FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Sarangapani Nivarthi

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMICS

FUNDAMENTALS OF POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Sarangapani Nivarthi

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

© RESERVED

This book contains information obtained from highly regarded resources.
Copyright for individual contents remains with the authors.
A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made
to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher
cannot assume responsibility for the validity of
all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted,
or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means,
now known or hereinafter invented, including photocopying,
microfilming and recording, or any information storage or retrieval system,
without permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically
from this work please access alexispress.us

First Published 2023

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Fundamentals of Political Economics by *Dr. Sarangapani Nivarthi*

ISBN 979-8-89161-815-2

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INVESTIGATION AND OVERVIEW ON POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Sarangapani Nivarthi, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.sarangapani.nivarthi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
With an emphasis on the interactions between political institutions, economic policies, and social results, this study offers an analysis and outline of political economics. The study investigates how political issues affect economic decision-making, resource allocation, income distribution, and overall economic performance using theoretical analysis and empirical data. The function of government involvement, the influence of political ideology on economic policy, the connection between economic growth and democracy, and the dynamics of political-economic power are important subjects. The research attempts to improve knowledge of the intricacies of political economics and its consequences for public policy and governance by looking at case studies and comparative analysis.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Economic Policy, Governance, Political Institutions, Resource Allocation.

INTRODUCTION

The 15th and 16th century mirror-of-princes writings are where contemporary political science got its start. These were intended to guide princes in their quest for excellence and morality. According to Smith, the role of political economy is to support the rulers in ensuring the well-being of their people and in obtaining the resources required to manage the sector that is now known as the public sector. According to Mill's concept, the actors rather than the activities are what set political economy apart from domestic economics [1], [2].The fulfillment of demand for both supply and consumption is essential to both economies. The traditional perspectives essentially amount to applying the lessons learned from managing a prosperous home to a new field that is, the affairs of the state. Political A crucial component of statecraft was considered to be the economy. A picture of the functioning and structure of the parties concerned is assumed by the provision for consumption and the necessary supply.

The writers of the classical era did not see statesmen or the state playing a significant role in managing the economy, despite the considerable focus on statecraft. Private economic agent's consumers, producers, merchants, etc. were expected to pursue their individual interests while working toward collectively best results when left unchecked by the government. It was thus anticipated that the markets would self-regulate in a way that would benefit the people and the state [3], [4]. In actuality, the term "political" in political economics was almost eliminated by the classic writers.

Marx vehemently disagreed with this strategy, questioning the evolutionary theory that underpinned the traditional viewpoint. Marx questioned the theory's "arrow of causality," which holds that individual interests create the economic structure known as markets. Smith had maintained that markets arise as a result of the actors' pursuit of welfare maximization and can be seen as aiding this pursuit. Marx believed that the economic structure and its production relations were what ultimately determined the interests of the person. The growth of the productive forces served as the foundation for the production relationships in turn. The field of political economics was greatly expanded by the Marxist approach. Above all, the social class system had to be seen as an integral component of the political economy [5], [6].

Although it adds new philosophical and technological components, the neoclassical perspective on political economy treats the economy as an analytically distinct part of society, much like the classic perspective. In other words, marginal calculus was developed to explain how economies functioned and utilitarianism was sought for as the basis for economic conduct The field of political economics expanded beyond its classical definition to include almost all human activity as a result of the allocation of utilities to outcomes and the acts that produce them. As a result, the idea of political economics has taken on several interpretations throughout the course of almost 200 years. The political and economic subsystems of society, which are theoretically separate from one another, are said to interact in the majority of definitions. Thus, it would appear conceivable to outline the correct realm of the notion using this idea as the focus point. Regretfully, there are a lot of facets to the idea of politics. Politics has historically been used to refer to the art of leadership, public affairs, governance, authoritative distribution of limited resources, and dispute resolution. separating politics and the economics; the former seems to deal with markets and the conduct of participants in such marketplaces. However, in the minds of Smith and Marx, the term "economy" also has another connotation [7], [8].

According to Caporaso and Levine the economy is defined as a specific set of activities pertaining to the production of commodities and services. Consequently, the fundamental features of an economy are production and trade. But there's also a third, broader meaning to the word "economic." This has to do with the logic that underpins economic activity. They are economic in the sense that they are deliberate and calculated, which incorporates the classical and neoclassic viewpoints. It would also seem that the Marxian idea fits within this abstract description.

Wish fulfillment systems as such could include some things we would prefer not to include in the political economy. For instance, to reduce the annoyance for non-smokers without depriving smokers of their momentary pleasure, a family may devise a "system" that permits smokers to indulge in their habit in a designated room. This system does not fall within the intuitive definition of political economy, despite the fact that it is clearly tied to the fulfilling of wants. This conclusion is based on the fact that the system in issue is not public in the way that political concerns are generally understood to be. Therefore, it is impossible to define demand fulfillment because its scope is too great, even if it encompasses a crucial component of political economy. We use a definition of political economy in this book that primarily draws on one of the previously discussed economics principles, specifically the idea that action is motivated by reasoning [9], [10].

Political economics will be defined as the application of means-ends thinking to public action. Stated differently, the calculation that political and economic actors use in their interactions with one another is what we perceive as the distinguishing characteristic of political economics. When interpreted this way, public choice is included in the political economy idea. The latter is often described as using economic the latter is often understood to be the broad application of economic logic to non-market environments, and to politics specifically. Political economy, therefore, is fundamentally broader than public choice as it applies the same logic to both politics and the economy. Since of our specific emphasis, the gap between political economy and public choice becomes irrelevant since we will be discussing what is known as economic reasoning. In our opinion, whether it is being used to politics or the economy is not as important. The notion of applying economic logic to non-market environments is alluring primarily because its tenets are succinctly stated.

The main contribution of rational choice theory has been the formulation and study of those principles. This theory's initial focus was mostly on establishing the fundamentals of behavior

in circumstances that were relatively stable. Thus, for instance, the maximizing of profits in markets was considered a significant example of rational action in classical political economics. Smith and his supporters spoke about the characteristics of the markets as an institution at the same time. These days, political economics is interested in similar ideas from other areas of human existence in addition to market behavior principles. However, the characteristics of the institutions are also given a lot of attention in addition to the behavior guidelines. The insight that rationality principles might vary depending on the institutional context leads naturally to this approach. In certain institutional contexts, a particular kind of conduct could provide the intended results, but not in others. Therefore, it is important to consider both the existing institutions and the behavior principles that are likely to accompany them if one's goal is to secure certain kinds of results. In fact, it becomes conceivable to discuss rational institutions in the sense of means ends in terms of the possibility of reaching certain sorts of results. Therefore, in certain situations, the rationality principles might apply not just to behavior standards but also to institutions.

This is how our conversation will go. In order to clarify how the most prevalent objectives of scientific investigation connect to the political economy research being conducted today, we will explain some fundamental ideas of philosophy of science in the next chapter. Political economics as a discipline may be considered sui generis, yet the terms used to describe its study are often found in philosophy of science. The following chapter presents economic man, often known as homo economics, as the fundamental actor of the political economy. Political economics, in its neoclassical form, approaches its study topic from the point of view of choice under different sorts of restrictions. This idealized agent is crucial to political economy. In turn, choices are thought of as the outcomes of calculation, consideration, or, more broadly, decision making. Therefore, the principles of decision making will be the focus of the homo economicus chapter. The premise of this debate is a passive environment, which naturally contradicts the common understanding of political economy's decision-making processes. Thus, one of the main instruments of contemporary political economics, the theory of games, is introduced along with other fundamental elements in the next chapter, which also features additional deliberating agents.

Group decision theory may be seen of as a generalization of game theory to the context of group decision-making, such as when it comes to allocating resources for collective goods. But this theory connects the behavior of markets with institutional architecture, and it developed mostly apart from game theory. Separate chapters will be devoted to the introduction and analysis of these two topics. In essence, the chapters on the assessment of public programs and conceptions of justice are political economics applications of game and group choice theory. The theories of justice, in turn, incorporate new notions, primarily those linked to fairness, into the theory of political economy; however, the former also draws on findings from other domains, particularly from multiple criteria decision theory and the theory of aggregation. Even though efficiency is emphasized in most game and decision theoretic literature, it is clear that fairness factors are taken into account while designing and assessing political economics institutions.

The idea of choosing is central to this literature. Human choices have a significant part in the structures, events, processes, and patterns that make up political economy. As such, a work on political economy models has to focus mostly on dissecting the fundamental components of decision making. We will start by concentrating on judgments made in surroundings that are stable and non-reactive in order to familiarize ourselves with the fundamental terminology and performance standards. Thus, the first model has a single active agent, the decision-maker, who uses the options available to him or her (henceforth, "her") to aim at predetermined objectives.

We next introduce more agents with comparable or dissimilar aims and decision alternatives before moving on to strategic situations. The new component in group choice situations is the institutional structure that guides the decision-making process. We have the fundamental instruments for modeling political economy when we have strategic players operating under predetermined institutional restrictions.

DISCUSSION

Like in many other academic disciplines, the interests of experts and laypeople sometimes diverge in political economics. However, these groups also believe that there are other issues that are significant. These are usually connected to significant political-economic occurrences, such the release of important policy declarations, unanticipated shifts in the course of development, or the creation of new institutions. Therefore, it is quite unlikely that anybody would question the academic or popular significance of President Roosevelt's declaration on December 8, 1941, which essentially meant that America was entering the Second World War against Japan and Germany. Similar to this, the economic policy pronouncements made by Jean-Claude Trichet and Alan Greenspan regarding the monetary policies of the European Central Bank and the Federal Reserve, respectively, are clearly of interest to scholars and the general public.

These announcements are also noteworthy, albeit for different reasons, for the decisions made by the principal players chief financial officer and chief executive officer during the course of events that culminated in the bankruptcy of Enron Corporation in December 2001, one of the biggest corporate collapses in history. The European Council's decision to convene a convention in order to start drafting the European Union's constitution in mid-December 2001 in Laeken, Belgium, was also significant from an intellectual and practical standpoint. The conference released their proposal for the European Constitution in 2004. It describes the fundamental rights of EU citizens, the Union's legal authority, the fundamental institutions and how they operate, how the Union is financed, and a host of other more detailed rules. In the member nations, the ratification procedure started in 2005. A few nations chose to hold a referendum on the proposed treaty. The idea was defeated in two referenda, one in France and one in the Netherlands, early in the summer of 2005.

It is reasonable to wonder why the choices and actions that were just detailed were taken or why they happened. Responses to these inquiries are often referred to as explanations of the corresponding choices or occurrences. Thus, what a historian intends to offer is an account of the event when she brings up the air force assault on Pearl Harbor in December 1941 and the subsequent policy planning talks in the US administration that resulted in the declaration of war against Japan a day later. In a similar vein, the reports detailing the discussions held in the boardrooms of the Federal Reserve and the European Central Bank serve as justifications for the choices made by their respective chairs. In a similar spirit, the leadership of Enron is looked to for answers on the reasons for the sharp decline in the company's stock value in 2001.

According to Hempel, universal laws statements that uphold a necessary relationship between certain kinds of facts or phenomena are included in the explanations of facts and phenomena in science. Natural laws that relate things like gas volume, pressure, and temperature are prime instances of these claims. Demonstrating that occurrences are examples of a general rule that encompasses various kinds of events is the equivalent of explaining them. Hempel's perspective is often referred to as the covering law explanation because of this.

The first issue we run into when extending Hempel's theory to the human sciences is that, at least intuitively, much of our conduct does not follow law-like regularities. This is not to imply that there are no rules of behavior; rather, it is to assert that the scope of our current

understanding of them is insufficient to support the claim that the majority, if not all, of social science explanations are grounded in them.3. However, explanations exist in the social sciences; however, they usually involve more constrained invariances or trends, which may contain exceptions, rather than universal laws.

Therefore, even while some investors may decide to reduce their investments for a variety of reasons, the rise in investment is often explained by the fall in interest rates. In a similar vein, although not everyone with a degree earns more than average, a person's higher-than-average income may be explained by her education. Hempel would certainly contend that, inasmuch as the two instances lack appropriate rules among their premises, they are at most explanation sketches rather than true explanations. There is no legal requirement that someone who has a university degree would always make more money than she would have without one, or that there will always be an increase in investment if interest rates decline. We are dealing here with regularities that permit exceptions, often a great number of them, as opposed to natural rules. However, this kind of explanation is common in political economics.

They meet the two fundamental Hempelian requirements: first, that the explanatory premises be taken as genuine; and second, that the explanandum was anticipated in light of the circumstances mentioned in those premises. However, they are not inferential proofs demonstrating that, given t However, in the context of explanation, what do we understand by relevance? The aforementioned explanation should be rejected primarily because it suggests a process unrelated to the event that needs to be described. Within a week after the onset of a cold, vitamin C use has little impact on recovery. The hypothesized reasons and the fact that healing would occur even in the absence of vitamin ingestion are what make them irrelevant. In turn, this independence is predicated on the processes of human physiology that we now believe to be true.

