typically posed and debates around such questions emerge with little, if any, prior consideration of a question that is, logically speaking, more fundamental: “What can we effectively achieve through political action? What goals are within and without the scope of political action?”

Because we pose and argue about normative political questions without first getting the descriptive facts straight, we often embark on political projects – which might be liberal and / or socialistic projects – that have little hope of success.

Anyone who accepts a principle like ought implies can or any of its logically weaker variants, such as the principle that ought presupposes or makes plausible can, is committed to rejecting “ought” claims that assert obligations to do things that cannot be done. The logic of such principles is that nothing that cannot be done can be an obligation. Thus, anyone who accepts such a principle is committed to rejecting political debate that runs purely in normative terms without prior consideration of what can and cannot be done. Given that most, if not all, people accept some such principle, most, if not all, people are committed to rejecting the traditional – purely normative – form of political debate.

More to the present point, if the question “Liberalism and / or Socialism?” is the normative question “Should we be liberals or socialists, or should we (somehow) combine liberalism and socialism?” then it is the wrong – or, more exactly, a premature – question to ask.

**Keywords:** problem of policymaker ignorance, logical priority of the epistemic, epistemic burden, F. A. Hayek, Ludwig von Mises, socialist calculation debate

---

## **Conjoined Crocodiles, Inequalities and Temporalities: J.B. Danquah on Liberalism and Socialism (Ghana, 1945-1965)**

Gerardo Serra

University of Manchester – United Kingdom

### **Summary**

Contemporary Ghanaian politics is said to revolve around two mutually exclusive traditions. The first, grounded in the ideas of Kwame Nkrumah (1909-1972), evokes notions of anti-imperialism, socialism and Pan-Africanism. The second tradition is primarily associated with the thought of lawyer, philosopher and politician Joseph Boakye Danquah (1895-1965). While the first tradition has received extensive coverage in intellectual history, the second (which so far has only attracted the attention of Ghana and West Africa specialists) has been subjected to a simplistic treatment. The result is that, from the point of view of the history of ideas, it has either been reduced to an African plea for individualism and ‘free markets’, or ‘explained away’ under the rubrics of ‘liberalism’ and a defence of ‘traditional culture’. Through a close reading of Danquah’s political, philosophical and literary works, this paper reveals the inadequacy of these frameworks, and presents a new assessment of Danquah’s intellectual trajectory. Specifically, it shows that Danquah’s work is a productive entry point to historicise the entanglement and mutual construction of notions of ‘socialism’ and ‘liberalism’. Secondly, it can shed light on the political work performed by the construction and mobilisation of these categories, and how they shaped the conceptual horizon within which Ghana’s decolonisation took place, and alternative postcolonial futures were imagined. Finally, the paper argues that the conjoined history of liberalism and socialism in Ghana cannot be dissociated from a critical interrogation of precolonial Akan symbols (the conjoined crocodiles, for example), values and institutions. Competing representations of Akan political cultures as egalitarian or individualistic had a far-



reaching effect on the conceptualisation of different forms of political and economic inequalities. From a methodological point of view, it is hoped that this investigation will raise broader questions on the implications of writing about the interaction of liberalism and socialism with indigenous categories and epistemologies.

**Keywords:** Ghana, liberalism, socialism, economic inequality, land, community

---

## **‘Since the 1960s we have seen state socialism in practice’: Jo Grimond, British Liberals, and the crisis of the post-war settlement**

Peter Sloman

University of Cambridge – United Kingdom

### **Summary**

Any analysis of the impact of socialism in modern Britain must grapple seriously with the interventionist policies which British governments pursued between the 1940s and the 1970s, and with the Labour Party’s role in shaping this ‘post-war settlement’. As Jim Tomlinson and David Edgerton have recently shown, this post-war era was distinguished not only by the ascendancy of Keynesian economics and the expansion of social welfare provision but also by corporatist bargaining and technocratic grand projects, underpinned by a strong strain of economic nationalism. Though such policies were pursued by both Labour and Conservative governments, they were particularly associated with the social-democratic left and came to define many people’s perceptions of ‘real existing socialism’.

