

The Chinese Dilemma: The Synthesis of Marx and Marshall¹

Xingfu Wang

Western scholars' attitudes to the rise of China are divided. Some believe that the rise of China will be a great event with historical significance; the emergence of the 'China model' not only signifies the transfer of hegemony, but also marks a radical reversal in the history of human civilization. 'History can henceforth simply be divided into BC and AC: Before China and After China'. Others think that the 'China model' is just a society of capitalism with Chinese characteristics or eastern authoritarian capitalism. Actually, the reality of contemporary China is ambiguous. The Chinese experiment can be understood neither as a typical socialist reform nor as an approach that has cast socialism to the wind. The mainstream discourses of the Communist Party of China contain some enlightened elements, but have not formed a rational value system. In this paper, I argue that the synthesis of Marx's theory of emancipation and Marshall's theory of citizenship will lead China out of its theoretical and practical dilemmas. Marshall's theory of citizenship was a systemic summary of the achievements of progressive politics for the last two centuries. The trilogy of civil right, political right and social right provides the normative basis of the basic modern institutions of the market economy, democratic politics and social welfare. However, in the end, Marshall was a bourgeois reformist; what he wanted to do was not to eliminate the inequality and class division in liberal–democratic–capitalist society, but rather to lessen its worst effects. Marxism is a radical vision of human emancipation; its basic content involves the full development of every individual and their free association. The future vision of society Marxism anticipates and the social model Marshall explicated are not opposites. Both of them insist that the freedom and equality bestowed on us by law rely on certain necessary social and material conditions. However, Marshall stopped half-way. Today, Marxism itself should be understood as an immanent critique and radicalizing of Marshall's conception of citizenship. The reform of China is at a crossroads: how to promote the social and political reforms in order to achieve the goal of socialism? China must find the

¹ This paper was funded by the program of Marxism and Liberalism in the Discourse of Modernity (NCET-08-0136). The article was originally read at the Left Forum Conference in March 2011. The author expresses sincere gratitude to Professor Norman Levine in Phoenix, who encouraged me to submit this article to *Critique* and assisted in preparing this English version.

missing link between Marxism and the theory of citizenship. In the historical context of contemporary China, the Marxism under Mao represented the revolution of the peasantry; the Marxism under the reforms of Deng Xiaoping was that of market socialism and the triumph over underdevelopment. Today, we are entering a new age of Marxism, the epoch of full socialist citizenship. This new revision must be grounded in the unification of Marx and Marshall. This does not mean we can throw out the Marxist ideal of radical emancipation, but means we have to admit that the full Marshallian citizenship is a realist bridge towards true socialism in China.

Keywords: Sinomania; Marx; Marxism; Marshall Citizenship; China Socialism

Sinophobia or Sinomania

Perry Anderson points out that the attitude of the western world toward China has been alternating for several centuries between Sinophobia and Sinomania. ‘Today, the high speed growth of the People’s Republic is transforming western attitudes once again, attracting excitement and enthusiasm in business and media alike, with a wave of fashion and fascination recalling the chinoiserie of rococo Europe. Sinophobia has by no means disappeared. However, another round of Sinomania is in the making.’ In the west some scholars believe that China will take the place of America in the near future as the dominant world power. The rise of the ‘China model’ and the end of the western one not only signifies the transfer of hegemony, but also marks a radical reversal in the history of human civilization. ‘History can henceforth simply be divided into BC and AC: Before China and After China.’² However, there are many scholars who believe that the ‘Chinese model’ will lead to capitalism with Chinese characteristics; at least, it will be oriented toward authoritarian capitalism, not socialism with Chinese characteristics. According to Slavoj Žižek, authoritarian capitalism will be a worse form of capitalism than western liberal capitalism.³ Regarding the future of the ‘Chinese model’, Anderson’s attitude is typical of the mindset of Left intellectuals, believing that, while in the 19th century Europe looked to America as the future, so in the 21st century the west will look to China as representing the future. He writes: ‘So far, certainly, no Tocqueville of the east has appeared. Is what he once achieved repeatable? There is plenty of time yet, but it is unlikely that DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA will find its successor, wherever else it might, in any MODERNITY IN CHINA.’⁴ Anderson and Žižek illuminate the fundamental bipolarity of contemporary Chinese Marxism, the clash between the ‘Chinese model’ of socialism and citizenship.

The polarization between Sinophobia and Sinomania is an indisputable part of contemporary history. The reasons for these divergences are complex. On the one

² Perry Anderson, ‘Sinomania’, *London Review of Books*, 32:2 (28 January 2010), p. 3.