In order to explain why the United States declared war on Japan, we search for events, circumstances, and phenomena that are real, support the declaration, and have bearing on the occurrence of the explanandum. Since the latter is a symbolic event, rather than identifying a pertinent set of natural laws from which an objective state of things can be inferred, the search for explanatory premises requires a study of perceptions, anticipations, intentions, and decision possibilities of relevant players. Because these kinds of factors make up the relevant process that, within the boundaries of our understanding, results in the reality that has to be explained. In contrast to the Hempelian explanation, the war declaration account and the other examples given at the beginning of this section allow for processes that are not law-like in the sense of natural laws.

Therefore, to explain anything is to show that, in light of the premises, it was reasonable to anticipate. Therefore, the only thing that initially sets explanation apart from prediction is that, in the former case, the phenomena of interest has already happened, but in the latter case, it hasn't. However, we are able to forecast events even while we do not fully comprehend their causes. For example, we may anticipate that day follows night based just on common observations and not on our understanding of celestial physics. However, because it doesn't address the topic of why the sun rises, it would be challenging to refer to this as an explanation of any specific break of dawn. Such an answer may be found in the description of our solar system, which demonstrates once again the need for meaningful regularities in addition to predictive accuracy in a really scientific explanation.

Within the analytical school of philosophy of science, hypotheses and explanations are connected by means of laws. Laws are fundamental to scientific ideas and play a critical part in explanations. To put it another way, theories are collections of rules arranged hierarchically.

Every law has a certain degree of abstraction, meaning that it may be derived from more abstract laws or is at the highest level. In either scenario, it makes it possible to draw less abstract rules and other claims from it. We may have a broad theory of human behavior, for instance. As details of the general theory in constrained situations, we ought to be able to infer the theory of economic and political behavior from this. This illustration closely resembles the concept of theory found in political economics. The greatest degree of it is comprised of the rational choice behavior principles.

From this, empirical observations are made using a variety of environmental parameters. Consequently, under certainty, risk, and uncertainty, we have the theory of choice. A strategic multi-actor environment is hypothesized, and this leads to game theory. The theory of mechanism design, bargaining, and electoral institutions are produced by a variety of additional requirements. The majority of these will be covered in the chapters that follow. Let's connect these and other hypotheses to the fundamental ideas of philosophy of science before delving into their specifics. It is clear that the theory of choice behavior and the idea of theory found in advanced natural sciences such as organic chemistry, mechanics, or basic particle physics differ in a number of significant ways. First off, the theory of choice consists of behavioral rules that the subjects of study human individuals may choose not to follow, as opposed to natural laws dictating their conduct.

The natural sciences do not take into account the knowledge of the principles that govern the behavior of the objects of investigation. As a result, the principles must unavoidably be contingent. Secondly, it is evident that the theory of choice is not comprehensive in the technical meaning of the word. A theory is considered complete when all propositions about the actual domain it describes that are known to be true can be derived from it. This is not the case according to the theory of choice, according to a large body of research. The theory-derived decision behavior clearly conflicts with actual facts in a number of situations. As a result, the theory's applicability is limited rather than universal.

As G Thus, theories serve a dual purpose in academic work: they summarize the findings (laws) and enable the assessment of our understanding via the use of empirical facts. It should be noted, however, that not all use of the word are covered by this range of hypotheses. Frequently, "theory" is nothing more than a conceptual tool for explaining the world. The diagrammatic representation of political systems, for instance. The term "model" has several varied connotations in both scientific and common language. Thus, to mention a few common applications, we could come across tiny models of structures and vehicles, mathematical models of social or environmental systems, role models, and model theory. Three categories are proposed by Achinstein (1968: 209–225): (i) representational models, (ii) theoretical models, and (iii) imaginary models. We discover real, distorted, and analog models in the first class. The models' representation of an item serves as its defining feature.

An artificial construct that depicts something that isn't necessarily artificial is called a representational model. Its main function is to provide a tool for analyzing or experimenting with the thing it represents. There is relatively little use of these kinds of models in political economics. The finest examples are probably video game representations of international commerce, where players take on the roles of various nations and the goal is to get some understanding of how these nations interact with one another and with different natural resources, etc. Basically, these models are instructional aids.

CONCLUSION

The examination and synopsis of political economics highlight the complex interplay between politics and economics in determining social outcomes. Economic policies, which in turn affect

resource allocation, income distribution, and overall economic performance, are heavily influenced by political institutions. Complex policy results that represent conflicting interests and ideologies are often the result of interactions between political players, interest groups, and society preferences. Policymakers, economists, and citizens alike must comprehend the dynamics of political economics because it offers insights into the forces that influence economic decision-making and its possible effects on society. Going ahead, to tackle urgent issues and advance sustainable development and equitable growth, multidisciplinary methods integrating political and economic research will be required.

REFERENCES:

[1] Y. Fu, "A 'Maker education + SPOC' teaching model for college political economics courses," *Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn.*, 2019, doi: 10.3991/ijet.v14i03.10103.

[2] C. Pei, J. Ni, and Y. Li, "Approaching Digital Economy from the Perspective of Political Economics," *China Financ. Econ. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1515/cfer-2019-080102.

[3] L. B. Adams, T. R. Alter, M. Parkes, A. Woolnough, and M. Reid, "Political economics, collective action and wicked socio-ecological problems," *Gateways Int. J. Community Res. Engagem.*, 2019.

[4] A. Agenjo-Calderón and L. Gálvez-Muñoz, "Feminist Economics: Theoretical and Political Dimensions," *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/ajes.12264.

[5] N. R. Lamoreaux and J. J. Wallis, "Adam Smith's Theory of Violence and the Political Economics of Development," in *Organizations, Civil Society, and the Roots of Development*, 2019. doi: 10.7208/chicago/9780226426532.003.0002.

[6] D. Batzilis, "Electoral competition and corruption: Evidence from municipality audits in Greece," *Int. Rev. Law Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.irle.2019.04.003.

[7] T. Emre Erkoc, "Islam and economics in the political sphere: a critical evaluation of the AKP era in Turkey," *J. Southeast Eur. Black Sea*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14683857.2019.1579412.

[8] P. Söderbaum, "Economics and democracy for sustainability politics," *Int. J. Plur. Econ. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1504/IJPEE.2019.098174.

[9] E. Pirgmaier and J. K. Steinberger, "Roots, riots, and radical change-A road less travelled for ecological economics," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072001.

[10] J. Muller and M. Young, "Knowledge, power and powerful knowledge re-visited," *Curric. J.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/09585176.2019.1570292.

CHAPTER 2

INVESTIGATION AND DETERMINATION OF INTERPRETING ACTS IN POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Shakeela Banu C, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka
India, Email Id- dr.shakeelabanu@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
The process of interpreting actions in political economics is examined and determined in this research, which focuses on the examination of legislative and policy choices in the larger framework of political institutions and economic theory. The study investigates how policymakers perceive and carry out economic policies, the variables affecting their decision-making processes, and the consequences for society outcomes using a mix of theoretical frameworks and empirical evidence. Important fields of study include how public opinion, institutional restraints, interest groups, and ideology influence the formulation and implementation of public policy. The goal of the research is to provide light on the difficulties involved in interpreting policy and how they affect economic governance by looking at case studies and comparative analysis.

KEYWORDS:

Economic Policies, Ideology, Interest Groups, Legislative Interpretation, Policy Implementation.

INTRODUCTION

The natural sciences have mostly dominated discussions of theory, model, and explanation in philosophy of science. In such conversations, a number of key social science concepts and ideas are avoided. The way facts or occurrences are interpreted is very important. In the natural sciences, some processes and phenomena may be challenging to interpret because different interpretations may result from the same measurements. However, in the social sciences, these interpretation issues are primarily made worse by the fact that the study subjects individuals and groups also interpret the events taking place in their surroundings [1], [2]. Furthermore, the interpretation has the power to alter the observed behavior of those things without affecting their objective qualities. For instance, various cultures have different conventions about how to conduct negotiations. For instance, what is appropriate in one culture such as getting down to business may be seen as rude or disrespectful by people from other cultures [3], [4].

The interpretation of facts, actions, utterances, etc., thus, presents a challenge not found in other disciplines, given that law-like regularities would comprise the foundation of theories and explanations likewise in social sciences. Once again, let's use the example of describing the United States' declaration of war in December 1941. If we were dealing with a natural occurrence, we would be searching for laws or other patterns that link the declaration of war's events to certain kinds of earlier events. One that says that people take action to eliminate threats whenever they feel threatened would be a good fit for this kind of regularity. As a result of the air assault on Pearl Harbor, the United States, or more precisely, its senior leaders, felt endangered. As a result, they took action to eliminate the threat by declaring war [5], [6].

To use one more example from the previous section, let's look at the European Union leaders' decision to organize a convention to draft a union constitution. Once again, one may search for a pattern linking decisions-related occurrences to decisions-related events that occurred earlier in time. One such pattern may be that when people are confronted with increasing uncertainty,

they make an effort to lessen it by taking appropriate action. The impending European Union expansion and the resulting sharp rise in the complexity of decision-making in this instance constitute the uncertainty. The two aforementioned regularities do not qualify as natural laws. Nonetheless, the justifications point to a course of action that people should choose when faced with danger. However, in human affairs, danger might also be interpreted differently. Although the shelling of one's fleet, as occurred at Pearl Harbor, is unquestionably a danger, decision complexity is undoubtedly a topic that various people may see differently.

It might be seen as a danger by some, an opportunity by others, or just an extra expense that must be balanced against other factors. The main point is that when humans make decisions, we often have to deal with circumstances that are seen differently by others in similar positions. It is thus doubtful that natural rules exist under these conditions. There will inevitably be a "teleological ring," to use the phrase, connecting the event types, even in situations where they may seem to be regularly or causally related to other event types requiring human judgments. Therefore, despite the fact that oppressed people do, in fact, regularly rebel and sometimes succeed in overthrowing their oppressors, this regularity which is by no means without exceptions is mediated by an oppressed phase of perception and deliberation that may or may not result in an uprising. Naturally, comparable teleological rings are present in economic regularities, such as those that link labor costs to capital movements or interest rate fluctuations to investment behavior [7], [8]. Behavior principles provide the foundation of the models that we will mostly be working with.

These serve as the equivalent of natural laws in physics or chemistry for theories in economics and society. Contrary to the rules of natural sciences, there are two common interpretations for the principles: factual and normative. When we refer to a factual principle of conduct, we imply the consistency of observed behavior, such as the tendency for audience members to raise their hands when a speaker is about to speak. On the other hand, the normative principle deals with actions that one believes should dictate actions, such as young people giving up their seats to older people on a packed bus. Theories or models are terms that may apply to systems of factual and normative principles, and they often do. It is often clear from the principles themselves or the context in which they are meant to be used whether one is working with a factual or normative system of principles. However, there are certain systems where the boundary is very thin.

This area includes several political economics models. Undoubtedly, there are certain models that are simple to categorize as true, such as the many macroeconomic models that connect employment, interest rates, exchange balances, and other variables. However, categorizing models that are based on individual behavior might be challenging at times. This is because the behavior rules in these models are based on the concept of rationality. A pattern of behavior's rationality is undoubtedly a desirable quality in most, if not all, situations. However, it is equally reasonable to assume that people behave rationally when it comes to political economics. Ultimately, as previously said, one interpretation of political economics is an economic framework within which political decisions are made. This ultimately equates to assuming that each person behaved rationally.

In light of this, it would seem that the inability of the actors to act in a way consistent with normative rationality may account for any disparities between actual political economy occurrences and those anticipated by our theories. But this is an oversimplified perspective. Whether normative or factual, the idea of rationality may be interpreted in a multitude of ways. Put another way, although it is possible to imagine basic situations in which almost every reasonable person might agree on the rational course of action, there are situations of just a little complexity in which the rules of rationality entail several non-equivalent courses of

action. Optimality, another essential idea in political economics, is interpretable both factually and normatively. Naturally, reaching optimum results is the most one can hope for, but even in the best-case scenario, each individual member of a group of people might behave optimally to produce outcomes that are worse than alternative outcomes for the group as a whole. As a result, optimality on one level—individual—may conflict with optimality on another—group. ous additional normative ideas. A deep examination of some facets of actual economies and polities is made possible by the simplified descriptions of the real world that are created by factual political economics models. Usually, one searches for model solutions, or stable results or equilibria that make up the theoretical predictions of the models. Afterwards, they serve as assessments of the reliability of models. Models are more often used, nonetheless, in the assessment of political-economic institutions [9], [10]. One may do experiments on planned institutions and determine how different external impulses or shocks affect the institutions' behavior by constructing models of the institutions. It is also possible to alter the model's structure and see how the change affects different facets of the organization.