This paper will explore the Liberal Party’s relationship with the post-war settlement through the lens of Jo Grimond’s thought. As a young Liberal candidate in 1945, Grimond shared in the general approbation for Keynes and Beveridge’s work, and during his decade as Liberal leader (1956-67) he sought to build the party’s support among the ‘new middle class’ by embracing the politics of growth and modernization. Yet Grimond’s liberalism was always inflected with a deep suspicion of bureaucratic power, which was reinforced by his friendship with market economists such as Alan Peacock and by his experiences as MP for Orkney and Shetland. By the 1970s and 80s, disillusionment with the welfare state and the mixed economy had become the central theme of his analysis, as seen most clearly in *The Common Welfare* (1978) and *A Personal Manifesto* (1982). Though Grimond’s intellectual journey was idiosyncratic, a close reading of his work promises to shed new light on the complex ways in which generational, sociological, and spatial factors shaped British Liberals’ attitudes towards social democracy.

---

## **Prefigurative activism today: from socialist values via anarchist means to the neoliberal status quo**

Rafal Soborski

Richmond: The American International University in London – United Kingdom

### **Summary**

This paper engages with the contestation of the neoliberal hegemony by anti-austerity movements, such as Occupy or, more recently, Nuit Debout that claim to speak on behalf of the ‘99 percent’. The paper argues that while anti-neoliberal mobilizations invoke socialist values, they have failed to transcend the

parameters of neoliberalism. One major hindrance, the paper contends, is the anarchist politics of prefiguration at the heart of anti-neoliberal activism. The intention of a prefigurative action is to unite its means with its aims – in other words, in a prefigurative movement the process is harmonized with the objective – and the appeal of prefiguration is related to a widespread perception that corruption and hypocrisy are all-pervasive in mainstream political space. However, as the paper will show by drawing on a discursive analysis of the political communication produced by activists and fellow-travelling intellectuals, this model of activism has some important flaws. Most importantly from the perspective adopted here, prefigurative politics typical of recent articulations of anti-neoliberalism has a highly individualistic dimension and so is fairly compatible with aspects of the neoliberal vision of human nature, especially its preoccupation with personal autonomy. Insistence on prefigurative principles has also led to a substitution of quarrels about the logistics of activism for any systematic debate about its political vision or purpose. The paper maps some of the main controversies surrounding prefiguration and brings the question of ideology into the debate about its implications. More specifically, the paper focuses on the interaction between three main ideological currents which shape today's progressive activism: socialism, which permeates its political values, anarchism, which informs its preferred tactics, and neoliberalism, which maintains a hegemonic grip over the ideational horizons of the movement while being unwittingly buttressed by the self-professed anti-ideological and anti-collectivist ethos of prefiguration.

**Keywords:** socialism, anarchism, neoliberalism, prefigurative activism, Occupy

---

## **Managerialism in government as the forced compromise between liberalism and socialism**

Nicholas Sowell

Département de langues – Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne – France

### **Summary**

While capitalism may now be “alone”, the spectacular rise of “political capitalism”[1] in China invalidates Fukuyama’s hypothesis that (mixed) market economies and liberal democracy are necessarily the End of History. Yet within the historical liberal democracies, two major shocks in fairly quick succession – the global financial crisis (GFC) and the Covid-19 pandemic – have profoundly redrawn the lines of what governments must do. Although neoliberalism has yet to be supplanted as the prevailing ideology of public policy, especially in the English-speaking countries, in practice public authorities have been navigating in uncharted ideological waters: since 2008, monetary policy, the spearhead of neoliberalism in the late 1970s, has been wholly upended with consequences that are not yet fully clear; fiscal policy has twice taken on burdens which are unprecedented in peace time; efforts have been made, especially in the United States and the United Kingdom, to invent new forms of economic nationalism, that have only led to incoherent changes and limited successes; and the pursuit of ever-more stringent CO2 emission targets could well set profound constraints on freedom of enterprise and economic individualism.

This communication will examine how the GFC, the Covid-19 pandemic and climate change have altered the political agenda in the United States and the United Kingdom. It will look at how the responsibilities of public authorities have changed dramatically, even though the practice of government is proceeding in an essentially managerialist manner. This approach to dealing with massive new challenges thus builds on the new public management agenda and the depoliticisation public policy associated with neoliberalism. The communication will moreover draw on the application of complexity theory in public management to seek to understand better the limits of both liberalism and socialism in dealing with the practical difficulties of government. It will conclude by examining to what extent the constraints of managerial government limit the scope of contemporary policies drawing on traditional (neo)liberal and socialist ideologies.