³ Slavoj Žižek, *First As Tragedy, Then As Farce* (London: Verso, 2009.)

⁴ Anderson, ‘Sinomania’, op. cit.

hand, there is the psychological perspective since every researcher, both western and Chinese, possesses their own personal attitudes toward China. On the other hand, there are the objective factors, because the reality of China is so complex and difficult, even for Chinese scholars. For foreign professors the acquisition of an understanding of today's China collides with three kinds of difficulty. The first is that they must grasp the complicated processes of the socio-economic reform of the country since Deng Xiaoping. This process of reform has been proceeding for over 30 years and during these three decades China has transitioned from a Stalinist form of socialism to a market-oriented economy, from one based on the independent producer to an export-oriented economy competing in the global marketplace, from an agricultural society to an industrial society based on hi-tech foundations. In every area of social structure, the political system, cultural productions and ideological reformations, China has undergone bewildering redefinitions. Deep and sustained research is required if these reinventions are to be properly comprehended. Second, China has a distinctive culture, and culture is a vital force in the shaping of any social formation. An understanding of Chinese culture is a necessary prerequisite before a student of Chinese society can adequately assess the changes transforming this social formation. Third, in order to grasp the central direction of the current evolution of Chinese society, it is also a prerequisite to understand the revision in the official political ideology in China. The uniqueness of the Chinese language makes it difficult to understand these ideological redefinitions and, in order to do so, it is necessary to either be fluent in Chinese, or to find adequate English translations that render these ideological nuances comprehensible. In the past 30 years the Communist Party of China has put forward a series of revisions regarding the meaning of communism; for example, socialism with Chinese characteristics, the goal of building a moderately prosperous society in all respects, the harmonious society and the scientific concept of development. All of these revisions overthrow traditional Stalinist and Maoist definitions of communism and to grasp their meaning requires a deep knowledge of Chinese history since the death of Mao.

Since Joshua Cooper Ramo's *The Beijing Consensus* was published, a major issue in Chinese studies relates to the existence of a 'Chinese model'. Ramo believes that 'the Beijing Consensus offers hope for the world'.⁵ In his view much of the world is looking for a new paradigm of development after the collapse of the Washington Consensus. The Beijing Consensus offers a proven and successful model of modernization for all countries seeking rapid industrial development. To the underdeveloped world the age of Neo-Liberalism is over and the Beijing Consensus appears to be the model by which societies can lift themselves out of economic backwardness.

Ramo's *The Beijing Consensus* focuses upon China's strategy of industrial advancement, but the concentration of John and Doris Naisbitt's book *China's Megatrends* is on the positive potentials of China's political system. They argue that

⁵ Joshua Cooper Ramo, *The Beijing Consensus* (London: Foreign Policy Center, 2004), p. 60.

the reforms taking place in China are not only creating an entirely new socio-economic system, but also a distinctive example of democracy, vertical democracy, which is a challenge to the western version of horizontal democracy. According to the assessment of the Naisbitts, in both its economic and political spheres, China has passed the stage of imitation and graduated into being a country of innovation. 'In the next decade China will not only change the global economy, but it will challenge western democracy with its own model.'⁶

Martin Jacques's book *When China Rules the World: The Rise of the Middle Kingdom and the End of the Western World* not only asserts that China will dominate the world in the near future, but because China is enriched by its distinctive culture and moral endowments, the new world hegemon will bestow a better form of civilization upon the planet. Jacques characterizes China as a 'civilization-state' and he defines Chinadom in the following terms: 'Long before the West, its rulers created the first modern bureaucracy, imbued with a Confucian outlook at once authoritarian and democratic, controlling domestic subjects more by moral education than by force and organizing adjacent regions into a consensual tributary system.'⁷ Chinadom provides an example of a more equal and peaceful relationship between the world's nation-states. The rise of the west since the Renaissance dethroned China's world leadership and bequeathed world predominance to the west, but this alteration in the world balance of power was unfortunate. The rapid contemporary development of China has returned the country to its previous world leadership, and has replaced the leadership of the west with the rejuvenation of China. According to Jacques, the transformation of China since Deng Xiaoping has given rise 'to a distinctively Chinese modernity' that is superior to the western brand. The works of Ramo, the Naisbitts and Jacques assume the crisis of Neo-Liberalism and the decline of American hegemony and see the ascent of Chinadom as providing a new universal paradigm.