DISCUSSION

The economic man, or homo economicus, is the fundamental component of political economics models. The economic man is an oversimplified theoretical representation of the person. It may be roughly understood as the residue that remains after real-world persons have had all non-economic factors eliminated. Specifically, the person in this model is expected to be rational in the sense that she will weigh the effects of her actions in light of the current and expected conditions. The economic man is a simplification, much like other models. We could not even begin to define or study political economics without simplification. However, the economic agent model is often seen to be insufficient and deceptive. It is, in fact, one of the concepts in contemporary social and political philosophy that is discussed the most. It is crucial to provide a detailed overview of it as a result. The economic man is shown in political economics models as an assumption. For this reason, talking about the different kinds of assumptions and their roles in political economics research is relevant.

The supposed negative link between reality and importance served as the primary source of provocation. In fact, it would be almost ridiculous to argue that creating meaningful theories just requires checking that one's presumptions are unrealistic. But Friedman is not making this argument. Instead, he argues that the impracticality of significant theory's presumptions is one of its defining characteristics. Saying that the F-twist holds for negligibility assumptions is equivalent to arguing that the assumptions made about variables or elements that may be ignored in the analysis are more implausible in major theories than they are in less significant theories. The F-twist appears rarely relevant to this assumption type on the not too improbable perspective that unrealistic assumptions are descriptively incorrect, as if a negligibility assumption is false, this clearly suggests that the factors or variables excluded should not be included after all. The idea doesn't "work" based on the provided presumptions. This does not, in and of itself, suggest that theories with a higher number of erroneous negligibility assumptions would be more important than those with a lower number of such assumptions. The result is the same in the case of domain assumptions for the obvious reason that adding descriptively inaccurate assumptions may limit rather than increase the validity of the theory. It is conceivable for an assumption of negligibility to become a domain one even if it turns out to be untrue within the intended application domain. Assume that the negligibility assumption in one's theory of economic behavior is that government action has no effect on the state of the national economy. If it is shown that the assumption is descriptively incorrect, it may be changed to a domain false assumption by declaring that the theory should only be used in systems in which the actions of the government have a negligible impact on the functioning of

the economy. Regarding heuristic assumptions, the F-twist seems to be a more reasonable stance to take. Consider the notion that "under a wide range of circumstances individual firms behave as if they were seeking rationally to maximize their expected returns," to use Friedman's own example. The entire hypothesis can be rewritten as the following counterfactual statement: "If the firms were seeking rationally to maximize their expected returns, then their behavior under a wide range of circumstances would resemble the observations." The portion of the hypothesis that begins with "as if" appears to be a heuristic assumption. It seems that the meanings of the two sentences are the same. However, the latter seems to be a heuristic assumption.

Whatever else Friedman may be trying to communicate with his "as if" phrase, it is clear that he is not claiming that the businesses are attempting to maximize their projected profits in a logical manner. Instead, it seems that although they may have a broad range of different objectives, their actions would be consistent with maximizing anticipated returns. Furthermore, he contends that interpreting the data from a "as if" perspective aids in behavior prediction. Now, compared to other sorts of assumptions, the unrealism of these assumptions seems more justifiable in this instance. Because heuristic assumptions are beneficial in making predictions, they are used. However, as it assumes an inverse link between unrealism and importance, this does not support the F-twist. It is arguable, however, that when the F-twist is applied to heuristic assumptions, there is no compelling reason to reject it; nonetheless, there are valid arguments in favor of negligibility and domain assumptions.

The assumption types listed above are not absolute. As we just said, presumptions have the ability to "migrate" between different types. It is possible to see an assumption's classification as a domain, heuristic, or negligibility assumption depending on how models are interpreted. As a result, Friedman's example from earlier may be seen as a domain assumption that the theory only applies to businesses that, as a matter of operational principle, maximize their projected returns. In a similar vein, it may be seen as a negligibility assumption, meaning that in modeling businesses, all other factors can be disregarded except from return maximization. Lastly, and maybe most logically, it may be seen as a heuristic assumption that helps forecast behavior in previously unstudied contexts.

This kind of uncertainty in interpreting presumptions also affects the economic man. It might be seen as a negligibility assumption that, while developing political economics models, all other factors can be disregarded except from the pursuit of utility maximization. However, it may also be argued that the economic man is a domain assumption, meaning that it applies exclusively in situations where the primary behavioral principle is the maximizing of individual value.

In fact, the usual justification of a theory that defies empirical data is that the study's domain assumptions make the theory invalid. The economic man, however, is best understood as a heuristic assumption that is useful for generating predictions, explaining observable occurrences, testing out different policy options, and creating political-economic institutions. Generally speaking, it is not meant to be a counterfactual assertion; in other words, the economic man is not an assumption that is known to be untrue in political economics models. Instead, it is a simplification that is thought to apply to a large class of agents and/or actions. It is thought to have heuristic value in helping the model builder take into consideration a large number of observations the more, the better. Although the economic man is not a set of beliefs held by everybody, there is a good deal of agreement on one of its characteristics rationality. There are two ways to look at rationality and the theory that supports it: normative and descriptive. argues that the normative view allows us to explain behavior by demonstrating that it was rational and that the person in question had goals and beliefs that made it appropriate for

her to behave in the way she did. Under the former interpretation, rationality relates to how one ought to behave, while the latter view pertains to how one does behave. Then, we may conclude that the activity occurred because the individual believed it to be reasonable. The accomplishment of certain objectives via the conduct is insufficient justification unless it can be shown that the individual had the beliefs and the aims that linked her actions to them. A simple illustration would be seeing a crowd of people suddenly racing down a street, but unexpected stock market buying and selling also falls into this category of circumstances when the technique of revealed preference is often used automatically.

A somewhat different environment is required for the hypothesized preference technique. In other words, someone would be curious to learn what types of consequences a new law might have. For instance, will raising the minimum wage improve the situation of the working poor or, on the other hand, cause more of them to lose their jobs? Every new law that is introduced is predicated on certain objectives and thought experiments on the behavior that reasonable individuals will exhibit in the new environment that the proposed legislation creates. Assuming the actors' rationality often provides a helpful baseline for evaluating the impact of new laws. Three elements of rationality are utility maximization, consistent preferences, and purposeful behavior.

The latter two elements are closely connected, as we will discover later: It is illogical to maximize utility in the absence of consistent preferences. When knowledge on more precise objectives of human behavior is lacking, it is common to presume that everyone aims to maximize welfare. However, utility maximization is a conceptually more helpful idea. Due to its greater generality, the latter is more beneficial. Benefit maximizing permits a broad range of social changes, including those that improve the wellbeing of others, from which the actor may get benefit, while individual welfare maximization is linked to egoism. This is important since one of the most common criticisms of rational choice theory is that it is predicated on egoistic conduct.

The goal-directed conduct with regard to consistent preferences is the foundation of the idea. It doesn't matter why options are ranked in a certain order of preference; egoism, altruism, or another principle might be at play.

The foundation of rational choice theory is the idea of a decision. The ability to make reasoned judgments is what distinguishes rational people or organizations. In turn, rational choices are those that enable the decision maker (DM, for short) to accomplish their objectives. It is impossible to discern between reasonable and irrational choices in the absence of objectives. Only the DM has access to concealed or confidential information about choices and objectives. As a result, an individual may choose to apply for a job with a company, but she may choose to keep her selection a secret until the very end of the application process. Comparably, even if her objective is to take a different position in B, a general may instruct a portion of her men to organize an assault on the enemy positions in A.5. Therefore, the actions do not always reflect the aims, and the choices do not necessarily follow from the deeds. However, to think of a committee that has two members and a chairman. The majority rule is used by the committee to decide decisions, and any motion that has the backing of two or more members is approved. If not, the proposal is turned down.

Assume the committee is tasked with determining whether to support a certain project. Each participant has the option to abstain, reject the financing, or support it. Following the members' indication of their positions by voting, the chair shares her thoughts. As a result, the latter votes knowing full well what the other voters have decided. Assume that the two members have different views on the project; one is in favor of financing while the other is against it. Thus,

the project's financing is decided by the chair's vote; if she supports it, it will be financed; if not, it won't. This is how a choice is established when there is uncertainty. The chair is presented with three choices: voting in favor of financing, voting against it, or abstaining. It is hard to determine which of these activities is sensible without knowing her intentions. Presume the chair is in favor of funding the project. If so, voting in favor of financing would be the sensible course of action for her to do since it ensures money. She only has one option if she decides she does not want to support the project: she may vote it down. If she is unsure whether to finance anything or not, the wisest course of action for her would be to abstain since it would result in indecision (because none of the primary alternatives obtains at least two votes). When there are two possible outcomes, knowing that the DM prefers one of the possibilities allows us to identify rational conduct since the DM's choice of that decision alternative leads to the desired result.

Let us imagine that the DM is granted the exclusive authority to decide which project ideas will get money first, rather than the chairman in a group. She is aware that the projects will be financed in the order she suggests until the available money is depleted, but she is unaware of the overall budget restriction, or the total amount of dollars available. There is no need to assume anything about the actions of others, since the DM is the only one with the power to decide the result. On the other side, the DM's preference order about the projects is required to define reasonable conduct. More precisely, the DM must be able to compare any two projects in terms of preference; that is, for any two projects, x and y, the DM must be able to express a preference for either x over y or y over x. Technically speaking, the DM's choice must be comprehensive.

This prerequisite is often referred to as connection. Why is this a mandatory requirement? Let's suppose that it wasn't met, meaning that the DM was unable to determine which of two projects is at least as good as the other. This would imply that the DM could not support one of these two initiatives because she is unsure whether it is at least as good as the other. She was also unable to abstain since doing so would imply that both projects are equally important. Therefore, none of the three action options could be supported by the DM's underlying preferences.

Transitivity, also known as logical consistency, is another need for the DM's preferences. According to this, if a project, let's say project 1, is deemed to be at least as desirable as another project, let's say project 2, and the latter at least as desirable as a third project, let's say project 3, then project 1 must be at least as desirable as project 3. In the 2000 U.S. presidential election, for instance, if a voter chose Nader over Gore and Gore over Bush, then transitivity dictates that she chose Nader over Bush.

It is difficult to create a preference order or ranking—that is, a list of candidates such that each candidate occupies a single place in the ranking—if the preferences do not meet transitivity. Transitivity ensures that there is a priority order and that each candidate is placed in exactly one place inside it, together with completeness.

We may use preference relations to "rationalize" or justify actions if the DM's preferences are subject to the completeness and transitivity constraints. An action is rational if it results in the chosen outcome. This is the fundamental concept of what Elster (1983) refers to as thin rationality. Actions that are in line with preferences which are comprehensive and transitive are considered rational. It is important to note that the guiding idea or reasoning behind the preference ranking has not been relevant at all up to this point. Stated differently, the concept of thin rationality lacks a foundational premise that shapes the desire. Specifically, the preferences might be global or local, egoistic or altruistic. Because preferences are connected

and transitive, we may create a hierarchy of options, ranging from best to worst and perhaps include ties. In any case, the sequence only has one spot for each choice. Therefore, we may see as logical any action that selects the option that is next best in line. Any subset of options may be justified using the same logic.

Any option might be considered reasonable if there are many options that are tied for the best position. Very few conditions must be met in order to create a preference ranking of options. However, it is not hard to imagine a scenario in which an intuitively reasonable individual could not be able to satisfy them. Reconsider Bush, Gore, and Nader as presidential contenders. It is possible that a voter who favors Nader's environmental proposals over Gore's will rate her higher than Gore. Furthermore, let's say that the same voter supports Gore over Bush due to concerns about employment and income inequality, meaning she believes Gore's policies would have resulted in a more equitable distribution of money and a greater number of jobs than those of Bush. We would now deduce from transitivity that the individual in issue favors Nader over Bush. It is conceivable, nevertheless, that the voter has a different choice. She could have believed, for instance, that Bush's crime reduction strategies were superior than Nader's.

CONCLUSION

The study and interpretation of actions in political economics provide insight on the complex mechanisms involved in the formulation and application of economic policy. Many elements, such as institutional restraints, public opinion, interest group influence, and ideological concerns, all affect how policies are interpreted. These elements influence the choices made by policymakers and have a big impact on social outcomes and economic governance. In order to successfully negotiate the complexity of economic policymaking and handle urgent concerns, politicians, economists, and citizens must possess a comprehensive grasp of the dynamics of policy interpretation. Going ahead, creating more intelligent and useful policy solutions will need multidisciplinary methods that include ideas from economics and political science.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. Karabarbounis and S. Pinto, “What Can We Learn from Online Wage Postings? Evidence from Glassdoor,” *Econ. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.21144/eq1040402.

