

## **Revisiting Marxism And Liberalism For Internationalism.**

**EzhilArasu.C.**

*B.Sc.,(Agri),M.A.(Philosophy )*  
*Corresponding Author: EzhilArasu.C.*

---

**Abstract:** Liberalism and Marxism are two schools of thought which have left deep imprints in sociological, political and economic theory. They are usually perceived as opposite, rival approaches. In the field of democracy there is a seemingly insurmountable rift around the question of political versus economic democracy. Liberals emphasize the former, Marxists the latter. Liberals say that economic democracy is too abstract and fuzzy a concept, therefore one should concentrate on the workings of an objective political democracy. Setback of Marxism-Communism and its current crises is seriously a handicap for Marxist all over the world. But, it is survival of capitalism in its most robust form that makes Marxism more pronouncing. Thus there are no alternative to liberal democracy, but reality reveals that Marxism continues to inspire million who feel that they are cheated by modern capitalistic enterprises and its ethos. This reformed social model of communist party achieved by reorganizing the varied working groups for social upliftment by bringing together all the like minded people, similar interest groups & organization along with political parties with varied ideologies like the union of left political parties to converge & to join hands with people of similar vision to realize the same & to bring it to existence in this chaotic world and make this world a really & truly a better place to live for all the living entity.

---

Date of Submission: 05-09-2018

Date of acceptance: 20-09-2018

---

### **I.INTRODUCTION**

Liberalism and Marxism are two schools of thought which have left deep imprints in sociological, political and economic theory. They are usually perceived as opposite, rival approaches. In the field of democracy there is a seemingly insurmountable rift around the question of political versus economic democracy. Liberals emphasize the former, Marxists the latter. Liberals say that economic democracy is too abstract and fuzzy a concept, therefore one should concentrate on the workings of an objective political democracy. Marxists insist that political democracy without economic democracy is insufficient. Both propositions are valid and not mutually exclusive. It proposes the creation of an operational, quantifiable index of economic democracy that can be used alongside the already existing indexes of political democracy. By using these two indexes jointly, political and economic democracy can be objectively evaluated. Thus, the requirements of both camps are met and maybe a more dialogical approach to democracy can be reached in the debate between liberals and Marxists. The joint index is used to evaluate the levels of economic and political democracy .

### **II.LIBERALISM.**

Liberalism can be identified as a political philosophy that emphasizes the idea of being free and liberate. This idea of being free could be applied to many concepts and situations, but liberalists focus more on democracy, civil rights, property ownership, religion, etc., in general. It was during the period of Enlightenment that this philosophy of Liberalism came into the field. The philosopher called John Locke is said to have introduced this concept. Liberalists rejected the absolute monarchy, the state religion, and the immense power and authority of kings, etc. Instead of the monarchy, liberalists promoted democracy. However, Liberalism gained much attention after the French Revolution and today it is a powerful influencing political force throughout the world.

### **III.MARXISM.**

Marxism refers to the political and economic theories brought out by Karl Marx, especially with regard to the capitalistic social structure. Marx analyzed the social structure based on the economic activities and, according to him, economy is one of the main requirements for humans to satisfy their needs. There are economic organizations that have been formed in such a way that they decide the social relations, ideologies, political and legal systems between social classes. The forces of production may have unequal relationships and profit sharing, which will lead them to the class struggle. The result of the class struggle will be the Socialism,

which is said to have a cooperative ownership in production. However, later on, this Socialism will pave the way to Communism that is the ideal social structure in Marx's point of view and there will neither be social classes nor states but the common ownership of the means of production. This is the simplest idea of Marxism.

#### **IV. MARXISM VS LIBERALISM**

The difference between Marxism and Liberalism stems from the key idea around which each of these concepts are built. Both Marxism and Liberalism are concepts that are espoused by people all over the world. Marxism was introduced by Karl Marx to explain the changes and developments in the society as a result of the conflict between the elites and the working class people. Liberalism, on the other hand, emphasizes the idea of being free and equal with regard to certain concepts like religion, trade, political freedom, civil rights, etc. Marxism focuses more on establishing a classless society that is called the "Communism" and Liberalism is just a movement that stresses the freedom in behavior or attitudes of individuals.

