

Political ideologies of Liberalism Vs Marxism: A View of Study in the 21st Century

Dr. E. Girani Singh

Assistant Professor, Dept. of Pol. Sc., Manipur Collage

Abstract

Ideology usually refers to a set of ideas, values, and a world-view which can shape the thoughts and actions of individuals and wider society. It has an influence on social structures, economics, and politics. Karl Marx defined ideology as a set of ideas and beliefs that are manipulative and convincing on the surface level, but are not actually true-what he called false consciousness. He created this concept to explain how the ruling class justifies their elite status through the socio cultural beliefs they spread in society. Actually an ideology is a set of opinion/belief of a group or an individual. Very often ideology refers to a set of optical beliefs or a set of ideas that characterize a particular culture. Monarchism, feudalism, imperialism, capitalism, Nazism, fascism, totalitarianism, utilitarianism, liberalism, communism, socialism, Marxism etc. are some of the ideologies on which socio-political life of mankind have been based. 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. The article argues that both propositions are valid and not mutually exclusive. It proposes the creation of an operational, quantifiable index of economic democracy that can be used along side the already existing indexes of political democracy. By using these two indexes jointly, political and economic democracy can be objectively evaluated. Thus, there requirements of both camps are met and may be 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 in the transition countries of Eastern Europe.

Keywords: economic democracy, Liberalism, Marxism, political democracy, transition countries.

1. Introduction

Liberalism and Marxism are two schools of thought which have left deep imprints in political, sociological and economic theory. Both have been very fruitful in illuminating a wide range of common issues across these fields and yet are usually perceived as opposite, rival approaches contradicting each other in general. Now-a-days such two schools of thought are very much important to study at the large scale and further to know the different forms of government working in the different part of the world.

As a valid example, the fall of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries in Eastern Europe obliged Marxist and liberal theorists to make further efforts to understand this process the former to comprehend the crumbling of communism, the latter interested in the political and economic transition to capitalism. Due to the circumstances surrounding these developments seemingly the complete victory of one side over the other the common task to analyze the perestroika and transition experience did not lead to a coming closer of the two contending views, but may have even led to a deepening of the gulf between them. This article argues that liberalism and Marxism are extremely useful approaches and are not mutually exclusive. As regard it would propose some first steps towards a synthesis between them exactly in relation to one of their greatest bones of contention the issue of democracy. No grand synthesis would be offered here, but rather the humble beginning of an effort to bring the more moderate contenders from each side to utilize some of their specific insights to co-jointly better illuminate this complex matter. In practice, there would propose the creation of a new, alternative index for measuring democracy, which incorporates liberal and Marxist insights and can therefore be more acceptable to both sides than the presently existing ones. It is hope that if we can create an index that is acceptable to both sides, this may lead to joint collaborative research which would deepen the present understanding of democracy and of the difficulties it still faces in being fully accepted in manyparts of the world. The article is composed of three sections presentation of how the problem of democracy historically arose between liberalism and Marxism; the proposal of a preliminary synthesis of the Marxist and liberal views via the creation of a joint index of democracy which incorporates insights from both camps; and an initial application of this index to the transition countries of Eastern Europe. Since we would focus on the experience of transition countries, we would start by describing the definitions of democracy used in the studies of transition. According to Schumpeter's intellectual heirs, historical experience has shown that it was with this model of political organization that modern societies have reached the greatest degree of freedom for their citizens. However, the elevation of liberal, representative democracy to the status of sole valid paradigm brings with it contradictions with definitions of democracy, based on its historical and etymological origins.

Marxism is a social, political and economy philosophy named after the 19th century German Philosopher and economic Karl Marx. His works examines the historical effects of capitalism on labour productivity and economic development and argues that worker revolution is needed to replace capitalism with a economist system. Marxism posits that the struggle between the bourgeoisie or capitalist and the proletariat or workers defines economic relations in a capitalist economy and will lead inevitably to a communist revolution. Marxist theory were influential in the development of socialism which requires shared ownership by workers of the means production. Marxism is both a social and political theory and encompasses Marxist class conflict theory and Marxian economics. Marxism was first publicly formulated in 1848 in the pamphlet 'The Communist Manifesto' by Dr. Karl Marx and F. Engels which lays out the theory of class struggle and revolution. Marxian economics focuses on criticism of capitalism detailed by Marx in his book – 'Das Kapital' published in 1867. Marxism is a philosophy while communism is a system of government based on Marxist principle. Marx envisioned a society in which workers owned the means of production. On the other hand, Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on the rights of the individual, liberty, consent of the governed, political equality, right to private property and equality before the law. Liberalism became a distinct opponent in the Age of Enlightenment, gaining popularity among the western philosophers and economists. Liberalism sought to replace the norms of hereditary privilege, state religion, absolute monarchy, the divine right of kings and traditional conservatism with representative

