

# **Politics and Contemporary European Studies and Sociology Departments**

Final year course

## **The Death of Socialism?**

**Convenor and Tutor: Luke Martell**  
[l.martell@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:l.martell@sussex.ac.uk)

**Autumn Term 2010**

## **Course: The Death of Socialism?**

### **Aims and objectives of the course**

Following the collapse of state socialism in Central and Eastern Europe and elsewhere, the erosion of central principles of Western social democracy and the prevalence of free market and capitalist ideas in the first decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, this course looks at the contemporary condition of socialism. Is socialism a relevant, feasible or desirable idea in contemporary society? Or is it dead, merely an historical relic of the 20<sup>th</sup> century?

The course will start by looking at the two predominant conceptions and experiences of socialism in the twentieth century - Marxist and social democratic socialism. What are the main features of these models of socialism? It will then examine criticisms of socialism from liberals and libertarians - such as Hayek and Nozick - and from new social movements - such as the women's movement and the green movement. What critical points are raised by these perspectives and how telling are they? We will look at reasons for the collapse of state socialism in the late 1980s and at attempts in the West to rethink socialism during an era in which neo-liberalism was a dominant force.

Do liberal and new social movements' criticisms and the collapse of state socialism suggest that socialism is dead? Did attempts to redefine socialism (as market socialism or radical democratic socialism) escape the criticisms of liberals and the new social movements and the problems experienced under old social democracy and state socialism? Or do they indicate that the era of socialism has well and truly passed?

In the final three topics we shall address this question further. We will discuss whether globalisation, for instance in the form of the global mobility of capital and finance, has led to the decline and loss of viability of social democracy. We will examine the attempt of Labour in Britain and current European social democrats to respond to the crisis of social democracy and will ask whether there is anything remaining of socialism in such attempts. We shall examine theses such as that of Fukuyama: that the day of socialism has passed and that capitalism has won the battle of the two ideologies and systems.

By the end of the course you should have a good critical understanding of:

- the main features of Marxist and social democratic conceptions of socialism and the differences between them
- New Right criticisms of socialism by Hayek and Nozick and ways in which they are distinctive and differ
- criticisms of socialism from ecological and feminist perspectives and arguments from such perspectives which suggest the continuing relevance of socialism
- different explanations for the collapse of state socialism and for crises in contemporary social democracy
- a critical understanding of attempts to redefine or revive socialism and social democracy, namely New Labour, market socialism and radical democratic socialism, and of the extent to which social democracy is undermined by globalisation
- an understanding of theses such as Fukuyama's that socialism is dead and capitalist liberal democracy is the dominant form of political and economic organization.

### **Topics**

Week 1      Introductory Meeting: what is socialism? Is socialism dead?

**Block 1: Different Forms of Socialist Thinking**

- Week 2 Marxist Ideas of Socialism  
Week 3 Social Democratic Ideas of Socialism

**Block 2: Criticisms of Socialism**

- Week 4 Socialism and its NeoLiberal Critics: Hayek and Nozick on Constructivism and Equality  
Week 5 Socialism and its New Social Movement Critics: Green and Feminist Criticisms of Socialism

**Block 3: Rethinking Socialism in the 1980s**

- Week 6 The Collapse of State Socialism In Central and Eastern Europe  
Week 7 Rethinking Socialism in the NeoLiberal Era: Market Socialism and Radical Democratic Socialism

**Block 4: The Death of Socialism?**

- Week 8 Globalisation and Social Democracy: has Globalisation led to the end of Social Democracy?  
Week 9 The Crisis and Rethinking of Social Democracy: New Labour, the Third Way and European Social Democracy  
Week 10 Fukuyama versus Chavez: Has Capitalism won the Battle with Socialism?

**Contacts**

**Convenor and Tutor:** Luke Martell, Friston 261, phone (67)8729, email [L.Martell@sussex.ac.uk](mailto:L.Martell@sussex.ac.uk). Tutor and person with overall responsibility for the course. Luke will have weekly office hours when you can see him without appointment – he will let you know when these are at the start of term.

Important information about the course may also be sent to you by email (eg any changes to timetabling arrangements or information which supplements that in this course document). You should check your email daily. You can access your email from off-campus via roundcube on the Sussex website.

**Seminars**

This course is taught by 10 two-hour weekly seminars. There are no lectures. The limiting of contact time to a seminar is because of the amount of credits the course is worth.

For the 30 credit sociology version of this course there is also individual supervision in the summer for the dissertation. This is not relevant to the 24 credit Polces version.

You should use the questions listed each week (and the blurb for each topic) to guide your reading. Come to seminars with your own answers to as many of the questions as you can, prepared to discuss them with the group.

If you find it difficult to get a word in please just raise your hand and I'll make sure you can contribute.

## **Reading**

Some of the main readings, listed in this course outline, will be available in a photocopied pack at a venue and time to be notified. There will be small charge to cover the cost of photocopying. We get this done at a low rate to minimise the cost to you.

The study pack will only cover some of the weeks of the course as for some other weeks readings are online, at links or on Study Direct.

You should try to do all the main reading listed each week, except where suggested otherwise (for example, in weeks where more than one topic is covered and it's suggested you choose between two areas). You should also try and dip into some of the secondary commentaries. The secondary commentaries are listed in rough order of priority and can also be used as further reading on topics you want to write an essay about.

On the basis that you are taking four courses this term you should spend about 9 hours a week in seminars and outside them working for this course. This includes time reading for each topic and writing essays.

## **Essays and assessment**

There are Polces and sociology versions of this course. You need to make sure you know which version you are taking. The content and teaching for the course is the same for both versions but the credits and assessment varies.

The Polces course SC030 worth 24 credits is assessed by one coursework essay of 2000 words in the autumn and a 4000 word extended essay submitted in the summer term.

The sociology version L2137 of the course is worth 30 credits and assessed by one coursework essay of 2000 words in the autumn and a 6000 word extended essay submitted in the summer term, supported by individual supervision.

You can use essay titles from this course document. If you want to make up a different title you are welcome to but check it with the tutor first. Before writing an essay discuss your idea and plan with the tutor.

You should submit two copies of the coursework essay to the school office on a date in week 8 to be confirmed. The tutor will return these with comments and a mark. In normal circumstances this will be within 15 working days.

There is a guide to essay assessment attached at the end of this reading list. Use this as a checklist to see if you have done the sort of things the marker will be looking for. There is also a list of criteria for essay classification so you know what the grades you get mean and what the marker is looking for. All returned essays will have comments on an essay feedback sheet. Please feel free to discuss any queries you have about your essays with the tutor.

There is good *study skills advice* at these links:

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/s3/> - aimed at first years but relevant to finalists also.

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/languages/1-6-8.html> - full and very useful site on essay writing, exams and assessment, seminars and reading.

<http://www.palgrave.com/skills4study/index.asp> - Skills for study - advice from Palgrave publishers - on exams, essays, presentations, seminars, lectures, reading and other areas.

These are useful areas on the *library web pages* which can help you with finding electronic and other resources for your essays :

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/library/resources/> - guide to different resources

Make sure you read the sections on plagiarism and collusion in your *Handbook for Candidates* for 2010-11. Plagiarism is considered a serious offence by the university and is penalised. Its definition in the 2009-10 *Handbook for Examiners* is as follows:

Plagiarism is the use, without acknowledgement, of the intellectual work of other people, and the act of representing the ideas or discoveries of another as one's own in written work submitted for assessment. To copy sentences, phrases or even striking expressions without acknowledgement of the sources (either by inadequate citation or failure to indicate verbatim quotations), is plagiarism; to paraphrase without acknowledgement is likewise plagiarism. Where such copying or paraphrase has occurred the mere mention of the source in the bibliography shall not be deemed sufficient acknowledgement; each such instance must be referred *specifically* to its source. Verbatim quotations must be either in inverted commas, or indented, and directly acknowledged.

Many students are caught and penalised for plagiarism every year. The penalties can be quite severe.

Make sure you also pay attention to the rules on collusion.

The university has a website on plagiarism at  
<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/academicoffice/1-4-1.html>

### **Course evaluation**

There will be an online course evaluation questionnaire at the end of term for you to record your feedback on the course and teaching. The feedback is taken very seriously by tutors and summaries of it are reported to the Polces department. But your feedback and suggestions on how the course could be improved is welcome at any time.

### **Electronic resources**

Many journal articles are online in the electronic library section of the library website. See the library link above.

There is also an online version of this course on Study Direct with links to online readings for some of the topics.

There are many websites devoted to socialism, where texts are available online (mostly older out of copyright texts, eg Marx, but also extracts from more recent sources). I can't vouch for the quality or authority of all of the sites below but they're worth a look. When using the internet always remember the plagiarism rules about acknowledging sources in your work – see the 'Handbook for Candidates' for the full details. When citing from the internet give the full link and the date you accessed it. Here are a few links but there are many others if you want to do your own hunting. Please do let me know if there are any links you think might be useful for others.

<http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/Politics/Socialism> – google's directory of sites on socialism.

<http://www.sociosite.net/topics/socialism.php> - Amsterdam sociology department Socio-site list of socialism links

<http://www.marxists.org> – Marxists' Internet Archive. Lots of Marx and Marxist sources. See also <http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/marx.html> and other Marxism links under the first topic on Marx.

<http://www.amielandmelburn.org.uk/> - Amiel and Melburn Trust – socialist education trust, includes archives from *Marxism Today* and *New Left Review* and grants and awards information.

<http://www.lipman-miliband.org.uk/> - Lipman-Miliband socialist education trust

<http://www.rosalux.de/cms/index.php?id=enql> – Rosalux – German socialist education foundation

But these are just a few suggestions. You will know of, or come across, many others.

## **WEEK ONE INTRODUCTORY MEETING: WHAT IS SOCIALISM? IS SOCIALISM DEAD?**

At the first meeting we'll discuss the organisation and content of the course and what the course is about, how we will run the seminars and any other things you'd like to ask about. So bring along any queries you have to this meeting. This is a good chance to ask any questions.