#### **V. CONTRAST POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES**

Liberalism and socialism have both followed the lead of the Enlightenment philosophers of the eighteenth century in anticipating continuing and ever-accelerating human progress through the exercise of reason. To some extent, of course, their expectations have been met. Whether measured in terms of religious tolerance, freedom of speech, the right to vote and participate in government, or health and life expectancy, the condition of most people in Europe and North America does indeed appear to be better than it was two centuries ago. In other respects, however, it is clear that things have not turned out as the early liberals and socialists expected. In particular, the forces of nationalism and religion remain politically powerful. Liberalism and socialism can both accommodate the kinds of local or parochial sentiments that nationalism embodies, but they do so uncomfortably. In different ways, each represents the universalism of the Enlightenment. Liberals do this by stressing individual liberty. For their part, socialists have sought to promote the interests of the working class, but they have tried to do this by overcoming or eliminating class divisions so that every individual may enjoy a free and fulfilling life. In neither case do national loyalties play a part. Yet nationalism has proved to be a persistent and significant factor in modern politics.

#### **VI. MARXISM AND THE LIBERALISM DEAL POSSIBLE.**

In its pursuit of equality, Marxism is an ideology committed to democracy in one or another sense of that contested term. True Marxism requires government of, by, and for the people. It aims to give everyone an equal voice in the decisions that affect his or her life in direct and important ways. But this can only happen, socialists say, if no one person or class controls most of the wealth and resources—and thus most of the power—within a society. Wealth must be shared equitably if not equally, and resources must be owned and controlled for the benefit of the whole society if true democracy is ever to take shape. Otherwise, they insist, we shall have nothing but government of the wealthy, by the wealthy, and for the wealthy.

#### **VII. MARX'S CRITIQUE OF CAPITALISM**

Although an outspoken critic of capitalism, Marx conceded that capitalism was at one time a progressive and even radical force: "The bourgeoisie, historically, has played a most revolutionary part." In its early phase, he said, capitalism had performed three important and historically progressive functions. First, in the late feudal period merchant capitalists hastened the demise of feudalism by breaking down trade barriers and opening new trade routes to Africa and the Orient. They were also instrumental in the European discovery of the New World: Columbus, after all, was looking not for America but for a shorter trade route by which to bring back tea, silk, and spices from the East Indies. Kings and aristocrats often found themselves in debt to newly wealthy merchant capitalists, who frequently forced legal and political concessions from them. In short, the bourgeoisie, wherever it has got the upper hand, has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, idyllic relations. It has pitilessly torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his "natural superiors," and has left remaining no other nexus [i.e., connection] between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous "cash payment." It has drowned the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm, of Philistine sentimentalism in the icy water of egotistical calculation. It has resolved personal worth into exchange value, and in place of the numberless infeasible chartered freedoms [of feudalism], has set up that single, unconscionable freedom—free trade. In one word, for exploitation, veiled by religious and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. Strange as it may seem, Marx views these as progressive moves—painful but necessary steps that will lead eventually to a more just and non-exploitative society. Capitalism has been a progressive force in a second respect. It has made human beings masters over nature. Capitalism "has been the first [economic system] to show what man's activity can bring about. It has accomplished wonders far surpassing.