democracy, rule of law and equality under the law. Philosopher and scientist John Locke was the first to develop a liberal theory which is often credited to his writing about the concept of separating church and state.

Liberalism and Marxism represent two distinct approaches to understanding the relationship between individuals, economy and government. Understanding these differences is crucial for navigating complex political debates. Liberalism encourages individuals innovation and entrepreneurship so that it leads to income inequality and social injustice. Hence it became market failure and economic instability. On the other side, Marxism aims to reduce economic inequality and promote social justice. It critiques the exploitation of workers under capitalism. In comparison liberalism prioritizes individual freedom while Marxism emphasizes collective well-being. Both are two influential political theories that have shaped modern society. While both theories aim to promote human well-being, they differ significantly in their views on individual rights, economic systems and the role of government. Liberalism emphasizes individual rights and freedoms, advocacy of limited government intervention in economic matters. It further supports free market capitalism. On the other hand Marxism emphasizes collective ownership and social equality, criticism of capitalism for exploiting workers. It further advocates for a centrally planned economy.

2. Objectives of the study

- i) Importance application of two schools of thought in the society.
- ii) Importance role of the schools of thought in the social development.
- iii) Study of comparison between the two schools of thought in the prevailing society.

3. Methodology of the study

The study is historical, descriptive as well as analytical. Secondary sources have been used so far. Sources like ideas on the works by different authors and research scholars in the form of 30 books, research papers, materials available on internet and newspapers, etc. have also been used.

4. Review of Literature

Literature includes books articles research papers, dissertation, thesis which is most related to the topic. Very few books concerning the research topic have been received here such as the book entitled of 'Political Theory-Principles of Political Science written by Dr. Vidya Dhar Mahajan in 1988 and found that Karl Marx's ideas are still relevant in today's world and can answer the complex and difficult questions faced by capitalism in the 21st century. His ideas and methods of analysis can still be used to interpret the world in order to change it for the betterment of the society. He further expressed that Karl Marx attacked liberalism from various angles. As regards its social aspect he condemned liberalism because it exalted the fortunate few at the expense of the oppressed many and cheated millions of the people of the just fruit of the labour. Then he himself believed that the inner contradiction in capitalism would ultimately lead to its destruction so that capitalism is its own grave-digger. The book entitle of 'History of Western Political Thought' written by Dr. R. S. Chaurasia in 1969 and found that communism was considered to be a purely scientific theory head boiled and perfectly realistic in contrast to utopian socialism of some of their predecessors. He further remarked that left ideology may be defined as a philosophy of history based on materialistic conception of human development and aiming for the

dictatorship of proletariat during transitory period and striving ultimately for classless and stateless society. It also found that historical materialism is the application of principle of dialectical materialism to the development of the society. In the book entitled 'Problem of Political Philosophy' written by K. K. Kulshrestha and S.P. Kashyap in 1975 which is published by S. Chand and Company P. Ltd. and expressed that the Marxist idea of the critical method is a legacy from Socrates and Plato. It further expressed that class struggle is the motive force of social development. In V.I. Lenin's book entitled 'The History Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx Collected Works Vol. 18' in 1986, published by progress publishers, Moscow and it pointed out, is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society. This book deal to the life and revolutionary politics of V. I. Lenin. Lenin further admitted that the ideal depends upon the revolution in road to proletarian revolution. The revolution proletariat in alliance with the mass of peasantry moved to proletarian revolution. Tsarism was hated by the entire population of Russia. Once again, in the book entitled 'History of Political Thought' written by Radhey Shyam Chaurasia in 2003 and expressed that Stalin differed with Trotsky regarding the international character of the working class movement. He further expressed that Stalin made Russia a world superpower but he did not believe in the withering away of the state. In place of bringing state towards an end, he made the state omnipotent and according to some persons gave socialism of rather to say state socialism to Russia in stead of communism. Finally it became Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism and so on. In the book entitled 'History of Political Thought' written by Das P. Gin 1995, Delhi, New Central Book Agency (P) Ltd. and expressed that Stalinism is different from Leninism because the theory and practice of Stalin is very close to totalitarian rule in the erstwhile USSR. The author further expressed that Stalin completely revised Lenin's idea about the states socialism and social classes respectively. He further proclaimed that the doctrine of peaceful co-existence of countries with different social system. Regarding this theme on 'Political ideologies of Liberalism vs Marxism: A View of Study' is very must different and especially from the others write ups which is a quite unique and challenge.

