

Chapter 1 : Karl Marx - Wikipedia

This bar-code number lets you verify that you're getting exactly the right version or edition of a book. The digit and digit formats both work.

Skepticism and Socialism from Rousseau to Foucault] Marxism and waiting for Godot First formulated in the mid-nineteenth century, classical Marxist socialism made two related pairs of claims, one pair economic and one pair moral. Morally, it argued, capitalism was evil both because of the self-interested motives of those engaged in capitalist competition and because of the exploitation and alienation that competition caused; socialism, by contrast, would be based on selfless sacrifice and communal sharing. The contradictions, they thought, would manifest themselves in increasing class conflict. As the exploitation increased, the proletariat would come to realize its alienation and oppression. At some point, the exploited proletariat would decide that it was not going to take it any more and revolution would ensue. They waited a long time. By the early part of the twentieth century, after several failed predictions of imminent revolution, not only was it becoming embarrassing to make further predictions, it was beginning to seem that capitalism was developing in a direction opposite to the way that Marxism said it should be developing. Three failed predictions Marxism was and is a class analysis, pitting economic classes against each other in a zero-sum competition. In that competition, the stronger parties would win each successive round of competition, forcing the weaker parties into more desperate straits. This class analysis yielded three definite predictions. First, it predicted that the proletariat would both increase as a percentage of the population and become poorer: Second, it predicted that the middle class would decrease to a very small percentage of the population: Third, it predicted that the capitalists would also decrease as a percentage of the population: Yet that was not how it worked out. By the early twentieth century it seemed that all three of the predictions failed to characterize the development of the capitalist countries. The class of manual laborers had both declined as a percentage of the population and become relatively better off. And the middle class had grown substantially both as a percentage of the population and in wealth, as had the upper class. Marxist socialism thus faced a set of theoretical problems: Why had the predictions not come to pass? Even more pressing was the practical problem of impatience: If the proletarian masses were the material of revolution, why were they not revolting? So what was to be done about the decidedly non-revolutionary working class? After decades of waiting hopefully and pouncing on any sign of worker dissatisfaction and unrest, the plain fact was that the proletariat was not going to revolt any time soon. Consequently, the waiting strategy needed to be rethought. Marxism on the Logic of Capitalism References [1] Werner Sombart, a Marxist early in his career, was among the first to rethink:

Chapter 2 : Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism : M.S. Frings :

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Marx was convinced that those middle decades of the nineteenth century were the twilight years of the capitalistic epoch of industrialization. His writings make it clear that he believed that the socialist revolution was right around the corner in his own lifetime. Rather than capital accumulation leading to a concentration of wealth and income, it has worked to disperse ownership and wealth among the members of industrial society. There have been at least two reasons for this development of capitalism. Financial Intermediation and the Dispersion of Wealth First, there has been the emergence of financial markets and financial intermediation. Modern banking and financial institutions emerged as intermediaries to collect and channel loanable funds from those who have greater or smaller savings to pass into the hands of those who have wanted to invest. To minimize the loss-risk from potential default on the part of borrowers, it was advantageous to disperse those funds to a wide spectrum of borrowers of varying size, types, and degrees of risk with corresponding interest charges and collateral requirements. That is, new capitalists, new property owners, new forms of capital accumulation were created. Rather than capital and wealth being concentrated, it became dispersed and widened as successful ventures generated profits from which new savings could be lent out to new borrowers through the same and expanding financial intermediary process. The developed market economy has generated a demand for a wide variety and spectrum of labor skills and talents. The outcome has not been a homogenization of labor, but the heterogeneity of labor varying in value and type. First, as capital accumulation and capital investment occurred over the decades, productive capital has tended to increase faster relative to the increase in the labor force population. Hence, the value of labor has, in general, risen in comparison to capital. Second, the improvement of productive capabilities through capital investment has raised the marginal product of labor. That is, with better tools and equipment, the productivity of labor per man-hour has gone up, and, thus, the productive value of each worker has risen as well. Third, while it is true that the replacement of some workers through capital investment results in the loss of particular jobs, through time since the same or a greater output can be obtained with fewer hands, this ultimately freed some workers for new tasks that could not be performed before. This creates new employment opportunities for work to be done that the society could not undertake earlier. If anything, in a developed system of division of labor, the employees and the employers in a particular industry or manufacture tend to have more in common with each other rather than with the respective workers or owners in another segment or corner of the market. Their common interest would be to use the government for forms of anti-competitive intervention to gain market share and profit advantages at the expense of producer rivals and consumers in the same or different markets for a greater amount of government assisted ill-gotten gains to divide among themselves. That is, the material activities of man in the pursuit of his survival and betterment. In the late nineteenth century, economists increasingly came to see the scarcity concept as central to economic understanding. Economics was re-formulated as the study of the principle of economizing behavior under the constraint of means insufficient to service all desire ends. In the 1870s and 1880s, economists developed an approach that extended and refined the economizing idea even further. That being the necessity to select among any and all competing ends when the means are insufficient to fulfill all of goals or purposes for which they might be applied. In this the individual compares all types of ends, regardless of their content. In the most general sense, there is, indeed, no such thing as the economic future. There is only the future in which economic factors are bound together, inexorably and quite without hope of separate identification, with the whole universe of forces determining the course of events. This pattern of causes and consequences, even when looked at after the event as history, almost paralyzes the mind with its intricacy. If the economic future can, indeed, be described, why not also the scientific future, the political future, the social future, the future in each and every sense? The more productive the society the more these types of ends are generally satisfied for the vast majority of people. As the Austrian

