

Title	ON WILLIAM GODWIN
Sub Title	
Author	白井, 厚(SHIRAI, ATSUSHI)
Publisher	Keio Economic Society, Keio University
Publication year	1965
Jtitle	Keio economic studies Vol.3, (1965.) ,p.39- 64
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	
Genre	Journal Article
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AA00260492-19650000-0039

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

ON WILLIAM GODWIN

ATSUSHI SHIRAI

- I. Preface
- II. Three Prototypes of Radicalism
- III. The Development of Radicalism
- IV. Utilitarianism of Godwin
- V. The Criticism of Private Property in the *Political Justice*
- VI. Economic Thought in the *Enquirer*
- VII. The Relationship of W. Godwin to The Utopian Socialism and The Ricardian Socialism
- VIII. Conclusion

I. PREFACE

Godwin is the first theorizer of modern anarchist communism. He exercised a great influence on the people who appeared after him. His optimistic and idealistic thought made Malthus resolve to work on his *An Essay on the Principle of Population*, and gave inspiration to such romantic poets as P. B. Shelley and W. Wordsworth. His criticism on capitalism was succeeded by the Ricardian socialists and R. Owen. As to the impact his great work *Political Justice* made to his contemporaries, W. Hazlitt writes:

“No work in our time gave such a blow to the philosophical mind of the country as the celebrated *Enquiry concerning Political Justice*. Tom Paine was considered for the time as a Tom Fool to him; Paley an old woman, Edmund Burke a flashy sophist.”⁽¹⁾

However, the days he reigned over the ideological kingdom was too short. The dark anti-revolutionary atmosphere, set upon the English society during the French Revolution, enshrouded him with a clamorous criticism against him, and drove him to the depth of oblivion while he was still alive. So, for a long time since, he was very little made of as an object of serious study, although he had sometimes enjoyed such a case where he was lauded as “Adam Smith in the socialist thought” as done by H. O. Foxwell.

(1) W. Hazlitt: *The Spirit of the Age, or Contemporary Portraits*, 1825, p. 30.

If you say that Smith was admired without being read and Malthus was condemned without being read, you can say also that Godwin was referred to as the Malthus's antagonist in the history of economics, and mentioned in the romanticist literature or listed in the chronicle of anarchism without being read.

Spurred, however, by the studies of Godwin in Europe and America which became very active after the latest war through F. E. L. Priestley's work, the reprinted 3rd edition of the *Political Justice*⁽²⁾, and G. Woodcock's *William Godwin*, the author intends to clarify what position Godwin's thought should take in the history of English radicalism.

II. THREE PROTOTYPES OF RADICALISM

Judged by the primary meaning of the word, radicalism will be defined as the thought which aims at effecting a drastic social reform. But in actual practice, the persons seized with any reforming or reactionary idea are perfunctorily and indiscriminately designated as radicals, in spite of a variety of ideological contents they embraced.

In discussing Godwin's thought, it seems important to bear in mind the following points: How Godwin came to absorb so intensively the spirit of the times characterized as the turning point from the thought of enlightenment to socialism? and what a significant and unique role Godwin's thought played in the ideological trend for social reform? Therefore to clarify the distinctive features of Godwin's thought we will now classify the so-called radicalism, which appeared after the Bourgeois Revolution in England, by the attitude politically to the Glorious Revolution, and economically to the then pervading capitalistic order of society.

The period of the Puritan Revolution—the truly significant bourgeois revolution in England—gave birth to the following three prototypes

(2) W. Godwin: *Enquiry concerning Political Justice, and Its Influences on Morals and Happiness, photographic facsimile of the third edition corrected, edited with variant readings of the first and second editions and with a critical introduction and notes*, by F. E. L. Priestley, the University of Toronto Press, 1946.

The 3rd Volume of the above consists of *Introduction, Supplementary Critical Notes, Textual Notes and Bibliography of Political Justice, Omitted Chapters: chapters from the edition of 1793 which were omitted from subsequent editions, Index to Volume III*.

Especially, the *Textual Notes* and the *Omitted Chapters* have made notes of all the differences,—word by word, phrase by phrase—found in each edition of *Political Justice* and made it possible to reproduce an exact reprint of each edition. It is not too much to say that this scrupulously conducted identification became the foundation for the research of Godwin's thought which became active after the war.

of radicalism:

The Independents: they advocated the realization of bourgeois order in polity and economy and demanded freedom and democracy;

The Levellers: they aimed at the establishment of a thoroughgoing democratic regime by popular sovereignty, non-authenticism, the alternative government and the political equality;

The Diggers: their objective was in the realization of a communistic society through such measures as the abolition of the wage labour system and the private property, the admistration of labour and the direction in production, the institution of politics and justice through the annual session of parliament, and the general consumption according to the necessities of life.

It is interesting to observe that the three prototypes of radicalism described above show differences in degree of their claim for reform in proportion to the distance each of them has to the centre of political or economic power. In other words, they exhibit the gradation in the radicalness of their projected programs as the bourgeoislike mild requests, the thoroughgoing plain democracy, and the critical attack on capitalism asking for the immediate enforcement of communism, reflecting the interests of the different classes of people as the industrial capitalists or the independent producers who are to become the capitalists, the independent producers that are bound to ruin, and the lowly farmers struggling in poverty.

Such being the case, these types of radicalism are essentially the reflections of the three types in economic interest: the capitalists, the independent producers, and the lowly farmers. These three are the original agencies which worked as pivots for the later development of radicalism, but with the acquisition of fresh elements and the exchange of views taking place among them, they have developed some types that are varied from the original ones. It is important, however, to know that these three are the basic ones which serve as the primaries for the comparative and analytical study of any economic reform movement.

Godwin rates the first of these three very high as is seen in his comment in his work, *History of the Commonwealth of England. From its Commencement to the Restoration of Charles the Second, 1824-28*⁽¹⁾, taking initiative⁽²⁾ in regarding the Puritan Revolution as

(1) In this book, Godwin argues for the inevitability of the Puritan Revolution, asserts the legitimacy in requesting the republican form of government, and analyzes the causes for the failure in republicanism. "Godwin's big four-volume history is, in spite of mistakes, prejudices and some pedantic moralising, a work worthy of

the true bourgeois revolution. However, he could not appreciate the other two rightly owing to the restricted research materials in his days. He went to go so far as to blame the Levellers for the selfishness they wrangled over the wage problem.