5. Importance of the study

These views are more relevant even today because both globalization and privatization have failed to solve many social issues and challenges such as poverty, unemployment, inequality, environment degradation, and communal conflict and so on. Hence there is a need of rethink and recheck about the idea of Political ideologies of Liberalism and Marxism in order to solve of all our problems on the earth.

6. Statement of the problem

The genres of literature produced so far discuss Marxism and Liberalism which found different view points written by different writers. Generally common people thought that 'Political ideologies of Liberalism vs Marxism : A View of Study' is above all the subjects so that such simple thought is very much challenging and also inspiring me to take up the present research paper. So this study is still lagging behind and quite distinct from the others' write ups.

7. Major finding of the study

- i) Capitalism — unequal distribution of income
— poor get poorer and rich get richer, class – struggle.

- high social costs
 - the way too much competition
 - slow development which encourages rich people to stay rich and poor people to stay poor.
- ii) Capitalism is a core component of Liberalism. If someone does not believe in capitalism, then that person cannot be a liberal. A liberal may believe that economic reforms are necessary for capitalism to function, but they still believe that capitalism is the best economy system available as such liberalism opposes capitalism while embracing capitalism.
- iii) Capitalism encourages progress and wealth creation but increases the gap between haves and have nots.
- iv) Capitalism is like weeds.
- v) Socialism
- promoting economic equality
 - ensuring basic needs
 - encouraging collective ownership
 - fostering social welfare
 - reducing exploitation
 - every person gets job.
- vi) Socialism tries to bridge that gap by making everyone have the same of everything. But since that destroys the motivation to work hard and improve, the total country's output falls, hence everyone ends up equally poor.
- vii) The system of use of private and free exchange for mutual benefit, often called capitalism.
- viii) Liberalism believed in political democracy which encoperates capitalism on the other hand, Marxism believed in economic democracy which brings socialism.
- ix) While socialism and communism share common goals and values, they differ in their approach, scope and degree of government control.

8. Origins of Ideology and Democracy

Ideology usually refers to a set of ideas, values, and a world-view which can shape the thoughts and actions of individuals and wider society. It has an influence on social structures, economics, and politics. Karl Marx defined ideology as a set of ideas and beliefs that are manipulative and convincing on the surface level, but are not actually true - what he called false consciousness. Karl Marx created this concept to explain how the ruling class justifies their elite status through the sociocultural beliefs they spread in society. Actually an ideology is a set of opinion/belief of a group or an individual. Very often ideology refers to a set of optical beliefs or a set of ideas that characterize a particular culture. Monarchism, feudalism, imperialism, capitalism, liberalism, Nazism, fascism, totalitarianism, utilitarianism, communism, socialism, Marxism etc. are some of the ideologies on which socio-political life of mankind have been based. As an ideology, the left ideology is characterized by an emphasis on the ideas such as, freedom, equality, fraternity, rights, progress, reform and internationalism. It is regarded as an expression of social welfare as the most important goal of its government. Communism,

socialism, Marxism etc. belong to left ideology because they seek to achieve social equality and egalitarianism, and are often in opposition to social hierarchy and private property; they are present accepted as the standard form of leftist ideology. Left politics socially involve a concern for those in society whom its adherent perceive as disadvantaged relative to others as well as a belief that there are unjustified inequalities that need to be reduced or abolished. Leftists believed in Marxian economics, named after the economic theories of Karl Marx. Some distinguish Marx's economic theories from his political philosophy, arguing that Marx's approach to understanding the economy is independent of his advocacy of revolutionary socialism or his belief in the inevitability of a proletarian revolution. Marxian economics do not exclusively rely on Marx and draw from a range of Marxist and non-Marxist sources. The dictatorship of the proletariat and workers' state are terms used by some Marxist, particularly Leninists and Marxist–Leninist, to describe what they see as a temporary state between the capitalist state of affairs and a communist society.

