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The new liberalism and the theory of social evolution; in relation to the cognition of "Class and Society"

Junichi Himeno

1. Problematic

New Liberalism has generally been thought of as a pattern of thinking balancing between liberalism and the intervention of the state in the late Victorian age, while being opposed to other patterns such as those of Laissez-Faire, Anarchism, Individualism and Ultra-Nationalism. This pattern of thinking reached its peak during the administration of the Liberal Party from 1906 to 1914. It supported various forms of social reform legislation connected with the English welfare state. Andrew Vincent and Raymond Plant, who surveyed the research on the New Liberalism since 1970’s, defined it as state intervention based on idealism. They classified the New Liberalists into three categories according to the social background of those spurring the intervention. Their first category comprises the elite, the second labour both as government administrators and Socialists party members, while the third category comprises journalists and social researchers, claring for social justice. According to this definition, both social and liberal imperialists are included here into the New Liberalism. If the idealism of Thomas Hill Green would constitute the core of the New Liberalism, that of Barnard Shaw and Webbs would have to be eliminated from that list. Recent research has stressed that the core of the New Liberalism was the idea of improvement based either on an economic analysis or on a class analysis. This narrow definition of the New Liberalism should be considered. Are there any sorts of social or economic analyses for national intervention in the Greenean context?

Michael Freeden tightened the definition of the New Liberalism and classified various general ideologies that had appeared in history with comparative. He drew their map using the concepts of core and adjacent. According to him, the New Liberalism is an ideology which (1) succeeded with the old liberalism, and (2) reflected the changes in society due to industry, and is adjacent to (3) the analogy of evolution, (4) the cooperation of self-developing organization, and (5) the equality with re-distribution. These five conditions should be the feature for the New Liberalism. It copes with social problems such as poverty, serious depression, and imperialism. It should be also grasped as the integrative ideology of the government of politics, the economy of the market, and the agents of civil society. Both Hobson and Hobhouse are central figures who could pass these tests of the New Liberalism. Freeden refers to this as follows:

'Advanced Liberals had arrived at an expanded and more radical expression of Green’s social philosophy by means of the concepts of ‘evolution’ and ‘organicism’. It was within this Liberal climate of ideas, with its combination of two central strands in English political thought - liberty and welfare - that the social legislation at the basis of the British Welfare State was nurtured.'

I shall here take up the ideological functions of the idea of social evolution. It influenced not only the politics, but also economic and social theory in those days by means of its explanation of social change and social order formation. It was also, as J.W. Burrow mentions, an ideology which claimed
to be influenced by the *theory of evolution*. Burrow explained the popularity of this idea of social evolution as follows:

'Theories of social evolution had provided for the Victorian an intellectual resting-place, a point of repose at which the tension between the need for certainty and the need to accommodate more diverse social facts, and more subtle ways of interpreting them, than the traditional certainties allowed for reached a kind of temporary equilibrium.'

The theory of social evolution occupied an especially high position among social ideologies in nineteenth century Britain. In the first place, according to Burrow, it provides various styles for the organization of social life and its interpretation. In the second place, it posits economic behavior as the standard for its absolute ideal. In the third place, it combines a theory of ethics and politics with social engineering. As for the relations with social philosophy in the theory of social evolution he referred to the character of its conservatism. According to him, the idea of evolution was an ideology that tried to explain the new society adapting to the intractability of complex social facts. It would become inherent not only to the new liberalism of the progressive society, but also to the proper conservatism of the time. What is the difference between these ideologies where the pattern of theory is concerned?

Although Burrow limited his analysis to the middle of the nineteenth century, I would focus to the end of the nineteenth century, and would like to clarify the differences of the pattern of social evolution.

First, I propose to take a look at what Darwin himself has to say about human nature. Second, I will trace Spencer's thoughts on social evolution. Third, I will clarify the characteristics of Huxley's ideas on social evolution, for he emphasized the ethical process. Fourth, I want to focus on the conservative social evolution of both W. Bagehot and M.H. Mallock. Finally, I will examine the function of the New Liberalism of J.A. Hobson in relation to the ideas on social evolution.