Egyptian pyramids, Roman aqueducts, and Gothic cathedrals; it has conducted expeditions that put in the shade all former exoduses of nations and crusades.” In sum, The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, has created more massive and more colossal productive forces than have all preceding generations together. Subjection of nature’s forces to man, machinery, application of chemistry to industry and agriculture, steam navigation, railways, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, canalization of rivers, whole populations conjured out of the ground—what earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labour? A third and closely related respect in which capitalism has proved to be a progressive force resides in its need for innovation and change. To remain profitable, industry must have new and more efficient machinery. These changes in the material forces of production bring about changes in the social relations of production, and thereby in the wider society: The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the forces of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society. . . . Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones. All fixed, fast-frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real conditions of life and his relations with his kind. In all of these respects, Marx contends, capitalism has been a progressive force for the good. But if capitalism has been beneficial, why is Marx so critical of it? And why does he think that capitalism should be overthrown and replaced? Of the many reasons Marx gives for doing so, the following three are of special importance. First, Marx claims that capitalism is outmoded. Although it was once progressive, capitalism has outlived its usefulness and now needs to be superseded. Just because capitalism represents an improvement over feudalism does not mean that no further advance is desirable or necessary. Just as adolescence prepares the way for adulthood, so, Marx maintains, capitalism has prepared the way for an even higher and freer form of society—communist society. Second, Marx contends that capitalism creates alienation. As we noted earlier, the concept of alienation or estrangement loomed large in Hegel’s philosophy of history. Marx also makes “alienation” central to his critique of capitalism. But Marx has a somewhat different understanding of alienation. In his view, it is not “spirit” that is alienated from itself, but people who are alienated from their work and from one another. The sense of alienation felt by the working class will eventually help to bring about the downfall of capitalism and the coming of communism. Under capitalism, Marx maintains, workers are alienated in four distinct but related ways. Because they are forced to sell their labor and do not own either the means of production (machinery, factories, etc.) or what they produce, they are alienated from the product of their labor. Because the capitalist system of mass production kills the creative spirit, workers cannot find satisfaction in their labor and are therefore alienated from the activity of production itself. The worker becomes “an appendage of the machine.” Workers are alienated from their distinctively and uniquely human potentials or “powers”—particularly the power to create and enjoy beauty—which are dulled or remain undeveloped in capitalist society. More specifically, humans have the ability to create objects that they have imagined beforehand, under circumstances of their own choosing. For Marx, what distinguishes humans from other animals is that humans do not necessarily have to produce driven blindly by an unthinking instinct for survival, but can produce freely as a means of self-expression and self-realization. Sadly, capitalism reduces work to mere necessity, robbing it of freedom and beauty, and thereby diminishes human life to a lower form of animal life. Capitalism alienates workers from one another, inasmuch as it makes them compete for jobs and this competition in turn drives down wages. But the workers are not the only ones who are alienated. Marx suggests that the capitalists, like the master in Hegel’s tale of the master and slave, also suffer from alienation. With all their material comforts, they think themselves free and fulfilled; but in fact they are not. They are, according to Marx, mere “appendages” to capital. They are not its master but its slave. The capitalists bow to their master, the almighty market, and tailor their actions accordingly. Far from being free, their actions are determined by forces outside their control. A capitalist, as an individual and a citizen, might wish to invest capital in her or his own country; but if more money can be made by investing abroad and moving jobs there, that is what a rational capitalist will do. And, Marx reasoned, since capital has no fatherland, capitalists have no fatherland; and workers should realize that they don’t either. Third, Marx maintains that capitalism is self-subverting. The operation of the capitalist system has an iron logic that holds everyone—even the capitalist—in its grip. It keeps the capitalist from being a fully developed, kind, and caring human being and makes him or her instead a cold and callous calculating machine. Yet Marx insists repeatedly that he is not criticizing capitalism on moral grounds, nor is he questioning the moral character of capitalists as individuals or even as a class. His supposedly “scientific” critique of capitalism aims to show how the logic of capitalism constrains the actions of everyone, including the capitalists themselves. This constraint is especially evident in the way in which the system operates to keep workers’ wages to a minimum subsistence level. “The average price of wage labor is the minimum wage, i.e., that quantum of the means of subsistence which is absolutely requisite to keep the laborer in bare existence as a laborer.” Capitalists keep wages low not because they are immoral or cruel, but because the logic of the system

requires them to do so. We can illustrate Marx's point by imagining two factories owned by competing capitalists. Both produce the same product—steel, say. One day, one of the capitalists takes pity on his workers. He raises their wages, shortens the working day, improves working conditions, installs safety equipment, adds a clinic and a day-care center. His competitor does none of these things. The result? The kindly capitalist goes out of business, his workers lose their jobs, and his heartless competitor flourishes. Why? Because to pay for these improvements he must either raise the cost of his product, which drives away consumers, or he must reduce his profit margin, which drives away investors, who want the largest possible return on their investment. The kindly capitalist, now bankrupt, is forced into the ranks of the workers. His competitor, by contrast, grows even richer. He and others like him corner ever-larger shares of their respective markets, resulting in reduced competition and a tendency toward monopoly. Such, according to Marx, is the logic of capitalism. The point of this imaginary tale is that, under capitalism, worker and capitalist alike are alienated from the full and free development of their human powers. Yet they are prevented from seeing this because, under capitalism, nothing is what it appears to be; everything is “inverted.” Fair seems foul and foul seems fair. In this topsy-turvy world the market is free, but individuals are not. “In bourgeois society,” says Marx, “capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality.” The workers appear to exchange their labor voluntarily for a daily wage. In reality, however, they are forced by fear of unemployment and eventual starvation to work for a subsistence wage. Capitalists appear to be free to act as they please. But in fact they are in the grip of forces beyond their control. Like the sorcerer's apprentice, the capitalists have grabbed hold of a broom that will soon sweep them away. Marx contends that capitalism has created conditions and unleashed forces that will one day destroy it. In particular, capitalism has created its own “grave diggers” by creating a class—the proletariat—with interests implacably opposed to its own, a class with everything to gain and nothing to lose by revolting against the ruling bourgeoisie. Yet, ironically, it is the bourgeoisie who are responsible for their own downfall, for they brought the workers together in the first place and then taught them to combine their labor and cooperate in the production of commodities. The workers eventually come to think of themselves as a unified class with common interests and a common class enemy, the bourgeoisie. They will then make the revolution that will overthrow capitalism and lead eventually to the creation of a classless communist society. Before examining the goal—the coming of a communist society—we need to look more closely at the process by which Marx believed that it would be achieved.