Milanovic, B., *Capitalism, Alone: The Future of the System That Rules the World*, Belknap Press, 2019.

**Keywords:** Capitalism, global financial crisis, Covid, 19, climate change, fiscal policy, public policy, managerialism, complexity theory, liberalism, socialism

---

## **Socialism against the State. Beyond the opposition between equality and liberty.**

Fabien Tarrit\*

REGARDS – Université de Reims - Champagne Ardenne : EA6292 – France

### **Summary**

For Marx, a planned and conscious organization of the economy does not entail a centralization of the means of production through a State, but it implies a cooperation and free association of producers within self-managed collective units. Therefore, our claim in that contribution is that socialism/communism, as advocated by its original followers, is antagonistic to the control of the state over economy. Our point here is to advocate a mode of organization articulated both around collective ownership and mutual planning, in which individuals cooperate for a common interest, implement standards of community and equality, and preclude market exchange and private ownership of the means of production, with a view to promoting social harmony. We advocate that, in theory, such a claim depends on the possibility to associate equality and liberty. This implies that an opposition between these two terms, which refers to the opposition between the State and the market, but also between holism and individualism, is conservative. What we intend to promote here is to overcome this opposition, in favour of a defense of individual freedom, insofar as it is precisely a condition for equality. As such, we will discuss the nature of liberty with the concept of self-ownership, and the issue of equality in terms of opportunity. This debate falls within an attempt of a regeneration of communism such as it has been implemented for a couple of years by several authors. It may be precised that this communication is a theoretical one, it is based on a confrontation of contemporary texts on the issue of communism, around the philosophical discussion on equality and liberty.

**Keywords:** Communism, Equality, Liberty, Cooperation

\*Fabien Tarrit is a Reader in Economics at the University of Rheims Champagne-Ardenne in France. He is the head of the research axis Economic Philosophy and Theory with REGARDS research unit. His main areas of research are Marxism, theories of justice, left-libertarianism... He wrote two books (Le Marxisme analytique. Une introduction critique. Syllepse, 2014, and G.A. Cohen et le marxisme. Editions universitaires européennes, 2016) and dozens of papers in scientific journals, in collective books, and for general public.

---

## **Debating democracy: socialism, liberalism and the foundations of politics in 1930s Britain**

James Thompson

University of Bristol – United Kingdom

### **Summary**

This paper reconstructs the debate about democracy in 1930s Britain as a site for understanding the complex, historical relationship between 'socialism' and 'liberalism'. It was between the wars that it became commonplace to assert that Britain was a 'democracy', and that this was a good thing. It was also, however, a period in which 'democracy' abroad seemed deeply vulnerable to many Britons, whilst doubts were also raised about British democracy's capacity to cope with the complexities of imperial governance and economic depression. It was in this context that a series of prominent political thinkers addressed the health and meaning of democracy in 1930s

Britain. Harold Laski found Democracy in Crisis (1933) while G D H Cole insisted in the same year that ‘we have not democracy’. Reginald Bassett outlined The Essentials of Parliamentary Democracy (1935) from a liberal proceduralist perspective that was an influence on his friend Evan Durbin’s significant account of The Politics of Democratic Socialism, published in 1940 but as Stephen Brooke has argued very much a product of the 1930s. This was, therefore, a genuine debate, for high intellectual stakes, in which ‘socialists’ and ‘liberals’ were compelled to relate their deepest convictions to the future prospects of ‘democracy’, and to address the entangled relationship between ‘socialism’ and ‘liberalism’ at a moment in which developments in continental Europe loomed large in the British political imagination.