In my opinion both Sinophobia and Sinomania are one-sided. I do not think that China has a conscious strategy of replacing the Washington Consensus with a Beijing Consensus. China's path of reform and development are not expressions of a premeditated plan driven by a single purpose, but is generated put of the experimental process. China cannot simply imitate the experience of other nations; it must learn by practice.

However, the re-emergence of China to its medieval greatness does not mean that the nation can escape from the problems of modernity. In order to again assume the role of global hegemon, it is required that China pass through and undergo the travails of industrialization and capitalism. Even though the official ideology of China is Marxism, the country is still subject to the analysis of Marxism. Marxism is the theory of modernity as well as its practice. It provided a theory for analyzing the

⁶ John Naisbitt and Doris Naisbitt, *China's Megatrends* (Beijing: China Industry and Commerce Joint Publishing House, 2009).

⁷ Cited from Anderson, 'Sinomania', op. cit.

rise of capitalism and its contradictions, such as class exploitation, alienation and class struggle. Although Marxism was a product of western civilization, it is applicable to any region of the world experiencing an industrial revolution. Marxism is a tool for diagnosing the social structure of capitalism and thus any area of the globe undergoing a capitalist metamorphosis is open to a Marxist interpretation. This is true of China.

The reality of contemporary China is ambiguous. Its market-oriented reform is capitalist in nature, but the nature of the ruling party and its socialist ideology encompass this market orientation with moral and socialist constraints. China cannot abandon its political dedication to the Marxist program. In general, China has made remarkable achievements in economic modernization, but in the area of political reform and the construction of a politico-socialist culture, its performance is not satisfactory. In my opinion the mainstream discourses of the Communist Party of China contain some enlightened elements, but the Party has not been progressive enough.

China must revitalize the theory of Marx and this paper will be devoted to enlightening the political theory of Marx. China must find in western political discourse concepts that can contribute to the re-empowerment of Chinese Marxism. This does not mean the renunciation of Marxism, but its philosophical expansion to include concepts it formerly overlooked. Marxism is both praxis and critique and it is now necessary to critique Marxism itself as a means of reigniting its progressivism. In this paper I argue that a socialist-oriented citizenship theory will provide the normative foundations for reconstructing socialist political philosophy, as well as reformulating the standards by which to measure social development. East and west must start a dialogue and disavow the claim of Rudyard Kipling that east and west can never meet. T.H. Marshall and Marx must be unified because Marshall can fill vacancies left by Marx.

Marxism and the Concept of Political Rights

A conflict has always existed between the Liberal idea of individual rights and the Marxist idea of socialism. From the perspective of Marxism the notion of citizenship, or individual rights was always seen as the defense of bourgeois private property. From the Liberal vantage point Marxism and the socialist movement was always seen as a barrier to the advancement of citizenship. However, this dichotomy between Liberalism and Marxism derives from a variety of misunderstandings.

According to the analysis of Anthony M. Rees the concept of citizenship has advanced through three stages: the 'First Wave' occurred in the 30 years before the First World War and was articulated by T.H. Green and carried forward by Leonard Trelawny Hobhouse; the 'Second Wave' lasted from the Second World War and T.H. Marshall during this period almost single-handedly revitalized the notion of citizenship; the contemporary world is the site of the 'Third Wave' and present day scholars use Marshall's theory as their starting point and improve it in order to

apply it to their new social environment.⁸ The notion of citizenship has been expanded since Marshall, but Marshall's political philosophy is still the launching pad for contemporary speculations on this subject.

What is citizenship? Marshall wrote that 'citizenship is a status bestowed on those who are full members of a community'.⁹ In order to trace the development of citizenship, Marshall divided it into three elements: civil right, political right and social right.

The civil element is composed of the right necessary for the preservation of individuality . . . liberty of person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and conclude valid contracts and the right of justice.

By the political element I mean the right to participate in the exercise of political power as a member of a body invested with political authority, or as an elector of the members of such a body. The corresponding institutions are parliament and the councils of local government.

By the social element I mean the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society. The institutions most closely connected with it are the educational system and the social services.¹⁰

These three definitions explained the meaning of citizenship and its connection to the socio-political structure.