Generally, each ideology contains certain ideas about what it considers the best form of government i.e., autocracy or democracy and the best economic system i.e., liberalism or Marxism. In this context, we would try to discuss all the facts, useful of historical background and current situation of the term left and right. The word left and right were initially used in the French revolution of the 18th century. At that time, France had monarchy, one king and his dynasty would rule the nation. Some people were in support of monarchy and some were against it and wanted democracy in their nation. At that time, the sitting arrangement of France parliament was in the following way:-

- People sitting on the right side were those who were loyal to their monarch, mainly the wealthy class;
- People sitting on the left side were those who were poor and were not loyal to their monarch and wanted democracy in their nation. These people were not happy from the monarchy and wanted a revolutionary change in the existing system.
- Therefore, the definition of left and right came from these historical facts and people used different words or tag for Left and right, which are the following:-
- Left means reformist, revolution.
- Right means conservative, establishment.

Etymologically speaking, the word democracy comes from the Greek *demokratia* meaning “power of the people”, “rule of the people”. It referred to the government system of Athens in the 5th century BC. In Athens every male adult citizen could himself vote in the assembly (*eklesia*) on the most important questions of the city. Apart from the *eklesia* which met at least ten times a year Athenian citizens elected a council (*boule*) made up of 500 people who exercised executive power, running daily business, putting into practice the decisions of the assembly, preparing the agenda of its future meetings, etc. The members were elected for a one year period. This council was divided into committees of 50 members, each committee governing for a period of one tenth of the year. Since nobody was allowed to remain on the council of 500 for more than two years, ordinary citizens had a good opportunity to serve on it at some point in their lives. Rotation in government posts was considered a good method to escape the formation of oligarchies and ensure participation. Athenian politicians in general were then not professionals but amateurs. Thus, in its Greek origins, democracy was direct, i.e., the citizens voted personally and directly in the assembly and the executive power of the council of 500 was not exercised by a separate class of politicians

but rather by the citizens themselves in alternation. Democracy was a new form of government in which the citizenry as a whole could exert power, in opposition to the previous regimes of monarchy/tyranny, one-man rule or aristocracy/oligarchy meaning rule of the few. The will of the majority of citizens ought to be the basis for the final decisions. The main point, as far as our discussion is concerned, is that democracy, in its origins, was basically direct that no middleman. It is important to emphasize this fact because, after its heyday in Athens, democracy went through a centuries long eclipse. Except for a few isolated cases, democracy reappeared as a political regime only after the democratizing shock by the French Revolution (1789) and the American War of Independence (1775- 1781) on the principles of political liberalism originated in the English Glorious Revolution (1689). Liberalism in its 17th century beginnings was an elitist doctrine. It was only after the democratizing shock of the French and American Revolutions that liberalism started vigorously expanding the suffrage to wider parts of the population, thus starting to form what we now call liberal democracy. The goal of a liberal democracy was to allow participation of greater portions of the population as electors and potential candidates for government posts at the same time trying to keep the public and private spheres separate, restraining government so that it would not become tyrannical over the individual. Thus, liberal democracy became an indirect democracy. Due to the excessively large size of the new nation-states, it was not any more possible for the people to directly exert power in Greek eklesia like assemblies and therefore it became necessary that citizens elect representatives to a smaller parliament, which would then take the proper final decisions. In such a way that influenced by Karl Marx and F. Engels, Marxism was emerged in the late 19th and early 20th century on the globe.