economist Ludwig von Mises pointed out, in *Theory and History*, this borders on anthropomorphism, the attributing to inanimate, lifeless objects, human conscious qualities: A machine is a device made by man. To ascribe to a machine any activity is anthropomorphism. The machine has no intelligence; it neither thinks nor chooses ends nor resorts to means for the realization of ends sought. This is always done by men. This fundamental thesis is open to three irrefutable objections. First, a technological invention is not something material. It is the product of a mental process, of reasoning and conceiving new ideas. The tools and machines may be called material, but the operation of the mind that created them is certainly spiritual. Second, mere invention and designing of technologically new implements are not sufficient to produce them. What is required, in addition to technological knowledge and planning, is capital previously accumulated out of saving. The production relations are thus not the product of the material productive forces but, on the contrary, the indispensable condition of their coming into existence. Furthermore, it must be remembered that the utilization of machines presupposes social cooperation under the division of labor. How then is it possible to explain the existence of society by tracing it back to the material productive forces which themselves can only appear in the frame of a previously existing social nexus? Machines, technologies, methods of production, emerge out of men having goals, and trying to figure out ways to attain them through devising means to construct those machines and tools for various purposes. Ideas, in other words, create machines; machines cannot and do not determinately create ideas. Why one particular set of goals rather than others? Why the human creative process resulting in a specific form of technology, and not some other? The bottom line is “we do not know. All that man is, is ultimately matter as physical beings, but how and why the physiology of men results in one set of ideas in their minds rather than some other set of ideas has never been answered. Marx, like many in his generation, was enthralled by the idea of the physical sciences as a key to all the mysteries of the universe. We do not know the origins of ideas. Historically, the development of a set of ideas within a particular individual can be traced, and the evolution of those ideas among individuals can be followed. Human Knowledge and the Unpredictability of the Future In his *Poverty of Historicism* philosopher of science, Karl Popper, famously pointed out the inescapable unpredictability of the future due to its dependency upon the knowledge that people possess and the impossibility of knowing today the knowledge that various people may only acquire tomorrow: The course of human history is strongly influenced by the growth of human knowledge. We cannot predict, by rational or scientific methods, the future growth of our scientific knowledge. We cannot, therefore, predict the future course of human history. This means that we must reject the possibility of a theoretical history; that is to say, of a historical social science that would correspond to theoretical physics. There can be no scientific theory of historical development serving as a basis for historical prediction. But what course the future holds in store is not only dependent upon the knowledge that individuals may acquire at various moments ahead, but how they understand and interpret that knowledge in the context of all they know and have experienced up until that time, and how they see its relevancy and usefulness given the goals and purposes they have decided to pursue and attempt to achieve which are, themselves, open to change as time passes and new experiences teach new things to each and every one of us. But the relation between the past, present, and future is chronological, not causal. How often the trends of the time seem inevitable and inescapable! Most people at the beginning of the twentieth century were confident that after all the political, social and economic achievements of the classical liberal order of the nineteenth century, the new century just dawning could only promise more personal freedom, greater material prosperity, and a likely secure peace for mankind. Many friends of liberty alive in the mids were deeply despondent, fearing or even believing that the epoch of freedom was ending with the rise of modern collectivism in the forms of the communist revolution in Russia, the fascist movement in Italy, the rise of Hitler and the Nazis to power in Germany, and the establishment of the New Deal in America. And many were concerned that another great war was coming that would end civilization as mankind had come to know it with the triumph of totalitarian collectivism everywhere. It did not turn out that way. During most of the post-World War II era that began in , many in the West were certain that Marxism, led and inspired by the Soviet Union and then Communist China, meant the end to liberal democracy and any form of market economy. It has not turned out that way. It does not have to happen that way. This is made easier when too

many among conservative or even some classical liberal circles sometimes falter or even fail to articulate and defend a consistent political and economic philosophy of individualism, free market capitalism, and strictly constitutionally limited government. History is the product and result of ideas — ideas about the nature of man, conceptions of how men could and should live together, and the political and economic institutional order of things that will best benefit humanity as the sum of the individuals making it up. What history has shown is that there has been greater human freedom, greater human prosperity, and greater human peace and tranquility during those times when the ideas of individual liberty, free markets, and limited government have most prevailed and been instituted in society. The greater the degree of government control, command, and coercion in society, the less these things have existed and blossomed. But this does not just happen. It requires each of us to understand the meaning, value and importance of liberty in that classical liberal and libertarian sense, and to be willing to defend and advance it among our fellow human beings. That is what would make history. The following two tabs change content below.

Chapter 3 : Mikhail Bakunin - Wikipedia

There is little more than a decade left before the bells allover the world will be ringing in the first hour of the twenty-first century, which will surely be an era of highly advanced technology. Looking back on the century that we live in, one can realize that generations of people who have.