2. Darwin's views on human nature and society after his *Origin of Species*

In the final chapter of the first edition of *The Origin of Species* Charles Darwin summarized the various aspects of biological evolution as follows:

"These laws, taken in the largest sense, being Growth with Reproduction; Inheritance which is almost implied by reproduction; Variability from the indirect and direct action of the conditions of life, and from use and disuse: a Ration of Increase so high as to lead to a Struggle for Life, and as a consequence to Natural Selection, entailing Divergence of Character and the Extinction of less-improved forms. Thus, from the war of nature, from famine and death, the most exalted object which we are capable of conceiving, namely, the production of the higher animals, directly follows."

Darwin's key ideas on evolution were those of natural selection and struggle for life, and he applied their principles to the world of plants and animals. The relationship between the idea of natural selection and the survival of fittest was not so simple, however. Even though Darwin's opinions on this point remained uncertain, hesitating whether to adopt natural selection or mutation as the key element in determining the direction of evolution, Darwin at any rate recognized that the law of species has no relation to human will or purpose. This idea strongly influenced social cognition in those days. Darwin emphasized that natural selection was distinct from human choice, but he was cautious about the personification of the word of Nature, and said that Nature meant both the synthetic action of natural law and its results. By the word of the law he meant the autonomy of the change of adaptation structure, which we can only observe as a series of facts. If the law of the change of adaptation structure were to be applied to human society, how could human altruism ever have come into the
Darwin continued his discussion of The Origin of Species to include human evolution in his book of The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex, which focuses on the development of the human race. Darwin asserted in this book that human beings were subject to the same origins as the animals. He explained step by step the development of mental abilities from those of the lower animals to those of human beings: instinct, emotion, curiosity, imitation, attention, memory, imagination, reason, improvement, tools and weapons, language, self-consciousness, and sense of beauty. Furthermore, he took care to draw a picture of human evolution and the social animal, which had been making progress towards developing a social instinct and to have faith in God, spirits, superstition, sympathy, morality and spirit. Darwin here paid attention to the ideal of the productive human being, beloved of classical economics, who has sympathy for his fellow man. His theory was influenced by the Lamarckian law of flexible structure to which both morality and intellect would be subject. However, Darwin was opposed to the idea of progress in history and he insisted on the plurality of historical trajectories in the manner of Baghot. Darwin quoted the words of Mr. Maine and mentioned, "The greatest part of mankind has never shewn a particle of desire that its civil institutions should be improved." He continued: "Progress seems to depend on many concurrent favourable conditions far too complex to be followed out." The pressure of natural selection was an indispensable restraint on human nature on behalf of its survival for life. But from the viewpoint of survival of the fittest, he severely judged dropouts and other socially undesirable behavior. In other words, depending on both Wallace and Golton, he feared the bad influence of retarded, handicapped and sick persons on civilized society. Although it looks like we see here the beginning of an argument for eugenics, Darwin himself thought that help for the weak was justified by the evolutionary existence of morality and the inbred sympathy of human beings for each other. He should, therefore, be distinguished from later chauvinistic thinkers of eugenics who pursued the idea that heredity was the key element in the determination of character.

When Darwin wrote about the history of mankind that "Progress was more general than a fall", he took the view that human nature was improvable. Progress comes from competition and the capacity for production acquired through the human qualities of knowledge, morality and religion. Here the social instinct was a fundamental principle in a morality borrowing both from intellect and custom. We can interpret the Darwinian context to say that when altruism tended toward the golden rule, utilitarian and ideal situations would be realized as the progressive human being inside evolution. Although this rhetoric sounds like a Greenian view of the New Liberalism, Darwin is more deterministic and market oriented.

Darwin avoided adopting a completely Lamarckian view on race. He grasped the character of race as the unconscious preservation of the individual, each of whom represented a variation in the desirable direction of human qualities. As we have seen in this section, Darwin recognized social evolution as competitive and productive, which is similar to both Smithian and Malthusian precedents. In his evolutionary society both class struggle and social poverty would be dissolved through competition. In terms of social evolution in this sense, Darwin should be classified as a market-oriented laissez-faire type of liberalist.