### **VIII.HOW COMMUNISM CHANGED THE WORLD.**

In the western world, many view communism as a defeated historic ideology, but communism continues to influence the world today. Only twenty-four years ago, communism fell in Russia. China, one of the largest nations on earth, proudly displays the label of communism today. Other smaller countries, such as Cuba, still follow the example of communism set by the Soviet Union. The main theory of communism, created by Karl Marx, is the theory that was and is utilized by many of these countries. This theory, called Marxism, is based on the idea that in capitalism, there is a working class being exploited by the rich. Because of Marxism, the political landscape of the modern world has been significantly altered, resulting in nations who call themselves communists and western countries whose politics still contain remnants of Marxist ideology. Communism is not simply one standard set of ideas. Rather, there are several different variations and schemes on the philosophy. However, the most relevant and accepted initial theory was first created by Karl Marx, who is seen as the father of communism. As explained by scholar Leslie Holmes, Marx lived the majority of his adult life in England during the early 1800s. His ideas were influenced by events occurring in Western Europe at the time, primarily the Industrial Revolution and the aftershock of the French Revolution. Other revolutions happening around the world at the time, which were also of interest for Marx. He developed a method of interpreting history based on people's chain reactions to events. Marx believed that class relationships were the motivating force of history. The distinction between classes was determined according to people's relationship to means of production. In other words, there were two main classes: land owners and non-land owners. In the context of the Industrial Revolution, this meant the factory owners and the factory workers. The working class was labeled the “proletariat” by Marx, which means “without property” . The people who owned the property were called “capitalists” or “bourgeoisie” . According to Marx, for the most part, private property and the struggles between these two classes are what cause revolutions in history. He thought that eventually this class tension would build up so much that a social revolution would take place, resulting in a perfect society with no ruling class where the government would simply “wither away” . Supposedly, just before this happened, there would be a temporary dictatorship of the proletariat, although Marx never clarified exactly what he meant by this dictatorship . Holmes' research charts the rise of communism, explaining that, in 1917, a Russian revolution took place, which was seen as the beginning of communism in power. This revolution would eventually lead to the beginning of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1922, also known as the Soviet Union. The Tsarist autocracy, which had been in place for centuries, was replaced by the Bolsheviks, the first communist party in the world, led by Vladimir Lenin. After a series of power struggles between the Bolsheviks and their