[2] T. Imai, “Legal regulation of autonomous driving technology: Current conditions and issues in Japan,” *IATSS Research*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.iatssr.2019.11.009.

[3] A. Homolar and P. A. Rodríguez-Merino, “Making sense of terrorism: a narrative approach to the study of violent events,” *Crit. Stud. Terror.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/17539153.2019.1585150.

[4] S. S. Bidie, “Director’s duty to act for a proper purpose in the context of distribution under the Companies act 71 of 2008,” *Potchefstroom Electron. Law J.*, 2019, doi: 10.17159/1727-3781/2019/v22i0a4221.

[5] A. N. Hayati, “A Study on Speech within the Marriage Ceremony of the Luwu Community, South Palopo in Basse Santempe (Bastem),” *Tamaddun*, 2019, doi: 10.33096/tamaddun.v18i1.21.

[6] R. Tipton, “Exploring the ESOL-PSIT relation: Interpellation, resistance and resilience,” *Lang. Commun.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.langcom.2018.12.004.

[7] T. Dow, “ICWA and the unwed father: A constitutional corrective,” *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*. 2019.

[8] S. Maitland, “Does interpreting ‘steal’ conflict? A translational perspective on power and restorative justice,” *Transl. Interpret.*, 2019, doi: 10.12807/ti.111201.2019.a02.

[9] S. Milne, C. Lomax, and M. H. Freeston, “A review of the relationship between intolerance of uncertainty and threat appraisal in anxiety,” *Cognitive Behaviour Therapist*. 2019. doi: 10.1017/S1754470X19000230.

[10] A. D. Bolatova, F. T. Uzdenova, and R. A. Kerimova, “Totem Beliefs in Karachay-Balkar Folklore and Literature,” *J. Hist. Cult. Art Res.*, 2019, doi: 10.7596/taksad.v8i1.2057.

CHAPTER 3

DETERMINATION OF VOTER'S CHOICE RELATION IN POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Sumbul Samreen, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.sumbul_samreen@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
In order to comprehend the variables affecting voters' choices in democracies, this research focuses on determining the voter's choice connection in political economics. The study looks at how voters' election choices and economic factors like inflation, employment, and income are related via theoretical frameworks and empirical data. It also looks at how voting behavior is influenced by non-economic variables like as party affiliation, ideology, social identity, and opinions about the effectiveness of the government. The research aims to provide light on the intricate processes that underlie voters' decisions in political economy by examining survey data, election outcomes, and case studies.

KEYWORDS:

Economic Variables, Ideology, Party Identification, Social Identity, Voting Behavior.

INTRODUCTION

The voter's choice relation among the three candidates will be determined if these three factors the environment, employment, and crime prevention policy are considered the only ones that determine the voter's preference in the manner that has been explained. On two of the three criteria, Nader is superior than Gore. In a similar vein, Gore is favored over Bush based on two factors, and Bush is preferred over Nader. This kind of preference association contains nothing irrational. However, due to its intransitivity, it is hard to determine which candidate a voter would rationally choose. It may be emphasized that Bush is better on two of the three criteria if the voter choose Nader [1], [2]. The same case may be made for Gore, etc., if she decides on Bush.

The preferences are often not apparent. Instead, their function is to provide a justification for decisions. In the event that only one candidate is eligible for voting, the voter may break the tie amongst the three by giving more weight to one criterion at the expense of the others, bringing up additional criteria, or using a random method. The last tool implies that the voter has no preference among the three options. By using the other two stratagems, a transitive preference connection is created in place of the circular one. Because cyclic individual preferences are not evident in real-world decision circumstances, decision theory's underlying premise is therefore at least partially justified.

Now, what would be the sensible course of action in light of the full and transitive preference relation? The decision made by the DM dictates the result under certainty. Thus, it would be clear for her to vote for Nader in order to help him win election, as he is the top contender in the voter's preference list. A vote in the other direction would cast the voter's preferred rating in serious doubt.\

The definition of what a rational actor would do is thus simple when we are confident of the outcomes of our choices: she would choose the course of action that, in her opinion, produces the best result. Naturally, when decisions are made without full knowledge of the consequences, things become more problematic. Naturally, this is usually the case in elections

when the result is not decided by a single voter. For instance, many of Nader's followers chose to vote for their second-ranked alternative over their favorite in the 2000 US presidential election, hoping to reduce the likelihood that their lowest-ranked contender would win [3], [4].

To see how this setup differs from the one previously explained, let's look at an example. You have just completed writing your first book, and it is now time to consider how to get it in front of readers. Since this is your first, you haven't gotten around to getting in touch with publishers before completing the book. Being a literary person, you have read a lot of books in your genre and, from speaking with publishers, you have discovered that firms A, B, and C are the three main publishers in the industry you are working in.

Of all, Company A is the most esteemed. Its works are shown at every major book fair in the globe, and the majority of its novels are reviewed in prestigious literary publications. Its distribution and marketing network is quite broad. The primary disadvantage of Company A is its extreme selectiveness. Comparatively speaking, it publishes a far smaller number of submissions than its rivals. Comparatively speaking, Company B accepts a much larger proportion of manuscripts than A, but presumably as a result of this, it is less prestigious. Additionally, it spends less on marketing books and has a lower level of global exposure. Finally, Company C publishes almost all of the submissions it gets, but it also expects the writers to assist with book promotion. The value you set to each firm is your evaluation of the financial (royalty and other income) and psychological (fame, honor, and esteem) benefits you would get from having your book published by that particular company [5], [6].

In the event that firm A accepts your article for publication, there would be significant advantages. However, the likelihood of this occurring is quite low. You would place a lower value on Company B, but its chances of success are better than in A's situation. You would most likely get a little advantage from Company C. In many regular decision-making scenarios, the aforementioned environment may be found in several guises. Even in the most straightforward situations, we often have to make decisions that might result in a wide range of outcomes, each of which can be distinguished by the possibility that the desired event would materialize as well as its usefulness. Individual job decisions, for instance, often come down to differing income expectations and the likelihood of achieving them after making the decision.

Circumstances when the finest results are also the most successful To put it another way, given the information in the table, reasonable persons may come to various conclusions. Someone who chooses firm A may claim that she did so in spite of the low possibilities of success because she values success so highly that even a remote probability of success justifies choosing it over the other options. In addition, she may feel fortunate. Someone other could choose option C and defend their decision by arguing that getting the work published is more important than anything else and that things are simply going to go against her. Because firm B offers a decent chance of success and some media exposure, a third party could choose it.

The broad range in the potential meaning of the terms "large," "medium," and "small" when applied to values and "almost hopeless," "reasonably good," and "excellent" when these denote probability values makes it challenging to assess the rationality of decisions made in Table 3.2-type scenarios. Let's imagine that we have numerical values that can be added to and multiplied in place of these spoken expressions. It is reasonable to suppose that the author searching for a publisher is just thinking about the money she will get if the company decide to publish her work. For the sake of simplicity, we will assume that, upon acceptance of the text, each corporation pays the whole contract amount in one flat payment. If her work is approved, Company A would issue her a contract guaranteeing her the amount of x(A). The weighted average of the values corresponding to each of the potential outcomes that might result from a

decision is the anticipated value. In turn, the weights represent the likelihood that the respective outcomes will occur once the decision has been taken. Assume that all possible outcomes are equally probable for a given option [7], [8]. This indicates, in our example, that for a given firm, the odds of acceptance and rejection are equal, or 1/2. Submitting a paper to this firm is projected to provide an average value of both acceptance and rejection, which we have assumed to be zero [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

Another example that is more representative of daily life in many cities throughout the globe is that of a passenger boarding an inner-city bus or tram. The machines beside the bus stops are where you can buy the two-euro tickets. If inspectors find passengers traveling without proper tickets, they will be fined €100 for their examination. Currently, a passenger knows that there is a p-percent chance that an inspector will be on any particular bus or tram. As a result, the likelihood that an inspector won't be present on a particular ride is 1 − p. The traveler has two options: buy a ticket or board the bus without one. The traveler goes the specified distance with or without encountering an inspector, depending on the option they make. She pays two euros either way. If a passenger chooses to travel without a ticket, there are two possible outcomes: either she encounters an inspector during her journey and is caught, or she does not.

The expected value is the average of the values the decision-maker (DM) would get if the scenario were replayed an infinite number of times, assuming that she would choose the same option each time, according to the most popular (frequency) interpretation of probability. Therefore, if the passenger were to go without a ticket on every trip, her average value per ride would be −1. The average is calculated by dividing the total number of rides by the sum of a series of zeros and -100s. In the same way, the anticipated values in the publication example show the theoretical average advantages for an author sending her book to a publishing business an unlimited number of times. It is obvious that the anticipated value is a rather speculative idea. However, it is comparable to decision under certainty in terms of logic. That is, it can be shown that conduct aimed at optimizing choice expectations may be seen as rational under reasonably plausible preferences in a manner similar to how selecting the option with the greatest value can be viewed as rational under conditions of certainty. We'll go into more detail on this subject soon.

Assume for the moment that it makes sense to use predicted utilities as guides for behavior. In our bus passenger example, it follows that a rational traveler would never buy a ticket since, in each voyage, she would lose 2 euros, with the average benefit clearly equal to −2. By choosing not to purchase a ticket, she increases her average benefit by double the amount. The bus firm should definitely reevaluate its inspection fee policy.7. As an alternative, the business can think about increasing the number of inspectors on the buses to reduce the anticipated advantage of traveling without a ticket. The bus rider calculation shown above is predicated on the idea that passengers are aware of the likelihood of running across an inspector when they board the vehicle. Furthermore, we have implicitly assumed that this likelihood corresponds to the method by which the bus firm places inspectors on its vehicles. The passenger may be in a foreign town and not be aware of the inspection regulations, or the bus operator might sometimes alter its policy, both of which might be said to be impractical. From an intuitive standpoint, it would make more sense to believe that, rather than an objective probability, the passenger, whether riding the bus with or without a ticket, has a fairly accurate suspicion or estimate of what would happen to her. She is aware that she will be penalized if she is found driving without a ticket. She is also aware that she will get away with it if she is not discovered.

Here, the passenger's decision and the two mutually incompatible conditioning events of being examined or not are what define the result and reward for her. The passenger doesn't know enough about the conditioning events or natural states to be able to give them objective probability. She is thus unable to calculate the anticipated advantage that she would get from purchasing or not purchasing a ticket. This situation exemplifies making decisions in the face of uncertainty: one knows, with some degree of confidence, what will happen if specific conditioning events take place, but they are unsure about the possibility of those occurrences. It is evident that the anticipated benefit calculation does not apply in this case, at least not in the manner described in the section above. The option "pick one coin" obviously outperforms the option "pick two coins" for you since it produces an outcome under both of the opponent's choices that is at least as good as the latter option, and it produces an outcome that is strictly better under the opponent's choice of "pick two coins."

It may happen that, in every situation, one alternative produces result that are strictly superior to those of its rival. It is argued that the former much outweighs the latter in this instance. Consider being issued a ticket in two straightforward lotteries, A and B. Both involve only one dice roll. In lottery A, you win 10 euros if the throw lands on the side with six dots. If not, you just win one euro. If the side six appears in lottery B, you earn twenty euros. For every other result, you get 2 euros. Since your payout in lottery B is always more than lottery A's, regardless of the result, lottery B unquestionably has a significant advantage over lottery A. Many decision-making scenarios that arise in daily life include weakly dominated choices. These are often disregarded since the decisions taken are seen as being so clear-cut that no thought is given to them. For instance, it is generally recommended that drivers in Britain drive on the left side of the road since this alternative predominates (at least somewhat) over driving on the right.

In a similar vein, students often turn in papers to their teachers during exams even when they are unsure whether their writings will be accepted. It is believed that making a submission pale in comparison to making no submission. When activities or institutions are evaluated using many performance criteria, an intriguing class of scenarios comes to light. For instance, when assessing higher education institutions, a number of performance factors are typically considered in the overall evaluations, such as the caliber and volume of research done, the caliber and volume of instruction and training provided, the institution's external environmental impact, etc. Representatives of the institutions being evaluated often debate, revise, and expand upon the criteria.

When compared to compromising for the current standards, the inclusion of criteria that benefit their institutions might easily be seen as a less dominant choice in these debates. These are not the only assessments of public-sector operations that have similar circumstances. Participants in the private sector also provide comparable strategic thought to those entities and operations that are inherently multidimensional (profitability, service quality, environmental soundness, etc.). necessary for arriving at decisions that may be defended as reasonable in the sense that they rule out possibilities that have a monopoly. Nevertheless, there are often no possibilities that predominate over the others certainly not in the most intriguing ones. Certain solutions provide the greatest results in certain situations, while others are better in others. These types of situations give rise to a variety of decision-making concepts.