Early years[edit] Mikhail Alexandrovich Bakunin was born to a Russian noble family "of only modest means" [3] they owned serfs [4] in the Pryamukhino village situated between Torzhok and Kuvshinovo. His father Alexander Mikhailovich Bakunin ru was a career diplomat who spent years serving in Italy and France and upon his return settled down at the paternal estate and turned a Marshal of Nobility. She came from the ancient noble Muravyov family that was founded during the 15th century by the Ryazan boyar Ivan Vasilievich Alapovsky nicknamed Muravey translates simply as "ant" who was granted lands in Veliky Novgorod. After Nicolas I became an Emperor, he gave up politics and devoted himself to the estate and his children five girls and five boys, the oldest of whom was Mikhail. In , he received a rank of Praporshchik and was seconded to serve in the Minsk and Grodno Governorates in one of the artillery brigades. In , he was seconded to Tver and from there went straight to his village. Though his father wished him to continue in either the military or the civil service, Bakunin decided to abandon both and made his way to Moscow, hoping to study philosophy. By autumn , Bakunin had conceived of forming a philosophical circle in his home town of Pryamukhino. Bakunin became increasingly influenced by Hegel and provided the first Russian translation of his work. In this period he began to develop his panslavic views. After long wrangles with his father, Bakunin went to Berlin in His stated plan at the time was still to become a university professor a "priest of truth" as he and his friends imagined it , but he soon encountered and joined students of the Young Hegelians and the socialist movement in Berlin. In his essay "The Reaction in Germany", he argued in favor of the revolutionary role of negation, summed up in the phrase "the passion for destruction is a creative passion". He abandoned his interest in an academic career, devoting more and more of his time to promoting revolution. The Russian government, becoming aware of this activity, ordered him to return to Russia. On his refusal, his property was confiscated. Until , he remained on friendly terms with the German communists, occasionally calling himself a communist and writing articles on communism in the Schweizerische Republikaner. This led to reports being circulated to the imperial police. Lelewel greatly influenced him, but he clashed with the Polish nationalists over their demand for a historic Poland based on the borders of before the Partitions of Poland as he defended the right of autonomy for the non-Polish peoples in these territories. He also did not support their clericalism and they did not support his calls for the emancipation of the peasantry. In , Bakunin went to Paris, then a centre of the European political current. He established contact with Karl Marx and Pierre-Joseph Proudhon , who greatly impressed him and with whom he formed a personal bond. In December , Emperor Nicholas issued a decree that stripped Bakunin of his privileges as a noble , confiscated his land in Russia, and condemned him to lifelong exile in Siberia. In another letter to the Constitutionel in March , he defended Poland following the repression of Catholics there. In his speech, Bakunin called for an alliance between the Polish and Russian peoples against the Emperor, and looked forward to "the definitive collapse of despotism in Russia. He spoke at a meeting organised by Lelewel in February about a great future for the Slavs, whose destiny was to rejuvenate the Western world. Around this time the Russian embassy circulated rumours that Bakunin was a Russian agent who had exceeded his orders. As the revolutionary movement of broke out, Bakunin was ecstatic, despite disappointment that little was happening in Russia. He left for Germany travelling through Baden to Frankfurt and Cologne. Much later in , Bakunin was to write: I must openly admit that in this controversy Marx and Engels were in the right. With characteristic insolence, they attacked Herwegh personally when he was not there to defend himself. In a face-to-face confrontation with them, I heatedly defended Herwegh, and our mutual dislike began then. The Congress was followed by an abortive insurrection that Bakunin had sought to promote and intensify but which was violently suppressed. As no barber was available, Rockel had to undertake the task. A small group of friends watched the operation, which had to be executed with a dull razor, causing no little pain, under which none but the victim himself

remained passive. We bade farewell to Bakunin with the firm conviction that we should never see him again alive. But in a week he was back once more, as he had realised immediately what a distorted account he had received as to the state of things in Prague, where all he found ready for him was a mere handful of childish students. Very similar to his expectations from the Prague students were his presumptions with regard to the Russian people. Bakunin published his Appeal to the Slavs [18] in the fall of , in which he proposed that Slav revolutionaries unite with Hungarian, Italian and German revolutionaries to overthrow the three major European autocracies, the Russian Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Kingdom of Prussia. Bakunin played a leading role in the May Uprising in Dresden in , helping to organize the defense of the barricades against Prussian troops with Richard Wagner and Wilhelm Heine. Bakunin was captured in Chemnitz and held for thirteen months before being condemned to death by the government of Saxony. His sentence was commuted to life to allow his extradition to Russia and Austria both of whom were seeking to prosecute him. In June , he was handed over to the Austrian authorities. Eleven months later he received a further death sentence but this too was commuted to life imprisonment. Finally, in May , Bakunin was handed over to the Russian authorities. Imprisonment, "confession" and exile[edit] Bakunin was taken to the Peter and Paul Fortress. At the beginning of his captivity, Count Orlov , an emissary of the Tsar, visited Bakunin and told him that the Tsar requested a written confession. It was here that he suffered from scurvy and all his teeth fell out as a result of the diet. He later recounted that he found some relief in mentally re-enacting the legend of Prometheus. His continuing imprisonment in these awful conditions led him to entreat his brother to supply him with poison. Bakunin and Antonina Kwiatkowska, circa Novelist Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn in his book *The Gulag Archipelago* published in recounts that Bakunin "abjectly groveled before Nicholas I" thereby avoiding execution. Was this wretchedness of soul? Within a year of arriving in Tomsk, Bakunin married Antonina Kwiatkowska, the daughter of a Polish merchant. He had been teaching her French. Muravyov was a liberal and Bakunin, as his relative, became a particular favourite. In the spring of Muravyov helped Bakunin with a job for Amur Development Agency which enabled him to move with his wife to Irkutsk , the capital of Eastern Siberia. Resenting the treatment of the colony by the Saint Petersburg bureaucracy, including its use as a dumping ground for malcontents, a proposal for a United States of Siberia emerged, independent of Russia and federated into a new United States of Siberia and America, following the example of the United States of America. Muravyov was forced to retire from his post as governor general, partly because of his liberal views and partly due to fears he might take Siberia towards independence. He was replaced by Korsakov, who perhaps was even more sympathetic to the plight of the Siberian exiles. Escape from exile and return to Europe[edit] On 5 June , Bakunin left Irkutsk under cover of company business, ostensibly employed by a Siberian merchant to make a trip to Nikolaevsk. By 17 July, he was on board the Russian warship *Strelok* bound for Kastri. However, in the port of Olga , Bakunin managed to persuade the American captain of the *SS Vickery* to take him on board. Despite bumping into the Russian Consul on board, Bakunin was able to sail away under the nose of the Russian Imperial Navy. In that Yokohama boarding-house we encountered an outlaw from the Wild West Heine, presumably as well as many other interesting guests. The presence of the Russian revolutionist Michael Bakunin, in flight from Siberia, was as far as one could see being winked at by the authorities. He was well-endowed with money, and none who came to know him could fail to pay their respects. Koe and Joseph Heco. In the period before the transcontinental railroads had been completed, the quickest way to New York was via Panama. Bakunin boarded the *Orizaba* for Panama, where after waiting for two weeks he boarded the *Champion* for New York. Bakunin immediately went to London to see Herzen. That evening he burst into the drawing-room where the family was having supper. Are you sitting down eating oysters! Tell me the news. What is happening, and where?! In , while still in Irkutsk , Bakunin and his political associates had been greatly impressed by Giuseppe Garibaldi and his expedition to Sicily , during which he declared himself dictator in the name of Victor Emmanuel II. Following his return to London, he wrote to Garibaldi on 31 January If you could have seen as I did the passionate enthusiasm of the whole town of Irkutsk, the capital of Eastern Siberia, at the news of your triumphal march across the possession of the mad king of Naples, you would have said as I did that there is no longer space or frontiers. Garibaldi was then engaged in preparations for the Expedition against