3. The ethics of social evolution in Spencer

Herbert Spencer also was a proponent of the positive effects of laissez-faire in the social context. In the formation of social evolution theory, his thought overlapped with that of Darwin. His first ideas on social evolution, Spencer wrote down in his thesis Progress; Its Law and Cause, published in 1857, two years before The Origin of Species. In Spencer's view social progress was measured by an increase in safety, life, and property. Concerning the expansion of freedom, which
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can satisfy many human desires, the right meaning of social progress was a structural change of the organic body allowing for such results. Here he emphasized the autonomic change of society as opposed to the teleological theory on progress. This idea on the nature of change in Spencer can be examined through the objective disinterest view.

Spencer viewed this process as an evolutionary one from the simple to the complex and on to ever greater differentiation, or, in other words, a change from the homogeneous to the heterogeneous. Spencer gradually distinguished the concept of evolution from that of progress. And he warned against personifying the word evolution, just as Darwin did with Nature. He observed not only the structure of society but also its dynamism as a social progress which 'consists in those changes of structure in the social organism which have entailed these consequences."

His idea of social evolution as complex structures rooted in simple causes was also applied to race and industry. Although he viewed, on the one hand, the difference between a civilized European and primitive man on the basis of their physical anthropology, on the other hand he also noted the differences in their economic situations. He drew attention to industrial growth and the specialization of some occupations, on the basis of the simple principle of the division of labour. This he seems to have learned from Adam Smith and Malthus, he applied it to the evolution of industrial society where the pressure of population works effectively to provide an incentive to increase the means of subsistence for life, in the same manner as Darwin."

Here I shall examine the role of knowledge in Spencer's ideas on social evolution. Two years after his thesis on Progress, he published a small booklet entitled What Knowledge is of Most Worth, in which he theorized on the role knowledge played in evolution. He classified life's various activities into five categories, and he found that knowledge has value in each of these five active processes. Spencer admitted that education was highly important for the acquisition of knowledge. His ideas seem like a mixture of the Hobbesian ideas of self-preservation and Smithian natural philosophy. Next, Spencer considered science the most valuable kind of knowledge. He pointed out the respect for modern science which is based on mathematics, Hegelian philosophy, astronomical physics, dynamics, chemistry, and the social science of the right for life and property. Those should all be used to compose a correct manual for the education of citizens."

According to Spencer the means of evolution is generally 'an integration of matter and a dissipation of motion'. In First Principles, social evolution is characterized by the metaphor of the society that is composed of coherent, differentiation, dynamics and multiplication. He understood the social evolution both with 'a balanced social structure' and 'with a fluctuation change'. In fact, though Spencer avoided the pitfalls of both teleological analysis and of the personalization of society, his social evolution overlapped with the validity of modern social progress. In other words, in Spencer's thinking on the evolution of society, the role of the government moved back to the rear, and he valued more the development of independent and spontaneous industrial enterprises as agents who through their mutual competition brought society to a higher level.

What kinds of function did ethics have in this social evolution? In his Principles of Ethics Spencer answered this question. Ethics here was conceived as a form of individual development, which is able to confer a value judgment on an act that empowers and helps to promote individual welfare. If an act is fueled by desire which finds its roots in the necessity to sustain life and is stimulated by instinct, then ethics imbues that act with understanding based on experience and self-criticism. If it acts, in private, to moderate behavior, it maintains a balance of the amount for activities. A strong attachment to the rapid attainment of an ideal or the tenacity of his private behavior leads to an imbalanced situation and causes the retrogression of society. Self-interest is a guide to the balance of conditions in society. As he examined the effects of altruism, we will want
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to know his opinion about "beneficence."

Spencer pointed out two kinds of beneficence. One was negative beneficence, which he thought as restraining free acts such as competition, contracts, blame and rewards, and payment without preparation. It was indicative of individual ability. The other was positive beneficence, which was found in acts of bravery, parental love, filial piety, aid to the wounded or sick, rescue from cruelty and danger, financial help to friends and relatives, and relief for the poor.

Spencer concluded that social poverty is a problem that should be solved by individual beneficence and that there was no need for a structural confrontation of it by society. Society has evolved its own structure and processes dynamically and successively according to each individual experience. Beneficence, in this conception, was the coordinator of social progress, in which utility circulated and self-power tended to be expanded. In this sense, Spencer's natural beneficence was distinguished from that of teleology and Providence. In other words, in his view beneficence or altruism were to be estimated only in so far as their utility for the maintenance of civilization could be gauged. Here both man's self-power and beneficence will realize a balanced production. In Spencer's theory of social evolution, the beneficent came out as the fittest in the struggle for survival. Not unlike Darwin, Spencer's conclusions on utilitarianism and the development of individual morality seem to characterize him as well as a market-oriented laissez-faire type of liberalist.