A person may choose to use the idea of focusing on the very worst-case situation that might result from any given decision under all possible conditions, and then choose the one that would provide her with the greatest benefit in that worst case scenario. Due to its ability to maximize the least reward for any choice, this approach is also known as the maximin principle or the play-it-safe rule. In that it gives the probability of unity to one particular state of nature for each

choice—that is, the one that, when combined with the option under consideration, produces the lowest payout—it may be seen as a variation of the anticipated utility maximization concept.

The play-it-safe guideline shows pessimism on the side of the DM rather than reason. The maximax principle, often known as the gambler's rule, is a mirror version of this rule that directs attention toward the choice with the highest potential reward among all of the options and selects that option. Stated differently, this rule searches for the choice linked to the greatest potential advantage. The rule is obviously predicated on excessive optimism. Regarding maximin, this rule may also be seen as maximizing anticipated utility under the assumption that one natural state, or the state that, when combined with the choice, produces the greatest possible result, is assigned a probability weight of unity for each option.

Numerous variants between the maximin and maximax rules are possible. In other words, the rationalist rule, which, under this probabilistic assumption, gives an equal chance to every condition of nature and selects the alternative that maximizes predicted benefit. The rationalist rule views all possible states of nature as equally likely, but the maximin and maximax rules presume that one state of nature will materialize for each choice with certainty. Since one cannot know the probability distribution of the states of nature when faced with uncertainty, these allocations of probability values are obviously only conjecture. On the other hand, the maximax rule recommends against purchasing as the rider's best-case scenario is a free ride, meaning there is no profit. Conversely, the purchase option would result in the payment 2 in every case. According to the rationalist rule, there would be a chance of 1/2 for both the states of nature: encountering the inspector and not having an inspector on the bus. In the latter case, the anticipated payoffs for the "don't buy" and "buy" options would be −50 and 2, respectively. The rationalist rule would thus advise purchasing. Hurwicz's guideline, in the end, would also advise purchasing if the passenger's level of optimism is lower than 49/50.

The aforementioned guidelines only partially take use of the fact that there are often many natural states that, when combined with the selected choice, influence the results. Since there are just two states of nature in the example above, it is not possible to discern this. However, more states may be included if the bus operator allowed inspectors to set the amount that caught free-riders must pay, within a fair range, rather than having a policy of perpetual penalties for doing so. The computations nevertheless concentrate on no more than two of these states of nature, notwithstanding the addition of others.

The weighted average of these, with maximax representing the best-case scenario and maximin examining the worst. Only the rationalist rule makes use of alternatives and data related to all states of nature. However, the way it assigns probabilities is often debatable since every state is given the same amount. One might easily bypass the problematic equiprobability assumption of the rationalist rule if one had any intuitions or gut feelings that can be stated as probabilities of different states happening. Therefore, the subjective or intuitive probabilities may be used as if they were objective. As a result, making decisions in an unclear environment might become decisions in a risky environment. One may thus strive to maximize the subjective anticipated utilities of alternatives rather than maximizing the expected utility. The anticipated utility maximization under risk and the optimal option calculation are similar in every way.

Every option under uncertainty principle has a rationale, which lends credence to it in particular situations. When making judgments, the maximin rule essentially ensures a fair degree of security. Imagine someone attempting to board a bus that is ready to depart from a stop across a busy street. Many would prefer cross the street at traffic signals than dash across the road in the middle of heavy traffic, even if it meant missing the bus and arriving at a crucial meeting around ten minutes late. Since running across the street in spite of traffic could result in a

disaster (serious bodily injury or even death), and crossing at traffic lights could, at worst, cause you to be late for the meeting, the former behavior can be seen as maximizing the minimum benefit. In general, it makes intuitive sense to attempt to avoid the worst potential consequences if they are bad enough. On the other hand, the maximax rule may be supported in situations when the choices are primarily different in terms of the related best outcomes. The rationalist rule, on the other hand, may be justified by arguing that all states of nature should be regarded as equally probable since no evidence suggests that one condition is more or less likely than the other to occur.

However, the basis of several of the previously described ideas is a little bit stronger than obvious. It might be argued that there are individuals who exemplify rationality by adhering to the principles of rational conduct within certain categories of situations. All of these ideas are part of the utility maximization rules (Harsanyi 1977: 22–47). Put differently, the maximum of utility under conditions of certainty, risk, and uncertainty may be seen as a rational choice principle. Here, "thin" rationality is interpreted to mean that an action is reasonable provided it aligns with the interests of the person in question. This indicates that when an actress picks option A over option B, she is making a logical decision. She is equally likely to choose A or B if she is undecided between the two.

Take into consideration a person who is given the option to choose between options A and B. Ask yourself what requirements her preferences would need to meet for us to determine whether or not her conduct is rational. This will help you understand how this theory of rationality connects to utility maximization. Of course, the individual must be able to demonstrate a preferred relationship between A and B. Stated differently, she must be able to indicate whether A is favored over B, represented by A ~ B, or if B is preferred over A, represented by B ~ A, or if she is undecided between A and B, represented by A ~ B. Technically speaking, we have to suppose that she has a full (or linked) preference relation over alternatives A and B. If none of the three options above were to occur, we would not be able to claim that her decision is in line with her preferences.

The asymmetry of the stringent preference is a further condition we must place on the preference connection. In other words, B cannot be preferred to A if A is preferred to B. Conversely, the lack of interest should adhere to symmetry: if the DM has no preference between A and B, then she must also have no preference between B and A. Assume for the moment that the A and B option scenario satisfies the aforementioned requirements. Then, actual numbers may be assigned to A and B such that, when the DM makes her preferred choice between the two, she behaves as if she is optimizing the numerical values. If she likes A over B, for instance, we may give A a value of 100 and B a value of 10, such that if the DM chooses A based on her choice, she ipso maximizes the value provided to the options. Likewise, in the event that she favors B over A, we will give B a higher numerical value than A, ensuring that the behavior reflecting her preferences would maximize the numerical value.

The last scenario is that the DM doesn't care about either A or B. If a sensible individual is unsure between A and B, then it would seem reasonable to say that she would pick A with an equal chance of 1/2. We can see that a DM who selects A and B with equal probability really maximizes the numerical value, which is the same for both alternatives due to the underlying indifference, by giving both options the same numerical value. The allotted numbers are sometimes referred to as utility values. Formally speaking, utility is defined as a function over alternatives or outcomes. Thus, by picking the option she likes above the other or, if she is undecided, by selecting both with the same probability, the DM seems to be maximizing her utility function in the two alternative situations.

A representation theorem synoptic proof is what we have shown above. As we've shown, preference relations may be expressed numerically using utility values while maintaining their essential characteristics, such as the preference for one choice over another or their indifference. It turns out that by adding two relatively minor extra constraints to preferences, we may apply the representation theorem to these more extended contexts. Transitivity of weak preference relations is the first. This equates to the subsequent prerequisite. Assume we choose options ai, aj, and ak from A such that ai aj and aj ak. The terms "at least as preferable as," "is better than or equal to," and "is no less preferable than" are used here to indicate relationships. It is now necessary for transitivity that ai ak. Put differently, if option j is at least as desirable as option k and if option i is as least as desirable as option j, then alternative i must also be at least as desirable as option k. Transitivity, for instance, implies that you also feel that beer is no less desirable than water if you feel, for example, that beer is no less preferable than milk and that milk is no less preferable than water.

CONCLUSION

Political economics' determination of the voter's choice connection draws attention to the complexity of voting behavior in democracies. Non-economic elements like ideology, party affiliation, and social identity also have a big impact on voters' choices, even if economic issues still matter a lot. These variables interact in a complicated way that changes depending on the situation and voting system. In order to predict election results and create successful electoral tactics, political parties, legislators, and analysts must have a thorough understanding of the mechanics of voter choice. Furthermore, in order to more accurately represent the varied preferences and interests of voters, this study emphasizes how crucial it is to address both economic and non-economic issues in political campaigns and policy-making processes.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Grover, A. K. Kar, Y. K. Dwivedi, and M. Janssen, “Polarization and acculturation in US Election 2016 outcomes – Can twitter analytics predict changes in voting preferences,” *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2018.09.009.

[2] A. Qureshi, D. Megías, and H. Rifa-Pous, “SeVEP: Secure and Verifiable Electronic Polling System,” *IEEE Access*, 2019, doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2897252.

[3] J. Kleinnijenhuis, J. van de Pol, A. M. J. van Hoof, and A. P. M. Krouwel, “Genuine effects of vote advice applications on party choice: Filtering out factors that affect both the advice obtained and the vote,” *Party Polit.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/1354068817713121.

[4] J. A. Elkink, S. Quinlan, and R. Sinnott, “Economic voting in EU referendums: Sociotropic versus egocentric voting in the lisbon treaty plebiscites in Ireland,” *Polit. Gov.*, 2019, doi: 10.17645/pag.v7i2.1944.

[5] B. Grofman, “Political Choices In One Dimension: Applications,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Public Choice: Volume 1*, 2019. doi: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190469733.013.9.

[6] V. Peresada, “The Role of the Party Press in the Electoral Process and Political Communication (Based on the Example of the 2012 Parliamentary Campaign),” *Sci. notes Inst. Journal.*, 2019, doi: 10.17721/2522-1272.2019.75.8.

[7] D. Kempe, “Communication, distortion, and randomness in metric voting,” in *AAAI 2020 - 34th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v34i02.5582.

[8] S. M. Utych, "A voter-centric explanation of the success of ideological candidates for the U.S. house," *Elect. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.electstud.2020.102137.

[9] R. H. Pildes and G. M. Parsons, "The Legality of Ranked-Choice Voting," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3563257.

[10] G. Manikandan, G. Anandaraju, and B. Karthikeyan, "A Candidate Aware Internet Voting System for Indian Scenario," in *2020 6th International Conference on Advanced Computing and Communication Systems, ICACCS 2020*, 2020. doi: 10.1109/ICACCS48705.2020.9074158.

CHAPTER 4

INVESTIGATION OF ECONOMIC MAN UNDER ATTACK SCENARIO

Dr. Syed Kazim, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.syed_kazim@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
This research explores the idea of the "Economic Man" under assault scenarios, examining the behavior of economic actors in the face of different threats including financial fraud, economic espionage, and cyberattacks. The study looks at how these dangers affect economic players' capacity to make logical decisions, maximize profits, and maximize utility. The paper analyzes the Economic Man model's vulnerabilities to various attack vectors using theoretical models and empirical data, and it proposes ways to reduce risks and improve the resilience of economic systems.

KEYWORDS:

Cyberattacks, Economic Espionage, Economic Man, Financial Fraud, Rational Decision-Making.

INTRODUCTION

A few rather easy requirements, be regarded as utility maximization. In other words, individuals who behave in a way that reflects their preferences and whose preferences are represented by full and transitive preference relations behave as if they are trying to maximize their utility function's value. There is a contention that individuals often fail to prioritize optimizing their own benefits. Instead, they want to ensure the greatest possible result for their loved one's kids, dogs, etc. Thus, the argument says, the economic man model is certain to fail for the simple fact that it only applies to a relatively narrow range of situations, namely the exchanges between economic players. This argument, which takes many different forms in the literature, is founded on a misinterpretation of thin rationality as it applies to the whole range of human activity what someone could desire to maximize profit or riches, for example [1], [2]. Money is not always the best way to quantify utility. Person 2's declared or expected satisfaction or pleasure under such outcomes may very well be a condition of Person 1's choice for those outcomes or the activities leading up to them. As a result, in a variety of scenarios, the argument of person 1's utility function may consist of a variable or collection of variables that have little to nothing to do with person 1's income or welfare level [3], [4].

Therefore, the critique of the rational choice theory that links egoism with rationality is misguided. More substantial criticism of the theory essentially stems from studies claiming to demonstrate that rational individuals generally depart from the theory's predictions in a methodical manner. Stated differently, it is reasonable to anticipate that there will be regular departures from EU or SEU maximization in certain sorts of situations. Furthermore, the variances appear to make intuitive sense in addition to being very prevalent. The inclusion of the idea of utility and the theory of declining marginal returns—the higher the current utility level, the less the utility rise that follows a given payout increase—are crucial in addressing the St. Petersburg dilemma. For instance, progressive income taxes is based on this theory, which states that at higher income levels than at lower ones, a given amount of income loss results in a lesser loss of utility. To put it another way, utility is not always linear in terms of money. The worth of an extra euro is quite high if one is really impoverished, but it diminishes as wealth

increases [5], [6]. As a result, the utility vs income curve is often concave upward. From top to bottom, the projected payment values rise (from value $1.46 to $1.83). In his experiments, Tversky (1969) discovered that a significant portion of his subjects behaved as follows: when faced with adjacent pairwise choices, they favored the prospect with the higher maximum value (and smaller expected payout); however, when faced with a comparison of the extreme prospects, they favored the one with a higher probability of winning (and higher expected value). One may, for instance, point out specific behaviors, such as favoring the first prospect over the second, the second over the third, the third over the fourth, the fourth over the fifth, and, in spite of everything, the fifth prospect over the first. As a result, these participants had intransitive preference relations.