The key to understanding the notion of citizenship was the interconnection of these three elements. Marshall approached the citizenship issue from a historical perspective. In the history of England, civil rights came first and their modern form was established before the first Reform Act of 1832. Political rights came next and their extension was one of the major accomplishments of the 19th century and universal suffrage was won in 1928. Although the idea of social rights had emerged during the 18th century Enlightenment, they were repressed during the triumph of Liberal capitalism in the 19th century, 'Their revival began with the development of public elementary education, but it was not until the 20th century that social rights attained an equal footing with the other two elements of citizenship'.¹¹ In summary, civil rights emerged in the 18th century, political rights matured in the 19th century and social rights were added to the agenda in the 20th century. However, the interrelationship of these three elements must also be understood from a logical perspective. Marshall was not a prolific writer, but we can infer his main preoccupations from the works of the 1950s to the 1970s. From a normative vantage point, Marshall affirmed that each factor had its distinct value and constitutive role in

⁸ Martin Bulmer and Anthony Rees (eds), *Citizenship Today: The Contemporary Relevance of T.H. Marshall* (Abingdon: Routledge, 1996), p. 3.

⁹ T.H. Marshall, 'Citizenship and Social Class' in Jeff Manza and Michael Sauder (eds) in *Inequality and Society: Social Science Perspectives on Social Stratification* (New York: Norton, 2009), p. 149.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 148–149.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 149.

gaining full membership in 20th century society. ‘Civil rights gave legal powers whose use was drastically curtailed by class prejudice and lack of economic opportunity.’¹² Political rights gave people the power to influence and determine their government. Contradicting Liberalism, Marshall emphasized the dimension of social rights in citizenship. In his early work Marshall emphasized the conflict between capitalism and citizenship, because ‘social rights in their modern form imply an invasion of contract by status, the subordination of market price to social justice, the replacement of the free bargain by the declaration of human rights.’¹³ However, Marshall was neither a revolutionary, nor a socialist. He advocated a model of a ‘hyphenated society’ in which capitalism, democracy and welfare represented different axial values and principles. The ‘hyphenated society’ was a fusion of three kinds of values and independent sub-systems that enjoyed equal contributory importance to full citizenship. He believed that, if we took the three sub-systems as of equal merit, we could avoid radical revolutions. ‘The golden calf of democratic socialism has been translated into a block of sacred cows.’¹⁴ Marshall affirmed that the aim of social right was the abatement of class hostility and not the total eradication of social inequality, or the reconstruction of the total social formation if capitalism. In his mind the ‘hyphenated society’ of civil–democratic–welfare was the defining essence of the structure of post-Second World War western society.

Marshall’s ‘Citizenship and Social Class’ has been criticized from at least three different perspectives—its historical, nation-state and mono-ethnic biases. Historically, Marshall’s theory is an example of linear logic, as a derivation from the narrow experience of England and thus not applicable to other social formations. In terms of the nation-state viewpoint, Marshall’s formula for citizenship presupposed the nation-state as the institutional sub-structure of citizenship and therefore his ‘hyphenated society’ did not relate to underdeveloped and Third World societies. Marshall’s non-ethnic bias is revealed by his presupposition of a homogeneous nation-state and that this inference was not appropriate to those social formations that were multi-ethnic and culturally diverse.

Castas Douzinas wrote that ‘the history of human right has been characterized by a conflict between its Liberal defenders and its rejection by Marxists and communitarians’.¹⁵ The critique of the concept of right is an integral part of Marx’s critique of capitalism. In ‘On The Jewish Question’, Marx pointed out that human rights in capitalist societies have two parts: the first is political rights, and ‘they fall under the category of political freedom, under the category of the right to vote’;¹⁶ and the second falls under the category of negative freedom by which a person has the right to pursue

¹² Ibid., p. 153.

¹³ Ibid., p. 154.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 154.

¹⁵ T.H. Marshall, *The Right of Welfare and Other Essays* (London: Heinemann, 1981), p. 128.

¹⁶ Costas Douzinas and Slavoj Žižek (eds), *Communism and Rights, the Idea of Communism* (London: Verso, 2010), p. 82.

what does not harm another. Obviously, the notion of rights in Marx's works only refers to the civil and political rights contained in Marshall's definition of citizenship.

Marx was aware of the limitations of the concept of rights when imprisoned in a Liberal framework. 'Political emancipation is, of course, a big step forward. True, it is not the final form of human emancipation in general, but it is the final form of human emancipation within the existing order of private property. It goes without saying that we are speaking here of real, practical emancipation.'¹⁷ In Marx's politics, 'All emancipation is a reduction of the human world and relationships to man himself.'¹⁸ However, in capitalist society, 'political emancipation is the reduction of man, on the one hand, to a member of civil society, to an egoistic, independent individual, and, on the other hand, to a citizen, a juridical person.'¹⁹ Political emancipation was the dissolution of feudal society and the revolution of civil society. According to Marx's idea, civil society is the alienation of the human essence: 'The human essence no longer the essence of the community, but rather the essence of the separation. Civil society has become the expression of the diremption of man from his communal being, from himself and other men.'²⁰ In capitalist society, the human right of freedom is the right of the self-enclosed and atomic individual and 'the practical application of the human right of freedom is the right of private property.'²¹ In Marx's mind,

only when the actual individual man absorbs the abstract citizen of the state into himself and has become in his empirical life, in his individual labor, in his individual relationships, a true species-being, only when he has recognized and organized his own forces as social forces and therefore no longer separates the social force from himself in the form of political force, only then is human emancipation completed.²²