4. Social evolution and the ethical process in Huxley

T.H. Huxley challenged the gap, indicated above, in the theory of social evolution between the concept of the fittest as the most suitable person from a utilitarian point of view and the most ethical person. Huxley devoted himself to a new theory of biology emerging after Darwin. He was a natural researcher in comparative anatomy, morphology, and fossilology of the vertebrate forms of life. He hated to be called a scientist, but he defended both the spirit and methods of science in the tradition of humanities. In his dispute with Reverend Wilberforce, who attacked the theory of evolution in natural science, Huxley held to a position of agnosticism (a word that was coined by him), and insisted that the scientific method should be distinguished from religion. Agnosticism for Huxley is not a doctrine but a method, and its principles can be traced back to ancient times when all things were tried and good people were firmly protected. In particular, the idea of the invariable of the human existing condition advocated by Malthus in The Principles of Population in 1797, was redefined as the cosmic process by him. Huxley's lecture series on evolution and ethics were epochal for the theory of social evolution in the 1890's. According to Huxley, the cosmic process was the state of nature.

Huxley here expanded the range of activities of man who would confront the cosmic process. This man was a person who could create the state of art in the state of nature in which the human should struggle for existence. He put attention to the artifice by his human energy and his intellect. He named its human territory as the horticultural process. It was a plantation against the cosmos, and its characteristic is "the elimination of that struggle, by the removal of the conditions which give rise to it." In this horticultural process, "the possibility of the choice toward the ruler's ideal" would be realized instead of a free struggle for existence. The ruler of this colony falls into the paradox that he must artificially create a new struggle for existence in order to control the population. It was an evolutionary process toward eugenics on the one hand to maintain the supreme descendant. Huxley, however, finds the social bond rather than the logical ideal in eugenics.

Huxley called the process of organization for the sympathy of conscience as the ethical process which strengthened a cooperative group against the cosmic process. To Huxley, the social evolution is nothing but an ethical process itself. This should be distinguished from the evolution of species in both the state of nature and the state of art. This process was not to imitate the cosmic
process but it was conceived as a battle with it. In the background of such a strong ethical process, there were serious social problems such as endemic poverty that could not be solved by laissez-faire. Here the human conscious choice is extolled. This view secularized the social image of Greenean, and scooped the process concerned with the interest of both confrontation and conflict. As Paradis has mentioned, he drew the picture of a new type of ethical man who would do active battle with social problems. He reminded his audience of the role of both legislation, morality, and the feeling of personal duty toward the community. Here Huxley included the two elements of instinctive behavior strengthened by conscious intellect and the acquired reflective movement. His concept of the ethical process of social evolution also opposed strict Epicureanism. Moreover, he does not make nature itself an ethical model, but grasped that the position of man was isolated from nature. Paradis characterized this as Huxley’s analogical naturalism. Huxley pointed out that man should have purpose, technology, and moral sense in conflict with social growth, and he thought that this made up the history of civilization.

Huxley adapted the theory of social evolution to show the eminence of human ethics in society against the background of new, seriously problematic, industrial circumstances. He, however, lacked the analysis of economic social class structure. Thus he seems to be a figure who bridged the old liberalism with the new liberalism.

5. Social evolution in conservative thought

In this section, I want to mention two social theories of evolution by the Conservatives W. Bagehot and W. H. Mallock, who applied the theory of social evolution to confirm their own conservative opinions.

In 1872, Bagehot wrote *Physics and Politics*, a book that was later hailed as a pioneer of political psychology. He adopted the principle of the natural selection and the other elements of which it was composed (imitation, assimilation, heredity) and applied it to politics and society. He then examined the possibility of any national character being considered the fittest in relation to the character of the age throughout the development of mankind. He agreed with Huxley on the point of the constraint of nature viz. physics. But he thought that the energy of a civilization meant the strength of the national state. Then he was of the opinion that civil society has continued from the primitive society on the point of natural restriction. Bagehot here focused on a study of the jurisprudence of Henry Maine, who held that manner was the true nature of the law and criticized a law profit theory based on the utilitarian morality of Bentham.