political enemies, the Bolsheviks gained complete control of Russia. In 1924, Lenin died, and the party needed a new leader. There were several competitors, but Joseph Stalin was the person eventually chosen. After Stalin took power, he instituted his own economic system of complete socialism, called the Five-Year Plan. The plan worked by setting specific production goals for the entire country. This included overarching control over the agricultural sphere. However, some of the slightly wealthier farmers, known as kulaks, refused to join the state system of collective farming. When they refused, their property was confiscated, and they were sent to Siberia to serve as slave labor. Holmes explains that 99% percent of farmland was added to the collective system by the close of the 1930s. Because of this collectivization, Russia experienced a harsh famine from 1932-1933 that resulted in the death of millions of people, and Stalin was accused of causing it. Stalin and the Communists did not seize control over only economic life; they also seized many civil liberties. All negative speech regarding public policy was prohibited, and the secret police became far more powerful. The Communists were especially harsh towards religious groups such as the Roman Catholics and Jewish communities. Rather than deal with political enemies in a peaceful fashion, Stalin chose to slaughter any person or group that posed a possible threat to his power. He continued to rule through World War II into the Cold War, when the Soviet Union emerged as one of the two most powerful nations on earth, along with United States, the USSR's capitalist rival. Around the time of the Cold War, a new nation founded on the ideas of communism began to rise; this nation was China. China's radical communist revolution was led by Mao Zedong. His goal was to create an anti-imperialist movement that would lead towards the greater goal of socialism. The revolution first began in the 1930s, when Mao sought to harness the power of the peasant class in China to propel his movement. When the revolution took place, socialism first affected the area of agriculture. None of the land was privately owned. Instead, there were village communes which could be borrowed for use by families who farmed. The actual land still belonged to the whole nation. As Marshall Berman points out, this is different from the Soviet Union, because in 1917, after a peasant revolution, the people in power in the USSR chose to recognize private property of those who received land from the government. However, modern China has changed. While civil liberties continue to be scarce, economically, China is growing fast and becoming more modern every day. Western countries are even beginning to feel endangered by China's growth, with the New York Times printing an article in June 2005 titled "Chinese Strength, U.S. Weakness". Chinese success is often used as an example by those who support a socialist system of economics, because of China's ability to keep up with the modern world and still remain communist. Some people see communism as a "doomed" system, incapable of working because of its very nature. Gang Ke is one these people; he describes communism as a fusion of politics and economics that is totalitarian and relies on a state-controlled, unchallengeable monopoly. According to Ke, this kind of "fusion" society leads to an economy dictated by the whims of those who happen to be in power. This system results in a greater emphasis on central government rather than the individual. Ke believes that the better alternative to communism is a liberal democracy, more specifically the kind of democracy which has been so successful in the West. He views the Chinese system of politics as a barrier to freedom, desperately in need of reform. Regardless of Ke's opinions about communism in China, it is undeniable that the essence and ideology of communism and more specifically Marxism have had profound influence on modern politics in the West. Marxism's basis is that the people who control the means of production in a capitalistic system will actively exploit the people who work for them. This idea is still very relevant in modern Western politics, which is demonstrated by the remarkable success of the democratic presidential candidate, Bernie Sanders. Although ultimately losing the Democratic nomination, Sanders came close to closing the polling gap with Hilary Clinton, and his view of taxes is an unmistakable echo of Marx's beliefs. In May of 2015, Sanders began endorsing a "Robin Hood Tax." The purpose of this tax was to take 0.5 percent of every Wall Street transaction to help pay for American students to attend college for free ("Sanders"). The ideology behind the tax is that rich Wall Street investors are unfairly profiting at the expense of the average worker. The similarity between Sanders's ideas and Marxism is clear; the only difference is that Sanders does not call for revolution. He would rather change a little at a time. Evidence of communism's influence permeates the world, whether it is in modern politics, history books, or museums of war. The Marxist concept of exploitation of the poor by the greedy rich has taken hold among academics and laborers alike. The Soviet Union and modern China have provided clear historical proof of how communism can work, but not necessarily how it does work, because of the varied and unique forms communism can take. Despite communism's ideas originating over a century ago, they continue to be just as relevant and radical today as when they were conceived, if not more so. Communism has altered the world in a way that Marx probably never thought was possible.

### **IX. THE RELEVANCE OF MARXISM TODAY.**

Despite, its failure and crisis Marxism continues to inspire millions of people throughout the globe. The reasons are: First: Class analysis continues to offer the most viable and pragmatic tool of analysis in a highly inegalitarian social world. Perhaps none can deny that the world continues to be divided among 'haves' and 'have-nots'. Though there are other interests and categories but any broad categorization in the political analysis

inevitably involves the issues relating to class. Secondly: The revolutionary potential of Marx continues to inspire people who have not benefited from capitalist ventures. The mechanism of rising expectations is being sought to be achieved through method devised by Marx. Thirdly: The highly egalitarian tinge of Marxism remains the only best alternative to liberalism. Regimes not benefiting from the capitalist modernization may get lured to doctrines that they may find more viable and attractive. As such, both people and the leadership in the developing world seek to interpret Marxism in their own way to suit their local milieu. Fourthly: The global economic integration in its longer turn is bound to produce, situations of scarcity and inequality wherein the deprived and isolated people would look to Marxism.