9. Socialist Objections

Even not taking into account some considerations which would be essential to the more literal defenders of direct democracy such as, the difficulty in achieving a faithful proportional representation of the electorate in Parliament, the problem of the divergence of opinions and positions of the electors and the elected in the post-election period, the Rousseau an problem of alienation of sovereignty, etc.. There is still a basic objection put forth by socialists in the 19th century which has not yet been adequately answered. The objection is that political democracy without economic democracy is insufficient to qualify a society as fully democratic. The most forceful formulation of this objection was Lenin's famous book entitled 'The State and Revolution'. In capitalist society, under the conditions most favorable to its development, we have a more or less complete democracy in the democratic republic. But this democracy is always bound in by the narrow framework of capitalist exploitation, and consequently always remains, in reality, a democracy for the minority, only for the possessing classes only for the rich. Freedom in capitalist society always remains just about the same as it was in the ancient Greek republics; freedom for the slave owners, Marx splendidly grasped this essence of capitalist democracy when, in analyzing the experience of the Paris Commune, he said that the oppressed were allowed, once every few years, to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class should be in parliament to represent and repress them. In the passage above, Lenin puts forth a series of questions that reflect the socialist criticism of the insufficiencies of political democracy unaccompanied by economic democracy. How one can believe that the vote, the power to elect of a slum dweller has the same weight as that of, say, Ted Turner, who owns influential media one person, one

vote is the basic principle of all definitions of democracy. But if the real voting power is the real capacity to make rulers of citizens vary according to their wealth, their access to or domination of the means of communication, then it can be considered a real democracy. The question of the control of the means of communication is especially crucial because the capacity of the citizen owners of the big media to influence the rest of the citizenry makes their vote as their real capacity to influence policies much greater than average. However, the socialist criticism of bourgeois democracy goes deeper than that. It says that capitalist society is inherently undemocratic because if the means of production are concentrated in the hands of minority class/bourgeoisies, and not socialized throughout the population, these unequal conditions would influence the strictly political field as well. Socialists ask why bourgeois democrats demand equality in the political field only. What the reason is for not expanding equality into the economic field as well. The socialists claim that there shall be collective ownership of land, capital, machinery and credit by the complete ownership of the people. Some philosophers have criticized the aim of socialism, arguing that equality erodes away at individual diversity and that the establishment of an equal society would have to entail strong coercion. Liberal political scientists restrict democratic equality to the political sphere, refusing to expand it to the economic field which is the main different view point of the two schools of thought such as Marxist and Capitalist Schools of thought.

10. Marxism vs Liberalism

Where we start on this issue of differences, it is a big debatable. At present we find this deadlock: liberals refuse to leave the safe haven of political democracy and extend their reach to economic democracy; revolutionary Marxists dwell on economic democracy and refuse to go without it to political democracy. In order to cross the sea that separates these two continents, it would propose the following research agenda: it is possible to come up with a unified field theory of democracy. In other words, it is possible to create a method that simultaneously evaluates in measures, the advances and setbacks in the fields of political and economic democracy. The possibility or functionality of such unified theory is denied by both the liberal and the Marxist sides. The post-Schumpeterian liberals say that the inclusion of economic democracy would be a complicating, highly subjective extra factor, which would undermine the concision, precision, functionality and objectivity typical of today's minimalist, procedural definitions of democracy. On the other hand, radical Marxists, in the footsteps of Lenin affirm that liberal democracy is always bound by the narrow framework of capitalist exploitation, and consequently always remains, in reality, a democracy for the minority, only for the possessing classes and that a real government of the people may only develop in a society in which the means of production are socialized therefore, it is a useless pastime to measure the illusion of political democracy in capitalist countries. As we see, one side refuses to measure the level of economic democracy and the other side of political democracy. From this perspective we came to now that political democracy in capitalist society whereas economic democracy in communist society.

We must admit that the search for this unified field, democratic theory is very difficult. The spheres of political and economic democracy seem so qualitatively different that the possibility of a joint measurement may turn out to be a Herculean, even Sisyphean task. However, this is a necessary effort for the sake of objective research on democratization. Take the case of two democratizing regions, for instance, Latin America and Eastern Europe. Some transitologists have written sophisticated work

comparing the democratization efforts in these two regions. If in the analysis of the South, a minimalist, Schumpeterian approach to democracy which centered on the political side is facilitated by the fact that the economic basis in the region of capitalism is the same before and after the transition, thus justifying the concentration on the political aspect. In the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe, the economic base changed completely from the beginning of transition, socialism to the end of capitalism. In this case, it is difficult not to take into account the consequences of the transformation on the economic side which is also measuring the changes in economic democracy. Due to the structural differences in the original modes of production these regions started off from, the comparative evaluation of the gains and losses the populations in the South and the East had with these transformations in particular and also the comparisons between capitalism and socialism in general are in need of a synthetic breakthrough in the field of evaluation of political and economic democracy. Such a breakthrough might allow a common language for Marxist and non-Marxist political scientists in their analyses of the transformations of the former socialist countries in general