In spite of such a disapproving attitude of Godwin toward the second, and his ignorance of the third, there is no question that his own idea of radicalism succeeds to the second in fact as he supported the direct democracy, individualism, and non-authenticism of the Levellers. And moreover, he went farther than the Levellers in the following points: the denial of wage labour system, anti-feudal and anti-capitalistic tendency, the abolition of political and religious authorities, the way of criticism of government as related to the private property, the views of avariciousness and misery as coming from some exterior restrictions, of labour as the source of wealth, communism based on production, the rule of reason, the consumption according to necessities, the democracy on the basis of parish, etc. In this way he proved himself to be the successor to the Diggers, although he was not conscious about it.

his abilities and industry. He was the first student of this period who used the Thomason tracts, which had as yet no catalogue. He found and read some of Tilburne's pamphlets, but cannot have discovered any of Walwyn's. On the other hand, he made good use of the Journals of Commons and Lords, still at this date little studied by historians. His hostility to the Levellers, though they held many of his own opinions, is to be explained by his dislike of all organised agitation." H. N. Brailsford: *The Levellers and the English Revolution*, edited and prepared for publication by C. Hill, 1961, p. 58.

(2) This book contains some controversial points, for example, his approving attitude for the Cromwell's oppression against the Levellers as a small sacrifice for the attainment of his greater objective, and his recognition of the Cromwell's conquest over Ireland as a tactics to gain the security of his revolutionary government and the respect of foreign countries, as well as his inattentiveness to the Diggers.

On the other hand, this book proved quite useful in the cause of political reform of the country. At the time when this book was published, the Royalists called the Puritan Revolution the Great Rebellion, taking it as an expression of conflicting personal interests, the view of revolution, for example, S. Namier, since Count E. Clarendon. In general, such a historical view by the Wiggs, for example, G. M. Trevelyan, G. Davis and others, who lauded the Glorious Revolution as the exhibition of the honorable tradition of freedom was powerful. Even radicals, for example, R. Price, praised the Glorious Revolution, not the Puritan Revolution. At the time when such was the political atmosphere of England, Godwin's book exerted a great influence in stimulating bourgeois radicalism and the incipient labour movement, by turning the people's thought to the revolutionary concept of Wiggs which wholly supported the behaviours of Parliamentarians, and by estimating much the movement of the Puritan Revolution.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF RADICALISM

Needless to say, it was J. Locke who formed a bourgeois theory of society on the basis of natural law, established the bourgeois liberalism and democracy, expounded the idea of private property as derived from the invested labour and thereby exercised a large influence on the subsequent development of economics. But in actual practice he was somewhat different. While he attacked the absolute monarchism, he was closely tied to the natural law concept of the mediaeval age, opposed the revolutionary Puritanism, reconciled his idea of labour ownership to the defense theory of the traditional system of ownership. Even his idea of the right of resistance was conciliated to the hereditary monarchism.

As can be seen above, the revolutionary bourgeois theory which appeared then was in fact a compromise to defend the existing merchantile system of order. While it is right to take Locke as one of the original figures who introduced the democratic way of thought, he was destined from the beginning for the committal of having an anti-common-people character. These bespeak the vital significance in this age of the first type of radicalism which practices the bourgeois revolution in politics and economics.

This first type of radicalism gained its further growth in bourgeois character through the utilitarianism of D. Hume, helped capitalism in the accomplishment of its autonomy and rationality through A. Smith against merchantile policies, and was formalized into the so-called highly factional "Philosophic Radicals" by D. Ricardo standing for the interests of bourgeoisie against the landowner.

This first type of radicalism started by the Independents, being hampered by the deep-rooted tradition of conservatism, did not complete the democracy and radical criticism of society, in spite of their banner of democracy and their theoretical perception of a coming fresh order of the modern world.

Handed over to Ricardo from Smith, economics gained in intensity as an empirical science, and made headway in identifying what its actual problems should be. But then banner proved to be no more than a mere "reform," and the piercing sharpness of radicalism was then entrusted to the hands of small-producers who had been estranged from the capitalist order of economics, and who had been looking for the chance to hit the flourishing bourgeoisie in capitalism.

The second pioneer type of radicalism, which was developed in the revolutionary tide for civil rights, solidified its theoretical foundation

through Locke's *Two Treatises of Government*, and was succeeded by the small bourgeois radicalism in the eighteenth century.

Since Locke's political thought, though savoured of the antiquity of the Royalists, developed a discussion on property related to direct producers, and contained some phases that are common with the interests of the small-producers of the eighteenth century, and that are generally considered "Lockism" on such matters as the property right of labour, democracy, and the right to resist, it proved a powerful theoretical weapon for the radicals in later days.

Examining the works of the representative radicals of small bourgeoisie as J. Priestley, R. Price and T. Paine, we find their force of argument being concentrated not on the capitalistic control, but on the state dictatorship or the merchantile prerogative, as is revealed in the absolute reliance by Priestley on the capitalistic system, the extolment by Price of the Glorious Revolution and the craving for wealth by Paine.

Since the first type of radicalism ended in a compromise to the status dictatorship and the merchantile prerogative, the establishment of a complete free state of bourgeois social order was left over as the task for the second type of radicalism, which is small bourgeois in nature.

Great as was the commission entrusted to the second type of radicalism, the responsibility was so heavy that it could not afford to engage in its essential duty of performing the capital-wage labour relationship criticism. This primary criticism was fully executed by the Ricardian Socialists in the nineteenth century when the working class came to be grouped together and emerged in the limelight.

The time of Godwin was characterized not only by the social change effected through the progress in the industrial revolution and the agricultural revolution, but by the severe criticism on the traditional authorities as a result of the surging tide of revolutionary influence from the French Revolution.

Seeing the vivid contrast between the ideal of enlightenment philosophy and the tragic realities of life, the rising bourgeoisie heighten their claim for political reform, and the independent small-producers, who are faced with their probable collapse on account of the advancing productive power, announce their critical view of the existing capitalism, though theirs was mainly in terms of moral precept. The skilled labourers also organized themselves and launched out on an primitive labour movement. On the other hand, the oppression from the government became frequent and the ideological conflict between classes became acute, presenting the so-called "French Revolution in

England.”⁽¹⁾

Godwin’s ideology is typically representative of the above described radicalism, and depicts the extremity of the individualism of modern age. Further, being highly sceptical of the capitalistic system, and negative of its major premises as the production of commercial good and the private property, he cut a distinctive figure as the only man who proposed a communism in his time. More than that, he earned a unique position in the ideological history of modern age as not only he proved himself of the third type of radicalism through his denial of the capital and wage-labour relationship and all the authorities as well as the institution of private property in general, but stressed the importance of the idea of progress in the course of human evolution so as to prevent the reactionary trend setting in.