Rome. By June, he had resolved to move to Italy, but was waiting for his wife to join him. When he left for Italy in August, Mazzini wrote to Maurizio Quadrio, one of his key supporters that Bakunin was a good and dependable person. Bakunin returned to England in September and focussed on Polish affairs. When the Polish insurrection broke out in January , he sailed to Copenhagen where he hoped to join the Polish insurgents. This attempt failed, and Bakunin met his wife in Stockholm before returning to London. Now he focussed again on going to Italy and his friend Aurelio Saffi wrote him letters of introduction for Florence , Turin and Milan. It was here that he first began to develop his anarchist ideas. Bakunin conceived the plan of forming a secret organization of revolutionaries to carry on propaganda work and prepare for direct action. By July , Bakunin was informing Herzen and Ogarev about the fruits of his work over the previous two years. Among his Polish associates was the former insurgent , Walery Mroczkowski who became a friend and translator into French. He supported freedom of association and the right of secession for each unit of the federation, but emphasized that this freedom must be joined with socialism for "[l]iberty without socialism is privilege, injustice; socialism without liberty is slavery and brutality". Bakunin played a prominent role in the Geneva Conference September , and joined the Central Committee. The founding conference was attended by 6, people. As Bakunin rose to speak: This solemn meeting of two old and tried warriors of the revolution produced an astonishing impression. Mratchkovsky and others found themselves in a minority. They seceded from the League establishing their own International Alliance of Socialist Democracy which adopted a revolutionary socialist program. Bakunin was instrumental in establishing branches of the International in Italy and Spain. In , the Social Democratic Alliance was refused entry to the First International on the grounds that it was an international organisation in itself, and only national organisations were permitted membership in the International. The Alliance dissolved and the various groups which it comprised joined the International separately.

Philosophy Of Prediction And Capitalism pdf download Capitalism: Capitalism is an economic system, dominant in the Western world since the breakup of feudalism, in which most means of production are privately held and production, prices, and incomes are determined by markets.

A precocious schoolchild, Marx studied law in Bonn and Berlin, and then wrote a PhD thesis in Philosophy, comparing the views of Democritus and Epicurus. On completion of his doctorate in Marx hoped for an academic job, but he had already fallen in with too radical a group of thinkers and there was no real prospect. Turning to journalism, Marx rapidly became involved in political and social issues, and soon found himself having to consider communist theory. Of his many early writings, four, in particular, stand out. The German Ideology, co-written with Engels in , was also unpublished but this is where we see Marx beginning to develop his theory of history. This was again jointly written with Engels and published with a great sense of excitement as Marx returned to Germany from exile to take part in the revolution of With the failure of the revolution Marx moved to London where he remained for the rest of his life. He now concentrated on the study of economics, producing, in , his Contribution to a Critique of Political Economy. In what follows, I shall concentrate on those texts and issues that have been given the greatest attention within the Anglo-American philosophical literature. Bauer had recently written against Jewish emancipation, from an atheist perspective, arguing that the religion of both Jews and Christians was a barrier to emancipation. In responding to Bauer, Marx makes one of the most enduring arguments from his early writings, by means of introducing a distinction between political emancipation “ essentially the grant of liberal rights and liberties ” and human emancipation. However, pushing matters deeper, in an argument reinvented by innumerable critics of liberalism, Marx argues that not only is political emancipation insufficient to bring about human emancipation, it is in some sense also a barrier. Liberal rights and ideas of justice are premised on the idea that each of us needs protection from other human beings who are a threat to our liberty and security. Therefore liberal rights are rights of separation, designed to protect us from such perceived threats. Freedom on such a view, is freedom from interference. What this view overlooks is the possibility “ for Marx, the fact “ that real freedom is to be found positively in our relations with other people. It is to be found in human community, not in isolation. Accordingly, insisting on a regime of rights encourages us to view each other in ways that undermine the possibility of the real freedom we may find in human emancipation. Now we should be clear that Marx does not oppose political emancipation, for he sees that liberalism is a great improvement on the systems of feudalism and religious prejudice and discrimination which existed in the Germany of his day. Nevertheless, such politically emancipated liberalism must be transcended on the route to genuine human emancipation. Unfortunately, Marx never tells us what human emancipation is, although it is clear that it is closely related to the idea of non-alienated labour, which we will explore below. Just as importantly Marx here also considers the question of how revolution might be achieved in Germany, and sets out the role of the proletariat in bringing about the emancipation of society as a whole. Precisely what it is about material life that creates religion is not set out with complete clarity. However, it seems that at least two aspects of alienation are responsible. One is alienated labour, which will be explored shortly. A second is the need for human beings to assert their communal essence. Whether or not we explicitly recognize it, human beings exist as a community, and what makes human life possible is our mutual dependence on the vast network of social and economic relations which engulf us all, even though this is rarely acknowledged in our day-to-day life. After the post-Reformation fragmentation of religion, where religion is no longer able to play the role even of a fake community of equals, the state fills this need by offering us the illusion of a community of citizens, all equal in the eyes of the law. Interestingly, the political liberal state, which is needed to manage the politics of religious diversity, takes on the role offered by religion in earlier times of providing a form of illusory community. But the state and religion will both be transcended when a genuine community of social and economic equals is created. Of course we are owed an answer to the question how such a society could be created. It is interesting to read Marx here in the light of his third Thesis on Feuerbach where he criticises an

