

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT

Liberalism and Citizens Economic Freedom

Tarekegn Jebessa Tesgersa
Lecturer, Oromia State University, Ethiopia

Abstract:

Liberalism (western viewpoint) is facing a strong challenge particularly from the political perspective of communitarism (Eastern and African perspective). They are challenging it from the very view point that it allows private property right and individualism and this in turn deteriorate the social, political and economic freedom of citizens. Liberalists contend for 'universal citizenship' perspective. This point deals with homogenization of peoples through assimilation. This assimilation is only possible through intensive and expensive social re-engineering under which the ingenious cultures and traditions of the respective society could be destructed and such cultural genocide is against international human right law of 1948 G.C. My basic intent in producing this article, therefore, is to uncover the political crime of 'liberalism political philosophy' in diminishing and limiting citizen's access for freedom socially, politically and economically.

1. Introduction

Liberalism is a political philosophy founded on the ideas of liberty and equity as cornerstone principles, which determine its existence as a political perspective. Based on their understanding of these principles, liberal philosophers articulate different ideologies such as freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, free market, civil right, democratic society, secular government and transitional corporations (Godwin, Kenneth et al, 2002). Advocates of this political philosophy contend that liberalism and its fruits are the results of 'Age of Enlightenment'. Today, liberal politicians of the world adopted many policies and strategies to enhance its aim and to totally reject social and political norms, state religion, absolute monarchy, and divine right of kings (Dorrie & Gary, 2014). The prominent thinker of England, John Locke, for example, takes the very concept liberalism forward by advocating that 'each man has a natural right to life, liberty, and property'. At the very verge of this 21st century, we are facing many types of liberalism. Some major types of them are classical liberalism, social liberalism, conservative liberalism, neoliberalism, national liberalism, ordoliberalism, and cultural liberalism. Though we have these diversified liberal philosophies, all shared the same common values like extensive freedom of thought, freedom of speech, limitation of government power, application of rule of law, market economy, sound democratic form of government (Alan Bullock & Maurice Shock, 1967). Generally, liberty, and equality are the two chief principles of liberalism.

The economic theory designed to establish this promise is classical economic theory, which is sometimes called liberal economic theory. The basic question to be asked, therefore, is that can this classical economic theory fix the promise of liberty and equality that are guaranteed by the liberal philosophers? To respond this question, I used deduction, induction and intuition approach as a research methodology. The general finding that I arrived at is that though liberalism and classical economic theories are designed to improve the political and economic conditions of the world, they fail to complement each other in realizing their respective mission for which they are designed.

2. Discussion, Analysis and Critic

The idea of classical economy goes back to the work of prominent scholars such as Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, Anne Robert, and John S. Mill (Adam Smith, 1778). As a theory, it was developed after the birth of capitalism in the western world and the rise of economic capitalism is highly associated with the breakdown of self-based labor in England as well as the creation of the first joint stock company in 1688. Classical economics (also known as liberal economics) assert that market functions best with minimal and/or government interferences in the market economy. They think that markets generally regulate themselves when free of coercion. The fundamental theory of classical economic theory is that the economy is self-regulating and there is no need of government disturbance being in the market.

When generally seen liberalism is a political philosophy and its respective economic theory is classical economic theory, which is sometimes called liberal economic theory designed to liberal politicians to accomplish their mission. They have their own value to remain active on the globe. While the core principle of liberalism (as a political philosophy) is liberty and equality, that classical economic theory is minimum interference of government for the best function of the market. They feel that government (the invisible hand) cannot treat the market failure. It is up to the market to adjust itself spontaneously through the war between market demand and market supply. They advocate the idea of 'laissez faire' or 'let it be' economic perspective (Bell, Duncan, 1967). Because liberalism and classical economic perspectives endorsed by thinkers of the same nation, they must not refute each other though the reality is not this. Liberalism advocated liberty and equality for all human beings. To realize these liberty and equality the preferred economic theory is

classical economic theory. Sadly, this classical economic theory is not this much powerful to establish the precious principles of liberalism that are liberty and equality. Liberal economists argue for competition and free trade that is neither hampered nor coddled by government for the economic prosperity of the concerned nation (Adam Smith, 1778, pp. 367). However, the doctrine of completion and free trade cannot bring liberty and equality that is guaranteed by liberalism.

The prominent sociologist and economist, Karl Marx, endorse that private ownership of properties (that is the core value of classical economic theory) make wealth accumulated in the hand of one and/or few individuals and the right of citizen to economic equality will be eroded in such a way. This in turn creates unjustifiable social class in which case those on the upper class oppress and exploit labor values for others. They are totally alienated from the output they produced and considered as a mere input (Karl Marx, 1876). Although liberalism propagate individual liberalism and individual equality, the political theory that is endorsed by liberal politicians (classical economic theory) fails to guarantee the promised liberty and equality.