However, the action is not inherently illogical. The little difference in probability, as opposed to the widely discernible payout differences, may be used to explain why the higher prospect in the subsequent comparisons ultimately prevails over the lower one. But when the possibilities go further away, the equation also takes into account the likelihood differences. Consequently, the fifth potential offers an almost 50% chance of winning anything. Certain important characteristics of behavior patterns under risk are explained by the prospect theory. Specifically, it explains the unique "treatment" choices with specific payouts get in decision behavior. In a similar vein, this theory makes the impacts of choice framing very evident. Prospect theory may be seen as an effort to refine EU maximization, in the same way that utilities were introduced to explain certain oddities, including the St. Petersburg paradox.

The utility values of alternatives, according to prospect theory, are relative in a significant way. In other words, the usefulness of an option depends on the decision-maker's frame of reference. She is likely to show risk aversion if she views an alternative as a gain relative to her current standard of living, but she will take risk if she is facing losses. One may shift the decision maker's reference point by presenting a dangerous scenario in a variety of ways, which helps make decisions that would otherwise be blatantly contradictory make sense [7], [8]. This is comparable to altering the EU values of options by accounting for the benchmark against which the options are assessed.

Despite this, there is a basic resemblance between prospect theory and EU maximization: in both scenarios, the decision behavior is described in terms of something related to the available alternatives.

The possibilities are thought to have an attribute that influences decisions; call it Nonetheless, the prospect theory is unable to explain some decision behaviors that go counter to EU maximization. Among such patterns, there is a significant class of behaviors that seem to condition decisions not just on reference points but also on the available possibilities. Stated differently, there are scenarios where decisions seem to be influenced by both the characteristics of the alternatives and the availability of alternative options. Context-dependence has been noted in consumer choice trials, for instance [9], [10].

Although they are often used in politics, compromise solutions may also be found in other group decision-making scenarios. For example, when choosing a departmental secretary, certain academics may place more emphasis on an applicant's linguistic proficiency, while others may value their ability to comprehend material. It is not hard to picture a situation in which three candidates, X, Y, and Z, are positioned in a two-dimensional space, with the vertical axis denoting the applicant's degree of text-processing method expertise and the horizontal axis reflecting their language proficiency. It's possible that Z's odds of winning are higher than Y's when X is there than they would have been if X hadn't applied. Given that Z is not the poorest candidate on any dimension, the existence of X among applicants may draw

attention to the language skills component. X and Y are both: X on the level of text-processing abilities and Y on the dimension of linguistic competence. The key inquiry, however, is whether or not the decisions that make up the asymmetric dominance effect and compromise are rational decisions.

The main problem is not that these decisions make intuitive sense in certain situations. Instead, the question should be: Is it ever reasonable to choose a "compromise" option? In a similar vein, is it ever reasonable to choose, out of two options, the one that predominates a third as long as the other one does not? It seems that "no" must be the response to both queries. It just does not follow that such decisions would always be appropriate, even while there are situations in which they might be justified as reasonable. Assume that in the scenario shown in Figure 4.3, the vertical dimension (let's say) reflects a feature that is critical to the chooser's success and the horizontal dimension (let's say) represents a quality that is essentially meaningless. Using the scenario from before, let's say that the academic secretary works in an English-speaking community and will solely be doing text-processing duties. In many situations, language proficiency is mostly unnecessary for the work at hand.

DISCUSSION

The ones that were the most dramatic were discussed above. How seriously does the position of Homo economicus now be undermined by all these other anomalies? There is disagreement among academics on this. The effects challenge the basic rationality assumption's descriptive and predictive power to the degree that they are systematic. That being said, normative relevance is a different story. The money pump argument is true even when individuals consistently break, say, the transitivity axiom in certain dangerous situations; that is, these people lose money regardless of how the conditioning events turn out. Therefore, it is possible to contend that persistent breaches of rationality are features of experimentation that do not exist in everyday life. Error-prone behavior would be eliminated by learning from errors. However, a few effect patterns occur often.

The examination of the general circumstances under which they arise is warranted by their ubiquity, rather than dismissing them as insignificant oddities. According to the latter, the environment may be passive in some ways but has the ability to change without the decision-maker's knowledge. But it's expected that one should neither predict nor respond to the latter's decisions. It isn't even considered to take precedence over states that originate from the decision maker's decisions or its own. It is believed to be a non-strategic entity in a nutshell. Obviously, this does not apply to many political economic contexts. It is unrealistic for entrepreneurs to think that businesses that are already established in a certain industry won't notice them when they enter it. Typically, political leaders intentionally create their campaigns to draw in new members from rival parties' ranks.

A crucial component of their designs are the representations of the latter. In fact, nearly every intentional action that has any bearing on political economy occurs in a strategic setting, which is defined by a number of purpose-driven actors who are conscious of one another's existence and the fact that their interactions determine the results. One of the most useful techniques for accurately simulating strategic settings is game theory. The UN uses a system in the election of the Secretary to make sure that no voter chooses her worst option to be chosen. Allowing every voter to veto a candidate is one approach to ensure that this won't occur. Assume that the US exercises its veto power over one of the nominees first.

The winner is the one who is left after the African coalition has the option to reject one of the contenders. Let's use the initials A for Ann, B for Boutros-Ghali, and H for Harlem Brundtland to represent the US options. The options available to the African coalition are represented by

the columns of the matrix, whilst the rows of the matrix show the US's choices. The terms "rows" and "columns" refer to tactics in game theory. Acts and strategies are sometimes distinguished from one another, with the former representing simple behavioral alternatives and the latter representing more complex acts. Examples of these distinctions include rules governing the selection of acts under different conditions and the results that arise from the US, or row player in this game, selecting one of its available acts and the African coalition, or column player, selecting one of its available strategies.

The entry at the intersection of row B and column BHA, for instance, represents the effect of the US vetoing B and the coalition adhering to strategy BHA, which stipulates that vetoing H is required in the event that the US vetoes B. Given that both B and H have been rejected, the result is A. Now, in row B's column BHA, one may put A instead of 0. This would simply show the outcomes of the players' decisions, not the significance of those decisions to the participants. This would be a very fair description of the option scenario if we are concerned in the choices' results rather than their worth to the participants. Then, instead of dealing with a game, we would really be dealing with a game form. A game is different from a game form because it includes information on the values of the outcomes. There would be no incentive to adopt any other strategy if there was one that would allow a player to get her greatest result regardless of the other player's decision. This tactic would eliminate strategic ambiguity in addition to guaranteeing the player her best result. Such a tactic would very certainly be chosen by a logical player. in four more columns. Whether option A or option B is selected, the results in the two columns are the same. Now when we are looking at rows A and H, we arrive to a similar conclusion: although rows H perform better in two columns, rows A provide a superior result for the US in four. The US payoffs are the same in both columns. The third US strategy pair, B and H, operates in a similar way. Here, however, we can see that while both techniques provide the same results in two columns, B outperforms H in six of them. Thus, B somewhat predominates over H in the wording.

As a result, the response to the question of what course of action would be best for the US is a little disappointing: it would rely on the African coalition's decision. However, because strategy B marginally outperforms strategy H, we may conclude that the latter is not the optimal course of action for the US. Now let's examine from the coalition's perspective. We can now provide a more thorough response. One of the two left-most tactics is clearly better when compared to the other: Whichever option the US chooses, BAA offers the coalition at least as much as BAB. Additionally, BAA offers a reward that is not just as high as BAB but strictly greater than BAB for one particular US option. In terms of game theory, this indicates that BAA has a little advantage over BAB. However, we can do more than just declaring that the alliance will favor BAA over BAB. In other words, one technique marginally outperforms the others.

This is an HHA tactic. It is without a doubt the best choice since it is the coalition's primary tactic. Similar to decision theory, this recommendation is based on a pairwise comparison of the various approaches using a uniform criterion to identify the pairwise winner. The option that comes out on top when weighed against all the others ought to be selected. Later on, this instinctive idea of what makes the ideal decision would come up more times. The prevailing approach advises the coalition to veto Brundtland in both situations when the US vetoes Annan and when it vetoes BoutrosGhali but to veto Annan in the first instance. Considering the coalition's inclinations and especially its perception of Brundtland as the least desirable choice, this makes perfect sense.

The one that comes from backward induction and the elimination of dominated strategies in matrix form. At this point, it seems sense to inquire about their relationship. As was said in the section above, the coalition's primary strategy is HHA, while the US's major alternative is B in

opposition to this approach. As a result, the players that use the dominating tactics play B and H, which leads to the outcome of Ann. By using backward induction, we can see that the US essentially needs to pick between (−1, 1) and (0, 0), taking into consideration the coalition's views for the ultimate results. The latter, which comes from its selection of B, is obviously better. When the alliance choose H and the US selects B, the reverse induction result is thus attained. Therefore, we arrive to the same recommendations for players that use backward induction and dominating methods.

This proves to be accurate in really broad circumstances. It goes without saying that the process of backward induction "survives" if one of the players has a dominating strategy. Therefore, using any of these methods yields the same results. Thus far, game analysis has not been all that different from common reasoning: if a strategy produces results that are superior than those of any rival under any conditions, then it makes sense to adopt it. Similar to this, it makes logical to believe that an opponent would choose a plan if it ensures her the best result in every situation. This is not to suggest that it would always be simple to identify dominating tactics. In fact, there may be a wide range of options, like in stock market trading. All that can be said, however, is that it makes sense to choose the distinct dominating approach when one exists.

The company may choose to either cheat or play by the rules, but the competition authority has the option to look elsewhere or put the company through a special audit. The payoffs are represented as utility quantities, with the capital letters denoting the authority's utilities and the lowercase letters denoting the firm's. Assume for the moment that lying is lucrative while done unseen but expensive when detected. As a result, $b > a$ and $c > d$. Assuming that the examination is costly, it makes sense if the company is engaging in dishonesty.

Put otherwise, $D > B$, while $A > C$. It is evident that if each player may choose just one of the two tactics, there are no Nash equilibria under these circumstances, which are typical of pursuit-evasion games in general.22 In other words, if the result of "play fair, overlook" is considered, it becomes evident that the company would benefit more from lying if it knew that the authorities would not interfere. Therefore, a Nash equilibrium cannot exist here. The result of "cheat, inspect" may also not be that, since the company would benefit more from acting fairly if it knew that a particular audit would be conducted. Because the company has an incentive to depart from both outcomes along the major diagonal of the reward matrix—as long as the authority selects the methods that lead to those outcomes—they are not equilibria. In a similar vein, there are no equilibria for the off-diagonal outcomes (b, B) and (c, C). In these circumstances.

The fact that the extended form representation is, in a sense, more informative than the matrix form provides the foundation for the concept of subgame perfection. In game trees, or extended forms, move sequences in particular are portrayed more transparently than in strategic forms. Subgame equilibria represent the common-sense maxim that rules that require illogical conduct under certain conditions should not be accepted. The unacceptable aggressive, keep out Nash equilibrium and the chain store game highlight another factor that is crucial in figuring out what behaviors are allowed in games. In other words, the chain shop would be better off deciding against the aggressive approach should the rival decide to join, which is the premise upon which this Nash equilibrium is eliminated. The chain store's approach is coupled with the competitor's stay-out strategy in the Nash equilibrium strategy pair, however. It is thus rather surprising that the game has led to the node that adopts the competitor's chosen entrance technique. It is illogical to use the equilibrium strategy pair. This means that it is assumed that an irrational opponent would not always respond to a reasonable tactic used against a rational player.

The issue of whether it is reasonable to presume that one's opponent is rational arises from this line of thinking. Generally speaking, common sense would indicate that it isn't. It is reasonable to take into account the chance that one's opponent is not rational with probability 1, particularly in scenarios where the players make errors in decision-making, recognizing the states of the environment, and have only partial knowledge of the game. This proposes an equilibrium notion known as the trembling-hand perfect equilibrium, which is intimately connected to the subgame perfect equilibrium. Two of the most well-known variations of the Nash equilibrium theory are the subgame perfect and trembling-hand perfect equilibria.

They each reflect an effort to address what seems to be the Nash equilibrium's fla namely, that it is too liberal in accepting possibilities that are intuitively improbable. Retaining the attractive characteristics of the Nash equilibrium while including additional desirable traits to exclude certain Nash equilibria is the aim of further improvements.