Needless to say, the workers in those days were immature, and were not fully awakened to their own interest, presenting no program of their own based on a theoretical criticism of capitalism as seen from the workers’ point of view. In criticizing the capitalistic politics or the institution of private property, the weapon the radicals in those days used was none but the one conceived by the bourgeoisie themselves in their attack on feudalism or the reactionary farmers’ thought adoring the pre-capitalistic regime or often the primitive Christian community.

Until they could not clear the characters of these theories formed by class consciousness, and until the proletariates did not have the real proletarian theory derived from their own class consciousness, their thoughts lacked the substantive foundation and remained ever Utopian estranged from the real history or classes.

However, all the proletarian theories, which later came to cristalize in the person of Marx, were fostered in the womb of the bourgeois theories at the inspiration of the critical elements of radicalism, and attained their maturity at the instigation of the practical labour movement. Such being the case, the “French Revolution in England” which introduced the fruits of French materialism was instrumental in planting the insipiency of modern socialism in that Island Empire. In this process of ideological transformation “the two great practical philosophers in modern ages, Bentham and Godwin, especially the latter should be named almost an exclusive property of the proletariats.”⁽²⁾

(1) According to Brailsford, this statement refers to the 22 year period from November 4, 1789, when Price gave the lecture: *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country*, to the time when Shelley wrote the poem *Hellas*. H. N. Brailsford: *Shelley, Godwin and Their Circles*, p. 7.

(2) F. Engels: *Die Lage der arbeitenden Klasse in England*, 1845, *Werke*, Bd. 2.

IV. GODWIN'S UTILITARIANISM

Godwin's object of study is in the search for pleasure or happiness. To him, justice means the principle which will bring about the maximum of happiness. We see the various influences from a number of scholars converged in him, but it is clear that his thought is generally utilitarian in character. Following Hume, he criticized the theory of social contract, denied the concept of natural right by Paine and others, and rejecting the idea which sets the basis of property in the invested labour, he was rather utilitarian in thought than dependent on the natural law. But his was very much different from the utilitarianism of Bentham, another leading successor of Helvétius. In contrast to Bentham who, starting with a complete egoism, merely aimed at the increase of sensuous pleasure, Godwin asked for the renunciation of selfishness, considered sensuous pleasure worth very little, pursued the interests of a society as a whole, and praised the intellectual pleasure based on reason. Halévy, therefore, thinks Godwin was not a true utilitarian.⁽¹⁾ F. E. L. Priestley claims that Godwin was basically Platonic, although his general thought scheme was of a mechanical necessity.⁽²⁾

Since, however, utilitarianism has never been expounded in its purely sensuous sense, Fleisher tells: "Godwin, like Helvétius and Holbach, was an avowed utilitarian."⁽³⁾ And D. H. Monro, considering this more or less a matter of words, writes: "If utilitarianism is defined as including egoism and relativism, Godwin was not one; neither was Sidgiwick, and it is doubtful if even Mill was. But it seems to me that Godwin went much further than Shaftesbury or Hutcheson. He opposed natural right, including the right to property, on the grounds that we have no right to anything except what will make for the greatest happiness of the greatest number. He opposed the social contract theory on the ground that promises are not the basis of morality, but are indeed essentially opposed to it. . . . He summed up his

S. 455. The statement was made by Engels when he was young and immature in thought. Especially, concerning the merit of the evaluation on Bentham, there is some room left for further examination.

IV-(1) E. Halévy: *The Growth of Philosophic Radicalism*, translated by M. Morris, p. 202.

IV-(2) F. E. L. Priestley: *Introduction to the Enquiry Concerning Political Justice and Its Influences on Morals and Happiness by William Godwin, Photographic Facsimile of the Third Edition Corrected, edited with Variant Readings of the First and Second Editions and with a Critical Introduction and Notes*, 1946, Vol. III, I. *Metaphysics and Psychology*.

IV-(3) D. Fleisher: *William Godwin, A Study in Liberalism*, 1951, p. 65.

moral theory in just two sentences: 'The end of virtue is to add to the sum of pleasurable sensation. The beacon and regulator of virtue is impartiality, that we shall not give that exertion to procure the pleasure of an individual, which might have been employed in procuring the pleasure of many individuals.' This principle of impartiality was his nearest approach to the moral sense: it is not essentially different from Bentham's 'every one to count as one, and no one for more than one.' He did indeed, like Sidgwick, regard it as an ultimate moral principle, which could not be deduced from egoism. But it is at least arguable that Godwin was not a confused and half-hearted utilitarian, but an exceptionally clear-sighted one, who has been much neglected by the historians of utilitarianism."⁽⁴⁾

It seems, however, possible to hold a dissenting view to the statement that Godwin's "principle of impartiality" is essentially the same as Bentham's "every one to count as one." As is explained in the well known illustration of Fenelon's⁽⁵⁾, Godwin is impartial so long as he deals with the "universal benevolence", but he is rather near to J. S. Mill, who counted culture very important, than Bentham's "every one to count as one", and stood for the "system of plural vote", when he comes to recognize the qualitative difference in pleasure, and contends for the differentiation of individuals according to their worths. Herein lies the peculiar significance of Godwin's utilitarianism.

However, seeing that utilitarianism has rarely been considered in the purely sensuous sense, its implication would be too limited, if taken as a egoism and relativism, and that the organic relation it holds to the surrounding ideological currents would be lost sight of, if its logical structure only be taken into consideration. Then it seems important to examine what Godwin learnt from Helvétius in the great stream of forming the bourgeois view of man, and how he eluded from sensuousness and state control, and came to harbour the rational anarchism.

Needless to say, Godwin was neither the same type of utilitarian as Helvétius, nor in any sense a follower of the formal rationalism of the natural law theorists. While standing on the premise of utilitarianism, he felt repulsive to its bourgeois vulgarity, and built a rationalistic view of humanity as its antithesis.

Different from his, an inconclusive repulse against the bourgeois vulgarity was exhibited by J. S. Mill who tried to harmonize the

(4) D. H. Monro: *Godwin's Moral Philosophy. An Interpretation of William Godwin*, 1953, p. 15.

(5) W. Godwin: *Political Justice*, Vol. I, pp. 126-7.

capitalistic economy with claims of the proletariat and extricate itself from the Bentham form of utilitarianism. Thus Godwin should be called the heralding master for Mill on that score.

Really, Godwin and Mill should be significantly accredited as opportune critics of classical economics. But there was a difference between the two in their critical attitude. Godwin expected nothing from the existing order while Mill, brought up under Benthamite influence sought the solution of economic problems in the ever shifting process of the given conditions. Godwin developed the third type of radicalism which denies the private property, through the concept of utilitarianism developed in the first type of radicalism.