We'll have an initial informal introductory discussion on 1) what socialism is and 2) whether it's dead. So think about what you might answer on these two issues and be ready to discuss them at the seminar.

## **WEEK TWO MARXIST IDEAS OF SOCIALISM**

The aim of the first two topics is to get an idea of different traditions of socialism: Marxist and social democratic. We shall come back to the different forms these have taken in practice in later weeks, although we will probably touch on the actual practices of these forms of socialism in these first two topics.

In this topic we'll look at Marx's views on 'scientific socialism', the form of political struggle appropriate to the transition to communism, the transitional period of 'socialism', the first stage of communism and the ultimate goal of communism itself characterised by the 'withering away of the state' and the dissolution of power relations. The aim is to get some conception of Marxist and Leninist ideas of socialism which were so massively influential across the globe throughout the 20th century in regimes whose demise has, for many, signaled the death of socialism.

### **Transition and Socialism**

Marx saw his socialism as scientific – i.e. involving the analysis and prediction of historical development – rather than utopian – i.e. a dream divorced from any analysis of real historical trends. Marx and Engels were optimistic that power relations would wither away with the abolition of private property and class divisions and the advent of communism. However, they believed that communism would not come about without a protracted revolutionary struggle in which the proletariat would have to confront opposition and the decaying forces of capitalism. They urged the need to - 'raise the proletariat to the level of a ruling class', to institute a 'dictatorship of the proletariat', and to 'smash the state' - all ideas which were interpreted in a very particular way by Lenin and other practicing Marxists. Marx and Engels also occasionally used softer, more peaceful sounding terms to describe the process of transition to communism - the need for the proletariat to 'win the battle of democracy', and for the state to 'wither away'. They were also anxious that the working class as a whole should participate rather than just a small revolutionary clique. One debate is over where the balance of their convictions lay - with 'force' or more 'democratic' means? Is the erosion of bourgeois class power conceivable in the absence of an intensification of class conflict?

### **Communism**

Marx was critical of utopian socialist blueprints and advocated a 'scientific' socialism. However he did envisage a form of proletarian government in the transitional period similar to that practiced in the Paris Commune of 1870, the problems of which he saw as instructive for communism as its strengths were. He saw the subsequent move to communism as involving an 'end of politics'. Was his prediction of the dissolution of political conflict and power relations in a classless communist society realistic or well enough thought out? And is there any connection between Marx's views on communism and the actual experience of state socialism under Marxist-Leninist regimes?

### **Questions for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

#### *Scientific socialism*

- What made Marx's socialism 'scientific' and how does scientific socialism differ from 'utopian' socialism?

#### *Transition*

- Through what steps or sequence did Marx envisage the transition to socialism happening?
- Did Marx see the transition as being a violent or peaceful process: coercive or democratic?
- What did Marx mean by the 'Dictatorship of the Proletariat'?

#### *Communism*

- What shape did Marx see the communist society taking: in a) the economy; b) social structure; c) political institutions?

- What did Marx and Engels mean by the 'withering away of the state'? How did they foresee this coming about?
  - What forms did Marx see communism reproducing from the Paris Commune?
- 'Actual' communism*
- What aspects of Marx's 'scientific socialism', of the transition to and the nature of communism, could be seen as having contributed to the problems that occurred under 'actual' communism?

### **Main Reading**

M. Evans Karl Marx Pt III, sections 3, 4 & 5 pp 136-64 on revolution, transition and the communist society.

M. Levin Marx, Engels and Liberal Democracy, ch 6 on democracy in the transition to communist society and in communist society itself. Also pp 156-68 on actual communism and its relationship to Marx's thinking. More critical interpretation of Marx's ideas than Evans.

D. Held Models of Democracy pp. 136 - 154 on direct democracy and the end of politics in communist society. Unlike Levin, interprets Marx's vision as involving direct democracy

### **Further Reading**

A. Wright Socialisms. A useful, brief and readable book which gives an overview of different ideas of socialism. Worth reading all the way through for this week and next week's topics (as, for similar reasons, is G. Lichtheim's A Short History of Socialism).

For general reading on socialism, also look in any books on political ideologies (eg by Heywood) – most have a chapter or two on socialism and/or communism which provide an introduction.

C. Pierson Marxist Theory and Democratic Politics ch 1.

K. Graham The Battle of Democracy chs 9 and 10. Discusses Marx and Lenin's views on democracy and socialism.

R.N. Berki Insight and Vision: The Problem of Communism in Marx's Thought

R.N. Berki Socialism chs 4 & 7

Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 27, 2, 1997, Hudelson and Louw debate whether Marx was totalitarian.

<http://pos.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/27/2/180>  
and <http://pos.sagepub.com>

A.J.Polan Lenin and the End of Politics, 1984 and 1992, says that what happened in Communist societies followed from Lenin's Marxist theory.

### **Marx in the Original**

If you want to look directly at Marx's own views on socialism and communism see:



The Civil War in France which discusses the Paris Commune.

The Communist Manifesto which outlines his historical materialist view of communism and how his idea of communism compares with other versions of socialism.

Critique of the Gotha Programme where he discusses his views on equality and the state.

Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844 (also known as the 'Paris Manuscripts') especially the sections on communism.

These can be found separately in the library or in various collections of Marx's work. Much of Marx's work is also available in full on the web:

Marxists.org internet archive – [www.marxists.org/](http://www.marxists.org/) A great website, full of texts by Marx(ists), a useful encyclopedia of terms relating to Marxism (check this out if you are stuck on a particular term used in some reading).

The sociosite – <http://www.sociosite.net/topics/sociologists.php#MARX>

The Marxism page – [www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/marx.html](http://www.anu.edu.au/polsci/marx/marx.html)

From Marx to Mao – <http://www.marx2mao.net>

If any of these sites don't work try searching the name of the site. They have all been checked prior to the course in summer 2010.

### **Essay Questions**

- Was Marx responsible for the problems of 'actually existing' socialism?
- To what extent do Marxist means for achieving socialism explain the ends that resulted?
- Is the Marxist conception of a communist society, of a free society or of a totalitarian one?
- Is scientific socialism better than utopian socialism?
- How realistic or desirable was Marx's idea of communism?

<b>WEEK 3      SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC IDEAS OF SOCIALISM</b>
---

Marxism was the dominant theory and experience of socialism in the 'East' and 'third world' in the twentieth century. In this topic we will look at another tradition of socialism - social democracy - which has dominated socialist practice in the 'West'. Social democrats from Bernstein and Kautsky, arguing with each other and with Luxemburg and Lenin, to present-day advocates, have raised many important issues. They have discussed reform versus revolution, gradualist versus radical models of change and questions of electoralism and party organisation. Can socialism germinate within capitalism or is it radically distinct? Some socialists envisage the transition to socialism through the gradual advance of 'citizenship' or democracy. Others (long before Blair used the phrase) have advocated a 'third way' beyond social democracy and Stalinism. What are the merits and limitations of liberal, pluralist and parliamentary democracy on the one hand and popular and direct forms on the other? Does participation in electoral processes inevitably lead to compromises on socialist principles? Is the state in capitalist society irredeemably tied to capitalist dictates or open to the pursuit of socialist

priorities? Are either class-based or popular or alliance-based conceptions of socialist agency adequate? Try to pin down in this topic what is distinctive about the arguments of the early theoreticians of social democracy like Kautsky and Bernstein. How do they differ from revolutionaries like Marx, Lenin and Luxemburg and how do they differ from one another?

In practice, social democracy has given a big role to a paternalist and liberal democratic state and (in the UK at least) an economic and social policy influenced by Keynes and Beveridge respectively. It involves a society based on mass production and mass consumption, the elimination of poverty and unemployment and Keynesian reflationary economics. The profits reaped from this consuming society and its growing economy are used to finance an extensive welfare state. Try to get a sense of what the main tenets of social democracy have been since Kautsky and Bernstein - in, for example, the work of Crosland or in the practice of contemporary social democracy. You should be able to see, through the evolution of ideas from Kautsky to Bernstein to Crosland, shifts which have led to the social democracy of the postwar and recent periods. If we have time we will try to at least touch on some of the problems that social democracy has encountered in practice since 1945, problems to do with Keynesian economics, the welfare state, globalisation, its electoral base and so on, although we shall discuss these again throughout the course and especially when we look at New Labour.

### **Questions for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

- What is social democracy and how does it differ from other socialisms?
  - \* attitude to parliament
  - \* relationship to class structure
  - \* theory of capitalism and capitalist development
  - \* attitude to transformation
- What are the distinctive characteristics of Kautsky and Bernstein's theories of social democracy and how do they differ from one another?
  - \* theory of capitalist development
  - \* attitude to class constituency
  - \* reformism
- What is the Leninist critique of social democracy?
  - \* view of the state
  - \* economism and trade union consciousness
  - \* theory of capitalist development
- What are the characteristics of Croslandite social democracy?
  - \* why does it see property ownership as not important?
  - \* how does it see Keynesianism implementing social democracy?
- What are the main characteristics of postwar social democracy?
  - \* extent and role of the state and social democracy
  - \* role of Keynesianism and welfare state
  - \* how reformist is it?
- What are the contemporary problems of social democracy?
  - \* dependence on private capital
  - \* globalisation and Keynesianism
  - \* effect of marketisation and privatisation
  - \* overload/fiscal crisis of the welfare state
  - \* effects of social democratic success
  - \* changing electoral base

(Some of these last questions, especially the very last, we shall return to in later topics but they are worth beginning to address now)

### **Main Reading**

A. Przeworski 'Social Democracy as a Historical Phenomenon' in his Capitalism and Social Democracy. A classic and influential Marxist-Leninist contribution to analyses of social democracy. Also in New Left Review 122 1980.