alternative theory. The crude materialism of Robert Owen and others assumes that human beings are fully determined by their material circumstances, and therefore to bring about an emancipated society it is necessary and sufficient to make the right changes to those material circumstances. However, how are those circumstances to be changed? By an enlightened philanthropist like Owen who can miraculously break through the chain of determination which ties down everyone else? Indeed if they do not create the revolution for themselves – in alliance, of course, with the philosopher – they will not be fit to receive it. However, the manuscripts are best known for their account of alienated labour. Here Marx famously depicts the worker under capitalism as suffering from four types of alienated labour. First, from the product, which as soon as it is created is taken away from its producer. Second, in productive activity work which is experienced as a torment. Third, from species-being, for humans produce blindly and not in accordance with their truly human powers. Finally, from other human beings, where the relation of exchange replaces the satisfaction of mutual need. Essentially he attempts to apply a Hegelian deduction of categories to economics, trying to demonstrate that all the categories of bourgeois economics – wages, rent, exchange, profit, etc. Consequently each category of alienated labour is supposed to be deducible from the previous one. However, Marx gets no further than deducing categories of alienated labour from each other. Quite possibly in the course of writing he came to understand that a different methodology is required for approaching economic issues. Nevertheless we are left with a very rich text on the nature of alienated labour. Both sides of our species essence are revealed here: It is important to understand that for Marx alienation is not merely a matter of subjective feeling, or confusion. In our daily lives we take decisions that have unintended consequences, which then combine to create large-scale social forces which may have an utterly unpredicted, and highly damaging, effect. For example, for as long as a capitalist intends to stay in business he must exploit his workers to the legal limit. Whether or not wracked by guilt the capitalist must act as a ruthless exploiter. Similarly the worker must take the best job on offer; there is simply no other sane option. But by doing this we reinforce the very structures that oppress us. Several of these have been touched on already for example, the discussions of religion in theses 4, 6 and 7, and revolution in thesis 3 so here I will concentrate only on the first, most overtly philosophical, thesis. Materialism is complimented for understanding the physical reality of the world, but is criticised for ignoring the active role of the human subject in creating the world we perceive. Idealism, at least as developed by Hegel, understands the active nature of the human subject, but confines it to thought or contemplation: Marx combines the insights of both traditions to propose a view in which human beings do indeed create – or at least transform – the world they find themselves in, but this transformation happens not in thought but through actual material activity; not through the imposition of sublime concepts but through the sweat of their brow, with picks and shovels. Economics Capital Volume 1 begins with an analysis of the idea of commodity production. A commodity is defined as a useful external object, produced for exchange on a market. Thus two necessary conditions for commodity production are the existence of a market, in which exchange can take place, and a social division of labour, in which different people produce different products, without which there would be no motivation for exchange. Marx suggests that commodities have both use-value – a use, in other words – and an exchange-value – initially to be understood as their price. Use value can easily be understood, so Marx says, but he insists that exchange value is a puzzling phenomenon, and relative exchange values need to be explained. Why does a quantity of one commodity exchange for a given quantity of another commodity? His explanation is in terms of the labour input required to produce the commodity, or rather, the socially necessary labour, which is labour exerted at the average level of intensity and productivity for that branch of activity within the economy. Thus the labour theory of value asserts that the value of a commodity is determined by the quantity of socially necessary labour time required to produce it. Marx provides a two stage argument for the labour theory of value. As commodities can be exchanged against each other, there must, Marx argues, be a third thing that they have in common. Both steps of the argument are, of course, highly contestable. Capitalism is distinctive, Marx argues, in that it involves not merely the exchange of commodities, but the advancement of capital, in the form of money, with the purpose of generating profit through the purchase of commodities and their transformation into other commodities which can command a higher price, and thus yield a profit. Marx claims that no previous theorist has been able adequately to explain