The critique of individual right in its Liberal and political appearance was extremely important to Marx because the capitalist order was based on the right of property. The Liberal and political expressions of individual rights were merely supports for the system of private property: 'The constitution of the political state and the dissolution of civil society into independent individuals . . . is completed in one and the same act.'²³

Marx denounced the individualistic interpretation of right. His repudiation of the individualistic formulation of right was continued in his negation of the individualistic Liberal interpretation of civil and political rights. His rejection of the Liberal, individualistic interpretation of rights was articulated in four arguments. First, individualistic civil and political rights were incompatible with the concepts of equality and freedom. Individualistic civil and political rights provided sustenance to

¹⁷ Karl Marx, *Early Political Writings*, ed. Joseph O'Malley (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 43.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 50.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 37.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 45.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 50.

²³ *Ibid.*, p. 49.

the greed of the capitalist class, thereby perpetuating a social order of oppression and exploitation, and were thus a total abrogation of the principles of equality and freedom. Second, individual rights turn human beings into an abstract and isolated egoistic personality and consequently serve to continue alienation. Third, the abstract equality contained in individualistic civil and political rights can never be realized in concrete reality. Marx wrote that 'right by its nature can consist only in the application if an equal standard' which means treating unequals as equals. 'To avoid all these defects right instead of being equal would have to be unequal.'²⁴ In Marx the highest principle of emancipation is the free association of people and mutual recognition. Fourth, civil rights and political rights that derive from a social formation that takes everyone as an isolated individual who sees others as competitors and threats must be rejected. Marx described this Liberal war of all against all as 'the freedom of man as monad isolated and withdrawn into himself.'²⁵

However, does Marx's negation of Liberal individualism mean an unbridgeable antithesis between a subject and socialism? Is there a place for individualism in Marx's theory of socialism? The challenge of the future is to create a complement relationship between civil-political and welfare rights within socialism. Marx and Marshall must be rendered compatible, or the socialism envisioned by Marx must incorporate civil and political and social rights. Marxism must open a dialogue with the language of rights.

The problem is expressed in the following form: can Marx's critique of individual rights be harmonized with Marshall's theory of citizenship, which includes civil-political and social rights? With certain reservations the answer is yes.

Like political rights in Marx's time citizenship rights have undergone great advances in the 20th century, but these advances are not the culmination of human emancipation. The social welfare of 'hyphenated society' certainly superseded the limits of Liberal civic and political right, but contemporary western society remains essentially capitalist. The western welfare state has an ambiguous structure and, while it seeks to abate class differences, it still retains class divisions and hierarchy. The welfare state suffers from a structural dilemma that Jürgen Habermas summarized in the following terms:

while the welfare-state guarantees are intended to serve the goal of social integration they, nevertheless, promote the disintegration of life-relations when these guarantees are separated through legalized social intervention from consensus mechanisms that integrate social action and are transferred through money and power to the media which fragment and disable social integration.²⁶

Habermas referred to this dilemma as the ambivalence of guaranteeing/taking away freedom. I do not deny that the western welfare state is subject to critique because it is

²⁴ Karl Marx, 'Critique of the Gotha Program', in *Selected Writings*, ed. David McLellan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 569.

²⁵ Marx, *Early Political Writings*, op. cit., p. 45.

²⁶ Jürgen Habermas, *The Theory of Communicative Action*, trans. Thomas McCarthy (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1987), Vol. II, p. 365.

afflicted with many problems, such as the worship of state and bureaucracy, hierarchy and stratification, paternalism and eclecticism, but it is also necessary to recognize the achievements of the welfare state in its moral and social improvements.

The aim of social rights is the reduction of class stratification and the alleviation of conflict between capitalism and democracy, but these aims cannot be won through the instrument of egoistic interest. Social rights are not formal rights that turn people into abstract monads of civil society. Rather the intent of social rights is to bestow upon a people the economic conditions that enable them to become fully empowered members of a community. We can critique the contradiction between the intent and result of the welfare state, but we cannot deny its potential for human emancipation. However, full citizenship rights are not possible unless sufficient material and productive conditions have been attained to make the distribution of social rights a possibility.