V. THE CRITICISM OF PRIVATE PROPERTY IN THE *Political Justice*

What Godwin was concerned was the establishment of moral philosophy, not the economics which describes the alienated facts. It is true that he refers occasionally to economic thoughts in his book, but they are treated only as a branch of moral philosophy, being always subjected to moral evaluation.

This ethical peculiarity of his economic thoughts can be explained partly by the ideological conditions of the time he lived. In Smith's time, the rising bourgeoisie, as the bearer of the new civil society, criticized mercantilism and set up the economics as the objective knowledge of rationality of the capitalistic autonomy. So, in Smith's notion, economics, social criticism and the primary bearer of economic movement (the rising industrial bourgeoisie) are unified as an integrated entity.

In the end of the eighteenth century the evils of capitalism became rampant inciting some serious social problems. The sceptre of economics, however, still rested in the hands of the bourgeoisie; the task of social criticism was entrusted to the farmers, artisan, independent small-producers who were suffering under the pressure of the Industrial Revolution and to the petit bourgeois intellectuals who were sympathetic to them; but the working people who should naturally stand against capitalism, being immature and unprepared, did not appear in the front yet. So, Godwin, burning in the cause of forming a just society, had but to depend on the sense of enlightened rationality of the petit bourgeoisie, instead of the organized labourers.

In spite of such a rather Utopian character of Godwin's speculation, here are two points which should be especially referred to: first, just as he says, "the subject of property is the key-stone that completes

the fabric of political justice,"⁽¹⁾ and the principle of property is of such a nature which, if erroneous, must be regarded as the source, "not only of the abuses above enumerated, but of others of innumerable kinds, too multifarious and subtle to enter into so brief a catalogue,"⁽²⁾ his thought is an attempt to regard the political system as a super-structure of the property system by combining the two aspects of his thought process: the individualism-anarchism and the private property criticism-communism.

Although his thorough liberalism may be said to be of petit bourgeois character, he concerned not only with political system, but, seeing a vital relationship between political power and property system, it went further to direct its piercing pen of criticism to the last mentioned. This is the point which makes him superior to others who are generally summed under the category of petit bourgeois liberalists, comprising such ideologists as anarchists, existentialists, religionists, E. Fromm, B. A. W. Russel and others.

In the second place, his criticism of private property was almost the only one set against the capitalistic regime which existed in his days. Even T. Paine and the people of the London Corresponding Society who are in a sense considered more radical than Godwin never thought of capitalism coming to an end sometime in the future, and T. Spence, who is considered the first modern socialist, restricted his criticism on property to land only. Indeed, Godwin was the only person who enlarged the scope of criticism so as to embrace the whole system of private property, especially focussing its target on the accumulated property.

Godwin thinks the social evils come more than anything else from the unequal distribution of wealth.⁽³⁾ Taking the civil society as a system of accumulated property, and believing that it is the legislation and law which help the rich gain wealth through violence and fraud, he made the following moral criticism on it:

"Its first effect is that which we already mentioned, a sense of dependence.

A second evil that arises out of the established system of property is the perpetual spectacle of injustice it exhibits.

This leads us to observe thirdly, that the established system of property is the true levelling system with respect to human species.

The fruitful source of crimes consists in this circumstances, one

(1) *Political Justice*, Vol. II, p. 420.

(2) *Ibid.*, pp. 421-2.

(3) *Ibid.*, Vol. I, pp. 14-5.

man's possessing in abundance that of which another man is destitute."⁽⁴⁾

In his criticism is often confused merchant with capitalists, and artisan with labourer, giving one the impression that he is depicting the wholesale dealer blamable for the situation. But in fact, when he mentioned the "system of accumulated property", he was vaguely conscious of the wage slavery system which is the basis of the civil society. He should be taken as criticizing the commercial profit making system that made this society.

His criticism, therefore, was most severe in attacking the commercialism of capitalism and the baneful effect it exerts on the workers.

He states: "The division of labour, as it has been treated by commercial writers, is for most part the offspring of avarice. It has been found that ten persons can make two hundred and forty times as many pins in a day as one person. This refinement is the growth of luxury. The object is to see how vast a surface the industry of the lower classes may be beaten, the more completely to guild over the indolent and the proud. The ingenuity of the merchant is whetted by new improvements of this sort to transport more of the wealth of the powerful into his own coffers."⁽⁵⁾

"It is accumulation that forms men into one common mass and makes them fit to be played upon like a brute machine."⁽⁶⁾

His criticism had no foundation in economics, and did not observe objectively the existing economic question in terms of the logical sequence of capital. Pursuing, however, rather its moral significance, he argued that as the profit making spirit of capitalism is against the primary principle of justice and happiness causing such evils as the original accumulation of capital, the production of the relative surplus value through the division of labour, and the alienation of labour by capital and the alienation of humanity, it should seriously be attacked.

His, therefore, made a marked contrast to the stand taken by the classical economists who, in spite of their concern over the same problem of material wealth and human happiness as Godwin, started with the preoccupation,—the man as a profit hunting creature,—and managed the question of developing productive power while being completely engrossed in their attempt to rationalize the operative function of capital, and utterly oblivious of such problems as the alienation of labour, the forced enhancement of its efficiency, the subordination of labour to capital, the enslavement of labour and the impoverishment

(4) *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 453-6.

(5) *Ibid.*, pp. 513-4.

(6) *Ibid.*, p. 446.

of the working masses.

For example, Smith confused the capitalistic production with the simple small-commodity production, and depicted the former as a harmonious system of freedom and equality. This same confusion, when fallen in the hands of Godwin, resulted in the exposure of the commodity production in general as generating violence, fraud, slavishness, injustice, quality deterioration, labour exploitation and delinquency, which are not necessarily the outcome of the capitalistic system of production alone.

Now, how does he conceive of the possession of material good? Here, he develops a unique theory of property. He states: "To whom does any article of property, suppose a loaf of bread, justly belong? To him who most wants it, or to whom the possession of it will be most beneficial."⁽⁷⁾

The benefit in this case means, of course, one which is considered with a highly cultivated reason. This is an application of his justice-utilitarian principle. He describes it as follows: "Justice is a principle which proposes to itself the production of the greatest sum of pleasure or happiness. Justice requires that I should put myself in the place of an impartial spectator of human concerns, and divest myself of retrospect to my own predilections."⁽⁸⁾ Agreeing with Rousseau, he takes luxury as a vanity and considers it as degrading. Also, he states, since no army, servant or any other political institution is necessary and the people live in peace of each other, they will be required to work only half a day for the ample production of their necessities of life.⁽⁹⁾

In such a society, there should be no compulsion of any sort, as every individual is integrated by its own reason. There should be no such thing as the common storehouse, the common repast, as was prescribed by More, the common labour or even the common habitation, since every one of these causes evil, defying the independence of individual and subjecting him to other's judgment. While feeling repulsed against the economic system which binds people by machines, Godwin still looks forward to their great possibility of removing the process of division and cooperation and saving labour from its trouble.