Bagehot threw doubt on the permanent nature of progress in Europe, on the grounds that, in ancient times and in the countries of the East, no idea of progress could be found. He thought that the strength of one country was not something due to progress but to the predominance of the civilization in comparison to that of other countries. The energy of the civilization here was developed by the cultivation of the power of resistance and the competition which leads to the power of race conquest. This power was even imitated by the races, which competed with each other.

According to Bagehot, moral qualities, viz. virtues like courage, honesty, subordination, a habit of cultivation, are acquired through war in early society, so that the imitation explains the fact that we find the same quality in different societies. He then turned his eye to the contrast between the new Western civilization and societies bound by custom and manners, stressing the wish of the former for continuous peace, free trade and the right to live seriously. Both free thought and developing science in civil society revealed the victory of reason of the age. Though he observed that these concepts diminished the importance of the idea of God and religion, he insisted on the importance of tolerance learned in discussion on behalf of the government instead of bigotry. The problem, for him, was the order of the governed.
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Now that politics and discussion have broken the stranglehold of stubborn custom, Bagehot felt, instead, the need for tolerance with discussion to arrive at equitable governance.41 He paid attention to the escape of man from his natural restrictions. He stated that Nature does not conform to make the environment of civilization in many points at all. He, then, drew the portrait of a dynamic man instead of a static man in civilized society, quoting a passage from Pascal that most of the evils of life arose from "man’s being unable to sit still in a room."42 He looked at human nature as being a continuation from the pre-modern age to the modern age.

Furthermore, he thought that civilized man, whose behavior was physically restrained, as well as pre-modern man could actively improve their societies. This opinion appeared in his view of the role of both knowledge and science.

"If we consider how much science has done and how much it is doing for mankind, and if the over-activity of men is proved to be the cause why science came so late into the world and is so small and scanty still, that will convince most people that our over-activity is a very great evil; but this is only part and perhaps not the greatest part of the harm that over-activity does."43

"One may incline to hope that the balance of good over evil is in favor of benevolence; one can hardly bear to think that it is not so: but anyhow it is certain that there is a most heavy debit of evil, and that this burden might almost all have been spared us if philanthropists as well as others had not inherited from their barbarous forefathers a wild passion for instant action."44

In the over-activity of science, he sought carefully to establish the recovery of a balance through discussion. What he wanted to respect in modern society was the animated moderation that could restrain the crude instinct. He used the theory of evolution of Darwin as a metaphor for the government, viz. the animated moderation, and he devised his own theory of social evolution as a political ideology. The image of political society in Bagehot is of a warm-hearted type of paternalism in which all social problems and especially poverty should be solved by government protection established through political discussion in parliament. This opinion reflected the climate of the discussions that were being held on the question of social problems during the 1870's.

The second edition of Golton's Hereditary Genius, published in 1892, he extolled the superiority of a strong race and great men of genius. It is against this background that Mallock's Aristocracy & Evolution has to be understood. Mallock applied the idea of social evolution of the survival of the fittest to the role and property of wealthy classes. Mallock himself had grown up as a landed nobleman of South Devon, a family background which made him a Tory and transcendent Anglican. After graduating from Balliol College Oxford, he became active as a poet and during the 1880's attacked the radicalism of Josef Chamber in political pamphlets. He thought it was due to their foreign origins that radicals have sympathy for the reform movement of the middle class. He theorized that the revolution by the working class due to blindness would form the counter power against the wealthy propertied class. He insisted on the rights of great men and was convinced that the problem of poverty could be solved by the oligarchy of nobles.45

Mallock's theory of the superiority of great men produced by social evolution first appeared in his book The Nineteenth Century in 1897. He consistently attacked the theory of social evolution of progress by Spencer and his followers.46 Mallock emphasized the role of the few in the community.47 He stated his conclusion clearly: 'The human race progresses because and when the strongest human powers and the highest human faculties lead it; such powers and faculties are embodied in and monopolized by a minority of exceptional men'.48 Mallock compared the faculty of the great men with the organization of the Catholic Church that was distinguished from the average belief.49 This sort of connection of social evolution with religion was made from the example of Benjamin Kidd's Social Evolution.
Spencer soon answered in an essay entitled 'What is social evolution?', written to correct Mallock's interpretative errors. Polemicizing, he quoted from his own early essay "Progress: Its Law and Causes" published in 1857:

'Social progress is supposed to consist in the produce of a greater quantity and variety of the articles required for satisfying men's want; in widening freedom of action; whereas, rightly understood, social progress consists in those changes of structure in the social organism which have entailed these consequences. The current conception is a teleological one . . . . But rightly to understand progress we must inquire what is the nature of these changes, considered apart from our interests.'