One weakness of traditional Marxism is its failure to appreciate the civil–political–social components of citizenship. Traditional Marxism wrongly attacks the welfare state, civil–political–social citizenship, as a form of neo-Liberalism. Marxism and Left radical thought in general are misdirected when they launch such attacks. I argue that the citizenship of civil–political–social rights makes an advance in human history and is not a barrier to socialism, not an impediment to the further acquisition of freedom and equality. Marxists and socialists need to rethink their evaluation of citizenship because Marshall’s idea of citizenship must not be overthrown, but radicalized.

How is the concept of citizenship to be radicalized? In answering this question it is first necessary to draw a distinction between the maximal and the possible. Clearly, for Marx the civil and political served the function of mystifying distractions that merely concealed bourgeois domination. Full human emancipation must transcend merely Liberal civil and political rights, must repossess alienated property and political power through the conquest of complete civil–political–social citizenship. However, Marx was much more subtle and dialectical in his understanding of civil–political rights than is sometimes supposed.

It is certainly true that for Marx citizenship rights are an ideological mask for bourgeois class domination, but they are not wholly reducible to such a tactic. The rights of citizens are not false or imaginary, but truncated, limited, partial and manipulated. Indeed, it is clear that in Marx’s view many of the democratic liberties enjoyed by working class citizens have been won in the struggle against sections of the bourgeoisie and as such embodied working class power.²⁷

Recently, some Marxist intellectuals have been pursuing the same line of thought. Etienne Balibar does not interpret the history of the rights of citizens as a linear, evolutionary, orderly and peaceful process concluding with the construction of the welfare state. In the attainment of full citizenship, civil–political–social, struggle and class combat were indispensable weapons in the attainment of the welfare state.

²⁷ Ed Rooksby, ‘Liberal Citizenship, Socialism and the State’, <http://www.publish.org/article.Jsp?id=813131>

However, he still insists that the equality of all these rights is the normative foundation of human emancipation. For Balibar 'liberalism is incapable of fully realizing the core principles that it claims to promote, uphold and embody . . . liberty and equality . . . in this sense simply cannot realize themselves.'²⁸ Oppressed, exploited, marginalized and excluded classes always form the foundation of Liberal capitalism. For Balibar, the principles of civil–political–social rights, or full citizenship, must be made universal and equal. In this way full citizenship contains a radical potential that can motivate the oppressed to struggle against the structural prerequisites of Liberal capitalism.

Jacques Ranciere also wants to resurrect the principles of civic-political–social rights in a radical democratic spirit. In his works the meaning of full citizenship is not simply defined in terms of occupational or economic status. Like Marx's proletariat that is a 'class that is not of civil society', Ranciere believes that the population living under the subjection of private property is 'a supplementary existence that counts for the uncounted, or part of those who have no part, that is, in the last instance, the equality of unspeaking beings.'²⁹ For them politics is the extension of civil–political–social rights to social groups who were previously excluded from community and society, or into areas of social life in which injustice had remained invisible.

Balibar and Ranciere are both radicalizing the idea of right. The Liberal concept of right only reached to the civil and political domains. The radicalization of right, its Marxist formulation, means extending the principle of right to the social. Right that encompasses the civil–political–social was the creation of Marshall; it is citizenship, but it is a new frontier for Marxism. Socialism must incorporate citizenship. Socialism is approached when citizenship is projected universally and equally to the entire population of a nation.

In expounding their radical view of human liberation, Balibar and Ranciere continue the thought of Marx as contained in his *Critique Of Hegel's Philosophy Of Right*. Marx pointed out that the proletariat was not just a class, but the embodiment of all social evils; therefore the liberation of the proletariat was not just the emancipation of a particular class but also the freedom of humanity. Marx stated that the existence of the proletariat 'does not stand partially opposed to the consequences, but totally opposed to the premises of the German political system; a sphere finally that cannot emancipate itself without emancipating itself from all enslaving spheres of society; a sphere, in short, that is the complete loss of humanity and can only redeem itself through the total redemption of humanity.'³⁰ I do not argue that the realization of citizenship in itself is the total emancipation of humanity, but full citizenship cannot just be considered as only a bourgeois right. Historically, the development of citizenship from civil right to social right was mostly advanced through the struggles of the working class. Even Marshall

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Jacques Ranciere, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*, trans. Steven Corcoran (New York: Continuum, 2010), p. 33.