John Locke's "Two Treatises on Government" of 1689 established two fundamental liberal ideas: economic liberty (that involves the right to have and use property) and intellectual liberty (which is about freedom of conscience). His natural right theory that is concerned with the right to life, liberty, and property. Rousseau was also able to develop basic ideas regarding liberalism and his idea of social contract which is concerned with the idea that people give up some rights to a government in order to receive social order. He asserted that each individual knows his or her own interest best and that man is born free. Liberal philosophers and liberal politicians use not only advocating the ideology of liberalism but also power to realize, particularly human right. To realize the French revolution (1789-1799) liberals used different violent acts in addition to their liberal ideas.

Though they endorse liberalism and classical economic theory in such a way, it is not without criticism throughout the history of political philosophies and economic theories (Frey, Linda and Frey, 2004). However, why liberalism and its respective classical economics (also called liberal economics) fail? Can these two perspectives can complete each other? Is there an alignment between liberalism as a political philosophy and classical economic as an economic theory? These are the basic inquiries this research work intended to answer. In his 4th century BC., work 'The Republic', Greek philosopher Plato, for example, contended that minimizing social inequality would promote civil peace and good government. Accordingly, an elite class of intellectuals known as guardians (philosopher-kings) should govern the state so that they may moderate the greed of the producing classes, such as artisans and farmers. To cement their faithfulness to the state instead of their own desires, the guardians would own no private property and would live communally, residing in barracks together and raising their children as a group instead of in small families (Carey, George W. 2009). *In such a way, Plato was able to prophesize the participatory economic theory that touch its peak during Karl Marx era (emphases added).*

In the medieval Christian church, the members of some monastic communities and religious orders also shared their land and goods. Such groups believed that concern with private property takes away from service to God and neighbor. In the 16th century, English writer Thomas Moore, in his treatise Utopia (1516), portrayed a society based on common ownership of property, whose rulers administered it through the application of pure reason. In 17th century England, a Puritan religious group known as the Diggers advocated the abolition of private ownership of land.

Criticism on the idea of private property and individual right continued into the Enlightenment of the 18th century, through such thinkers as Immanuel Kant in Germany and Jean Jacques Rousseau in France. Philosophers of the Enlightenment maintained that it is the natural condition of human beings to share equally in political authority and the rewards of labor. The French Revolution (1789-1799), which defeated the monarchy, developed from this philosophical basis (Frey, Linda and Frey, 2004). François Noël Babeuf, a revolutionary agitator, advocated the role of common ownership of land and total economic and political equality among citizens (participatory economics). For both Marx and Engels, capitalism (today's liberalism) was a dark incidence and communism a thinly outlined picture of a glowing future. In such a way, the intellectual ancestors of the communist regimes of the 20th century claimed to study and criticize capitalism by means of rigorous science (Karl Marx, pp. 543).

Although material standards of living for many have increased (largely as a result of democratic movements to tame the system like the creation of the modern welfare system), today's societies are characterized by rising inequality between the rich and the poor, environmental destruction, conspicuous consumerism, recurring financial crises, increasingly longer working hours, monopolies of power, persistent unemployment and a host of other undesirable outcomes (Karl Marx, pp. 543). Most workers have very little meaningful control over their working lives, while large corporations and lobby groups have gained significant influence over the political system.

As it can be understood from the current occupy movement banners 'we are the 99%' reflect that the liberalism economic system advances the interests of an elite few above the vast majority, and, in doing so is not only unjust but is also leading us towards environmental catastrophes.

From the above tremendous different facts, it is increasingly apparent that liberalism is not working well for majority of the world population. Growing inequality of wealth and income is putting the famous American and western Europeans middle class in danger of becoming rebellious against the long aged political and economic philosophy that their fathers and forefathers enjoyed (liberal capitalism) in searching for an alternative political and economic structure. They are tired of being unemployed and free rider and recently they are facing economic prospects that worse than what their parents relished. Citizens and workers in different parts of the world rose up against various forms of state liberalism in the early part of the 20th century, demanding for a greater economic justice and democracy and greater control over their labor outputs (R. Landor, 1871, pp. 23).

John M. Keynes also contends that [Capitalism] is not a success. It is not intelligent, it is not beautiful, it is not just, it is not virtuous- and it does not deliver the goods. In short, we dislike it, and we are beginning to despise it. However, when we wonder what to put in its place, we are extremely perplexed. It cannot solve the problem of inflation and high employment rates (John M. Keynes,

1941). According to Theo Hobson's argument, it is time to consider Nietzsche's claim about liberalism and its respective classical economic theory when he said Nietzsche is right in saying that liberalism and liberal democracy is being flawed (TheoHobson, 2009). Liberalism is encountering several failures and many philosophers including ordinary people are contending that liberalism does not work today more than ever before. It has no power to bind the global political and economic situations together because it lacks practicality. It is becoming a rhetoric ideology and becoming the other utopia (in addition to communism). The belief in equality and social justice which thinkers like Nietzsche believes the 'byproduct' of Judaism and Christianity is leading the world economic and political fragmentation.