We won't talk about any further improvements. Predicting future events or making sense of past events in social interactions portrayed as games is the fundamental goal of the Nash equilibrium, all of its modifications, and other solution ideas. Equipped with fundamental notions for solving games, we proceed to discuss specific game kinds that have played and now play a significant role in game theory applications.

The significance of game theory in political economics today is determined by what game-theoretical analysis can provide to our comprehension of these crucial game settings. different game genres simultaneously. However, there is a noticeable distinction between non-zero-sum and zero-sum settings or, more accurately, between circumstances in which these fundamental game types are the most suitable models. While some strategy combinations may result in at least some shared losses or profits in non-zero-sum settings, in zero-sum settings the players simply extract payoffs from each other.

The classification of non-zero-sum games as ones with mixed motives stems from the sheer potential of shared benefits or losses. Non-zero-sum two-player games are a very diverse class of games; they may occur in highly conflictual environments or in pure coordination situations. Actually, since these games are so heterogeneous, there is a growing body of research that focuses more on specific game types than on the common characteristics of non-zero-sum environments. 2 x 2 games are two-player games in which each player has two tactics. There are a total of 78 distinct 2 x 2 non-zero-sum ordinal games, meaning that the payoffs in each game are only ordinally significant and that the games vary from one another in terms of the players' strategic uncertainty. Put differently, if players may strictly order the four possible outcomes, then there are 78 strategically distinct games

In order to clarify the last argument, let's first explain what a Pareto improvement or shift from one result to another is. It is a modification that raises the payout for at least one player without lowering the payout for the other players.27 Because adopting the cooperative approach results in a reward of 3 for both players rather than 2 for them, the change in the PD from the equilibrium outcome to that which comes from both players taking that course is thus a Pareto improvement.

If there are no feasible Pareto improvements from the result, then it is Pareto optimum. To put it another way, any change in strategy that results in a Pareto optimum outcome lowers the payout for at least one participant.

The PD provides a fairly succinct illustration of the tension between individual and group reason. The PD illustrates how these two may not always be consistent, if the former is taken to mean that the dominant strategy must be chosen whenever there is a choice and the latter to

mean that Pareto optimality must be met. In fact, the tension that exists between these two schools of thought is as extreme as it gets. To put it another way, we may see from the PD matrix form that there are three Pareto optimum outcomes, or all the possible outcomes that arise from choosing the cooperative approach by at least one participant.

The Assurance game has sometimes been seen as an appropriate representation of a scenario prior to the adoption of a shared weight, length, or value standard. Respecting a recognized standard lowers transaction costs and facilitates trade partner communication. On the other hand, the consequences are worst for the conforming party and best for the defector if one's spouse turns out to be a non-conformist. For all parties, the situation in which no norm is set is the worst possible. Of course, playing the Assurance game as a group activity game is also an option. However, in this instance, the norm or standard's widespread acceptability is highly prized. The Assurance and Chicken games show how assessing one's opponent's perceived level of reason plays a significant role in choosing the optimal game plan. Playing D is the most profitable course of action if it can be assumed that the opponent is reasonable in the sense that they are attempting to avoid the worst possible result in Chicken. On the other hand, C is the wise course of action to take if there is a good possibility that the opponent will play D despite the potential implications. The best course of action in Assurance is to make the same decisions as your opponent. She plays C, which indicates that it is the optimal reaction, if her goal is to get the biggest payout. She chooses D because it is the ideal response if her goal is to maximize the security level reward. The lowest payout connected to any method is called the security level.

CONCLUSION

The examination of Economic Man under Attack scenarios highlights the vulnerability of conventional economic models in the face of contemporary risks and difficulties. Financial fraud, cyberattacks, and economic espionage may all interfere with economic actors' ability to make logical decisions, which can result in less-than-ideal results and systemic weaknesses. Policymakers, companies, and academics need to take proactive steps to improve cybersecurity, fortify regulatory frameworks, and raise public knowledge of possible risks in order to solve these problems. Societies can strengthen the defenses against changing threats to economic systems and maintain the integrity of the Economic Man model by combining ideas from risk management, economics, and cybersecurity.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. N. Hellmich, “Social psychological aspects of ‘making’ economists: A review of the nature versus nurture debate,” *Citizenship, Soc. Econ. Educ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2047173420908068.

[2] F. Mhando *et al.*, “Microfinance and Peer Health Leadership Intervention Implementation for Men in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania: A Qualitative Assessment of Perceived Economic and Health Outcomes,” *Am. J. Mens. Health*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1557988320936892.

[3] L. Chai and M. Maroto, “Economic Insecurity among Gay and Bisexual Men: Evidence from the 1991–2016 U.S. General Social Survey,” *Sociol. Perspect.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0731121419849100.

[4] M. Lafferty and K. H. Maher, “Transnational intimacy and economic precarity of western men in northeast Thailand,” *J. Ethn. Migr. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/1369183X.2020.1711571.

[5] Y. Ma, M. A. Koondhar, S. Liu, H. Wang, and R. Kong, "Perceived value influencing the household waste sorting behaviors in rural China," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17176093.

[6] K. Manji, L. Heise, and B. Cislaghi, "Couples' Economic Equilibrium, Gender Norms and Intimate Partner Violence in Kirumba, Tanzania," *Violence Against Women*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1077801219895331.

[7] K. V. Monroe, "Masculinity, migration, and forced conscription in the Syrian war," *Cult. Anthropol.*, 2020, doi: 10.14506/ca35.2.08.

[8] L. Lebedeva and A. Sorokina, "Homo economicus evolution: from economic to social man," *Ìstorìâ Nar. Gospod. ta Ekon. dumki Ukraïni*, 2020, doi: 10.15407/ingedu2020.53.127.

[9] P. Wändell, A. C. Carlsson, X. Li, D. Gasevic, J. Sundquist, and K. Sundquist, "The association between sociodemographic characteristics and dementia in patients with atrial fibrillation," *Aging Clin. Exp. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s40520-019-01449-3.

[10] T. Bosqui *et al.*, "Antipsychotic medication use among working-age first-generation migrants resident in Finland: An administrative data linkage study," *Scand. J. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1403494819841960.

CHAPTER 5

AN ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMITIVE COMMUNAL MODE OF PRODUCTION

Dr. Uma C Swadimath, Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.uma_swadimath@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Man arose from these distant predecessors after a very lengthy evolution that includes many transitional phases. One of the biggest shifts in the evolution of nature was the appearance of humans. The traits, historical relevance, and effects of the archaic communal system of production on human cultures are all examined in this paper. Primitive communalism's economic, social, and cultural dynamics are examined in this study, with particular attention paid to the lack of class divisions, communal work patterns, and common resource ownership. By using anthropological, historical, and economic viewpoints, the research clarifies how early human civilizations were shaped by basic communalism and establishes the foundation for comprehending later production methods.

KEYWORDS:

Collective Ownership, Communal Labor, Primitive Communalism, Production Mode, Social Organization.

INTRODUCTION

Science estimates that the Quaternary era of earth's history, which includes the emergence of man, lasted little less than a million years. An advanced species of anthropoid apes lived in parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa that were known for their warm, humid conditions. This pivotal moment occurred when the ancestors of man started creating labor-intensive tools. Although tools are the most basic of human inventions, the creation of them marks the beginning of the essential distinction between man and animal. It is well known that apes would often use a stick or stone to protect themselves from harm or to knock fruit off trees. However, not a single animal has ever produced even the most basic tool. The circumstances of their everyday existence compelled the ancestors of man to create tools [1], [2]. They learned from experience that sharpened stones may be used to hunt animals or to defend against attacks. Stone tools were fashioned by the ancestors of man by pounding one stone against another. In this sense, the process of creating implements got underway.

Labor starts when the tools are made. The anthropoid ape's forepaws were transformed into human hands via labor. This is shown by the remains of the ape-man, a step-in evolution from ape to man, that archaeologists have discovered. Although the ape-man's brain was far smaller than that of a human, his hand was already quite similar to a human's. It follows that the hand is both a tool and a byproduct of labor. An more upright walk was acquired by the ancestors of man as hands became free for labor-intensive tasks. The final shift to an upright walk occurred after the hands were busy with labor, and this was crucial in the creation of man. The early men also lived in herds, as did their predecessors who before man. However, a relationship via labor developed amongst mankind that was not present in the world of animals and could not exist there. Men worked together to make the tools and then used them together. As a result, the evolution from the zoological to the social state was accompanied with the birth of human society [3], [4].

Well-spoken discourse emerged as a result of men's shared labor. Language serves as a tool for men to interact with one another, share ideas, and come to mutual understanding. The continual and essential need for idea interchange is that without it, humankind's joint actions in the face of natural forces and social production itself cannot exist. Language growth and thinking development are intimately related. Man's sensory organs were refined and his circle of sensations and concepts extended throughout labor.

In the prehistoric era, man was entirely reliant on his natural environment and was burdened by the challenges of life and his conflict with the natural world. Because the tools of labor were so archaic, learning the fundamental forces of nature progressed very slowly. Roughly cut stones and sticks were the first tools used by humans. The rod, the stone, and his extended arm all resembled artificial extensions of his body organs.

Men lived in groups of no more than a few dozen, since a larger single number would not have been able to sustain themselves. Clashes sometimes broke out between groups when they came together. Numerous parties were devoured by wild animals or died of starvation. Men's common labor was their sole option for employment under these circumstances and was also a need [5], [6]. Primitive man survived for a very long period primarily via hunting and collecting food, which were done cooperatively with the use of the most basic tools. What was acquired together was eaten together. Because of the instability of the food source, cannibalism happened among prehistoric man. Over countless thousands of years, humans gradually gained the ability to create the most basic tools for tasks like striking, cutting, digging, and other basic tasks that nearly depleted the entire realm of production. It was as though they were fumbling their way through an incredibly slow accumulation of experience. For prehistoric man, the discovery of fire represented a significant success in his battle with nature. Men first discovered how to utilize fire, which had developed naturally. They saw forest fires, volcanic explosions, and lightning striking a tree.

The fire, which had happened by accident, was lengthy and well-maintained. It was not until many thousands of years that man discovered how to make fire. Men discovered that friction was the source of fire and learnt how to create it as a result of more sophisticated tool manufacturing.

With the discovery of fire and its use, humans gained control over certain elements of nature. At last, prehistoric man had separated from the animal kingdom, marking the end of his protracted transition into a human being. The circumstances of man's material existence were drastically altered with the discovery of fire. First, the ability to utilize fire to make food expanded the range of edible items accessible to humans. Meat, fish, starchy roots, tubers, and other foods could all be consumed thanks to fire. Second, ire started to be used extensively in the creation of the tools of production. Furthermore, it provided shelter from the cold, which allowed humans to disperse across the majority of the planet. Fourthly, fire provided protection against untamed animals [7], [8].

Hunting continued to be the primary source of survival resources for a considerable amount of time. It gave men access to flesh, bones for making implants, and skins for clothing, all of which had an impact on the evolution of the human body overall and the brain in particular. As man's physical and mental abilities developed, he was able to refine his tools. A hunting stick was one with a sharpened end. He then started attaching the stick to the sharpened stones. There were stone-tipped spears, stone axes, knives, scrapers, harpoons, and fishhooks. The growth of fishing and the hunting of huge game were made feasible by these tools. Stone continued to be the primary material used to make implements for a very long period. The term "Stone Age" refers to the hundreds of thousands of years during which stone tools were the primary tool.

Man did not learn to produce metal tools until much later. Initially, he utilized native metal, first copper (though, being a soft metal, it was not often used to make tools), then bronze (an alloy of copper and tin), and then iron So, the Bronze Age came after the Stone Age, and the Iron Age after that.

Another significant advancement in the growth of society's productive forces was the invention of primitive agriculture. It was around this time when prehistoric man noticed grains sprouting on the ground as they were harvesting fruits and plant roots. Even though this went unnoticed for thousands of years, eventually prehistoric man made the link between these occurrences and started growing plants. Agriculture developed as a result. It stayed really archaic for a very long time. The ground was split up by hand, first with a straightforward staff and then a stick with a hooked end, known as a hoe. The seeds were dispersed throughout the muck that the river floods had thrown down in the river valleys [9]–[11].

DISCUSSION

The use of cattle for draught was made feasible by the domestication of animals. Later, when mankind discovered how to process metal, agricultural labor became more productive due to the introduction of metal tools. Tillage gained more stability. Early tribes started to settle down and have settled lives. But only one of them is flawless in the subgame. This requires the chain to collaborate and the rival to enter. Hence, for both players, the result of each game is 2. Assume that this game is being played in 20 different places sequentially, with the one we just looked at being the last one. Assume the rival chooses to participate. The chain may choose the option that offers the highest payout since it is the last game and need not consider any long-term effects of its decision. It is obviously cooperative. Given this knowledge, the competitor would be better suited selecting enter. In the final game, we so have (cooperate, enter).