**Keywords:** liberalism, socialism, democracy

---

## **No Lesser Evil: John Ruskin against Liberalism and Socialism**

Jean-Yves Tizot

Institut des Langues et Cultures d’Europe, Amérique, Afrique, Asie et Australie  
Université Grenoble Alpes : EA7356 – France

### **Summary**

One of the severest 19th century detractors of liberalism in the English language, John Ruskin, had probably never heard of, or perhaps more rightly never read, the works of Marx and Engels. But Ruskin proposed elements of interpretation of capitalism and formulated a critique of its economic and social foundations so sharp and insightful that, according to certain commentators, he should be considered on a par with the founders of ‘Marxism’. Ruskin was, and to an extent still is, famous as a ‘Victorian art critic’, even though this label is highly debatable. But it is also possible to argue that Ruskin’s main destination as a thinker was the radical critique of liberalism and capitalism. He remains, therefore, very difficult to categorise, and the various attempts to do so, offering him as a ‘Tory socialist’, an ‘ethical socialist’, a utopian thinker or even a forerunner of the Welfare State, miss some central points of his social and political vision and underestimate the radicality of his critique of orthodox liberal doctrine and the related material practices.

Even before Capital was first published in German (1867), Ruskin had embarked on the mission that would occupy most of the second part of his intellectual life: the radical de-bunking of liberalism, especially as expressed in the doctrine of political economy, and of capitalism as a general mode of social organisation. His critique included the damaging and dehumanising effects of capitalist production and consumption, including the destruction of the natural elements of the human environment. In the words of P. D. Anthony, Ruskin wanted ‘to awaken the world to the perils of devastation which, he believed, would follow from its preoccupation with profit and its subservience to a false economic doctrine’. When Capital was published in English in 1887, Ruskin had already written and published several volumes dedicated to the critique of “the soi-disant science of political economy” and the social relations of liberal capitalist society.

One of his favorite targets was J. S. Mill, but Ruskin was even more critical of what he called ‘socialism’, because he saw it as exacerbating the worst tendencies of capitalism and as a product of the inexorable progress of applied liberalism. More than common ground, socialism and liberalism shared for him a similar orientation, and, on a certain plane, similar goals. The nature, organisation and aims of human work are what make capitalism and socialism, for Ruskin, twin evils rather than a pair of opposites. Yet Ruskin claimed to be ‘the reddest of the reds’ as well as a ‘Communist of the old school’, and one commentator recently called Ruskin ‘a Victorian visionary’ who ‘can save communism from Marx’ (E. McCarragher, 2019). The paper proposes to explore what amounts to a unique radical contribution to modern political thought, and to show how Ruskin saw ‘Socialism’ as an outcome and a continuation of liberalism, not a remedy or an antidote, and opposed it for the same fundamental reasons he objected to liberal capitalism. To do so, it is necessary to examine carefully what Ruskin meant by ‘Socialism’. The answer to that question appears at first narrow and limited, but in fact it concerns no lesser a problem than the historical meaning of ‘Progress’ and extends from Ruskin’s own time into our contemporary period, as a challenge to the received idea of the political Left.

**Keywords:** Ruskin, socialism, liberalism, capitalism, political economy, social critique, Marx, Engels, Tory, ethical, socialist, socialism, communist, communism, industrialism, productivism, ecology, environment, welfare state, Progress, wealth, illth

---

## **“A synthesis between Communism and Fascism”: Subhas Chandra Bose’s sām̄yavāda as a non-Western overcoming of ‘opposite’ ideologies**

Maria Tumiotto

University of Manchester [Manchester] – United Kingdom

### **Summary**

The Bengali politician Subhas Chandra Bose was one of the protagonists of India’s fight for independence. During the Thirties, he emerged as a leader of the Indian National Congress’ young, socialist wing, and was elected president of the party in 1938. However, Bose’s radical views caused a split between him and the Gandhian majority of the Congress. The split widened during the Second World War, when Bose openly sided with the Axis Powers in an anti-British perspective.

From the early stages of his political life, Bose proved to be particularly receptive to the ideologies that were developing outside India at the time. His lengthy sojourns in Europe between 1933 and 1943 allowed him to observe directly and draw inspiration from the epochal political experiments that were taking place there. In fact, Bose himself in his book *The Indian Struggle* described his political doctrine, sām̄yavāda, as “a synthesis between Communism and Fascism” based on the traits shared by the two ideologies.