G. Esping-Andersen Politics Against Markets ch 1 'Social Democracy in Theory and Practice'. Discusses the meaning of social democracy, classical debates on it and what its bases for success or failure are. Esping-Andersen is one of the leading theorists of social democracy. This chapter includes an assessment of Przeworski's work.

J. Stephens The Transition from Capitalism to Socialism ch 3 'Revolution and Reform'. Discusses classical and contemporary debates on whether socialism is better pursued through reform than revolution.

### **Further Reading**

C. Pierson Hard Choices: social democracy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, 2001 book, ch 2 on the making of social democracy including some of the classical debates involving Bernstein and others; ch 3 on classical social democracy and the alternatives discussing the era of Keynesian welfare social democracy and its decline.

B. Hindess Parliamentary Democracy and Socialist Politics ch 1. Discusses early marxist debates amongst Kautsky, Bernstein, Lenin and others on whether socialism can be pursued through parliamentary democracy.

C. Pierson Marxist Theory and Democratic Politics chs 2 & 3 discuss classical marxist debates between revolutionary socialists like Luxemburg and Lenin and those, such as Bernstein and Kautsky, more oriented towards parliamentary socialism and social democracy. (Chs 4 & 5 discuss examples of attempts to pursue socialism democratically and chs 6, 7 & 8 discuss more recent theoretical debates about the compatibility of socialism with democratic institutions).

Sheri Berman, 'The Roots and Rationale of Social Democracy, Social Philosophy and Policy, 20, 1, 2003.

<http://bc.barnard.edu/~sberman/Pages/publications/The%20Roots%20and%20Rationale%20of%20Social%20Democracy.pdf>

Sheri Berman, 'Unheralded Battle: Capitalism, the Left, Social Democracy, and Democratic Socialism', Dissent, Winter 2009.

<http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/?article=1332>

D. Sassoon One Hundred Years of Socialism, huge book but quite accessible. Reading what you can from books 1 and 2 would be useful for this topic.

*Some of the reading from the New Labour topic later on also talks about postwar social democracy and its problems.*

### **Essay Questions**

- Does social democracy provide either a viable or a desirable alternative to Marxist-Leninism?
- Is the revolution-reform dichotomy useful?
- Must socialism be a working-class project?
- Is it possible to be both socialist and democratic, or are the two contradictory?

<b>WEEK 4</b>	<b>SOCIALISM AND ITS NEO-LIBERAL CRITICS: HAYEK AND NOZICK ON CONSTRUCTIVISM AND EQUALITY</b>
---------------	---

This week and next week we shall be looking at criticisms of socialism: this week from a new right perspective and next week from the more 'leftish' perspective of new social movements - the greens and feminists in particular. In this topic we will look at discussions of socialist values amongst recent neoliberal political philosophers. Their views, which question the most basic principles of socialism, enjoyed widespread support in the 1980s and are behind much of the individualist and free market thinking of that period and the early 1990s. They by no means disappeared from the political and economic world of the 1990s and early 21<sup>st</sup> century. In fact many see the current period as involving the consolidation of neo-liberal power globally, even after the financial crisis. How far are they successful in undermining socialism?

Some people manage to read on both these thinkers in one week and get a reasonable sense of what each is about. But you could also choose to focus on getting to grips with just one who seems most interesting to you. Nozick focuses mostly on the philosophical justification for private property against redistribution. Hayek focuses more on practical political-economic questions to do with planning, equality, freedom etc.

### **The Road to Hell is Paved with Good Intentions: Hayek and the Critique of Constructivism**

We will look first at Hayek's neo-liberal critique of socialist constructivism and the state and his advocacy of evolutionism and the role of markets and liberty. A socialist in the 1920s and a refugee from the Nazis in the 1930s Hayek published *The Road to Serfdom* in 1944 as a warning against the trend towards collective planning. He believed socialism could not work as an economic system because (unlike markets) it lacks the information to plan effectively, and also does not have adequate motivational mechanisms. His critique was both epistemological (ie a theory of knowledge) and based on an argument about incentives. Socialism inevitably deteriorates into totalitarianism as a political system because of these problems of information and incentives. Much of his work is a critique of 'constructivism'. He believed it is a 'fatal conceit' to think we can *construct* a better society to that which has *evolved* across the centuries. Capitalism, meanwhile, creates growth from which everyone benefits.

What is it that makes Hayek's argument evolutionary and epistemological? Why does he see socialism lacking the incentives necessary for a successful economy? Why does he think these problems will always necessarily lead down the 'road to serfdom' and is he right about this? How adequate is his alternative based on evolution, liberty, markets and the 'rule of law'? Is Hayek really a liberal or a conservative?

### **Questions on Hayek for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

### *The Critique of Constructivism*

- What is 'constructivism'? Why is Hayek against it? What is distinctively 'epistemological' and 'anti-rationalist' about Hayek's critique of socialism compared to other right-wing critics?
- What is the 'Road to Serfdom' and why does Hayek think that constructivism, distributive justice and the loss of incentives necessarily lead down it?
- What is it about constructivist and pluralist societies that leads to too much power in the hands of experts and bureaucrats?
- What does Hayek mean by 'evolution' and 'spontaneous order' and why does he prefer them to constructivism? What properties do markets have that make them preferable to planning for the allocation of goods and services?
- What problems are there with Hayek's critique of constructivism and advocacy of spontaneous order?
  - \* false dichotomy/polarisation?
  - \* inevitability of serfdom?
  - \* illiberalism/authoritarianism?
  - \* conservatism?

The above questions on constructivism are some main issues, but you may also want to think about Hayek's views on equality and liberty mentioned in the questions below.

### *Equality, Liberty and Justice*

- What are the reasons, concerning incentives, and the more philosophical reasons why Hayek is against equality or 'teleocratic' ideas of justice? What is his preferred idea of justice?
- What is the 'trickle-down' view of economic growth and how is it linked to arguments for inequality?
- What is 'negative' freedom and why does Hayek prefer it to 'positive' freedom?
- What is 'consequentialist' or 'utilitarian' about Hayek's arguments for freedom compared to those of other right-wing thinkers?

### **Robbing from the Rich to Give to the Poor is Unjust: Nozick's 'Entitlements' Perspective on Justice**

We will also look at the critique of egalitarian ideas of justice as put forward by the right-wing libertarian political philosopher Robert Nozick. Nozick advocates a historical perspective in which ideas such as the initial acquisition and just transfer of property are important. He argues against the equation of social justice with 'equality' or 'end-states' and in favour of 'entitlements'. He says that we shouldn't judge what is just according to existing distributional patterns but according to where they came from. His argument, which defends capitalist property rights against socialist egalitarianism, suggests that egalitarian redistribution is immoral because it transgresses historically acquired property rights. How is his critique different from that of others on the new right? What is *historical* about his theory and what role does *entitlements* play? How do these foci make his theory different from 'end state' or 'patterned' ideas of justice? What do his principles of 'initial acquisition', 'just transfer' and the 'rectification of injustice' mean?

### **Questions on Nozick for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

- What is 'self-ownership' and what part does this play in Nozick's ideas?
- How does Nozick see property ownership being based on historical entitlements?
- How does this go against distributional or egalitarian ideas of justice?

- What are Nozick's principles of a) just acquisition, b) just transfer and c) the rectification of injustice?
- How do Nozick's justifications for capitalism differ from those of other supporters of the system, eg from utilitarian or libertarian justifications?
- What implications does Nozick's theory have for the role of the state?
- What problems, if any, are there with Nozick's critique of egalitarian ideas about redistribution and his case for capitalist property rights?
  - \* are there other non-entitlements/rights ideas of obligations?
  - \* are there other criteria of desert?
  - \* is there a problem of rectifying long-ago illegitimate acquisitions or transfers?
  - \* is his rectification of injustice principle actually radically *redistributional*?
  - \* how adequate is Nozick's idea of what 'self-ownership' requires?

### **Main Reading on Hayek**

E. Butler Hayek, Chapter 3 on Hayek's critique of socialism. (However, other chapters survey Hayek on markets, planning, egalitarianism, evolutionism and constitutional reform, and are well worth looking at).

C. Kukathis Hayek and Modern Liberalism, Chapter 2 on the critique of constructivism. (Also see ch 3 on individualism and spontaneous order and ch 4 on liberty and the rule of law).

### **Further Reading on Hayek**

A. Gamble Hayek, good overview of Hayek's work bringing out clearly many of the themes relevant to this week's topic. (See also Gamble's The Free Economy and the Strong State on the Thatcherite experiments influenced by Hayek).

N. Barry 'F.A. Hayek & Market Liberalism' in Tivey and Wright Political Thought since 1945

N. Barry et al Hayek's 'Serfdom' Revisited esp chs 1 (outline of general themes of book) & 2 (review of criticisms).

N. Barry Hayek's Social and Economic Philosophy chs 3-7, pp 179-82 & 9. Sympathetic outline of main themes of Hayek's work.

C. Hoy A Philosophy of Individual Freedom. Overview of Hayek on freedom, markets, the rule of law and need for a constitution to limit government.

B. Crowley The Self, the Individual and the Community chs 2 & 3. On Hayek's case for the spontaneous order of the market by someone who has become less hostile to Hayek over time.

J. Gray Hayek on Liberty chs 2, 3 & 6. Sympathetic exegesis.

J. Gray Liberalisms ch. 6. Critique of Hayek on liberty. Difficult and dense but very useful.

J. Tomlinson Hayek and the Market.

S. Brittan The Role and Limits of Government ch 3, also in Butler and Pirie Hayek on the Fabric of Human Society. Attacks Hayek for rule-bound evolutionism which makes him authoritarian rather than libertarian.

D. Green The New Right, ch on Hayek

P. Saunders 'When Prophecy Fails' Economy and Society 22, 1, February 1993. Polemical, clear outline of the neo-liberal rejection of socialism - influenced by Hayek.