The function of the government is reduced to the minimum necessary to ensure these principles. Modern liberalism also prefers an open society based on pluralism and democratic government, while protecting minority rights and individual citizens. Some modern trends of liberalism are more tolerant of government regulation of free markets for the sake of equal opportunity to succeed, universal education and reducing the difference in incomes. Proponents of such views believe that the political system should contain elements of the welfare state, including state unemployment benefits, homeless shelters and free health care. Nowadays, liberalism is one of the leading ideologies in the world. The concept of personal liberty, dignity, freedom of speech, universal human rights, religious tolerance, privacy, private property, free markets, equality, rule of law, government transparency, limits on state power, the supreme power of the people, self-determination of the nation, enlightened and sound public policy are commonplace. For the liberal-democratic political systems countries are so different in culture and level of economic well-being, such as Finland, Spain, Estonia, Slovenia, Cyprus, Canada, Uruguay and Taiwan. In all these countries, liberal values play a key role in shaping the new society's goals, even though the gap between ideals and reality. By virtue of the fact that in Western Europe and North America, most political movements are in solidarity with the ideals of political liberalism, there was the need for a more narrow classification.

The right wing liberals have focused on classical liberalism, but objected to several provisions of social liberalism. They adjoin the conservatives who share and become traditional in these countries, political liberal values, but frequently condemn some of the cultural manifestations of liberalism as contrary to morality. It should be noted that, historically, conservative liberalism is an ideological antagonist, but after the Second World War and the discrediting of authoritarian leadership role in the western conservatism began to play a moderate flow. In the second half of 20th century the conservatives were the most active defenders of private property and the supporters of privatization. Libertarians believe that government should not interfere in personal life or business, except to protect the liberty and property of some of the encroachments of others. They support the economic and cultural liberalism and oppose social liberalism. Part of the libertarian believes that for the implementation of rule of law, the state must have sufficient strength; others argue that law enforcement should be carried out by public and private organizations. In foreign policy, libertarians generally are opposed to any military aggression. Modern social liberals tend to regard themselves as centrists and Social Democrats.

Considerable influence, recently gained in particular in Scandinavia, where a series of protracted economic decline, has exacerbated social security. To solve these problems, the Social Democrats have been steadily increasing taxes and public sector in the economy. However, many decades of hard struggle for power between the right and other liberal forces led to the effective laws and transparent government, which effectively protect the civil rights of persons and property of entrepreneurs. Attempts to divert the country too far toward socialism led to the Social Democrats in the loss of power and the subsequent liberalization. So today, in the Nordic countries prices are not regulated even state-owned enterprises, with the exception of monopolies, private banks, and there are no barriers to trade, including international. This combination of liberal and social policies led to the realization of liberal-democratic political system with a high level of social protection. The main objectives of its policy of liberal parties most often is considered the strengthening of liberal democracy and the rule of law, judicial independence, control over the transparency of government, civil rights and free competition. However, the presence of the word liberal in the name of the party itself cannot determine whether the right-wing supporters of the liberals, social liberals or libertarians.

Public liberal movements also varied significantly. Some movement in favour of sexual freedom, free sale of weapons or drugs, the expansion of the functions of private security firms and the transfer of part of the police. Economic liberals often favour a single rate of income tax, or even replace the income tax per capita, for the privatization of education, healthcare and public pension system, for the translation of science to finance the self-supporting. In many countries, the liberals are in favour of abolition, disarmament, renunciation of nuclear technology and environmental protection. In recent years, the debate over multiculturalism has intensified. While all parties agree on the fact that ethnic minorities should share the fundamental values of society, some believe that the function of the majority should be limited to protecting the rights of ethnic communities, while others are proponents of early integration of minorities in the name of preserving the integrity of the nation. Marxism is the philosophical, political and economic doctrine and a movement founded by Dr Karl Marx in the middle of the 19th century. There are different interpretations of Marx's theory of the different political parties and movements in social thought and political practice. Political Marxism is a version of socialism, along with left-anarchism, Christian socialism and Marxism is not the host part of the Democratic Socialism / Social Democracy. In this regard we need to discuss about the importance of these two schools of thought at the large scale in the form of seminar, symposium, conference etc. all over the globe.