how capitalism as a whole can make a profit. The cost of this commodity is determined in the same way as the cost of every other; i. Suppose that such commodities take four hours to produce. Thus the first four hours of the working day is spent on producing value equivalent to the value of the wages the worker will be paid. This is known as necessary labour. Any work the worker does above this is known as surplus labour, producing surplus value for the capitalist. Surplus value, according to Marx, is the source of all profit. Other commodities simply pass their value on to the finished commodities, but do not create any extra value. They are known as constant capital. Profit, then, is the result of the labour performed by the worker beyond that necessary to create the value of his or her wages. This is the surplus value theory of profit. It appears to follow from this analysis that as industry becomes more mechanised, using more constant capital and less variable capital, the rate of profit ought to fall. For as a proportion less capital will be advanced on labour, and only labour can create value. In Capital Volume 3 Marx does indeed make the prediction that the rate of profit will fall over time, and this is one of the factors which leads to the downfall of capitalism. A further consequence of this analysis is a difficulty for the theory that Marx did recognise, and tried, albeit unsuccessfully, to meet also in Capital Volume 3. It follows from the analysis so far that labour intensive industries ought to have a higher rate of profit than those which use less labour. Not only is this empirically false, it is theoretically unacceptable. Accordingly, Marx argued that in real economic life prices vary in a systematic way from values. Although there are known techniques for solving this problem now albeit with unwelcome side consequences, we should recall that the labour theory of value was initially motivated as an intuitively plausible theory of price. But when the connection between price and value is rendered as indirect as it is in the final theory, the intuitive motivation of the theory drains away. Any commodity can be picked to play a similar role. Consequently with equal justification one could set out a corn theory of value, arguing that corn has the unique power of creating more value than it costs. Formally this would be identical to the labour theory of value. Nevertheless, the claims that somehow labour is responsible for the creation of value, and that profit is the consequence of exploitation, remain intuitively powerful, even if they are difficult to establish in detail. However, even if the labour theory of value is considered discredited, there are elements of his theory that remain of worth. Both provide a salutary corrective to aspects of orthodox economic theory. Theory of History Marx did not set out his theory of history in great detail. Accordingly, it has to be constructed from a variety of texts, both those where he attempts to apply a theoretical analysis to past and future historical events, and those of a more purely theoretical nature. However, *The German Ideology*, co-written with Engels in 1845, is a vital early source in which Marx first sets out the basics of the outlook of historical materialism.

Chapter 5 : Kenneth Stickers, Manfred S. Frings, Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism - PhilPapers

This is to express profound gratitude to Mr. George Miller, Graduate Assistant, Department of Philosophy, DePaul University, for having aided me.

Definition Socialism is an economic philosophy based on the need for regulations on capitalism. Unchecked capitalism, most economists agree, can create serious problems in the long term, since short-term personal profit does not motivate companies to take care of infrastructure, the environment, or their workers. Socialists emphasize this fact and argue that only the government can solve the problems created by capitalism. Other economic philosophies generally acknowledge the problem, but advocate other solutions to it, while only a few extremists deny that there is any problem with absolute capitalism. Although many people think that socialism and capitalism are completely incompatible systems, the fact is that most developed nations operate on a combination of both. For example, nearly every major city in the developed world has some system of government-run public transportation, such as bus lines or a subway. There are also laws against child labor, unsafe workplaces, and reckless pollution, and government programs that help provide education, food, and healthcare to the poor. All of these are socialist ideas that exist in relative harmony with capitalist economies.

Types of Socialism Socialists tend to be active social and political theorists, and have developed a bewildering array of different schools of thought. These various schools disagree on almost everything, but they all agree that unchecked capitalism is a dangerous and destructive force. Also, these schools are not mutually exclusive: Here is a small sample of some forms that socialism can take: Communism This is one of the most extreme forms of socialism, and a highly controversial political philosophy. We will explore Communism in greater detail in section 3, but for now you can think of Communism as a highly exaggerated form of socialism though some socialists argue that Communism is actually not socialist at all! Market Socialism The government has an important role to play in protecting the poor, the environment, and future generations, but should not set prices or interfere too much in the market. Often combined with democratic socialism, or the view that socialism should be based on elections. Many countries in Europe pursue this model, which has helped them limit the effects of extreme poverty, but also imposes high tax burdens and in some cases, when not managed well, can create budget problems. Christian Socialism Lots of people today argue that socialism is anti-religion, but this is far from the truth. In fact, socialism is in many ways based on religion: Christianity heavily emphasizes helping the poor, an idea that would ultimately evolve into European socialism. Eco-Socialism No one can deny that our planet is facing serious environmental challenges, from burning rainforests to bleached corals and melting glaciers. Eco-socialists argue that these problems can only be solved by government intervention, and that the capitalist profit motive cannot be reconciled with environmental protection. They advocate strict limits on pollution and extractive industries such as mining, fishing, and drilling. Socialist Anarchism Anarchism is an extraordinary family of political philosophies, some of which belong to the socialist tradition. Socialist anarchists believe that a socialist society can only emerge from the destruction of all existing governments, and argue that new, more socialistic systems will emerge after this worldwide collapse. Nazism belongs to the family of fascist ideologies, which are based on authoritarian capitalism rather than on socialism. Hitler criticized both capitalism and socialism, seeing his philosophy as a new, third approach. Marxism Refers to any of the philosophies derived from the works of Karl Marx. Marx was an extremely energetic writer, and his ideas are central in fields from economics and history to cinema and comparative literature. Above all, he was an economist who tried to understand the inherent structure of capitalism. He argued that capitalist economies inevitably favor those at the top, and that working-class people were always exploited either in overt ways unsafe conditions, wage theft, unfair hiring practices, etc. In addition, the culture of a capitalist society is set up to favor the rich, as media, advertising, film, etc. Marx lived before the age of mass media and advertising, so this aspect of his theory was mostly developed by later Marxists. Communism Marx was inspired by socialism, an economic philosophy that already existed in Europe. He agreed with the socialists that capitalism was creating problems for the working class, and his philosophy tried to explain why and how that could happen. In cooperation with a few other socialist