According to recent progressive politicians, liberalism and its classical economic system is collapsing as predicted by prominent scholars like Karl Marx and Nietzsche. Countless liberals are also approving this though in sad face.

According to Own Jose, for example, the effect of tramp victory, for example, is that racist, women haters, homophobias, and right wing authoritarians feel vindicated. This by itself is what people dislike about liberalism because it gives a sense that it is a loose of alliance of various victims; which does not include the white working class.

John Hawkins (May 2012) also contend that liberal economic policies and strategies does not work by listing numerous failure of liberalism and classical economics as a basic justification. He criticized liberalism and its respective economic theory from the viewpoint of funding the whole country on the back of few rich people (the buffet rule) which is practically fails when Americans rally against junior bush and Obama administration by holding a banner that reads 'we are the 99%'. The other criticism he forwarded is that liberals incentivize failure because they are willing, for example, to pay 500 dollar for the purpose of food security and/or any other damages. The argument here is that such a political and economic practice could increase free riders in the economic system. Liberalism is also criticized in creating hostile business environment. Every businessperson prefers to fiercely compete in the economic market to with both competitive and comparative advantages as much they can and this in turn damages the concept of cooperative economics and at the end of the day one becomes the real hostile of the other. The business environments of the liberals are also not this much predictable by national and transnational corporations cannot know what to expect because of turbulent change in the business and politics world. This is why many business corporations in America (the soil of liberalism) prefer to hoard money rather than investing it.

According to John Hawkins again government in the liberal world is inherently slow, stupid, passive and inefficient because it simply tap resources from people without contributing to the market economy. Rather than availing public goods that the right time, at right price at the right location, it advocate *laissez fair* administrative system in which case all resources including water are privatized to private owners. Liberalism and classical economics does not work since its base of governing theory is inequality (not freedom). John Hawkins argues that equality is a major component of free society and it cannot be its center. Furthermore, equality involves not only humanity but also equality of outcomes that the liberal economic system fails to establish.

According to Bill Murchison, liberalism and classical economic system does not work because it fails to satisfy the esteem, cognitive, aesthetic, self-actualization and transcendental need of people it labor much to satisfy the physiological need of people. However, human being is not only an economic being (*homo-economicus*) but also a political being (*homo-politicus*) that cannot live by bread alone. They become rebellious to satisfy their higher need that is beyond bread (Abraham Mass, 1978).

But, are liberalism and its respective classical economic theory complementing each other's, so that they can survive together? The answer is no! They are at the verge of failing together because they fail to complement each other to survive together. The principle here is that "the divided home and/or kingdom will be automatically fall." (Holy bible, King James version, 1961).

However, why liberalism as an ideology and classical economics as an economic theory is collapsing from time to time? The first argument for the failure liberalism and classical economy is its failure to renew itself to compete with the newly emerging political philosophies and economic theories, particularly with the political and economic ideologies from the communitarian world. Advocates of this communitarian political and economic viewpoint on the way of eroding the concept of liberalism and classical economics from Asian, Africa, Latin-American, and Eastern Europe (Gifford, Rob, 2008). In such a way, liberalism way of thinking is shrinking to its homeland (America and Eastern Europe). The second justifying reason is for the shrinkage of liberalism is and classical economics is the rigidity of it is regarding economic plan. Economic plan (short-range, medium range and long-range) economic plans are conducted in a highly centralized manner. Economic policies, strategies, and plans are bestowed on the shoulder of ordinary citizens from above (top-down approach of policymaking).

The third major reason I contend is for the collapse of liberalism is the inability of liberal politicians to effectively lead the micro and macroeconomics of the concerned nation. Because they excluded from the economic system (because classical economic theory advice this), they do not know what is private corporations are doing in the market. They leave the market to spontaneously adjust itself regarding the problem of microeconomics and tried their best to treat the problem of high unemployment and inflation rate concerning the problem of macroeconomics (John M. Keynes, 2006).

They are to this extent weak, lazy, and stupid to solve the micro and macroeconomic problem of their citizen. Concerning microeconomics, they wait the market to adjust itself through the fight between market demand and market supply. The fourth reason is the unlawful political interference of the liberal world in the internal affairs of developing and under developed nations in the name of human right and democracy (Amin & Samir 2004). Both junior bush and Obama administration, for example, interfere in the internal conditions of Libya and sovereign Arab world without good cause and apologize after his resign from presidential office in 2017 primary election. They developed to idea of interfering in the national affairs of sovereign nation from their national attitude that they are advocators and prosecutors of international peace and security though no one appoints them on this position.