In addressing sām̄yavāda, historiography often reported the definition given by Bose in *The Indian Struggle* without critically assessing it. However, a closer look at Bose’s own words shows that over time sām̄yavāda embodied different meanings: from a mere synonym of “equality” or “socialism” to a combination of totalitarian postulates, from a radical alter-native to Gandhi’s methods of ahisā and satyāgraha to an all-round project of “benevolent dictatorship” aimed at governing independent India.

Through an analysis of some essential primary sources, such as Bose’s speeches and writings, this paper retraces the origins and constant development of the sām̄yavāda ideology, with the aim to highlight the originality of this doctrine. Bose’s sām̄yavāda in fact can be read as a non-Western attempt to combine two ideologies traditionally considered antithetical into an original, though intrinsically paradoxical, synthesis suited to an anti- and post-colonial programme.

**Keywords:** Bose, India, communism, fascism, synthesis

---

## **‘Transcending liberalism and socialism: The institutional economics of class in British idealist thought and practice**

Professor Colin Tyler

Centre for Idealism and the New Liberalism, and Associate Dean (Research) in the Faculty of Business, Law and Politics, University of Hull, UK

### **Summary**

Academics and social critics from across the social and political spectrum took an increasing interest in the institution of class in mid-Victorian Britain. Yet, the British idealists’ conceptions of class have been widely misunderstood in the extensive scholarly literature that has grown up on “the social problem”. This paper seeks to correct some of those misunderstandings. It focuses on the writings and social reformism of the British idealists, James Bonar, Edward Caird, T.H. Green, H.J.W. Hetherington, Sir Henry Jones, J.H. Muirhead, D.G. Ritchie, Arnold Toynbee, and especially Bernard and Helen Bosanquet. It establishes that, in various ways and to varying degrees, these British idealists rejected two distinctions that became central to subsequent treatments of this central

aspect of economic life. On the one hand, the British idealists' analyses of the economic functions of class highlighted on otherwise the often-misunderstood interconnections of material and ideational factors. Secondly and relatedly, the British idealists emphasised the interaction of individuals and institutions in the economic sphere. As such, their analyses of the economic functions of class show how the British idealists both anticipated the institutional economics of Thorstein Veblen (1857-1929), John R. Commons (1862-1945) and others, and rejected the too-easy intellectual and political divisions between liberalism and socialism which continue to frame economic histories of the period.

---

## **Can Liberalism Save Itself from Socialism by Learning from It?**

Nikolai Wenzel\*

Fayetteville State University (NC) – USA

### **Summary**

The traditional taxonomy of liberalism and socialism is no longer a useful heuristic for understanding the US political landscape. The “left” – once heir to the social freedom of classical liberalism – is lapsing into an illiberal combination of cultural Marxism, power-driven postmodernism, and the censorship of cancel culture. The “right” – once heir to the economic freedom of classical liberalism – is increasingly protectionist and populist, and has overseen increases in the size and cost of the federal government that shame the New Deal. The US federal government currently controls approximately one third of the economy, to which we can add 20% controlled by state and local governments, and 10% in compliance costs with regulations. At this 60% government-to-GDP ratio, we can hardly speak of the US as liberal – but the US model of state-sponsored cronyism does not amount to socialism either. Instead, we see a disappearance of traditional liberal values, with a parallel rise of illiberal extremism in both the traditional left and traditional right. This paper examines the decline of liberalism, and hopefully its rebirth. Within the rebirth, this paper examines the idea that liberalism learn from the better angels of socialism (concern for the poor without the unintended consequences of state intervention) – from a substantive perspective, but also in terms of public relations. It closes with lessons from conscious capitalism, to reclaim the best of the liberal tradition, while correcting its abuses, but also without lapsing into socialism.