Spencer continued:

'He is dominated by the current idea of progress as a process of improvement, in the human sense; and is thus led to join with those social changes which constitute advance in social organization, those social changes which are ancillary to it—not constituting parts of the advance itself, but yielding fit materials and conditions.'

Spencer viewed Mallock's theory of social evolution as teleology, essentially different from his own theory of causality. Spencer criticized Mallock's anthropocentric interpretation and emphasized the need for the word "evolution" which expressed un-organic change instead of the progress that brought into "the process of the improvement." As for social evolution Spencer pointed out the expansion of heterogeneity of each part. Furthermore, he stressed the development of both coherence and definiteness in the civilization of industrial society. He then went on to the example of the market where there was no need for great men in order to arrive at distribution and exchange. Moreover, he grasped that the constitution was not created but grew. Though Mallock emphasized the relief for the poor by his great men in the social evolution, to Spencer this was nothing but social sustentation. He did not always contradict Mallock's examples of the high rewards reaped by great men, such as discoverers, inventors, teachers, and administrators, and admitted that these inequalities were natural. Spencer, however, supported both the development of the middle class and the competitive market as well as natural evolution in his theory of social evolution. He supported the new role of the noble as the mover of social progress in his own social evolution. When we compare Spencer with Mallock, it seems clear that the latter stresses class separation more than the former. Mallock's theory of social evolution can be characterized as one in which evolution is determined by elite agents.

Next, we will examine another narrow meaning of New Liberalism proposed by J. A. Hobson in relation of the theory of social evolution.

6. The new liberalism and social progress in Hobson

Hobson's polemic with Mallock in his article 'Mr. Mallock as Political Economist' shows clear differences in their interpretation of social progress. The most crucial points Hobson raises against Mallock can be summarized as follows:

1. Labor and ability are two distinct productive powers.
2. Progress in modern industry is due to the ability of a few.
3. The labor movement seeks to overthrow the practical control of ability.

Mallock distinguished labor which is 'definitely productive of a particular result' from ability which is 'indefinitely great in its productivity.' Next, he insisted that it was the power of the few that fuels social progress. Therefore, he viewed the new labor movement, with its simple-minded workers' demands, as a challenge to production. Hobson criticized him as follows:

'In truth, Mr. Mallock's "ability" applies
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exclusively to inventions of machinery and improved methods of industry. The very wording of his phrases shows that invention of machinery was the "ability" which Mr. Mallock had in his mind when framing his definition. In the fuller setting given in his work, "Labour and the Popular Welfare," "skill" is excluded *totidem verbis* from "ability", because it does not contain this indefinitely large productive power which belongs only to the "inventor."54

Hobson considered this opinion as a 'philosophical defense of property'. Hobson pointed out Mallock's failure to distinguish between management ability and ownership.

'How to shift the supposed natural claim of the inventor on to the business man who enjoy a monopoly of the invention-this is the "jump" which Mr, Mallock finds in front of him!'55

'Hereditary in business management, luck, and speculation, are not the merely incidental and modifying circumstances which Mr. Mallock thinks them; they are, in the large majority of modern businesses, chief operative causes. In most cases fair business capacity and care are doubtless essential conditions of success, but they cannot of themselves command success, and most frequently they play but a small part as compared with the extrinsic qualities I have named. The successful entrepreneur is usually a man of sound common sense, but he is seldom more, and, to do him justice, he seldom lays claim to the "genius" which literary outsiders foist upon him. It is, perhaps, likely that at least 10 per cent. of the employees in any average successful business possess the natural ability, if they had enjoyed the education and the opportunity, to manage the business as well as the actual manager.'56