11. Overall Views

The terms capitalism, liberalism, communism and socialism are ideologies distinct from one another. Although capitalism is clear-cut from the rest, the same cannot be said about communism and socialism. Socialism and communism different from each other. Although the factors they shares are as follows:

- Communism and socialism arose as a form of protest against the exploitation of the working class during the age of the Industrial Revolution (1760 – 1840). On the other hand liberalism is the way of life and also believes the economy of capitalism.
- The other being that they are an alternative to capitalism.
- The main criticism of capitalism is income inequality.

- Fascism and Nazism are two faces of the same coin of totalitarianism. Although both Nazism and Fascism rejected the ideology of liberalism, democracy, communism however there are some fundamental differences between the two such as Fascism believes in the corporatisation of all elements to form an organic state. For Fascists state was an unipotent element of their beliefs and further believes in the class system, far-right and authoritarian whereas Nazism emphasised on racism. The doctrine believes in the superiority of a state ruled by a particular race in this case, the Aryan race and also believes class based society and far-right.
- One of the important feature of both Nazism and Fascism is that they are openly supported the system of Capitalism but opposed to Marxism. These main differences are as follows:

12. Conclusion

Marxism is a later philosophy, which in many ways was created as a response to Liberalism. It is primarily an economic philosophy, focusing on economic equality instead of personal liberty. Marxism imagines all of history as the struggle between the Haves and the Have nots. Throughout history these two groups have taken many forms, nobles and serfs, masters and slaves, capitalists and workers. But it's always the same struggle. Marxism sees the Haves as unproductive parasites who leach wealth from the Have nots. They must be destroyed so that the workers can finally enjoy economic equality, and therefore it will get true freedom. Marxists are especially opposed to the system of Capitalism that most liberals take for granted. Capitalism is a core component of Liberalism. If someone does not believe in capitalism, then that person cannot be a liberal. A liberal may believe that economic reforms are necessary for capitalism to function, but they still believe that capitalism is the best economy system available as such liberalism opposes socialism while embracing capitalism. Liberalism seems the opposite of Fascism and strongly support liberty, democracy, individualism, egalitarian which is a way of life. However both are supporting the economy system of capitalism. Marxism is a philosophical framework that shapes not only economic and political systems but also ways of living with socialism and communism evolving from its core principles. Generally economic democracy can lead to more inclusive, equitable and sustainable and economic systems so that it leads to equal opportunities, resources and services regardless of their background, income or social status. Finally, the article concludes that liberalism advocates for political democracy, which incorporates capitalism, while Marxism emphasizes economic democracy, leading to socialism or communism. These contrasting ideologies continue to shape global politics, economies, and social structures, influencing ongoing debates on freedom, equality, and justice.

References

1. Blumberg, Paul. 1968. *Industrial Democracy: The Sociology of Participation*. London: Constable.
2. Bobbio, Norberto. 1983. *Qual Socialismo?* Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
3. Brinton, Crane, Christopher, John B., and Wolff, Robert Lee. 1965. *Civilization in the West*. Englewoods Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
4. Cloutier, Bernard. 2007. Gini Coefficients. <http://berclo.net/page01/01en-gini-coef.html> (accessed September 10, 2007).



5. Coppedge, Michael, and Reinicke, Wolfgang. 1990 “Measuring Polyarchy”. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, vol. 25, n. 1, pp. 51-72.
6. Diamond, Larry, Linz, Juan J., and Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1989. *Politics in Developing Countries: Latin America*. Boulder: L. Rienner Publishers.
7. Greskovits, Bela. 1998. *The Political Economy of Protest and Patience: East European and Latin American Transformations Compared*. Budapest: Central European University Press. Held, David. 1987. *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.