### **Some of Hayek's Own Writings Relevant to the Critique of Socialism**

The Road to Serfdom. The system of private property and free competition is the basis of a free society but is being eroded by well-intentioned but fatally flawed attempts to plan economic and social life.

The Fatal Conceit. Critique of socialist utopianism.

Individualism and Economic Order. Chs 7, 8 & 9 defends Mises' views on impossibility of socialist planning without markets.

New Studies in Philosophy, Politics, Economics and the History of Ideas. Ch 14 attacks move to planning in 1970s America by rehearsing earlier 1930s debate on socialism.

Knowledge, Evolution and Society. Short essays which form basis for later 'Fatal Conceit' book.

The Constitution of Liberty esp pt 1. Outlines his views on freedom, democracy, law and equality.

Studies in Philosophy, Politics and Economics esp ch 11. Outlines basic principles of Hayek's conception of a liberal social order.

Law, Legislation and Liberty Vol. 2 'The Mirage of Social Justice'. On markets and redistribution.

### **Main Reading on Nozick**

W. Kymlicka Contemporary Political Philosophy, pp. 95 – 125. This excerpt is taken from the first part of chapter 4; the rest of the chapter (not given here) deals with other forms of libertarianism and egalitarian arguments made by Rawls which contrast with that of Nozick.

### **Further Reading on Nozick**

R. Scruton ed. Conservative Texts excerpt by Nozick on pp 227-41

R. Plant Modern Political Thought ch 3 on Hayek, Nozick and others. Also ch. 6 on liberty.

R. Nozick Anarchy, State and Utopia esp pt II 'Beyond the Minimal State' which sets out the historical entitlements theory and critique of ideas of justice and equality.

J. Wolff Robert Nozick: Property, Justice and the Minimal State

J. Paul Reading Nozick esp Pt I (general overview of Nozick's Anarchy, State and Utopia) and Pt IV (on his advocacy of entitlement theory over distributive alternatives).

G.A. Cohen 'Nozick on Appropriation' New Left Review 150 1985. Left critique of contradictions in Nozick's criteria of just appropriation.

G.A. Cohen Self-ownership, Freedom and Equality, includes chapters criticising Nozick from an egalitarian socialist point of view

R. Norman Free & Equal ch 7 denies equality undermines freedom and attacks Nozick's notion of rights

D. Green The New Right ch 2 sympathetic discussion of Nozick, esp pp 45-9 on distribution.

J. R. Lucas On Justice ch 12. Critique of Nozick.

G. Sampson An End to Allegiance, ch on Nozick, critique from another new right perspective

### **Left (and other) Critiques of Neo-Liberalism**

J. Gray Beyond the New Right, collection of articles criticising the new right, by a former sympathiser turned conservative and later (after this book) a Blair supporter. See also Gray's later work which frequently gives much space to criticism of the new right.

J. O'Neill The Market associational socialist philosopher criticises advocacies of the market

D. Miller Market, State and Community Pt I. Critique by market socialist.

K. Hoover & R. Plant Conservative Capitalism ch 10. Critique of neo-liberal arguments for free markets and minimal state.

N. Bosanquet 'Challenging the New Right' in Kilmaronock The Radical Challenge. Social democrat critique of neo-liberal assumptions about workings of capitalism and markets. Challenges indifference to inequality and poverty.

B. Hindess Freedom, Equality and the Market chs 8 & 9. Warns against simplistic eulogies of state or market. Attacks neo-liberal arguments for markets.

### **Essay Questions**

- Discuss and evaluate Hayek's critique of social engineering.
- Is socialism undermined by the 'fatal conceit' Hayek accuses it of?
- Will socialism, as Hayek claims, inevitably lead down the 'road to serfdom'?
- "Taking from the rich to give to the poor is morally unacceptable". Outline and assess criticisms of the Robin Hood philosophy of equality.
- Critically assess Nozick's entitlements theory of justice. Does it undermine justifications for socialist redistribution?
- 'An equal society cannot be a free society'. Discuss criticisms of socialist egalitarianism.

<b>WEEK 5</b>	<b>SOCIALISM AND ITS NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS CRITICS: GREEN AND FEMINIST CRITIQUES OF SOCIALISM</b>
---------------	--



In the 1960s and afterwards a number of social movements enjoyed a revival in their fortunes. They stressed values and principles which challenge socialist orthodoxies about, for example, the centrality of class and the state. Amongst such movements two prominent cases have been the women's and green movements. Feminists have sometimes said that capitalism has been blamed by socialists for women's oppression when there are other patriarchal factors involved that socialism has been equally susceptible to. Some have challenged the class-centeredness of socialism, emphasising the importance of non-class identities like gender. Feminists have criticised the statist and paternalistic style of socialist politics, sometimes preferring a more decentered and less structured approach in their own movement. They have argued that trade unions and the labour movement have been biased towards the interests of male workers and that the socialist movement has been male-dominated. Furthermore they have argued that socialists are concerned with economic, production-centered issues at the expense of attention to issues to do with reproduction and personal life which are of equal political importance – 'the personal is political'. However there are also Marxist and socialist feminists who put as much emphasis on features of socialism which they feel make it especially open to furthering the interests of women. And some say that while socialism has been vulnerable to these charges in the past it is less so now.

Ecologists also challenge the class-centered emphasis of socialism, arguing that there are issues, such as environmental problems, which are important universally and across class boundaries. For some an emphasis on the working class is problematic because the interests of this group are seen as especially counter-productive as far as the environment goes. Some ecologists criticise socialism for its orientation towards economic growth and productivism and insufficient attention to natural limits and the consequences of growth for the environment. Many ecologists prefer more decentralist and lifestyle approaches to politics over the emphasis of some socialists on achieving change through the central state. And the finger often gets pointed at the poor record of Eastern bloc socialism as far as the environment goes. Yet there are others – eco-socialists - who say that the collectivism, political economy and class perspective of socialism is especially conducive to understanding and solving environmental problems. Furthermore others see positive green aspects in Marx's thought and utopian socialism.

As with the previous topic you can try to read on both ecology and feminism. But you might want to focus on one or the other in your reading.

### **Questions for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

#### *Green criticisms of socialism*

- What does 'natural limits' mean? Why does this cast doubt on the adequacy of socialist thinking?
- Why is socialism committed to economic growth, technological progress and development of the forces of production? Why are these problematic from a green perspective?
- Why might socialism's commitment to a class perspective be problematic from a green point of view?
- What implications does the focus of some greens on 'industrialism' as the problem have for socialism's attempt to offer itself as an alternative to capitalism?
- What criticisms do greens make about the environmental record of 'actual' socialist countries?

#### *Eco-socialism*

- What implications do socialist commitments to public over private interests and to the state and intervention have for solving environmental problems?
- What aspects of 'utopian' socialism relate to the ideas of greens?
- What aspects of the thought of the early Marx have a bearing on green issues? Was the early Marx 'green'?

#### *Feminist criticisms of socialism*

- Why have feminists been critical of socialist emphases on capitalism in explaining women's oppression?
- What criticisms do feminists make of the traditional concerns of trade unions?
- What criticisms do feminists make of socialism's emphasis on class oppression?
- What criticisms do feminists make of the democratic structures of socialist politics?
- What implications does the feminist emphasis on the 'personal as political' have for socialism?

#### *Socialist feminism*

- To what extent might the socialist analysis of capitalism and class help the understanding of women's oppression?
- To what extent are socialist values and feminist values be complementary?

### **Main Reading on Feminist Critiques of Socialism**

A.M. Jaggar Feminist Politics and Human Nature, pp. 229 – 244. Extract is on Feminist criticisms of Marxist Leninist politics. (However, see also chs 8 & 10 on Marxism, socialism and feminism)

R. Tong Feminist Thought, chapter 3 on Marxist and Socialist feminism.

### **Further Reading on Feminist Critiques of Socialism**

Valerie Bryson, Feminist Political Theory, 2nd edn 2003, chapters on Marxist and socialist feminism.

J. Mitchell Woman's Estate ch 4 'The Politics of Women's Liberation 2' on problems in socialist theories. Longer version in J. Mitchell Women: The Longest Revolution pp 17-55 and shorter version in M. Schneir The Vintage Book of Feminism

D. Adlam 'Socialist Feminism and Contemporary Politics' in Politics and Power 1

S. Rowbotham et al Beyond the Fragments. Influential feminist critique of the practices of the socialist movement. See especially article by Rowbotham.

H. Hartmann The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism, critique of Marxist explanations for women's oppression.

G. Kitching Rethinking Socialism ch 4 'Feminism; potential and actuality'. Critical reaction to feminist critiques of socialism.

S. Rowbotham Women, Resistance and Revolution. Account of role of feminism and women in revolutionary movements throughout history.

A. Phillips Divided Loyalties pp 122-48 and ch 6. Discusses the experience of women and feminism in the British labour movement.

D. Coole Women in Political Theory chs 7, 8 & 9. Discussion of utopian, Marxist and social democratic socialism from a feminist perspective.

D. Adlam et al ed Politics and Power Vol. 3 esp editorials and interviews with Morrell and Richardson

### **Main Reading on Ecological Critiques of Socialism**

R. Eckersley Environmentalism and Political Theory chs 4 & 6. Skeptical about Marx being green but sees socialism as amenable to an ecological perspective. (see also ch 5 on neo-Marxism).

M. Ryle Ecology and Socialism, Chapter 2. Brief, readable discussion by an eco-socialist - discusses ecological critiques of socialism.

### **Further Reading on Ecology and Socialism**

D. Pepper Eco-Socialism

A. Dobson Green Political Thought ch 5. Discussion of socialism and feminism by radical green.

R. Williams 'Socialism and Ecology' in his Resources of Hope. Also available as SERA pamphlet. Influential thinker of the 'new left'.

A. Taylor Choosing our Future: a practical politics of the environment pp 21-42 and pp 200-9 makes a socialist case for environmental change and gives a social democratic conception of sustainability.

R. Bahro Socialism and Survival and From Red to Green. Bahro is an ex-Marxist who joined the green movement. In these two books he explains why.