³⁰ Marx, *Early Political Writings*, op. cit, p. 69.

recognized that the element of social welfare in citizenship was contradictory to capitalism.

There is a difference between Marx and Balibar. Marx argued that the proletariat could not claim a class right, but only a universal human right. As Marxists our urgent task is how to combine Marx's spirit of radical emancipation while simultaneously retaining the principle of citizenship. As socialists our task is to reconstruct the lost linkage between socialism and citizenship, but we still need to criticize the ideological basis of the individualist conception of rights and stress the social and collective nature of rights. Conversely, we need to expose the irreconcilability between capitalism and citizenship. By bestowing more socialist content on the concept of citizenship, we will make the struggle for citizenship an instrument of socialist strategy.

During the past 30 years China has achieved remarkable economic growth and in 2010 its GDP surpassed that of Japan, becoming the second largest economic power in the world. The high-speed development of China has attracted global attention and this is documented by the fact that the 'Chinese model' has become a frequently used phrase in the western media. Admittedly, China deserves to be proud of the successes it has produced in many fields. In addition to economic progress, in its anti-poverty programs and lifting the standard of living throughout the nation, its accomplishments are also remarkable. Nevertheless, China still faces many serious problems. On the one hand, China is producing many billionaires each year, but on the other hand the class divide between the rich and poor is also widening and the Gini coefficient has surpassed 0.5. China is now a country with high levels of inequality and, although the GDP increases rapidly, the share that is distributed to the laborer declines year after year. While national revenue grows substantially, the proportion of expenditure spent on public goods and social services is seriously inadequate. Regardless of the success and the applause showered on the 'Chinese model', there are still nearly a billion people who live below the official poverty line. Many economists are accustomed to explain the inequality in contemporary China by the Kuznets Curve (inverted U curve), because these economists assume this inequality to be a universal phenomenon of a special stage of economic growth, but I believe that a direct and important factor in the persistence of inequality is the absence in China of the concept of citizenship in its full civil-political-social elements.

On Marshall's formula for citizenship, the market, democracy and welfare are three independent, but equally contributory, factors to the health of 20th century social formations, and the difficult task of the 'hyphenated society' is to integrate them. The main purpose of political rights is to provide the opportunity and means for people to participate in the public sphere, but political rights will also influence people's economic status. Some social scientists have already pointed out that democratization is a key precondition for the alleviation of poverty as the franchise provides the poor with the channels by which to influence and develop policies that would be to their economic advantage. The concept of citizenship includes the principle of freedom

from poverty.³¹ Ranciere affirms that ‘the essence of politics is dissensus . . . Political demonstration makes visible that which had no reason to be seen: it inserts the invisible world into the visible.’³² If members of a class have no political rights, they have no voice in the making of public policy. If people have no political voice they have no medium by which to influence the decision-making process of government. Poverty is not an accident, but rather a manifestation of class power. The democracy–poverty nexus can be used in the analysis of the income gap between urban and rural China. Most of the residents of rural China suffer from higher rates of poverty than inhabitants of metropolitan areas. The alleviation of poverty and the narrowing of the income gap will only be achieved by means of the democratization of political rights.

The issue of social rights is also of paramount concern in today’s China. The leaders of the country claim that it is a socialist society; however, China, unfortunately, has not developed a comprehensive system of social rights. For a long time not only have economic policies been dominated by Liberalism and marketization, but also the areas of social rights have been ruled by the Liberal principles of commercialization and privatization. China had established a far-ranging social welfare system that covered urban residents during the tenure of MaoTze-Tung, but the system almost completely collapsed during the reform era that began with Deng Xiaoping. Not only farmers, but also urban workers lost the benefits of the social welfare system. It is no accident that many poor people today come from the ranks of those who lost, or had no, social rights during the reform period.

Amartya Sen asserts that the full range of goods and services a person acquires in a community are determined by his ‘exchange of entitlement mapping’,³³ or includes the transfer of entitlements based on social rights. Social rights imply that everyone should not be at the mercy of the market but should be entitled to receive social help from the state if he or she falls into poverty. The Chinese government has not fulfilled this responsibility very well. In the official ideology of the Chinese Communist Party, the institutions of government are asked to pay attention to the people’s livelihoods, but the people do not have constitutional rights to these entitlements, there are no statutory guarantees and this is why it is so difficult to narrow the income gap that is plaguing China.