### **X. REVOLUTION - A REMOTE FEASIBILITY**

There is a clear distinction in history between periods of gradual development and periods in which entire social system is radically and abruptly changed. A radical change in the social system, resulting in one socio-economic formation being replaced by another, is called a social revolution. In economic terms, it seems from a conflict between the productive forces and production relations. The progressive elements of society seek to resolve the conflict and remove the old production relations. But they are resisted by the reactionary classes which fight to prevent any change. The ruling class uses the power of the state to crush a revolutionary movement. Accordingly, the question of power is the question of any revolution. Once the revolutionary class seized power, it uses its power to do away with the old system altogether and introduce a new order.

History shows that revolutions cannot be made to order. There must be a revolutionary situation. This happens when a society reaches a state where the ruling class no longer rule in the old way and the oppressed are no longer willing to live in the old way.

But not every revolutionary situation develops into a revolution. To effect a revolution there must be massive political forces ready for action. These come from the classes interested in toppling the existing system and capable of carrying through the revolution to victory, the classes that are the motive force of the revolution. To rally the political forces of the revolution the revolutionary classes must have experience of class struggle, from political parties and organizations, and produce leaders who are dedicated to the revolutionary cause.

Revolutions differ in their nature in accordance with their tasks. If a revolution introduces bourgeois relations, it is a bourgeois revolution. If it introduces a social system, it is a socialist revolution.

In social revolutions the great role of the oppressed and exploited classes is clearly revealed. With their heroic struggle they undermine the foundations of the old society. They form the striking force of the revolution which assaults the state power of the revolutionary classes. They also defend the revolutionary gains against the encroachments of counterrevolution. The oppressed classes are the main motive force of all great revolutions.

Now, With the collapse of the Communist governments in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, Communism's influence has virtually disappeared in Europe, but approximately one quarter of the world's population still lives under some type of Communist Party rule, primarily in the People's Republic of China, Vietnam, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, and Cuba. Although the Chinese Communist Party continues to have control over much of the political life of its country, its economic and political reforms contradict much of Marxist theory. China has instituted significant economic reforms and is gradually implementing expansion of the rule of law. Therefore the idea of revolution today, whether it is possible and, if so, what forces can bring it about and with what strategy, is the question.

### **XI. MARXISM IN NEW DIMENSION**

Marxist is a person who supports or believes in the principles of Marxism. Marxism is now not for classless society or stateless society, Marxists need not be atheists, need not study and follow Das-capital, or dialectical materialism, or surplus value theory etc. Now true Marxist duty is to bring profound change globally for eradication of poverty, striving to achieve equality, dignity and freedom for all regardless of faith or nationality.

### **XII. IS IT POSSIBLE TO HAVE A DEMOCRATIC MARXIST SOCIETY?**

Although no country has fully instituted democratic Marxism, the socialist parties and labor movements of other countries have won many victories for their people. Many northern European countries enjoy tremendous prosperity and relative economic equality thanks to the policies pursued by social democratic parties hiding Marx's name. These nations used their relative wealth to insure a high standard of living for their citizens—high wages, health care and subsidized education. Most importantly, social democratic parties supported strong labor movements that became central players in economic decision-making. Democratic socialists believe that both the economy and society should be run democratically—to meet public needs, not to make profits for a few. To achieve a more just society, many structures of our government and economy must be radically transformed through greater economic and social democracy so that ordinary people can participate in the many decisions that affect our lives.

Democratic Marxists do not want to create an all-powerful government bureaucracy. But they do not want big corporate bureaucracies to control our society either. Rather, we believe that social and economic decisions should be made by those whom they most affect.

Today, corporate executives who answer only to themselves and a few wealthy stockholders make basic economic decisions affecting millions of people. Resources are used to make money for capitalists rather than to meet human needs. We believe that the workers and consumers who are affected by economic institutions should own and control them.

Social ownership could take many forms, such as worker-owned cooperatives or publicly owned enterprises managed by workers and consumer representatives. Democratic socialists favor as much decentralization as possible. While the large concentrations of capital in industries such as energy and steel may necessitate some form of state ownership, many consumer-goods industries might be best run as cooperatives.