J. Porritt Seeing Green pp 224-8 & 43-9 critique of socialism and capitalism as equally committed to industrialism.

D. Schecter Radical Theories, ch on green socialism by a libertarian socialist

P. Dickens Society and Nature ch 3. Says Marx offers a green perspective.

T. Benton Natural Relations ch 2. Sympathetic but critical assessment of ecological merits of Marx. Also in Radical Philosophy 50 1988 and Sayers & Osborne Socialism, Feminism and Philosophy.

T. Benton, ed, The Greening of Marxism, 1996, useful collection on this topic

P. Osborne Socialism and the Limits of Liberalism chs 10 & 11 (Benton and Soper discuss whether Marx had ecological perspective. Benton is less sympathetic to Marx, Soper more so).

John Bellamy Foster Ecology Against Capitalism 2002 and Marx's Ecology 2000, discuss relations between capitalism, marxism and ecology. See also his writings in

Monthly Review - <http://www.monthlyreview.org/index.html> and his article in the American Journal of Sociology, 105, 2, Sept 1999.

Climate and Capitalism, online eco-socialist journal - <http://climateandcapitalism.com/>

Development and Change, 40, 6, 2009, special issue of this journal on whether capitalism is compatible with solving climate change, contributions giving contrasting views.

### **Essay Questions**

- Do its emphases on class, the state and economic growth undermine socialism?
- Can socialism be made more green? Or is it intrinsically unecological?
- Is Marx green?
- Do feminist critiques of socialism render it redundant?
- Are feminist criticisms of socialism mainly historical? Or do they still apply?

<b>WEEK 6      THE COLLAPSE OF STATE SOCIALISM IN EASTERN EUROPE</b>
--

This week, and in week 8, we shall look at crises and collapse in the two dominant forms of socialism in practice in the twentieth century - social democracy in the West and state socialism in the East.

As the basis for making sense of their collapse it is important first of all to get a good idea of what characteristics these societies had and how they were organised. How were their economies structured, what forms of political system did they have, and what was the relationship between state and society

in state socialist societies? Of course, state socialist societies were different to one another and often took diverse routes to becoming 'socialist'. Some say they were 'totalitarian'; for others this is too extreme a label. And despite their ultimate demise, for a long time they commanded extensive legitimacy in both East and West and, for some, still do. We need to think why that might have been.

However, collapse they eventually did. What were the reasons for the collapse of the state socialist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe and elsewhere in 1989? Some authors put it down to internal economic stagnation resulting from the inadequacies of central economic planning. Others suggest it was due to economic underperformance relative to the West. Some critics suggest the downfall of the Soviet Union and state socialist societies came about because of changing social structure and the growth of an educated middle class with high expectations that could not be met. Others put it down to the lack of political pluralism and democracy which undermined the legitimacy and credibility of the regimes. Further accounts draw attention to the influence of changes in Gorbachev's foreign policy or more proximate 'domino effect' factors in the collapse of state socialism.

What are the arguments for these different perspectives and to what extent are they convincing? Was the decline of socialism due to internal problems or to factors in the wider context? Could socialism be pursued in a more economically successful and politically democratic way, or were the problems of the communist societies down to the nature of socialism itself? Does the collapse of the state socialist regimes signal, as

Fukuyama has suggested, the death of socialism, the end of history and the global triumph of liberal capitalism? Was there anything positive about these state socialist societies? Is there anything capitalism can learn from them?

### **Questions for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

#### *The Nature of State Socialism*

- How was state socialism different from capitalist liberal democracy?
  - \* organisation of the economy
  - \* organisation of politics
  - \* relationship between society and state

How did different countries take different routes to state socialism? On what bases did state socialism command legitimacy for long periods? Were they 'totalitarian'? Were they 'socialist' or 'state capitalist'?

#### *Social Structure and Collapse*

- Who were the new middle class in state socialist societies and why were they significant in the collapse?

#### *Economy and Collapse*

- Why were there problems of stagnation in state socialist economies?
  - \* organisation of the economy
  - \* techniques of production

To what extent was this a factor in their decline?

#### *Political Legitimacy and Collapse*

- Why did state socialist societies suffer increasing loss of political legitimacy amongst their populations? Was this a factor in their decline?

#### *External and International Factors*

- To what extent did the overextension or international involvement of state socialist societies undermine them?
- What do people have in mind when they say the collapse was due to external and relative factors rather than internal, absolute decline? What role might economic comparison and telecommunications have played in this?

#### *Proximate Factors*

- What changes in foreign policy happened under Gorbachev and how did these contribute to collapse?
- What was the 'demonstration' or 'domino' effect? What was its role?

### **Main Reading**

D. Lane The Rise and Fall of State Socialism, ch 8. Survey of main explanations for collapse of state socialism. Chapter 6 also deals with some of the explanations for collapse.

### **Further Reading**

Leslie Holmes Post-communism, especially ch 2, outlines of some of the factors.

R. Dahrendorf Reflections on the Revolution in Europe. Short readable pamphlet. Argues that socialism is dead and rejects 'middle way' between capitalism and communism.

F. Halliday 'The Ends of Cold War' New Left Review 180 1990. Also in Blackburn After the Fall. Highlights international cold war factors. <http://www.newleftreview.org/A603>

E. Hobsbawm 'Goodbye to all That' Marxism Today October 1990. Also in Blackburn After the Fall. Distinguished socialist historian looks at the changing historical fortunes of capitalism and communism, why the latter collapsed, and what the foreseeable prospects are for the world in the 21st century. <http://bit.ly/goodbye>

E. Hobsbawm 'Out of the Ashes' Marxism Today April 1991. Also in Blackburn After the Fall. Looks at the historical experience of communism and social democracy in power, at why communism failed and expresses optimism about the future of socialism. <http://bit.ly/ashes>

C. Pierson Socialism After Communism pp 27-9 & 64-75. Very brief review of some interpretations of 1989 and its implications

Fred Halliday, 'What was Communism?', Open Democracy, October 2009, <http://www.opendemocracy.net/article/what-was-communism>

A. Callinicos The Revenge of History, account of the collapse of Eastern bloc communism by an anti-Stalinist Marxist. Socialism has not died, he argues.

R. Skidelsky The World After Communism, a conservative on communism, its collapse and post-communism. Like Fukuyama he supports the victory of capitalism.

M. Gorbachev Perestroika, readable critique of old-style soviet socialism by a key architect in its reform and, as it happened, its eventual collapse.

Z. Brzezinski The Grand Failure, a critique of the failure and decline of communism written just before the 1989 collapse.

D. Chirot (ed) The Crisis of Leninism and the Decline of the Left, edited collection with a special emphasis on the implications for the left.

R. Blackburn ed After the Fall: The Failure of Communism and the Future of Socialism. Useful collection of articles by left-wing commentators. Pt I analyses collapse and Pt II looks at implications for future. Includes some of the articles referred to above.

Archie Brown, The Rise and Fall of Communism, 2009, recent but weak on economics.

C. Pierson 'The Death of Socialism? 1989 and all that' History of European Ideas, 19, 333-9. Also D. Lovell 'Propositions on "The End of Socialism?"' History of European Ideas, 19, 333-9

M.G. Roskin The Rebirth of East Europe, see sections on problems and collapse of communism.

R. Sakwa Postcommunism, again see sections on problems and collapse of communism.

E. Hobsbawm 'End of Socialism' in his book Age of Extremes

G. Schopflin 'The End of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe' in Politics in Eastern Europe 1945-92

M. Mazower The Dark Continent, historian on Europe

Gales Stokes, The Walls came Tumbling Down, 1993

Stephen White, Communism and its Collapse, 2000

### **Essay Questions**

- Was centralised planning and state ownership in the economy the reason for the collapse of state socialism?
- Did communism collapse because it wasn't democratic and liberal enough?
- Was the collapse of state socialism due to its socialist nature?
- Can we learn from achievements of state socialism as well as its failures?
- Is it too easy for socialists to dismiss state socialism as not socialist?
- Can the collapse of state socialism be blamed on external pressures rather than internal or inherent problems?

<b>WEEK 7      RETHINKING SOCIALISM IN THE NEO-LIBERAL ERA: MARKET SOCIALISM AND RADICAL DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISM</b>
---

There were few socialists by the 1980s who did not feel that traditional forms of socialism did not need some serious rethinking. In Britain and the USA the neo-liberal governments of Reagan and Thatcher were in power, pursuing radical economic experiments and shifting the agenda sharply to the free market right. Socialists felt they needed to respond to the new right agenda of freedom and individualism. State socialism was widely discredited and, as it turned out, on its last legs. Many socialists were influenced by the sort of criticisms from new social movements that we have discussed. In the face of all these pressures, revised forms of socialism proposed included those that gave greater credence to the role of the market in socialism and advocated a more democratised form of socialism. These models responded to many of the issues that we have discussed so far on this course and many of their themes and suggestions found their way into revisions of social democracy in the 1990s. In this topic we will be looking at ideas of socialism which tried to escape the problems highlighted by liberal and new social movement critics and which aimed to overcome the deficiencies of Eastern bloc-style state socialism.

Market reconceptualisations of socialism took seriously the criticism of the Right that socialism was deficient on informational and motivational grounds, on individual liberty and on responsiveness to the consumer. However, they felt that socialism did not need to be rejected but could be revised to take account of such weaknesses. Market socialists argue that socialists should drop their traditional antipathy to markets. They should realise that socialism is not synonymous with a non-market society, but with issues such as social ownership or values like equality and community which, it is argued, are compatible with the market. In fact the market can provide distinctive benefits. More moderate pluralist and pragmatic contributors like Nove advocate a role for markets and private enterprise within a socialist economy. The more radical and

philosophical Le Grand, Estrin, Miller and others advocate a fully blown free market economy, but with worker-controlled enterprises. Critics of market socialism range from the orthodox Marxism of Mandel to more moderate democratic planners like Devine and Elson and mavericks like Frankel. Some of the references below look at actual practices of market socialism in countries such as Yugoslavia and China. A key issue is whether such experiments have succeeded or whether there has been too much of a clash between the market and socialism in such places.