**Keywords:** liberalism, socialism, public choice, conscious capitalism

\*Nikolai G. Wenzel, Ph.D. is Distinguished Professor of Economics at Fayetteville State University (Fayetteville, North Carolina, USA), where he holds the L.V. Hackley Chair for the Study of Capitalism and Free Enterprise. Ph.D. (2007), George Mason University; BS (1994), Georgetown University. He is a research fellow of the Institut Economique Molinari (Paris) and was a research fellow of the Center for Law & Economics at the University of Paris Law School (Panthéon-Assas) from 2008 until the center closed in 2019. He is a member of the Mont Pèlerin Society, and the author of a book and more than 50 articles and chapters in political economy. [nwenzel@uncfsu.edu](mailto:nwenzel@uncfsu.edu)

---

## The Provenance of an Economics of Adaptation in Long-term Relationships

Dean Williamson

Independent Researcher – USA

### Summary

The paper illuminates the emergence of the economics of organization associated with such names as Ronald Coase, Harold Demsetz, Herbert Simon, Oliver Williamson and Oliver Hart. It does so by exploring both points of tension and complementarity between conceptions of the Administrative State and market-mediated exchange (*la libre concurrence* in Vilfredo Pareto's parlance). The launching point for this exploration is really Herbert Simon's suggestion that a "mythical visitor from Mars" would puzzle over the fact that observers label many economies "market economies". Yet, in observing that these erstwhile "market economies" are heavily populated by entities (firms, government entities and such) that support non-market, administrative processes, the Martian might yet be compelled to ask "Wouldn't 'organizational economy' be the more appropriate term?"

The paper amounts to a critique of orthodox approaches in economic theory to organization within firms and between firms. Orthodox approaches motivate the application of such tools as "merger simulation" in antitrust analysis. Such tools are important, but other analyses are also important – sometimes more important. The orthodox approach ignores the governance of inter-firm relations (via long-term contract or joint venture).

The paper illuminates a path connecting seemingly disjoint bodies of theory and thought encompassing JJ. Rousseau's *Discours sur l'Origine et les Fondements de l'Inégalité parmi les Hommes* (1755), the "Scientific Socialism" (Marxism) of Marx and Engels, the Leninist application of Frederick Taylor's "Scientific Management", the debates between Ludwig von Mises and Oskar Lange in the 1930's, the emergence of Implementation Theory/Mechanism Design in post-war economic theory, and the emergence of an empirically testable economics of organization starting in the 1980's to the present.

**Keywords:** adaptation, incomplete contracting, economics of organization, inter, firm governance, system engineering

---

## A utopian consensus: The Growth ideal, the liberalization of socialism and the Melancholy of Politics

Iason Zarikos Panteion

University [Athens] – Greece

### Summary

Liberals and socialists had converged on a series of fundamental issues even before the fall of the Eastern Bloc. This paper suggests that the main reason behind this convergence was a historically distinct cluster of ideas, the ideology of incessant economic growth. We also suggest that the residual social suspicion on "unbridled consumerism" prevented growthism from exerting a complete ideological domination. Societies opted for incessant growth, socialists opted for free markets because of their perceived superiority in promoting growth but both them and their liberal opponents kept denouncing materialism as a second-order ideal.

Therefore, when liberals and socialists reached their utopian consensus of an economy that would expand forever, they did not deem their new dream worthy of its name: no growth radicalism has ever been recognized or celebrated thus, the self-proclaimed "end of ideologies" and great political projects. With only a handful of exceptions, the intellectual trajectory of growthism has not been studied despite its fundamental importance for interpreting the trajectory of liberalism and socialism worldwide. This neglect has produced grave conceptual confusion and the attendant plethora of misnomers: the rise of meta-democracy, the domination of economism and the broad family of concepts related to consumerism are analytical concepts that obscure rather than illuminate contemporary history. We suggest that they are byproducts of the

utopian consensus on incessant economic growth and its internal contradictions. Historians have not yet succeeded in disentangling their analytical concepts from the epistemologically naive discourse of ideologists. As a result, our knowledge on a series of fundamental topics such as the convergence of liberals and socialists, consumerism, contemporary environmentalism and, finally, the disillusionment of Western societies towards politics remains elusive.

To illuminate this utopian consensus, we shall discuss the famous and misinterpreted thesis on the End of History and other selected texts from the anglophone world and international organizations.