He observes: "At present, to pull down a tree, to cut a canal, to navigate a vessel requires the labour of many. Will it always require the labour of many? When we look at the complicated machines of

(7) *Ibid.*,

(8) *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. xxv.

(9) *Ibid.*, Vol II, p. 484. In *The Enquirer*, this was extended to two hours.

human contrivance, various sorts of mills, of weaving engines, of steam engines, are we not astonished at the compendium of labour they produce? Who shall say where this species of improvement must stop? At present such inventions alarm the labouring part of the community; and they may be productive of temporary distress, though they conduce in the sequel to the most important interest of the multitude. But in the state of equal labour their utility will be liable to no dispute. Here after it is by no means clear that the most extensive operations will not be within the reach of one man; or, to make use of familiar instance, that a plough may not be turned into field and perform its office without the need of superintendence.”⁽¹⁰⁾

In this way he was opposed to the professionalization of people through the division of labour, and favoured the wholly accomplished type of man with infinite progress of machine and development of reason thereby revealing his idealism consciousness as a petit bourgeoisie.

Godwin was under the influence of the atomic view of society and utilitarianism, revealing the establishment of the civil society, and never showed the sentimentalism for such a thing as the old agricultural community as haboured by the Diggers and T. Spence. Against the selfish government of capital, however, he tried to defend his freedom and independence by his moral criticism according to his strict principle of “justice”.

His optimism, which differed from that of Smith, was derived from his criticism on the cumulative system of wealth, being dependent on the enlightening effect of an abstractedly conceived human reason. His idea, therefore, goes beyond the boundaries of the bourgeoisie, as it aims at shaking the basis of property system, but at the same time not a step has it taken outside the scope of the petit bourgeoisie or the intelligentzia so long as it expects something from the human reason. His Utopia was just a reflection of the aspirations of the ruining independent small-producers, such as the extolment of simple life, the security of independence, freedom and safety, the distribution of property according to the worths and the requirements of individuals, etc.

Further, he disliked revolution, although he lived right in the midst of revolutionary atmosphere, and distinguished himself from any revolutionary groups. Moreover in the later edition of his *Political Justice*, he looked as though he was compromising with the existing property system, when he wrote for the enlargement of individual

(10) *Ibid.*, pp. 502-3.

(11) R. Schlatter: *Private Property*, 1951, chapters VII, VIII, IX.

property right, emphasized the security of property, and went so far as to state that an unequal property system is the requisite prelude to high civilization. However, paradoxical as it looks, it seems that only from among the thought of small-producers will come out a really cardinal criticism against the existing orders at the time when the base working class had no organization of their own and were in ignorance, and the upper strata as the London Corresponding Society were confined themselves within the narrowly circumscribed program as the equal voting right and the parliamentary reform.

The romanticism of Godwin not only served as an inspiration to the romantic poets who resisted against the commercial society through their practical artistic endeavors, but directly confronted the cumulative property system by diverting the logic of the thought of enlightenment to its own end.

Then utilitarianism soon fell in the hands of proletariat, having many socialistic systems of thought shift from the natural property theory to the utilitarian theory of property, that is, transferring the standard of distribution to be determined by social utility, not by the amount of labour.

In discussing the contribution of utilitarianism to labour movement, the Benthamite influence is often considered the sole one. But when we come to recall that the Bentham's arithmetic theory of morals lost its sharp critical spirit against the state and the religion based on the philosophy of enlightenment, it seems right to conclude that it was Godwin rather than Bentham, who truly inherited Helvétius's utilitarianism and his revolutionary spirit.

VI. ECONOMIC THOUGHT IN *The Enquirer*

The Enquirer is a collection of Godwin's essays on education and the commentaries on society. His educational thought is characterized: 1. the thorough liberalism, the emphasis on the importance of mental independence, the exclusion of authority, 2. the trust in reason, 3. the principle of equality.

In the words of Woodcock: "It represents the most remarkable and advanced treatise on education that has appeared by the end of the eighteenth century, and, with its emphasis on freedom as the basis of an education in which the pupil, rather than the teacher, is the central figure, it anticipates the best in modern educational theory, and is actually still in advance of educational practice in a world that demands from its people obedience rather than the full and free development of

their personal potentialities.”⁽¹⁾

Really in it is revealed a fervent criticism against the old system, and a matured, epoch-making educational view aiming at the cultivation of the modern humanity which even surpasses Rousseau in thoroughness. Not only in the eighteenth century epoch-making, but even at the present moment it presses on us living in the situation “alienated” with its ever fresh claim for the individuality of human being.

Examining the criticism on capitalism and the economic thought in this book, we get struck by the following points:

Instead of taking poverty in a merely sensuous sense, he considers it in relation to the total amount of production in a society, and takes up the question of surplus labour, although it is considered from the standpoint of value in use.⁽²⁾ Also, he gives a severe criticism on luxury. He thinks prodigality takes more labour of workers, but brings no increase in their wages. Compared with prodigality, avariciousness causes less evil, he considers. The point is well clarified in the following passage:

“How far does the conduct of the rich man who lives up to his fortune on the one hand, and of the avaricious man on the other, contribute to the placing of human beings in the condition in which they ought to be placed?

Every man who invests a new luxury, adds so much to the quantity of labour entailed on the lower orders of society. The same may be affirmed of every man who adds a new dish to his table, or who imposes a new tax upon the inhabitants of his country. It is a gross and ridiculous error to suppose that the rich pay for anything. There is no wealth in the world except this, the labour of man. What is misnamed wealth, is merely a power vested in certain individuals by the institutions of society, to compel others to labour for their benefit. So much labour is requisite to produce the necessaries of life; so much more to produce those superfluities which at present exist in any country. Every new luxury is a new weight thrown into the scale. The poor are scarcely ever benefited by this. It adds a certain portion to the mass of their labour; but it adds nothing to their conveniences. Their wages are not changed. They are paid no more now for the work of ten hours, than before for the work of eight. They support the burden; but they come in for no share of the fruit. If a rich man employ the poor in breaking up land and cultivating its useful productions, he may be their benefactor. But, if he employ them in

(1) G. Woodcock: *William Godwin, A. Biographical Study*, 1946, pp. 132-3.