There were also revisionist redefinitions of socialism which aimed less to throw out traditional socialist commitments to be replaced by individualism and markets and more to democratise the way in which collectivist commitments are delivered. Democratic rethinkers of socialism go from those who argue for the acceptance of liberal parliamentary democracy, through those who argue for democratic reform of liberal institutions and economic democracy to radical democrats who propose alternative new forms of democracy. Radical democratic socialists go back to popular democratic ideas of participation and communitarianism, and to citizenship debates and republican traditions in social and political thought, to construct a socialism based on participation, community and pluralism. They have a vision of a radical democratic socialism based on active citizenship and civic virtue. Just as with the market socialists, some (although certainly not all) of these ideas of democratic reform made their way into revisions of social democracy in the 1990s, including those of Tony Blair and New Labour.

### **Questions on Market Socialism for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

- Why did the idea of marketising socialism become an issue? What pressures put it on the agenda?
- What is 'market socialism'? What different sorts of market socialism are there?
- What arguments do market socialists put for markets?
- What do market socialists say is socialist about market socialism?
- What concrete examples of market socialism have there been or are there? What did they look like? What were their successes or failures?
- What are the strengths and weaknesses of market socialism?

### **Questions on Radical Democratic Socialism for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

- What have socialists' attitude to the institutions of democracy traditionally been?
- Why did 1980s socialist thinkers fall on democratisation as a concept for rethinking socialism? What made democracy an important concept for socialists?
- What forms of democratisation do different radical democratic socialists propose?
- How does radical democratic socialism differ in approach from market socialism? How does it differ in the way it responds to the right?
- What problems are there with radical democratic socialism? Can they be overcome?

### **Main Reading**

C. Pierson Socialism After Communism, Pt II. (outlines what market socialism is and case for it). See also Pt III (outlines criticisms of market socialism).

B. Hindess ed Reactions to the Right, includes chapters on individualist, market and democratising socialisms

### **Futher reading on both market and radical democratic socialisms**



Erik Olin Wright, more recent articles on statist, democratic, market and associational socialisms

'Taking the social in socialism seriously' 2004

<http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Socialism.pdf>

and the published version in New Left Review 2006

[http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published writing/New Left Review paper.pdf](http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/New%20Left%20Review%20paper.pdf)

and the book version <http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/ERU.htm>

### **Further Reading on Market Socialism**

D. Schecter Radical Theories ch 5 on market socialism by a libertarian socialist critic – gives explanation of market socialism in practice in Yugoslavia.

B. Hindess Reactions to the Right ch by Tomlinson on market socialism

David Lane The Rise and Fall of State Socialism ch. 5 on practical attempts at market socialism

A. Nove The Economics of Feasible Socialism. A very influential revisionist statement of the case for socialists accepting a role for markets.

J. LeGrand and S. Estrin eds Market Socialism. This and the Miller book below are excellent statements of the philosophical case for market socialism. See esp (but not only) chs 1 & 2.

D. Miller Market, State & Community, advocates what has been called 'neo-liberalism without the capitalists'

I. Forbes ed Market Socialism (Fabian pamphlet)

J. Roemer A Future for Socialism on the history, development and future of market socialism by an 'analytical marxist'

D. Elson 'Market socialism or socialisation of the market', New Left Review 172 1988. Argues for socialisation of the market rather than market socialism or central planning.

P. Devine Democracy and Economic Planning. Argument against central planning and markets and for democratic planning.

R. Blackburn 'Fin de Siecle: Socialism after the Crash' in R. Blackburn ed. After the Fall. Earlier version in New Left Review 185 1991. Detailed discussion of plan-market debates.

B. Frankel Beyond the State. Critic of market socialism.

Radical Philosophy 39 & 40 1985 (Nove/Frankel debate)

E. Mandel Articles in New Left Review 159 & 169. Hardline attack on market socialism.  
<http://www.newleftreview.org/?view=929>

C. Harman 'The Myth of Market Socialism' International Socialism Journal 42, 3-62, critique from Marxist perspective

T. Carver 'Market Socialism: peace in our time?' History of European Ideas 19, pp 279-84

B. Ollman (ed). Market Socialism, 1998,  
<http://www.nyu.edu/projects/ollman/books/ms.php>

P.K. Bardhan and J.E. Roemer (eds) Market Socialism

Janos Kornai and Yingyi Qian, Markets and Socialism, 2008, on China and Vietnam, sample chapter here - <http://www.palgrave.com/products/title.aspx?PID=280680>

### **Further Reading on Radical Democratic Socialism**

P. Hirst 'Democracy: socialism's best answer to the right' in Hindess Reactions to the Right, sympathetic but critical on radical democratic socialism

P. Hirst Representative Democracy and its Limits esp chs 1, 5 & 6. Argues for pluralist, democratic, associational socialism.

Economy & Society 20, 2, 1991. Special issue on state, democracy and socialism. See especially (but not only) Hindess' critique of radical democratic socialism.

J. Keane Democracy and Civil Society, esp preface and chs 1 & 4. Accessible and key statement of case for socialism as democratisation, influenced by East European anti-politics tradition.

S. Sayer & D. McLellan eds. Socialism and Democracy, accessible introductory collection, especially Gamble's piece

C. Mouffe 'The Civics Lesson' New Statesman & Society 7 October 1988

N. Poulantzas State, Power, Socialism esp Pt 5 'Towards a Democratic Socialism'

N. Bobbio Which Socialism?

S Bowles & H Gintis Democracy and Capitalism esp ch 7 on postliberal democracy.

D. Held Models of Democracy esp Pt III 'Concluding Reflections' where he advocates principle of 'democratic autonomy'.

A. Wright Socialisms history of socialism advocating a pluralist democratic approach

F. Cunningham Democratic Theory and Socialism

P. Hirst Law, Socialism and Democracy

C. Mouffe ed. Dimensions of Radical Democracy, post-marxist argument for pluralist democratic socialism influenced by discourse theory.

B. Hindess 'Socialism and Democracy: elaborations of the idea of the self-governing community' History of European Ideas 19 pp 309-15

### **Essay Questions**

- Is the market compatible with socialism?
- Is market socialism a contradiction?
- Does democracy provide 'socialism's best answer to the right'?
- "Democratic socialism is a contradiction in terms. You can have democracy or socialism. You cannot have both". Discuss

\*\*\*\*\*

<b>WEEK 8 GLOBALISATION AND SOCIAL DEMOCRACY: HAS GLOBALISATION LED TO THE END OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY AND WELFARE?</b>
---

Some argue that economies are no longer national and so no longer controlled by national governments. Social policy is limited by global constraints, laws are made by supra-national bodies. Human rights, environmental problems, terrorism crime, etc are global issues in relation to which politics must be (or is) organised globally. The nation-state has declined. What powers have been lost by nation-states and to whom? In particular, what implications does globalisation have for national social democracy?

Social democracy is traditionally associated with high taxes, high public spending, large welfare states and a working class base, all of which are seen to have been eroded by globalisation or made impossible due to the pressures of mobile international finance and globally mobile capital. These are said by some to have led governments (like New Labour) to construct neoliberal 'competition states'. Social democrats give up their traditional policies and practice neoliberal policies to attract and keep mobile capital in the country. Some of the reading and questions below focus on whether national social democracy is no longer viable under globalisation because of the rise of the 'competition state'.

There are, of course, various points of view. Some argue that nations are unevenly affected by the globalisation of politics, or even that they are the key actors in it and ultimately benefit rather than losing from it. Some argue that nation-states retain quite a bit of autonomy to pursue social democratic policies. Others say that social democracy works well in some places which are very globalised and that the neoliberal competition state is something we think we have to go along with, rather than something we really have to.

To what extent are globalisation and global capital things which constrain or prevent social democracy? Has it been the rise of globalisation rather than its own record that has brought an end to the social democratic forms of socialism?

- What does it mean to say that the nation-state is sovereign?
- What global and supra-national forces are said to have undermined the sovereignty of nation-states and of social democracy?

- Why has globalisation led to the 'competition state'? What pressures from neoliberal globalisation are there on the state?
- Why do nation-states choose to adopt a competition state model and is this the only path that is possible under globalisation?
- Is national social democracy made impossible by globalisation and the pressure to neoliberal competitiveness?
- Is there any evidence against the competition state thesis?

### Reading

*A number of the readings focus on social democracy and the neoliberal competition state, and are mostly (but not entirely) sceptical about this thesis:*

Layna Mosley, 'Globalisation and the state: still room to move?', *New Political Economy*, 10, 3, September 2005, says states still have 'room to move' under globalisation and do not have to join a 'race to the bottom'. Online at:  
<http://www.unc.edu/~lmosley/NPEmosleyfinal.pdf>

See also her book, *Global Capital and National Governments*, 2003 and another related 2000 article by her here: <http://www.unc.edu/~lmosley/mosleyIO2000.pdf>.

Philip Cerny and Mark Evans, 'Globalisation and Public Policy under New Labour', *Policy Studies*, 25, 1, 2004, say that New Labour have adopted a competition state approach making the nation-state subservient to globalisation. <http://bit.ly/sBIUI>

Tore Fougner, 'The State, international competitiveness and neoliberal globalisation: is there a future beyond "the competition state"', *Review of International Studies*, 32, 2006, says that the state does not have to be a competition state in response to globalisation and that the pressure to be so is more a product of neoliberal hegemony than something necessary. <http://bit.ly/fougner>

Evelyn Huber and John D. Stephens, 'Globalisation, Competitiveness and the Social Democratic Model', *Social Policy and Society*, 1, 1, 2002, argue that globalisation does not compel states to become neoliberal competition states and that in fact social democracy is a better model under globalisation in many ways, including in terms of competitiveness. <http://bit.ly/hubste>

Colin Crouch, *Post-Democracy*, 2005, more pessimistic and sociological perspective, says the decline of the working class and rise of the global firm has led to political elites being oriented around links with business at the expense of social democracy. See also his Fabian Society publication *Coping with Post-democracy*, 2000.