When Mallock pointed out that 'The inheritance of the enterprise, good luck, speculation are not the mere circumstances,' he seemed to observe the non-function of capital investment to the securities for invention by the aristocrat, in other words, the gentleman. On the other hand, Hobson said that the ability of managers and supervisors means the "comprehensive success of scheme" adding that the contributions of their judgment, intelligence, responsibility and honesty should be included in what we understand as labor.' Here we can find radical view of the division of labour originated from Adam Smith, with modified aspect of management ability. So he recommended that simple manual labor should be saved as much as possible and be left to the machine. He thought 'This more effective co-operation of modern labour must be regarded as an immense direct source of increased productivity.' The development of productivity supported social progress by ability should be balanced with enjoyment as its rewards. He, then, watched not only old gentleman, but also warned against monopolies, the conspiracy, corruption, and parasitism of which link up the new industrial imperialism.57

How then did Hobson evaluate the labor movement? In the first place, he admitted it had bargaining power, for labor could be traded as a commodity:

'Labourers are required to be present in person during the delivery of the labour-power they sell, and are therefore compelled to safeguard that sale with more particularity than are the sellers of commodities, lest the conditions under which their labour-power is given out should damage their life and the future production of labour-power.'59

As for manpower, labor is different from other goods. Hobson sought to define the conditions of sale of the manpower he considered goods. This manpower formed the basis for the formation of trade unions by the workers. So Hobson could be called a New Liberalist who did not insist of self-governance of laborers but admitted the function of market to adjust the distribution of labor. He did not to rely on market mechanism perfectly, he was a typical Social Democrat, who insisted that the 'organization was for the common good.'60 Though he pointed out social inequality, he was not only a Socialist but he also was a New Liberalist or a Social Democrat. He thought that
the self control by workers, he called it *trade individualism*, was not socialism but only the goal of Cooperatives. Here he criticized Syndicalism. For Hobson socialism meant the *democratic control of industry* which should not be organized by each industrial unit. Next, the general manager should elected not from the trade unions but from the *body of citizens*. The workers whom Hobson here called citizens were possible agents to control the industry, in order to maximize the industrial wealth, and he considered the conditions of labour which include various grade of managers. The *body of citizens* was composed of workers who are concerned about the social control of their industry, and this could be an agent of Social Democracy to Hobson. Where the government was concerned, he said that the people should choose their officials democratically, so they could control their local and central governments. This idea of industrial democracy is quite similar to that of Webbs. However Webbs proposed a stronger collectivism to control the organization.

Hobson explained his ideas about industrial democracy in detail in his *The Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, 1894 in which he spoke of “industrial evolution”:

'Assuming that industrial evolution places an increasing proportion of the consuming public in secure possession of the prime physical necessaries of life, it is surely possible that they too may come to value less highly a quantitative increase in consumption, and may develop individuality of tastes which require individual production for their satisfaction.'

First, we can state that Hobson's social theory is characterized by its orientation toward the workers. Second, it reflects the new industrial labour dispute. Third, it employed the metaphor of social evolution. Fourth, he respected the efforts of individuals. And fifth, he insisted on the re-distribution of both income and labor. So, in the end, only Hobson seems to pass the five conditions test proposed by Freeden to define the New Liberalism.

7. Conclusive remarks

As I have mentioned above, Charles Darwin and Herbert Spencer had refined social theory by incorporating the new concepts of evolution and radicalism, which stand on the free market of division of labor. Facing the new poverty in the market, Thomas Huxley and people such as T.H. Green modified this social theory by including ethical process which had adjustable functions both socially and politically. This was a reflection of the division of social classes, and it formed a transitional social theory for the end of nineteenth century. In the *fin de siecle* social evolution theory, standpoints on intervention in society divided both conservative thinkers such as Walter Bagehot, Benjamin Kidd, and W.H. Mallock, as well as social democratic thinkers such as J.A. Hobson, L.T. Hobhouse and Webbs.

We can now ascertain that the narrow definition of the New Liberalism according to the five criteria that I outlined in the first section of this paper applies only to the latter group. And the social evolution theory had various versions of modification. We must be careful to characterize the New Liberalism ideology with some features as the pattern of theory. Now we can see the attractiveness of the concepts of core and adjacent, on which Freeden insisted.
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