Democratic socialists have long rejected the belief that the whole economy should be centrally planned. While we believe that democratic planning can shape major social investments like mass transit, housing, and energy, market mechanisms are needed to determine the demand for many consumer goods.

Finally Democracy and Marxism can go hand in hand. All over the world, wherever the idea of democracy has taken root, the vision of Marxism has taken root as well.

### **XIII. NEW WORLD ORDER IS NOT A DREAM BUT A GOAL.**

A wish list of dream world that would like to see emerge by near future. These are dreams, but hoping that many of the dreams will coincide with everyone. Here is the list:

- There will be no poor people, no beggars, no homeless people, no street children anywhere in the world. Every country will have its own poverty museum. The global poverty museum will be located in the country that is the last to come out of poverty.
- There will be no passports and no visas for anybody anywhere in the world. All people will be truly global citizens of equal status.
- There will be no war, no war preparations, and no military establishment to fight wars. There will be no nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction.
- There will be no more incurable diseases, from cancer to AIDS, anywhere in the world. Disease will become a very rare phenomenon subject to immediate and effective treatment. High-quality healthcare will be available to everyone. Infant mortality and maternal mortality will be things of the past.
- There will be a global education system accessible to all from anywhere in the world. All children will experience fun and excitement in learning and growing up. All children will grow up as caring and sharing persons, believing that their own development should be consistent with the development of others in the world.
- The global economic system will encourage individuals, businesses, and institutions to share their prosperity and participate actively in bringing prosperity to others, making income inequality an irrelevant issue. "Unemployment" and "welfare" will be unheard of.
- Social business will be a substantial part of the business world.
- There will be only one global currency. Coins and paper currency will be gone.
- Technology will be available with which all secret bank accounts and transactions of politicians, government officials, business people, intelligence agencies, underworld organizations, and terrorist groups can be easily detected and monitored.
- State-of-the art financial services of every kind will be available to every person in the world.
- All people will be committed to maintaining a sustainable lifestyle based on appropriate technologies. Sun, water, and wind will be the main sources of power.
- Humans will be able to forecast earthquakes, cyclones, tsunamis, and other natural disasters precisely and in plenty of time to minimize damage and loss of life.
- There will be no discrimination of any kind, whether based on race, color, religion, gender, sexual orientation, political belief, language, culture, or any other factor.
- There will be no need of paper and therefore no need to cut down trees. There will be biodegradable reusable synthetic papers, in cases where "paper" is absolutely needed.
- Basic connectivity will be wireless and nearly costless.
- Everybody will read and hear everything in his own language. Technology will make it possible for a person to speak, read, and write in his own language while the listener will hear and the reader will read the message in his own language.
- All cultures, ethnic groups, and religions will flourish to their full beauty and creativity, contributing to the magnificent unified orchestra of human society.
- All people will enjoy an environment of continuous innovation, restructuring of institutions, and revisiting of concepts and ideas.

- All peoples will share a world of peace, harmony, and friendship devoted to expanding the frontiers of human potential.

These are all achievable goals .whenwe proceed through the future, it will be easier and easier to get closer to our dreams. The difficult part is making up our minds now. As more of us can agree on what we want to achieve, the quicker we can reach our goals. Marxism will never die, but we need to understand its most fundamental tool for creating non-violent new dimensional paths. The real tool is the Marxist dialectic, known as dialectical materialism. Dialectics are a method of discourse between two parties. Dialectical materialism is used to formulate the Marxist view of the world, by reinterpreting all things through a lens that is absolutely needed now.

#### **XIV. THE MAJOR SOCIAL PROBLEMS IN INDIA.**

Population problems, casteism, untouchability, regionalism, linguism and communalism, beggary, unemployment, poverty, labour problems, rural problems, problems of industrialization and urbanization, prostitution, crime, suicide, juvenile delinquency, youth tensions and student unrest and finally the problems of democracy. The social problems of India have no single or simple cause. Each problem has a complex history and is usually not due to one but to many causes. War, poverty, unemployment or crimes do not offer single or simple explanation of their occurrence. Sometimes one problem is so interwoven with other problems that it cannot be solved apart from them.