Paul Hirst, 'Has Globalisation Killed Social Democracy?', *Political Quarterly* 1999. No, he argues. <http://bit.ly/hirst>

Dani Rodrik, 'Why do more open Economies have Bigger Governments?' *Journal of Political Economy*, 106, 5, 1998.

### Essay Questions

'Nations benefit, in aggregate terms, from trade and financial openness, but openness forces them into competition with one another. Competition reduces governments'

abilities to provide goods and services to their citizens and renders governments more accountable to external economic agents than to citizens. This hypothesis implies not only a convergence of national policies, but also a convergence toward the lowest common denominator'. (Mosley 2005). Discuss the implications that this competition thesis has for social democracy.

'Members of the global corporate elite do nothing so blatant as taking away our right to vote.... They merely point out to a government that, if it persists in maintaining, say, extensive labour rights, they will not invest in the country. All major parties in the country, fearing to call their bluff, tell their electorates that outmoded labour regulation must be reformed. The electorate then, whether conscious of the deregulation proposal or not, duly votes for those parties, there being few others to choose from'. (Crouch 2005: 33). Does corporate globalisation mean that governments have little choice but to follow the interests of business?

\*\*\*\*

<b>WEEK 9 THE CRISIS AND RETHINKING OF SOCIAL DEMOCRACY: NEW LABOUR, THE THIRD WAY AND EUROPEAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY</b>
--

This week we will focus on the crisis of social democracy from the 1970s onwards and how social democratic parties, New Labour in particular between 1997 and 2010, have tried to respond to it. This is an issue which related back to many themes we have looked at this term: the collapse of Marxist-influenced state socialism; the origins and development of social democracy; new right and social movement criticisms of socialism; attempts to develop market socialist and radical democratic alternatives; and the pressure of globalisation.

Two principle causes of the crisis of social democracy are often highlighted. One is the decline of social democracy's traditional bedrock of support amongst the industrial working class. This class has shrunk as a result of the decline of manufacturing industry and with the growth of services, the public sector and middle class white collar work. Furthermore, it is argued that social democracy's base has not only declined in size but has also become dealigned from its historical social democratic allegiances. It is now less partisan and more calculating in deciding on its loyalties. In short, social democracy has to orient to more middle class and calculating support.

The policies of traditional social democracy are also said to be in trouble. Post-war social democracy was based on Keynesian economics and a universal welfare state. However, Keynesianism is said to have been undermined by processes such as globalisation, and the welfare state is now too costly, inefficient, undemocratic and irrelevant to modern needs. The economics and social policy of social democracy, it is said, are in need of renewal.

Social democracy throughout Europe, and arguably most radically in Britain, has tried to build alternative bases of electoral support, move away from the economics of public ownership and Keynesianism and to a bias towards private initiative and supply-side economics, to reform the welfare state and a shift away from socialist to more liberal values. What did the changes in New Labour actually amount to? Were they just soundbites or did they have substance? Were they a break with old social democracy or just Old Labour rehashed? Were they Thatcherism with a human face or still

something distinctively left-wing? What does the 'third way' mean, if anything, and how broadly is it applicable? Our focus in this seminar will be on New Labour, but by no means exclusively so.

### **Questions For Reading and Seminar Discussion**

- Why did New Labour's electoral base decline, fragment and dealign?
- What was New Labour's approach to gaining electoral support?
- What sociological assumptions did New Labour make about the changed world we live in? What were the implications of these?
- What did the Keynesian welfare state involve, and why is it said to be less relevant now?
- What was New Labour's economic approach?
- What was New Labour's attitude to welfare reform and social policy?
- What was New Labour's approach to the constitution and political system? Was New Labour a party of democratic reform or authoritarian control?
- What were the values of 'Old Labour', and did New Labour continue to hold to them or not? Was New Labour just 'Thatcherism in disguise'?
- To what extent did New Labour achieve progress on social democratic concerns such as equality, poverty, community, etc?
- Did New Labour leave a social democratic legacy that influenced the ConDem coalition?
- How did the reforms that happened in the Labour Party in Britain compare with those in social democratic parties elsewhere? Is the 'Third Way' applicable outside the UK?
- What is or was the 'Third Way'? Does it have a future? Are there realistic alternatives to it?

### **Main Reading**

Eric Shaw, Losing Labour's Soul? New Labour and the Blair Government 1997-2007, good book, 2007.

A. Chadwick and R. Heffernan, eds. The New Labour Reader, 2003.

### **Further Reading on New Labour, The Third Way, and European Social Democracy**

Peter Wilby, 'Thatcherism's Final Triumph' Prospect 127, October 2006, says New Labour missed the chance to push Britain leftwards.

[http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article\\_details.php?id=7800](http://www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id=7800)

David Coates, Prolonged Labour: The Slow Birth of New Labour in Britain, 2005.

Robert Page, 'Without a Song in their Heart: New Labour the Welfare State and the retreat from democratic socialism', Journal of Social Policy, 36, 1, 2007, argues that New Labour is not socialist.

S. White ed. New Labour: the progressive future?, 2001, looks at the ideology of New Labour, its policies in government, and compares New Labour to other social democratic parties.

Good White chapter is here: <http://www.palgrave.com/PDFs/0333915658.Pdf>

S. Hall (1998) 'The Great Moving Nowhere Show', Marxism Today. New Labour is a continuation of Thatcherism.

<http://www.sussex.ac.uk/Users/ssfa2/hallnowhere.pdf>

C. Pierson Hard Choices: social democracy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, 2001, see ch 4 on globalisation and how it undermines social democracy, ch 5 on demographic change and social democracy, and ch 6 on the future of social democracy.

A. Callinicos Against the Third Way: an anti-capitalist critique, brief 2001 book, Trotskyist explains why he is against the third way and why a workers' revolution is the alternative.

C. Pierson Socialism After Communism, 1995, ch 1 on social democracy's declining class basis and & ch 2 on problems in its political economy.

A. Seldon ed The Blair Effect, 2001, covers range of areas. There is a 2001-5 edition jointly edited with Kavanagh.

S. Ludlam and M. Smith eds Governing as New Labour, 2004, and New Labour in Government, 2001, collections cover range of areas and comparisons with European social democratic parties.

D. Coates and P. Lawler eds New Labour in Power, 2000 collection, on different policy areas and comparisons with the US Democrats and European social democracy.

Wolfgang Merkel et al, Social Democracy in Power, 2007, comparative study of whether social democratic parties have managed to stay social democratic.

A. Giddens The Third Way (1998), The Third Way and its Critics (2000), The Global Third Way Debate (ed 2001) and Where Now for New Labour? (2002) sociologist Blair supporter gives his version of the third way. Also Over to You Mr Brown (2007).

T. Blair The Third Way, Fabian society pamphlet sets out what Blair thinks the 'third way' means. See also his New Britain collection of speeches.

G. Kelly (ed) The New European Left, outlines of what is going on in other European social democratic parties.

Marxism Today 1998 one-off issue criticising New Labour for being too Thatcherite, conservative, authoritarian, etc.

Marxism Today's are archived here:

[http://www.amielandmelburn.org.uk/collections/mt/index\\_frame.htm](http://www.amielandmelburn.org.uk/collections/mt/index_frame.htm)

C. Hay The Political Economy of New Labour, 1999, critique of New Labour for accommodating too much to Thatcherism.

A. Heath *et al* eds The Rise of New Labour psephologists focus on New Labour's analysis of, and performance at, elections.

Roy Hattersley, 'It's no Longer my Party', The Observer, 24 June 2001, after one term of New Labour, former deputy leader says Blair's meritocracy is not social democracy.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2001/jun/24/labour2001to2005.news>

S. Hall, 'Son of Margaret?' New Statesman and Society 6 October 1994 says New Labour is just a continuation of Thatcherism.

See also S. Hall and M. Jacques 'Blair: is he the greatest Tory since Thatcher?' The Observer 13 April 1997.

Stuart Hall, 'New Labour has picked up where Thatcherism left off', The Guardian, 6 August 2003, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2003/aug/06/society.labour>

The article titles speak for themselves!

Patrick Diamond and Roger Liddle, eds, Beyond New Labour: the future of social democracy in Britain, 2009, looks at the future

### **Essay Questions**

- 'Farewell to the working class'? Have changes in social structure caused a crisis for social democracy?
- Is the Keynesian Welfare State over?
- 'New Labour'. Was it New? Was it Labour?
- Did New Labour solve the crisis of social democracy or did they end social democracy?
- What is the Third Way? Where does it lead?

<b>WEEK 10    FUKUYAMA VERSUS CHAVEZ: HAS CAPITALISM WON THE BATTLE WITH SOCIALISM?</b>
---

For some, New Labour is just the final proof that socialism is now dead and that capitalism has won the battle and is the 'only game in town'. Fukuyama is the most famous, but certainly not only, commentator to talk of the victory of capitalist liberal democracy over its old ideological adversary. Drawing on 'end of history' ideas from those such as Hegel and Kojève, Fukuyama says that capitalism has won the battle of ideas with socialism. The ideological debate is over. Capitalism and liberal democracy are the new hegemony.