(2) W. Godwin: *The Enquirer*, 1823, pp. 144.

erecting palace, in sinking canals, in laying out his parks, and modelling his pleasure-grounds, he will be found, when rightly considered, their enemy. He is adding to the weight of oppressions, and vast accumulation of labour, by which they are already sunk beneath the level of the brutes."⁽³⁾

Thus firmly convinced of the antagonism between capital and labour, he tried to testify to the existence of poverty in opulence, the substance of wealth being in the labour of man and the production of luxury causing an increase in requisite labour and hours of the poor, but bringing no increase in wages.

In consequence of his economic thought presented above, here is another feature which makes it distinct from many other radical thoughts; it is his criticism on the then existing industrialism.

Owen, Saint-Simon, Fourier and other so-called Utopian socialists were in fact bourgeois. In spite of their sharp criticism of the contradictions in the capitalist society, they sometimes expected their dream-land realized in the rational development of the existing industrial society.

Godwin, however, was different. He repelled against the selfishness which was the motive force of the industrial society. He was quite dubious of the industrial development itself. He emphatically stated that the labourers and the artisans toiling under the flourishing industrialism were merely its victims, and that the enlargement of employment for these people would make no solution for the situation as the economists in those days maintained.

Another feature of the economic thought in *The Enquirer* is the Godwin's increased awareness of the notion "Wealth is in labour" as was mentioned before. Trying to seek the basis of wealth in human labour, he manifested an excellent analytical power in his attempt to attribute it to some definite social relationship. This approach, being succeeded later by the Ricardian Socialists, served as a logical weapon in their opposition against the economists who upheld the importance of capital and developed it as a criticism against the fetishism of the capitalists.

VII. THE RELATIONSHIP OF W. GODWIN TO THE UTOPIAN SOCIALISM AND THE RICARDIAN SOCIALISM

Having studied the economic thoughts in the *Political Justice* and *The Enquirer*, that is, having examined the Godwin's criticism on private property, his criticism on industrialism and the significance of

(3) *Ibid.*, 1797, pp. 177-8.

labour he emphatically dwelled on, it seems that we are now ready to see where Godwin, the Ricardian socialism and the Utopian socialism should stand in the history of English social thought.

Roughly stated, Godwin should be named a Utopian thinker, for he condemned the capitalistic system as a moral evil, instead of analysing its economic organization in the scientific spirit, and sought its improvement in the progress of human reason. He was, however, different from the so-called Utopian socialists like Owen, Saint-Simon, and Fourier, who were without exception deeply bourgeois tinged and were a sort of industrialists. He was from the beginning a hard criticizer of industrialism; the fact sets him apart from the Utopian socialists in general.

As Godwin was opposed both to feudalism and capitalism, he may be taken as an ideological compariot of independent small-producer class. This can also be deduced from the fact that he was rather in favour of an avaricious man than the man of prodigality and considered an unpretentious, simple life of self-sufficiency as an ideal one. Judged by such a bent of thought, he was rather pre-modernistic in his socialistic tendency; in spite of his great dream for a coming machine age, he failed to understand positively the development of the productive power which moves the history, and therefore failed to give due estimation of the progressive significance of capitalism. After all he was blind to the essence of capitalism.

In proportion as we come to appreciate the ideological value of his Utopia, we get struck by its ever growing distance from the existing realities, and by the archaism of the substantiating material he made use of. Engels stated at the outset of *Die Entwicklung des Sozialismus von der Utopie zur Wissenschaft*: "The modern socialism originated in the consciousness of the class antagonism between labour and capital, and of the anarchistic nature of production." Godwin's thought, however, was in the stage of the pre-Utopian socialism, because, though he lived in the midst of the vortex of industrial revolution, there existed no such thing as the transitional capitalistic crisis, and the antagonism between labour and capital was understood as that between the poor and the rich, and the anarchistic nature of production was just vaguely grasped in the extravagance of the rich.

On the other hand, the fact that he stressed the importance of labour, that is, he recognized labour as the creative determinant of wealth brought him close to the Ricardian socialists.

In the third edition of the *Political Justice*, he classified the three

degrees of property right. He writes:

“(1) The first and simplest degree, is that of my permanent right in those things, the use of which being attributed to me, a greater sum of benefit or pleasure will result, than could have arisen from their being otherwise appropriated.

(2) The second degree of property, is the empire to which every man is entitled, over the produce of his own industry, even that part of it the use of which ought not to be appropriated to himself.

(3) The third degree of property, is that which occupies the most vigilant attention in the civilized states of Europe. It is a system, in whatever manner established, by which one man enters into the faculty of disposing of the produce of another man’s industry.”⁽¹⁾

As the (1) was already stressed in the first edition, and (3) is definitely condemned as a right of extortion because property is the produce of one’s own daily labour and is directly in contradiction to (2), here remains (2) as the question to be considered:

According to Godwin, the principle—one has the property right to the produce of his own labour—has only a negative or a supplementary meaning or if seen from a different angle, it is a kind of robbery. However, his setting up this right afresh signifies that there gained in him the thought “the right to the whole produce of labour (das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag).” Being struck by this fact, Anton Menger goes so far as to say that Godwin was the first person who claimed scientifically for the right to the whole produce of labour.⁽²⁾

The right of producer to the produce of his own labour was originated by Locke as the theory of natural property right, and was transmitted to some classical economists. It was, therefore, not necessarily new with Godwin. Also, Menger’s explanation that Godwin’s three degrees of property right make the three principles of property law corresponding to the right to existence, the right to the whole produce of labour and the private property under the prevalent legal administration of order, is not correct.

Further, the Menger’s attempt to prove that Marx and Rodbertus borrowed the most important part of their socialistic theory from the English and the French theorists of the preceding age, without mentioning any source material thereof proved a complete failure, as is clarified in Engels’ criticism. However the statement by Menger in the same place: “In fact, Godwin may be regarded as the first

(1) *Political Justice*, Vol. II, pp. 432-5.

(2) A. Mengler: *Das Recht auf den vollen Arbeitsertrag, is geschichtlicher Darstellung*, 3 Auf., 1891, S. 40.

scientific socialist of modern times, possessed of the seeds of all the ideas of recent socialism and anarchism"⁽³⁾ is worthy of our attention, although it can not be accepted as it is.