#### **XV. THE LEFT PARTIES WILL HAVE TO EMERGE AS THE REAL POLITICAL ALTERNATIVE.**

As for as India is concerned it is a complicated and confusing situation, full of challenges and conflicts, we shall need new ideologies to explain why social conditions are as they are, to evaluate those conditions, to provide a sense of orientation, and to set out a program of action—an attempt to take India as it is and to remake. Indian Marxists need unique ideologies to give meaning to the democratic ideal and substance to the concept of Dalit and Women liberation. Indian political system is very often condemned as corrupt. Inefficient and defective. Unhealthy competition among the political parties for power has many a times damaged our national interests. The Indian Left today needs to radically realign its identity along the lines of world socialist parties, and must initiate free internal debate and honest introspection within the party.

#### **XVI. CONCLUSION.**

Setback of Marxism-Communism and its current crises is seriously a handicap for Marxist all over the world. But, it is survival of capitalism in its most robust form that makes Marxism more pronouncing. Thus there are no alternative to liberal democracy, but reality reveals that Marxism continues to inspire million who feel that they are cheated by modern capitalistic enterprises and its ethos. As such, Marxism is bound to bounce back the moment rises of capitalism become evident.

The vital role of the communist party is to integrate the various movements viz., Peasant Movements, Tribal Movements, Dalit Movements, Backward Caste/Class movements, Women Movements, Industrial Working Class Movements, Students' Movements, Middle Class Movements, Human Rights and Environmental Movements and lead the working class and its allies on all the immediate & current issues that confront them & to conglomerate them into a social consciousness and to provide their leading section with a revolutionary form of organization. In contrary to wider belief that socialism is not synonymous with strict equality, and certainly not with coerced uniformity, but it stands against excessive inequality. Socialism today points to a radical reinterpretation of the traditional principles of equality and community. The principle of socialist equality is inclusive of liberal preoccupations with individual liberty, autonomy and responsibility, while the principle of socialist community is no longer defined as the antithesis of individualism.

Embracing this socialist model for the 21<sup>st</sup> century could have many radical and far-reaching implication. Above all, it means that socialists must rethink the role of the state within socialist society. which will result in social reorientation; bringing together of like minded people, similar interest groups & organization along with political parties with varied ideologies like the union of left political parties to converge & to join hands with people of similar vision to realize the same & to bring it to existence in this chaotic world and make this world a really & truly a better place to live for all the living entity.

#### **REFERENCES**

- [1]. Liberalism, Marxism and Democratic Theory Revisited: Proposal of a Joint Index of Political and Economic Democracy. Angelo Segrillo .Department of History, University of São Paulo
- [2]. <https://www.differencebetween.com/difference-between-marxism-and-vs-liberalism/>
- [3]. POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES AND THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL NINTH EDITION TERENCE BALL Arizona State University RICHARD DAGGER University of Richmond With the assistance of DANIEL



- I. O'NEILL University of Florida Boston Columbus Indianapolis New York San Francis.  
Page.no.194,319 and 331
- [4]. How Communism Changed the World. [https://www.nwacc.edu/c/document.../get\\_file?...How%20Communism.pdf](https://www.nwacc.edu/c/document.../get_file?...How%20Communism.pdf)
- [5]. Essay on the Relevance of Marxism in the 21st Century. [www.shareyouressays.com/essays/essay-on-the-relevance-of-marxism-in.../113671](http://www.shareyouressays.com/essays/essay-on-the-relevance-of-marxism-in.../113671)
- [6]. Fundamentals of political knowledge. - Moscow: Novosti Press Agency .page no
- [7]. Communism - New World Encyclopedia .[www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Communism](http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Communism)
- [8]. What is Democratic Socialism? Q & A - Democratic Socialists of America  
[https://www.dsausa.org/what\\_is\\_democratic\\_socialism](https://www.dsausa.org/what_is_democratic_socialism).
- [9]. Creating a World Without Poverty: Social Business and the Future of Capitalism. by Muhammad Yunus (Author), Karl Weber page 225,226, and 227
- [10]. Paper-7 Social Problems, Social Policy, Social Legislation  
[DDCddceutkal.ac.in/Syllabus/MSW/Paper\\_07.pdf](http://DDCddceutkal.ac.in/Syllabus/MSW/Paper_07.pdf) page no2 and3.

EzhilArasu.C..’’ Revisiting Marxism And Liberalism For Internationalism.’’ IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS). vol. 23 no. 09, 2018, pp.48-56.