Both fascism and communism are seen to have been defeated in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In the West, class inequality as a problem is also over – inequalities in opportunities are not to do with capitalism but to do with residues from the past, e.g. racism is to do with the legacy of slavery not capitalism. Left parties are in decline and conservatives dominant. China and the rest of Asia are accepting capitalist and liberal principles. All this is primarily a victory of ideology. Liberalism is a long way from being realised materially in many places. But it has won ideologically. There are no alternative ideologies with visions of alternative economic and political systems. Islamic fundamentalism has little appeal beyond Muslim states while nationalism does not itself go against capitalism. Continuing international conflicts are between states still locked into history and those at the end of history – eg the Gulf War and Kosovo. There are no ideological grounds for major conflicts between nations. The struggle between opposing systems is no longer the determining tendency of the present-day era. The end of history means the end of ideologies. Economics, not politics, is the preoccupation. Problems are technical and not the stuff of heroic dreams. We face centuries of boredom.



Of course there are criticisms of Fukuyama. The future is unpredictable and societies have always been plagued by clashes between warring values. Capitalism may now be dominant but there are new contests between different forms of capitalism. Fukuyama assumes that market economies and liberal democracy go together. Yet this has not always been the case. Is his thesis truer of capitalism's spread than liberal democracy's? The former seems more popular than the latter.

Furthermore, does the financial crisis show that capitalism is fatally flawed? A small crisis in one section of the US mortgage market seems to be able to create huge negative repercussions across the globe. What would a more serious shock do? And there are those who argue that socialism is far from dead, for instance, Chavez with his advocacy of a 21<sup>st</sup> century socialism in his own country but also more internationally. Fukuyama himself has addressed Chavez's attempt to revive socialism.

This week we shall examine the claim that socialism is dead and that there is no longer any prospect for its revival. Debate over this issue depends in part on what might seem the very academic questions of what is meant by 'socialism' and by 'dead'. If socialism is not dead, in what shape or form does it have any continuing role? If capitalism is not unrivalled, then what are the alternatives to it, socialist or otherwise? Is the world now divided between different forms of capitalism, or are other divisions equally significant? Does capitalism need an enemy to ensure its own survival, and where may this come from?

### **Questions for Reading and Seminar Discussion**

- What does Fukuyama take from Hegel and Kojève? In what way does he invert Marx?
- How does he see fascism and communism as having been defeated in the twentieth century?
- In what way does he say class has been solved as a problem in the capitalist west?
- What does Fukuyama have to say about alternatives such as Islamic fundamentalism and nationalism?
- How does he reconcile continuing international conflicts with his end of history thesis?
- In what way is his thesis primarily ideological?
- What are the main criticisms that can be made of Fukuyama? How fair have Fukuyama's critics been?
- What evidence is there that socialism is still alive?
- What rivalries are there either within capitalism or externally to it?
- Does Chavez show that history has not ended and there is a future for socialism? What does Fukuyama have to say about Chavez?
- What does the financial crisis imply for the future of capitalism and the end of history thesis?
- Is there any evidence that capitalist liberal democracy will *not* be the dominant form of society for the rest of the twenty first century?
- Is socialism dead? What do 'socialism' and 'dead' mean?

### **Main Reading**

F. Fukuyama 'The End of History?' National Interest Summer, 1989.  
<http://www.viet-studies.info/EndofHistory.htm>

(His argument is extended in F. Fukuyama The End of History and the Last Man)

Frances Fukuyama, 'Second Thoughts: the last man in a bottle' National Interest 1999, he revisits the theme 10 years later.

<http://mlfonseca.files.wordpress.com/2009/04/ffukuyama.pdf>

### **Further Reading**

F. Fukuyama, 'A self-defeating hegemony', Guardian, 25 October 2007, says that US policy has led to anti-americanism, a new faultline in world politics he did not predict in 'The End of History'.

[http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/francis\\_fukuyama/2007/10/a\\_selfdefeating\\_hegemony.html](http://commentisfree.guardian.co.uk/francis_fukuyama/2007/10/a_selfdefeating_hegemony.html)

Frances Fukuyama, 'The End of Chavez - History's against him' Washington Post, August 6th 2006, in this article and the one below Fukuyama discusses end of history themes in relation to Chavez and Latin America.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/08/04/AR2006080401768.html>

Frances Fukuyama, 'A Quiet Revolution', Foreign Affairs, November/December 2007.

<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/63039/francis-fukuyama/a-quiet-revolution>

See Open Democracy debate at: <http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-fukuyama/issue.jsp>

T. Burns ed. After History? Francis Fukuyama and his Critics

C. Bertram and A. Chitty eds Has History Ended?

H. Williams et al eds Francis Fukuyama and the End of History

P. Anderson The Ends of History, 1994

K. Kumar 'Post-History: living at the end' in G. Browning et al eds Understanding Contemporary Society, 2000

P. Saunders Capitalism: a social audit chapter on 'The Future of Capitalism'

Marxism Today November 1989 pieces on Fukuyama, <http://bit.ly/endhist>

M. Albert Capitalism against Capitalism thesis that global divisions are between different forms of capitalism

### **Essay Questions**

- What does Fukuyama really say in his 'end of history' thesis? How adequate do you find his analysis?
- Does the financial crisis show that capitalism is fatally flawed?
- Fukuyama versus Chavez. Is socialism dead?

- Defining what you mean by 'socialism' and 'dead', give your views on whether socialism is dead or not.

\*\*\*\*\*

Hope you enjoyed the course!

## **GUIDE TO ESSAY ASSESSMENT**

**Below are key questions which guide the assessment of your essay:**

### **Structure and Quality of Argument**

- Is the essay plan stated in the introduction?
- Is the overall structure of the argument clear and coherent?
- Are the points made in a logical sequence?
- Is the argument sufficiently analytical?
- Is there a conclusion?
- Does the conclusion address the essay question directly?
- Is the conclusion adequately supported by the preceding argument?

### **Use of Evidence**

- Are the points made supported by evidence from cited sources?
- Are the sources drawn on sufficient and appropriate?
- If empirical evidence is used, is it described clearly and in appropriate detail?
- Does the evidence presented support the conclusions reached?
- Is the interpretation of the evidence presented appropriately qualified (i.e. avoiding overgeneralisations and sweeping statements)?

### **Contents**

- Is the writer's argument adequately backed up rather than just asserted?
- Are the sources used subjected to analysis and critical reflection?
- Has the student researched the topic sufficiently?
- Are there any important omissions?
- Has the student thought about what they have read or simply reproduced material from sources?
- Is there evidence of critical thinking or an original synthesis?
- Does the student have an argument?
- Has the student gone beyond the essential reading?

### **Writing and Presentation Skills**

- Is the essay referenced correctly, including page numbers of passages referred to?
- Are quotations and paraphrases of others' work identified and fully referenced?
- Are the ideas presented fully credited?
- Is there any evidence of plagiarism?
- Is the essay fluent and readable?
- Is the grammar and spelling adequate?
- Has the writer made an effort to use their own words?

## Generic Assessment Criteria in SocCul

### *Basis on which marks are awarded*

**0-19 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is far below the standard required at the current level of your degree programme.** It indicates that the work is extremely weak and seriously inadequate. This will be because either the work is far too short, is badly jumbled and incoherent in content, or fails to address the essay title or question asked. It will show very little evidence of knowledge or understanding of the relevant course material and may exhibit very weak writing and/or analytical skills.

**20-39 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is below, but at the upper end is approaching, the standard required at the current level of your degree programme.** It indicates weak work of an inadequate standard. This will be because either the work is too short, is very poorly organized, or is poorly directed at the essay title or question asked. It will show very limited knowledge or understanding of the relevant course material and display weak writing and/or analytical skills. Essay work will exhibit no clear argument, may have very weak spelling and grammar, very inadequate or absent references and/or bibliography and may contain major factual errors. Quantitative work will contain significant errors and incorrect conclusions.

**40-49 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is of an acceptable standard at the current the level of your degree programme.** Work of this type will show limited knowledge and understanding of relevant course material. It will show evidence of some reading and comprehension, but the essay or answer may be weakly structured, cover only a limited range of the relevant material or have a weakly developed or incomplete argument. The work will exhibit weak essay writing or analytical skills. It may be poorly-presented without properly laid out footnotes and/or a bibliography, or in the case of quantitative work, it may not be possible to follow the several steps in the logic and reasoning leading to the results obtained and the conclusions reached.

**50-59 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is of a satisfactory to very satisfactory standard at the current level of your degree programme.** Work of this quality will show clear knowledge and understanding of relevant course material. It will focus on the essay title or question posed and show evidence that relevant basic works of reference have been read and understood. The work will exhibit sound essay writing and/or analytical skills. It will be reasonably well structured and coherently presented. Essay work should exhibit satisfactory use of footnotes and/or a bibliography and in more quantitative work it should be possible to follow the logical steps leading to the answer obtained and the conclusions reached. Arguments and issues should be discussed and illustrated by reference to examples, but these may not fully documented or detailed.

**60-69 A mark in this range is indicative of that the work is of a good to very good standard for the current level of your degree programme.** Work of this quality shows a good level of knowledge and understanding of relevant course material. It will show evidence of reading a wide diversity of material and of being able to use ideas gleaned from this reading to support and develop arguments. Essay work will exhibit good writing skills with well organized, accurate footnotes and/or a bibliography that follows the accepted 'style' of the subject. Arguments and issues will be illustrated by reference to well documented, detailed and relevant examples. There should be clear evidence of critical engagement with the objects, issues or topics being analyzed. Any quantitative work will be clearly presented, the results should be correct and any conclusions clearly and accurately expressed.

**70 – 84 A mark in this range is indicative that the work is of an excellent standard for the current level of your degree programme.** The work will exhibit excellent levels of knowledge

and understanding comprising all the qualities of good work stated above, with additional elements of originality and flair. The work will demonstrate a range of critical reading that goes well beyond that provided on reading lists. Answers or essays will be fluently-written and include independent argument that demonstrate an awareness of the nuances and assumptions of the question or title. Essays will make excellent use of appropriate, fully referenced, detailed examples.

**85 - 100 A mark in this range is indicative of outstanding work.** Marks in this range will be awarded for work that exhibits all the attributes of excellent work but has very substantial elements of originality and flair. Marks at the upper end of the range will indicate that the work is of publishable, or near publishable academic standard.