In Section III of the introduction titled "The English School of Socialists" by H. O. Foxwell to the English translation by Mr. E. Tanner of this Menger's book, Foxwell picked six thinkers: Godwin, Hall, Thompson, Gray, Hodgskin and Bray. Of Owen who is generally considered a representative socialist of England, he writes: "Robert Owen himself was not remarkable as a militant and destructive thinker," and mentions rather Spence, Paine, Cobbett and Ogilvie as more revolutionary. And following Menger, he takes Godwin as the foremost of all the English socialist theorists. He writes highly of him: "By its philosophic completeness, its rigorous and fearless, if somewhat puerile logic, and its admirably lucid exposition, the *Political Justice* may fairly entitle its author to be regarded as the Adam Smith of socialistic speculation."⁽⁴⁾

Now, we proceed to examine the reasons which made Menger and Foxwell come to recognize Godwin as the first advocate for scientific socialism. In other words, we will see how much socialistic element there is in Godwin's thought. Menger clearly perceived in him the thoughts that make the mainstays of socialistic order; he thinks Godwin gave a decisive conclusion to the theoretic basis for the right to the whole produce of labour and the right to existence.⁽⁵⁾ According to Foxwell, Godwin's philosophy is a combination of the purest communism and the highly anarchistic individualism.

Both Menger and Foxwell sought the basis of their commendation of Godwin's socialistic tendency in the influency he exercised over the socialists of later days, especially on Owen and Thompson (Menger

(3) A. a. O., S. 40.

(4) Foxwell: *Introduction to The Right to the Whole Produce of Labour*, trans. by M. E. Tanner, p. XXIX.

(5) Concerning this point, Priestley states: "Godwin's 'three degrees of property' have, then, their foundation in Locke, and receive further exposition in Smith. To Godwin belongs the credit of being the first to give them systematic logical arrangement, and it was his clear-cut formulation which provided the stimulus for a good deal of later socialism, and which has caused more than one writer to call him the first modern scientific socialist. The 'scientific' nature of his work does not lie in any genuinely scientific economic method, but rather in the logical order he gives to fundamental concepts of property. The clarity of his presentation brings out the inherent conflict between the right to subsistence and the right to the whole produce of one's own labour, and all subsequent forms of socialism have had to choose between the two." F. E. L. Priestley: *Introduction to the Political Justice*, Vol. III, pp. 67-8.

added Hall to these two, as he was especially emphatic on the whole labour's right to its produce.)

This interpretation by Menger and Foxwell worked to bring the relationship between the Ricardian Socialists and Godwin much closer than before. There is no doubt that Godwin largely affected the Ricardian Socialists, and that there was something common between them, as both of them attached importance to labour, and sought their theoretical foundation for their stands in a class of independent producers.

We nevertheless feel somewhat hesitant in lump them together as the "English school of socialists." In the first place, there must have been a marked difference between them in the comprehension of various problems. For Godwin nearly completed his thought structure in the eighteenth century, while the Ricardian Socialists flourished in the twenties of the nineteenth century. The former disliked the mass movement, while the latter rather supported the labour movement, and centering around the question of distribution, they started with economic theory and formed the demand of capital as the immediate target of attack.

In the second place, the Ricardian Socialists advocated, for the freedom of commercial, activities, and they all looked upon the private property as something divine, although they were opposed to the capitalistic exploitation. They were eager to remove capitalism, but considered its foundation, the commodity production as something ultimate and thus they were basically small producer conscious in their general thought. On the other hand, Godwin, while he entertained a great expectation of the coming intellectual development of the civil society and stood firm for the abolition of the feudalistic tradition of status in it, he was at the same time quite opposed to the system of commodity-exchange which makes the foundation of civil society, and looked forward to abolishing it along with the circulation of capital.

In brief, Godwin was in an earlier stage than the so-called Utopian socialist in his criticism of the industrialism. On the other hand, he went farther beyond the Utopian socialists and looked more like the Ricardian Socialists in that he strongly advocated on labour as the source of wealth, and criticized the fetishism on that basis. Thus, in spite of his apparent semblance to the Ricardian Socialists, he was not necessarily in accord with them either. Indeed, he was a unique existence as an social thinker; unique in the sense that he differed from the Ricardian Socialists who were the second type of radicalism, as he embraced communism, opposing to the profit making of the

bourgeois, and thus proved himself a third type of radicalism.

The entire criticism of the bourgeois ideology in those days generally portrayed the agricultural community in the mediaeval age as its ideal type. But the idea of progress prevalent in Godwin's time seems to have set him forward looking instead of backward reminiscent. Visionary of the human nature and society ever approaching to their perfection through the infinite development of reason, he gave a high credit to the machine too. Such were the conditions which enabled him to acquire a complete individualism, become the founder of modern anarchism and introduce the educational theory which is modern or even up-to-date in its content, as was mentioned before.

Delivered from the reactionary tendency of such a person as Spence, Godwin succeeded in cultivating himself a set of excellent ideologies by which he could criticize bourgeois disposition of the Utopian socialists and the petite bourgeois spirit of the Ricardian Socialists.

He excellently criticized the system of private property and attacked the various forms it took such as the slight of human dignity, the alienation, the break-up, the distortion, the enslavement, the impoverishment of human being or human nature, as well as the extortion of unpaid labour and the fetishism of capital, at the important transitional time when the idea of enlightenment was being replaced by socialism, although he was rather poor in his understanding of the law of the capitalistic social order.

On account of his insufficient knowledge of the positive phase of capitalism, his revolutionary idea of the world remained after all as an ideological vision, and his practical contribution to the actual social movement was very limited. Still, his critical views of the world worked as valuable material for the development of Utopian socialism, the Ricardian Socialism and the romanticism, before the rise of truly scientific, proletariat socialism.

VIII. CONCLUSION

Godwin's thought first took its shape as a Calvinist minister's idea with the background of independent producers, and turned to deism under the influence of Swift, Rousseau, and French materialist, and further took the course of Socinianism and atheism. It is true that he was tinged with romantist idealism and Platonism, but as a whole he had clearly a settled formula for materialism, utilitarianism and the theory of necessity. It is the first point that his thought was largely supported by the idea of enlightenment and progress, centering around

such thinkers as Locke and Helvétius.

Godwin, however, was highly critical of the bourgeoisie in spite of the fact that the idea of enlightenment was essentially a bourgeois thought. Also, although he was an intellectual with the circumstance of a small-producer, and the radicalism of the small-producer was generally the simple-commodity-producer type, he went to the extremity in his thought so as to deny the private property itself, and attack any power whatsoever, coming finally to harbour anarchistic communism. The trend of thought above as pursued by Godwin is what we previously called the 3rd type of radicalism, originally derived from Diggers. Godwin may not have been conscious about it, but we find a number of points common between Godwin and this 3rd type of radicalism. His was different from the 1st and the 2nd type of radicalism which compromised with power, lapsed into the argument defensive, and after all failed to get out of the thought frame of bourgeoisie. This is the second characteristic we should be aware in the perusal of the philosophy of Godwin.