The fifth cause for the stumbling of liberalism and classical economic theory the political and economic strategy it follows regarding the value, norm, and culture religion and indigenous knowledge of both developing and underdeveloped nations. They are rejecting

the values, norms, and cultures of the other world in the name of civilization, free speech, human right, and individual freedom. According to many African and Asian thinkers, both Judaism, Christianity, International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and different technology supported Medias were used and are still using as an instrument to erode the indigenous values and norms of the other nation. For the sake of their values and culture, developing and underdeveloped nations are developing the hatred attitude toward liberalism and classical economic system without a good cause.

The sixth and final reason I feel for the together fall of liberalism and classical economic theory is that the lack of conceptual and practical alignment between liberalism as a political philosophy and classical economics as an economic theory. While liberalism promises for liberty and equality for individuals, (they do not take group liberty and equality in to consideration) its respective classical economic theory advocates the 'no/minimal interference' of government in the market economy. However, the reality is that liberal politicians cannot establish their promise for liberty and equality without the key players of government in the economic market. Because classical economists endorse laissez fair (passive, stupid and inefficient) politicians, liberal politicians cannot fix their promise for liberty and equality since they are obliged to be passive, stupid and inefficient being abnormally influenced by the thought of classical economists(Hahnel & Routledge, 2005).

From all these it is possible to infer that classical economist fail to serve the mission for which they are designed (serving liberal politicians to fix their promise for liberty and equality). Therefore, I contented that there is a mismatch and unalignment between liberalism as a political philosophy and classical economics as an economic theory because there is no way in which they complement one another (Otto Neurath, 2006).

Can liberalism and its respective economic theory revive to survive together? Yes! Liberalism can restore its power by full-filing two basic things. The first thing is that it should able to renew its doctrine of 'competition and free trade' that endorse the exclusion of government from the market economy. This is regarding the classical economic theory. The second important thing is that the two foundational principles of liberalism (liberty and equality) should be re described because their old definition takes into consideration only individually liberty and individual equality. However, nations those claims communitarian perspective are emerging with the alternative types of liberty and equality that takes into consideration, not only individuals liberty and equality but also group liberty and equality. Liberal politicians must solve this problem. Unless liberalism and its respective classical economic theory take these two actions, they cannot remain well established in the face of today's competitive political and economic world (Gould& Andrew, 1999).

3. Conclusion

Although world leaders such as Donald Regan and Margaret Thatcher are well known for their mythology that "There Is No Alternative" (the TINA doctrine) to capitalism, today's scholars , particularly in the communitarianism world, are inventing the 'next economic theory' that can fix all economic right, economic freedom and economic democracy of people can be maintained. The promise liberal political philosophy (liberty and equity) cannot be fixed without the active involvement of government in the market economy through this idea is rejected by the respective classical economic theory. From this very fact, it is possible to infer that liberalism as a political philosophy and classical economics as an economic theory fail to complement each other. If continue with their recent trend, liberalism and its respective classical economic system cannot live long unless they continuously renew themselves according to the political and economic quiet of 21st century. Generally, though liberalism and classical economic theory are separately good, they are bad when tied together because they could not complement one another.

4. References

- i. Ayal, Eliezer B.; Karras, Georgios (Spring 1998). "Components of economic freedom and growth: an empirical study"
- ii. Berggren, Niclas (1999). "Economic Freedom and Equality: Friends or Foes?"
- iii. Bernard H. Siegan. Property and Freedom: The Constitution, the Courts, and Land-Use Regulation.
- iv. Economic Freedom and Growth: Decomposing the Effects by Fredrik Carlsson & Susanna Lundström
- v. Economic Freedom and its Measurement: The Encyclopedia of Public Choice, 2004
- vi. Gwartney, L., R. Lawson, and W. Block (1996). Economic Freedom of the World, 1975–1995.
- vii. Jacoby, Daniel (1998): Laboring for Freedom: A New Look at the History of Labor in America (eBook)
- viii. Milton Friedman: Capitalism and freedom, (2002)
- ix. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon. No Gods, No Masters: An Anthology of Anarchism. Edited by Daniel Guerin, translated by Paul Sharkey. 2005.
- x. Rožāns, Edgars: The Socioeconomic Impact of Economic Freedom. Humanities and Social Sciences.
- xi. Scully, Gerald (2002): Economic Freedom, Government Policy, and the Trade-Off Between Equity and Economic Growth
- xii. Surjit S. Bhalla. Freedom and economic growth: a virtuous cycle? (1997)
- xiii. Tullock, Gordon (1988). Walker, Michael A., ed. Freedom, Democracy and Economic Welfare.