**Keywords:** Consensus, Ideology, Economic Growth, Liberalism

---

## **What went wrong with British socialism? The post-war United Kingdom through the lenses of Ralph Miliband.**

Anna Zielinska

Laboratoire Histoire des Sciences et de Philosophie - Archives Henri Poincaré– Université de Lorraine,  
Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique : UMR7117 – France

### **Summary**

In 2014, a UKIP member wrote about Edward Miliband that he was “Polish and not British [1] so how’d he know what’s good for Britain?” (Wintour 2014). The phrase as such is of course just an example of a xenophobic rant, but it is somehow curious: in what sense the then-Labour Party Leader born in Camden (London) could be seen as “Polish” by anyone? Ed’s and David’s Miliband family came indeed from Poland. Samuel (1895–1966) was a member of the Jewish Bund (an organisation of socialist workers in Poland), and moved to Belgium in the early 1920, along with his wife Renia. Their son, Ralph Miliband was born in 1924 in Brussels. After the end of the Second World War, the family reunited in London, where Samuel and Ralph waited for Reni and the daughter, Anna Helena.

Ralph later became not only a professor of politics at the LSE, but a leading British scholar of Marxism. His positions were considered by some of his contemporaries as a bit old fashioned (Samuel 1994, 266), yet his criticism of weak British socialism is an interesting entry point to understand the ideological struggles in the post-War Britain.

Notably, in 1961, Ralph Miliband proposed a thorough analysis of British parliamentary socialism, which he accused of its refusal not only of any revolutionary ambitions, but also of rejection of “any kind of political action (such as industrial action for political purposes) which fell, or which appeared to them to fall, outside the framework and conventions of the parliamentary system.” (Miliband 1961, 13). A few years later, he described the form of state of the post-war democratic regimes as “bourgeois democratic”, where “an economically dominant class rules through democratic institutions, rather than by way of dictatorship” (Miliband 1969, 22).

His critical work came with a hope, when he stated that the aim of socialists was to create an “authentically democratic social order, a truly free society of self-governing men and women, in which, in Marx’s phrase, the state will be converted ‘from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinate to it’” (Miliband 1969, 277). Whether this process was meant to happen by means of a revolution or of democratic (even though radical) re- forms, is not clear. Nevertheless today, almost forty years after Margaret Thatcher’s war on state has been declared in the UK, it is particularly interesting to see what kind of tools the 20th century British socialism left for the 21st century.

Ralph Miliband noted in his diary in 1940: “The Englishman is a rabid nationalist. They are perhaps the most nationalist people in the world ... When you hear the English talk of this war you sometimes almost want them to lose it to show them how things are. They have the greatest contempt for the continent in general and for the French in particular.” It is difficult to refute him when one reads Daily Mail headline in 2013: “The man who hated Britain” (Stoegner et Wodak 2016).

**Keywords:** Socialism, UK, political philosophy

---



## **Mill and Socialism: a reappraisal**

Michel Zouboulakis

University of Thessaly [Volos] – Greece

### **Summary**

John Stuart Mill, the author of the 19th c. liberal Bible *On Liberty* (1859), wrote extensively on Socialism. In his *Principles of Economics* (particularly after the 3d edition of 1852) and mostly in his *Chapters on Socialism*, published posthumously in 1879, Mill showed great interest for many aspects of the socialist organization of the economy and society. Nothing summarizes best his overall position on Socialism than his Preface in the 3d ed. of *Principles*: It appears to me that the great end of social improvement should be to fit mankind by cultivation, for a state of society combining the greatest personal freedom with that just distribution of the fruits of labour, which the present laws of property do not profess to aim at.

Mill's views puzzled many liberal economists in the 20th century, such as Lord Robbins and Friedrich von Hayek. The former concluded that "Mill's socialism proves to be much more like non-revolutionary syndicalism than anything which would be called socialism at the present day" (Robbins 1973). Hayek believed that Mill's socialist ideas came through the influence of his wife, Harriet Hardy-Taylor-Mill. In appraising his advance towards socialism in the consecutive editions of his *Principles*, Hayek concluded that "it was Mrs. Mill rather than John Stuart Mill to whom this is due" (Hayek 2015, 309).

On the opposite side, many Socialists also admired and praised Mill's inclinations, such as Sidney Webb and Harold Laski suggesting that he contributed significantly to the spread of socialist ideas in Britain. Nonetheless, we suggest here that Mill was clear on the nature of the ideal political institutions he aspired to: in a conflict-less quasi-egalitarian society institutions should be participatory and representative as they are the fittest to guarantee individual self-development.

**Keywords** : Mill, Liberalism, Socialism