philosophers, Marx invented Communism, an extreme form of socialism that would become extremely influential throughout the world. Communism eventually grew into a complete philosophy of government – in other words, whereas socialism is basically an economic philosophy, Communism is a broader philosophy covering economics, politics, culture, history, and even art. Some of its central ideas include: The need for revolution. Marx did not believe this could be achieved through nonviolence. After the revolution, Communist believed, they could set up a society without any class inequality, one in which everyone shared in the resources equally. Unfortunately for Marx and his followers, the predictions did not prove true, as we will see in section 5. As a result, Communism has become fairly unpopular in the developed world. And yet I am not so opposed to capitalism that I have failed to see its relative merits. It started out with a noble and high motive, [namely] to block the trade monopolies of nobles, but like most human system it fell victim to the very thing it was revolting against [i.e. So today capitalism has outlived its usefulness. Democratic Socialists like Martin Luther King argued that American capitalism was built on the exploitation of the poor, especially slaves and their descendants. When I ask why the poor have no food, they call me a Communist. He argued that Christianity meant not just helping the poor, but actively working to counteract the systems that kept them poor. He famously argued that he was not a Marxist because his socialism was derived straight from the example of Jesus Christ, not from modern European philosophers. The History and Importance of Socialism Because socialism is such a complex and diverse family of philosophies, its origins are difficult to trace accurately. What we can say is that modern-day socialism was born along with many other radical philosophies during the Enlightenment. Nearly all of our modern-day political philosophies are the children and grandchildren of the Enlightenment, including liberalism, socialism, conservatism, libertarianism, Communism, anarchism, and even fascism. It was an extremely fertile period for political philosophy! Socialism started to solidify in the early 19th century, when Europe was wracked with political turmoil. Anti-monarchists in France had succeeded in overthrowing the government in 1792, but they had been unable to agree on what kind of government should be established in its place. The result was a period of various authoritarian governments punctuated by bloody revolutions. Marx advocated a worldwide Communist revolution and predicted that these uprisings would be followed by a Dictatorship of the Proletariat, and then, over time, the withering away of the state so that a stable Communist society could be achieved. In many countries, Communist revolutions did take place, but none of them ever got past the so-called Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Rather than withering away as it was supposed to, the state always seemed to get more and more powerful in these countries. The most obvious example is the Soviet Union, which continued to have an extremely powerful and centralized state for decades after its revolution was carried out. The Soviet state never withered away, but instead collapsed and was replaced by the modern Russian Federation, which is also highly authoritarian. Others, however, criticized the Soviets for their heavy-handed authoritarianism and their suppression of political debate. Socialists continue to be active in America today, though they have rarely used that term to describe their own movements. Socialists want to build on the accomplishments of their predecessors in the previous century and advocate for a society based on the model of Democratic Socialist countries such as Norway and Finland. Socialism in Popular Culture Example 1 The setting for Wall-E could be interpreted as eco-socialist, since it shows how a capitalist corporation Buy-N-Large polluted the entire planet and made it unsuitable for life. This implies that if there had been stronger regulations the planet might have been saved. Superman is here to rescue them. Red Son imagines the story of Superman with one twist: He has all the same powers as the traditional Superman, but his philosophy is reversed. In the comic, his arch-enemy is still the same: Lex Luthor, evil genius billionaire. Like many economic and political philosophies, this word comes in two forms:

Chapter 6 : Download Philosophy Of Prediction And Capitalism read id:wmnj5wt

There is little more than a decade left before the bells all over the world will be ringing in the first hour of the twenty-first century, which will surely be an era of highly advanced technology.

Biography Childhood and early education: The family occupied two rooms on the ground floor and three on the first floor. A classical liberal, he took part in agitation for a constitution and reforms in Prussia, then governed by an absolute monarchy. Lion Philips was a wealthy Dutch tobacco manufacturer and industrialist, upon whom Karl and Jenny Marx would later often come to rely for loans while they were exiled in London. By employing many liberal humanists as teachers, Wyttenbach incurred the anger of the local conservative government. Subsequently, police raided the school in and discovered that literature espousing political liberalism was being distributed among the students. He became engaged to Jenny von Westphalen, an educated baroness of the Prussian ruling class who had known Marx since childhood. As she had broken off her engagement with a young aristocrat to be with Marx, their relationship was socially controversial owing to the differences between their religious and class origins, but Marx befriended her father Ludwig von Westphalen a liberal aristocrat and later dedicated his doctoral thesis to him. Hegel, whose ideas were then widely debated among European philosophical circles. Marx was also engaged in writing his doctoral thesis, *The Difference Between the Democritean and Epicurean Philosophy of Nature*, [57] which he completed in It was described as "a daring and original piece of work in which Marx set out to show that theology must yield to the superior wisdom of philosophy". Marx decided instead to submit his thesis to the more liberal University of Jena, whose faculty awarded him his PhD in April There they scandalised their class by getting drunk, laughing in church and galloping through the streets on donkeys. Marx criticised both right-wing European governments as well as figures in the liberal and socialist movements whom he thought ineffective or counter-productive. Initially living with Ruge and his wife communally at 23 Rue Vaneau, they found the living conditions difficult, so moved out following the birth of their daughter Jenny in Based in Paris, the paper was connected to the League of the Just, a utopian socialist secret society of workers and artisans. Marx attended some of their meetings, but did not join. This work was published in as *The Holy Family*. Simon and Charles Fourier [85] and the history of France. Still Marx was always drawn back to his economic studies: However, to stay in Belgium he had to pledge not to publish anything on the subject of contemporary politics. Engels had already spent two years living in Manchester from November [] to August In *German Ideology*, Marx and Engels finally completed their philosophy, which was based solely on materialism as the sole motor force in history. This was the intent of the new book that Marx was planning, but to get the manuscript past the government censors he called the book *The Poverty of Philosophy* [] and offered it as a response to the "petty bourgeois philosophy" of the French anarchist socialist Pierre-Joseph Proudhon as expressed in his book *The Philosophy of Poverty* While residing in Brussels in, Marx continued his association with the secret radical organisation League of the Just. Accordingly, in June the League was reorganised by its membership into a new open "above ground" political society that appealed directly to the working classes. No longer a secret society, the Communist League wanted to make aims and intentions clear to the general public rather than hiding its beliefs as the League of the Just had been doing. Proceeding on from this, the Manifesto presents the argument for why the Communist League, as opposed to other socialist and liberal political parties and groups at the time, was truly acting in the interests of the proletariat to overthrow capitalist society and to replace it with socialism. Designed to put forward news from across Europe with his own Marxist interpretation of events, the newspaper featured Marx as a primary writer and the dominant editorial influence. Despite contributions by fellow members of the Communist League, according to Friedrich Engels it remained "a simple dictatorship by Marx". With his wife Jenny expecting their fourth child and not able to move back to Germany or Belgium, in August he sought refuge in London. The headquarters of the Communist League also moved to London. However, in the winter of 1847 a split within the ranks of the Communist League occurred when a faction within it led by August Willich and Karl Schapper began agitating for an immediate uprising. Willich and Schapper believed that once the Communist League had initiated the uprising, the entire working