And the significance of the unique time called the "French Revolution in England" will give still more weight in Godwin's thought. When the French Revolution, one of the greatest events in history, surged to the shores of England, the most developing capitalistic country in the world, the people there were incited to a variety of activities: right or left, conservative or progressive, such as socialism, communism, anarchism, reactionism, feminism, romanticism, atheism, labour movement, etc. These are the serious problems even at the present moment.

Godwin's thought, should not be taken as a "blossom out of season" or an "eccentric fantasy", but it is an extreme response of the spirit of his age. It, rising above his age, has the importance even in our age. This is the third characteristic of Godwin's thought.

It is true that the Godwin's thought, owing to its character of the independent producer, did not attain an organized theoretic economics. It was, however, by no means a mosaic of anarchronic fragments; it was ever forward looking in outlook. Not a remnant of the idea of natural law, it repulsed against the bourgeois concept of society on the basis of the combative utilitarianism. Acting as an anti-thesis of the bourgeois utilitarianism, it formallized itself into the anarchistic communism effected through the revolution of human nature by reason, aiming at the establishment of democracy and further its subjugation. Here we can find even such an epoch-making educational idea depicting the independent, free and equal humanity which goes beyond

Rousseau, complete trust to the spontaneity of child, the highest regard to individuality and a complete exclusion of power.

In brief, Godwin's thought seems to have the two distinct features: the thoroughgoing individualism in the modernistic sense of the word, and the severe criticism on society. The first took the form of denunciation of power culminating into anarchism, while the second, starting with the criticism on private property and capitalism, settled on to communism. Further, grasping politics in terms of property system, and attacking the alienation of humanity involved in the cumulative process of wealth, he succeeded in establishing a unique anarchistic communism.

This criticism on power, the criticism on private property and the criticism on fetishism exercised a large influence on W. Thompson who published *An Inquiry into the Principle of the Distribution of Wealth*, 1824, and T. Hodgskin who brought out *Labour Defended against the Claims of Capital*, 1825. In Owen's thought and Chartism too, Godwin's influence can be perceived.

However, Thompson, while admitting Bentham's utilitarianism as the assumption, ended in the pursuit of small-producer's dream longing for the free labour, the security of labour's produce and the free exchange. On the other hand, all what Hodgkin could accomplish was the idealization of the free competition among the small-commodity-producers on the basis of the natural law concept of Locke and Smith. Indeed, it appears to take a long way to go for mankind before they succeed in realizing Godwin's anarchistic communism to completely eradicate the bourgeois and petite-bourgeois nature.

As everybody knows, Marx says in his *Kritik des Gothaer Programms* that the commodity exchange, the distribution according to capacity, and the equality of right, realized in the first stage of communism (socialism) are the bourgeois notions tinged with the main features of the old system of society. In the second stage (communism), he explains, labour is the primary essential for life, and everybody works according to one's capacity and receives according to his necessities. Marx says that he derived this idea from "Chacun produira selon ses facultés et consommera selon ses besoins" appeared in J. J. C. L. Blanc: *Organization du Travail*, 1839. Needless to say, this idea was originally stated in the Bible and the publications by some thinkers. To be specific, it was Godwin who prescribed this in 1793.

Further, according to a paragraph of the *Kritik des Gothaer Programms*, as a society gets transformed into communism, the antagonism between the spiritual and the physical labour disappears—

one of the greatest changes in the history of mankind, comparable to the vanishing of the society divided by social classes. To bring about this change, as well as the gigantic progress in scientific technique and productive power, an infinite advancement in human spirit and individual freedom in a complete sense—that is to say the realization of Godwin's idea—will be the indispensable premises.

Lately, a great deal is said of the "social alienation". That is, such concepts as the "alienation of labour produce", the "alienation of labour itself", the "alienation of species", and the "alienation of humanity" as are mentioned in Marx's *Philosophisch-ökonomische Manuskripte*, 1844, are now being scrutinized in the fresh light of modernism to-day. This concept of "alienation" is radically critical of the traditional economics, which is ever after wealth getting and is an embodiment of the laws of the private property. These general characteristics of alienation theory seem to have been took up by Marx in the formalization of his historical materialism.

Then the modern communism which was started by Thomas More and culminated in Godwin, hitting hard the creeds of wealth getting and its privated ownership, along with the classical economics, became the major premise for the advent of Marxism.

Moreover, anarchism,—stressing the individual freedom to its extremity and rejecting any organized control over individual including the state authority—, served as the heralding criticism against the "mass society" which makes a distinct characteristic of the present society. In other words, it worked as the motive force for the ideological awakening and the practical movement that were bound to come in connection with the various social conditions, such as the mass production, the functional allocation system and the mass communication, followed by such controversial arguments as the rationalization with irrationality, the democratization (liberalization) with autocracy, the organization with atomization, the deprivation of individual self in the mass operation coming along with the development of bureaucratic organization and technical progress.

Further, if we consider the alienation of present days from two aspects of capitalism and mass society, it seems quite possible to grasp the problem of alienation in terms of organization and private property. So, it is quite certain that the problem of division of labour will remain as one of the greatest issues of mankind even after the disappearance of private property in a socialistic world.

At the time when the classical economists, especially A. Smith lauded the division of labour as promotive of productive power, Godwin

looked upon it as the contrivance coming from human avariciousness, which results in the monopoly, indolence, and strengthening of labour. In the world Godwin describes, there exist not only no such thing as the private property but the organized division of labour which causes substantially the "alienation" of individuals. Different from More, Godwin's world admits no habitation, no common repast and even cooperation, as these obstruct the exercise of private spontaneous judgment. Opposing to the professionalization of people through the division of labour, he valued the human being as wholly integrated through the cultivation of its reason. The people so molded would have to work only for two hours a day, being engaged in some intellectual or creative pursuits, or sports. Delivered from any ostentation, they take pleasure only in the search for intellectual refinement. And he sought the compensatory device for the abolition of the division and cooperation of labour in a possible machine which would manage everything by itself.

The ideal society so portrayed, of course, would have the same limitation as those of the one conceived by independent small-producers. May be, however, that the prescribed society of Marx where people are absolved from the "stain of bourgeois right", where "disappear the slavish dependence of individuals under the division of labour and the antagonism between the spiritual and the physical labour," and the "Godwin's world" which aims at the realization of the benefit of the whole through reason, are essentially very close of each other.

Not only that the remarkable progress of late in the scientific technique, testifying to the complete defeat of the Malthusian theory of population, makes us to recall Godwin's utopia, but for a man today, being urged of the necessity of professionalizing some specific sectors, as well as of considering the probabilities of the integrated being, Godwin's Utopian thought is a philosophical treasury which will furnish us with some fresh materials for the prospective development of the world.