China has made some adjustments since the beginning of the 21st century. The guiding principle of government policy was changed from ‘Efficiency is the priority and justice should also be taken into consideration’ to ‘An equal role for both efficiency and fairness’. In recent years, expenditure on pensions, medical insurance, health care, education and culture has increased. In particular, the government has begun to expand medical insurance to rural areas and construct a universal net of social security. This is unprecedented in China. However, the conditions in China

³¹ Simi Kamal, ‘The Democracy-Poverty Nexus: Summary On Issues Of Participation’, http://archive.idea.int/df/2000df/papers_presented_1.html

³² Ranciere, op. cit., pp. 38–39.

³³ A. Sen, *Poverty and Famines: An Essay on Entitlements and Deprivation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), p. 2.

remain unsatisfactory when measured against the norms of the principles of citizenship. Marshall's strategy is still not operative in China.

Present day China is at a crucial stage of development. 'After 30 years of torrid economic expansion China is standing at a crossroads. The government must decide what model of growth it wants to follow in order to both sustain economic progress while improving the peoples standard of living.'³⁴ In a press conference after the closing meeting of the Fourth Session of the 11th National Peoples Congress (NPC), Premier Wen Jiabao said: 'We have embarked on a path of growth that fits the national conditions of China', but he denied that the Chinese developmental paradigm was a 'model'. According to Wen, the Chinese growth paradigm consists of four components: (1) it will continue to focus on economic construction and the promotion of industrio-technological development; (2) it will persist in the strategy of 'comprehensive, coordinated and sustainable development'; (3) it will further advance social fairness and justice and maintain social stability and harmony; and (4) it will further the protection of the democratic rights of the people and release the initiative and creativity of the people.³⁵ These ideas largely evade the reality of Chinese social conditions. Wen's talk does not correspond to the ethical norms of socialism, or to the full rights, civil-political-social, of a people.

The most urgent task confronting China is the construction of a system of citizenship, with particular emphasis on political rights. If the people do not possess universal suffrage, they cannot effectively influence the government and protect themselves from the abuse of government power. Many of the problems facing China are rooted in the deficit of political rights. Premier Wen emotionally stated 'that the fate of a country lies in the hearts of a people', but if the people do not have citizenship, no political power, they will have no control over their own fate. Essentially, without the freedom to vote, the people have no personal freedom.

Some people believe that the 21st century will be China's century, but what can China contribute to the world? I believe that a Chinese road toward citizenship is the best contribution. The future of China will depend on whether a 'Tocqueville of the East' can produce a viable model of citizenship that conforms to the realities of China. The Chinese discourse on citizenship must incorporate three fundamental principles.

1. The discourse must be socialist and not Liberal. Socialism strives to meet the norms of liberty, democracy and equality, and these principles must have their own institutional embodiment. For example, democracy means more than an elected parliament and a universal franchise. Democracy also means the capacity of each person to participate in public life and to collectively manage social production. Freedom is not the right of private property, but the

³⁴ 'China at the Crossroads of Development', http://www.chinataiwan.org/english/News/op/201103/t20110311_1782265.htm

³⁵ Premier Wen Jiabao, <http://english.hebei.com.cn/news/cn/20110314/8250.html>

- opportunity for persons to objectify their full capabilities. The distinctive feature of socialism is its prioritizing of social rights.
2. The bitter experience of 20th century socialism was its tendency to glorify the state. Tragically, the 20th century taught us that the state was not only a beneficent source of citizenship, but could also degenerate into authoritarianism. The discourse of socialism must also be directed at rethinking the relationship between the norms of citizenship and the institutions of citizenship, i.e. the state.
 3. The discourse must correlate to the national conditions of China. I recognize that China has found an avenue to modernization that fits the national conditions of China, but it has not found a developmental avenue toward the realization of citizenship. The 'Chinese model' gave China economic success, but it still has not produced a model for institutional reforms conducive to citizenship. The Chinese discourse on citizenship should look for possible connections between the socialist tradition and the Chinese cultural tradition. All societies must be rooted in ethical values. If China fails to cultivate social morality, it will not gain the allegiance of the people.

In summary, China must find the missing link between Marxism and the theory of citizenship. It must conduct a revision of Marxism, which is not an unchanging philosophy, but a system of thought that undergoes historical modification. The history of Marxism has undergone several transformations: Leninism, or Marxism as the revolution of the proletariat; Stalinism, or state capitalism and the dictatorship of the KGB; Maoism, or Marxism as the revolution of the peasantry; and Marxism under the reforms of Deng Xiaoping as market socialism and triumph over underdevelopment. The victory over underdevelopment created the conditions for a new age of Marxism, the epoch of full socialist citizenship. This new revision must be grounded in the unification of Marx and Marshall.