class from across Europe would rise "spontaneously" to join it, thus creating revolution across Europe. Marx and Engels protested that such an unplanned uprising on the part of the Communist League was "adventuristic" and would be suicide for the Communist League. Marx maintained that this would spell doom for the Communist League itself, arguing that changes in society are not achieved overnight through the efforts and will power of a handful of men. In the present stage of development circa 1848, following the defeat of the uprisings across Europe in he felt that the Communist League should encourage the working class to unite with progressive elements of the rising bourgeoisie to defeat the feudal aristocracy on issues involving demands for governmental reforms, such as a constitutional republic with freely elected assemblies and universal male suffrage. In other words, the working class must join with bourgeois and democratic forces to bring about the successful conclusion of the bourgeois revolution before stressing the working class agenda and a working class revolution. In London, without finances to run a newspaper themselves, he and Engels turned to international journalism. The Tribune was a vehicle for Marx to reach a transatlantic public to make a "hidden war" to Henry Charles Carey []. The journal had wide working-class appeal from its foundation; at two cents, it was inexpensive; [] and, with about 50,000 copies per issue, its circulation was the widest in the United States. Marx had sent his articles on Tuesdays and Fridays, but, that October, the Tribune discharged all its correspondents in Europe except Marx and B. Taylor, and reduced Marx to a weekly article. Between September and November 1848, only five were published. After a six-month interval, Marx resumed contributions in September until March 1849, when Dana wrote to inform him that there was no longer space in the Tribune for reports from London, due to American domestic affairs. In all, 67 Marx-Engels articles were published, of which 51 written by Engels, although Marx did some research for them in the British Museum. After the "failures" of 1848, the revolutionary impetus appeared spent and not to be renewed without an economic recession. Contention arose between Marx and his fellow communists, whom he denounced as "adventurists". Marx deemed it fanciful to propose that "will power" could be sufficient to create the revolutionary conditions when in reality the economic component was the necessary requisite. Yet, this economy was seen as too immature for a capitalist revolution. Moreover, any economic crisis arising in the United States would not lead to revolutionary contagion of the older economies of individual European nations, which were closed systems bounded by their national borders. When the so-called "Panic of 1847" in the United States spread globally, it broke all economic theory models, [] and was the first truly global economic crisis. Financial necessity had forced Marx to abandon economic studies in 1847 and give thirteen years to working on other projects. He had always sought to return to economics. However, the departure of Charles Dana from the paper in late 1848 and the resultant change in the editorial board brought about a new editorial policy. The new editorial board supported an immediate peace between the Union and the Confederacy in the Civil War in the United States with slavery left intact in the Confederacy. Marx strongly disagreed with this new political position and in 1849 was forced to withdraw as a writer for the Tribune. In response to the bloody suppression of this rebellion, Marx wrote one of his most famous pamphlets, "The Civil War in France", a defence of the Commune. This work was intended merely as a preview of his three-volume *Das Kapital* English title: *Critique of Political Economy*, which he intended to publish at a later date. The work was enthusiastically received, and the edition sold out quickly. No longer was there any "natural reward of individual labour. Each labourer produces only some part of a whole, and each part having no value or utility of itself, there is nothing on which the labourer can seize, and say: By the autumn of 1848, the entire first edition of the German language edition of *Capital* had been sold out and a second edition was published. The Process of Circulation of Capital. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole.

Chapter 7 : Karl Marx (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism (Martinus Nijhoff Philosophy Library Book 20) - Kindle edition by M.S. Frings. Download it once and read it on your Kindle device, PC, phones or tablets. Use features like bookmarks, note taking and highlighting while reading Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism (Martinus Nijhoff Philosophy Library.

Chapter 8 : Socialism: Examples and Definition | Philosophy Terms

This entry has no external links. Add one.; Setup an account with your affiliations in order to access resources via your University's proxy server Configure custom proxy (use this if your affiliation does not provide a proxy).

Chapter 9 : M.S. Frings: Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism (PDF) - ebook download - english

'Philosophy of Prediction and Capitalism' by M.S. Frings is a digital PDF ebook for direct download to PC, Mac, Notebook, Tablet, iPad, iPhone, Smartphone, eReader - but not for Kindle. A DRM capable reader equipment is required.