Both players are aware of what will occur in the final, 20th game during the 19th game. Thus, the 19th game is essentially the last "undecided" game. By the same reasoning as before, it makes sense for the chain to collaborate and for the rival to join. Therefore, in terms of the result, even the 19th game is determined. This argument can now be followed back to the very first game, with the same conclusion: cooperating is the rational reaction, and entering is the competitively sensible thing to do. However, it is obvious that this is not rational for the chain. It receives a meager 40 in rewards across 20 games, which is obviously much less than it might earn. It may gain far more, especially if it was made known before to the first game that it would, at the very least, react forcefully to every player. Selten refers to this method of operation as the deterrence hypothesis.

Naturally, whether or not the other players are discouraged determines whether or not the deterrent is successful. In the event that they are not, the chain is left with the pitiful 4 that it received in the previous two cooperative games. This is just ten percent of what it would have received from the induction technique. The chain's ability to successfully use deterrence obviously relies on how credible its threat of aggression is, but there's another, more obvious factor to take into account: how effective the threat is.28

This rises in proportion to the absolute difference in the threatened player's payoffs between (i) complying with the threat and (ii) resisting it. The threat is more potent the greater the disparity. Conversely, the threat's credibility hinges on the impact that fulfilling it would have on the one making the threat. Let us say that in the chain store vs rival scenario, the chain store threatens to retaliate aggressively against any new competitor that joins the market. The effectiveness of the chain shop game's unique subgame perfect equilibrium, in which the chain cooperates and the competition enters, seems implausible, indicating that the game description could be lacking some important information. Rosenthal (1981) casts doubt on the viability of

presuming that prospective participants are aware of the chain's payout structure. Assume that a number of newcomers have been disappointed to learn that the chain shop reacts angrily rather than cooperatively to their entry. This experience would undoubtedly make it less likely for a new rival to believe that the chain would cooperate and that they should thus join. The rival will probably at some time wonder whether her presumptions about the rewards from the chain shop are accurate.

This finding is combined with the sequential equilibrium solution approach of Kreps and Wilson (1982b). This alteration necessitates changing the best course of action to follow, etc. Kreps and Wilson take into account the scenario where the competitors are up against a chain shop that is either weak or difficult. The payouts are where these two vary from one another. The tough chain prioritizes seeming competitive, while the weak chain does not. As a result, the chain will now favor aggressiveness over other strategies, and the rival would be better off remaining out. Throughout the simulation, the participants revise their perceptions of whether they are up against a strong or weak chain business.

Their ideal reaction is adjusted in line with that. The opponent's evaluations, the game history beliefs, and the selected tactics are all consistent when the game is in balance. The most widely used method for updating opponent beliefs comes from the Bayes theorem, which makes it possible to transform a priori probabilities into a posteriori one. The theorem provides a guideline for revising a probability estimate in response to new information. For the sake of illustration, let us imagine that a rival is aware, based on prior experience, that forty percent of chains who use aggressive techniques reach out to their best employees and provide attractive job offers to them within the chain. Although they only make up 10% of all cooperative chains, certain cooperative chains also carry out such activity. Previous data also shows that over 70% of the chains engage in fierce competition with potential rivals.

Let us identify the following events: A) the chain is difficult; that is, each player knows exactly what has transpired earlier in the game while making her decision; and B) the chain contacts the competitor's top staff with appealing employment offers. She is also aware of every outcome that might result from her decision, depending on the other player's decision. At least one information set in games with imperfect information is made up of many nodes.

In reality, games with insufficient knowledge are not games at all according to game theory.30 In other words, they lack some of the data required to build a strategy set for every participant and a payout function that outlines the rewards to each player based on the decisions made on their chosen course of action. In games with imperfect knowledge, we usually don't know about the preferences or beliefs of the players. The game's rules may also be unclear in various situations. The so-called Harsanyi transformation converts imperfect information games into ones with partial information. Asymmetric information distribution games are among the imperfect information games of particular interest in political economics. One player has information in certain games that the other player does not.

The details might concern the player's attributes (talents, values, attitudes, physical or mental toughness, etc.) or certain actions she has taken. For instance, you would undoubtedly be quite interested in an applicant's abilities, drive, and work habits if you were hiring a research assistant. However, it's conceivable that the application materials exclude some important information. Likewise, it is possible that some of the applicants for the position may already have accepted offers from other companies without your knowledge. Because the candidates perform more competently than you and are more aware of their own qualities, there is an asymmetry in the information dissemination. Asymmetric information games may not always correspond to incomplete information games. Let's imagine your buddy says she wants to go

to her vacation house in the middle of nowhere to escape the distractions of her job and complete the novel she has been working on for a while. She turns to you, the happy owner of a brand-new gadget, even if she doesn't possess a laptop. You two agree that she will give you $50 a week in exchange for the laptop. You are both aware of the characteristics and state of the computer.

When you make the agreement, you have no idea how cautious your buddy would be with your computer. She may give it back to you after a week, give you the $50 you committed to, and the computer might be in total disarray. Alternatively, after a few weeks, she could give your laptop back in pristine shape. Everything hinges on how carefully she has managed the computer. These kinds of environments are rather typical in daily life. We refer to them as moral hazard. Its two key components are that one person has more influence over the developments than the other and that both parties are aware at the time of the agreement that the final payoffs rely in part on future events. Insurance, shareholder and management interactions, and several other principal-agent games are instances of moral hazard. In these games, the principle, one player, appoints the agent, another, to help her with certain responsibilities. Hiring agreements inherently include a moral hazard since they are usually formed before the work is actually completed. There are sometimes two categories of moral hazard distinguished. On the one hand, there are scenarios in which players' attributes—such as their skill level or capacity to pick up new languages—are lacking information instead of their actions.

The principle is the former player, who did not know the agent to whom she assigned certain responsibilities when she signed the contract. The parties' ultimate payout is dependent on the agent's performance as well as, to the agent's knowledge, other elements that may not be known to the principal. A voter's engagement with her MP serves as an illustration of this in the parliament. Voters may have some knowledge of the principles and concerns that the MP, if elected, will represent in the legislature at the time of the election, but new topics will come up on the agenda as the term progresses. Voters are essentially unaware of the "type" of MP at election time as their perception of the MP's overall performance is mostly based on these unidentified concerns. This environment is almost identical to moral hazard. If the plan is rejected, there won't be any transactions; it will become the agency's budget. The budget is determined by the audit's findings if the committee chooses to send the agency for one. But the audit is expensive.

The closed process and the open procedure are taken into consideration. The committee is limited to the three options mentioned above in the former case. On the other side, it may make a counteroffer in the open method, which the agency may accept or reject. Banks demonstrates that there is a fundamental trade-off between fairness and efficiency in the closed method, with the cost of auditing dictating the trade-off under certain assumptions about the utility functions of the parties and variations in auditing costs. Efficiency loss might be the result of audits or no exchange. Both parties would lose money if there was no exchange, but the committee would obtain the same budget in the event of an audit—just without having to pay for the audit. The division of excess between the committee and the agency is referred to as equity. In the event where auditing expenses are extremely low, the committee keeps the full excess, but if auditing costs are considerable, the agency gains from exaggerated budget demands.

It turns out that the budget requests are meaningless when figuring out the agency's equilibrium budget when open process is followed. In fact, they play no part at all in providing information. Rather, the result is mostly dependent on the auditing expenses. Coincidentally, Banks demonstrates that in the equilibrium, the closed method is preferred over the committee We are working with comprehensive information games when all participants are aware of the tactics,

payoffs, and game regulations. Studying these games is beneficial because it allows us to concentrate on the fundamentals of strategic behavior, tactics, results, payoffs, and different solution ideas.

However, from the perspective of real-world application, the whole information games could be impractical. It is really a significant assumption to know someone else's choices, ideas about the acts that are open to her, or even her views on the causal process that links actions to outcomes. Thus, a number of factors might be at play when forecasts of results come to pass. First of all, the actors may just be illogical, which would mean that their actions would defy the rationality assumption's behavior expectations. Second, their interpretation of the interaction scenario could not match the analyst's. Specifically, the participants can think that the analyst's intended results are not what would happen as a result of the strategy decisions. Thirdly, the subjective values that the participants attribute to the outcomes could not match the analyst's payout calculations. Fourthly, there's a chance that the participants have a superficial or blatantly inaccurate understanding of one another's preferences and/or strategy sets. Put another way, there might be a variety of informational asymmetries at play, or there can just be insufficient information in the game.

Thus, there are several reasons why two-person game theory predictions don't work in actual games. In fact, it is uncommon to see the theory used in situations that are solely predictive. Game theory literature often discuss topics such as labor disputes, foreign wars, plea bargaining, and so on, but it is uncommon for the theory to be used to forecast unknowns. Instead, the theory serves as a standard by which empirical findings are assessed. As a result, one contrasts the interaction's result with other game solutions.

The theory's function is to explain rather than to forecast the facts. The theory offers a framework for evaluating and explaining past occurrences in terms of the objectives, choices, information, and convictions of the people involved.

It is instructive to understand the objectives and interests of both the US and Iraq, as well as their strategic choices and core convictions, in order to appreciate why the US and its allies attacked Iraq in the spring of 2003: The US had three strategic options: a full-scale invasion, limited-scope military actions, and a tightening of the economic blockade. The US's main priority, at least when it came to media coverage, was to combat terrorism and, more especially, the movement known as al Qaeda, which was thought to be behind the September 11 attacks on the US. The US held the fundamental view that Iraq was associated with al Qaeda and posed a danger to both the US and its strategic allies due to its efforts to develop and manufacture WMDs. Iraq's choices for strategy included working with the UN inspection teams, giving up by disarming some of its army, and destroying weapons development or plans. Similarly, one of the central tenets of Iraqism may have been that the US must set a much higher bar for war against Iraq than it did for an invasion of Afghanistan. Of fact, considering the US and Iraq as players is a great oversimplification given that both nations had a number of competing or mutually supporting political groups that may justifiably be classified as participants. However, it helps to see the national leaders as actors when analyzing the dispute at the level of the forces most directly engaged. This does not rule out the idea that different power brokers are engaged in a lower-level game of policy formulation inside both nations.

This everyday action gains a standard vocabulary and a set of analytic methods from game theory. Siebe describes meeting an ambassador who had participated in several international discussions and was highly respected by his colleagues as a result of his accomplishments in those conversations. Nevertheless, game theory was unknown to this diplomat. In a sense, the narrative tells. Similar to the individual who, for all his life, had been having conversations in

prose without understanding what the word meant, people apply game theoretic reasoning almost automatically without realizing that there may be an abstract theory that provides a broader explanation for why some negotiators succeed while others fail.

CONCLUSION

In order to make certain kinds of occurrences comprehensible, we often attempt to explain them by bringing up factors that, in the context of the players' choices, knowledge, beliefs, and tactics, made the event's occurrence unavoidable. The important function of the primordial communal method of production in human history and social evolution is revealed via investigation. Prehistoric communalism created the conditions for cooperative, egalitarian, and socially cohesive early human communities by encouraging communal resource ownership and cooperative work practices. Even if new production methods have appeared, studying ancient communalism is still essential to comprehending the roots of social structure and economic systems. Through an analysis of the fundamental ideas and workings of early communalism, researchers may learn more about the intricacies of human society and the historical development of production modes.

REFERENCES:

[1] F. Dawood, M. Anda, and G. M. Shafiullah, “Hydrogen production for energy: An overview,” *International Journal of Hydrogen Energy*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ijhydene.2019.12.059.

[2] E. Rauch, C. Linder, and P. Dallasega, “Anthropocentric perspective of production before and within Industry 4.0,” *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.cie.2019.01.018.

[3] P. C. Oostlander, J. van Houcke, R. H. Wijffels, and M. J. Barbosa, “Microalgae production cost in aquaculture hatcheries,” *Aquaculture*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2020.735310.

[4] G. V. Oddsson, “A definition of aquaculture intensity based on production functions-the aquaculture production intensity scale (APIS),” *Water (Switzerland)*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/w12030765.

[5] H. Warmelink, J. Koivisto, I. Mayer, M. Vesa, and J. Hamari, “Gamification of production and logistics operations: Status quo and future directions,” *J. Bus. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.09.011.

[6] Z. Kang, C. Catal, and B. Tekinerdogan, “Machine learning applications in production lines: A systematic literature review,” *Computers and Industrial Engineering*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.cie.2020.106773.

[7] R. Cioffi, M. Travaglioni, G. Piscitelli, A. Petrillo, and F. De Felice, “Artificial intelligence and machine learning applications in smart production: Progress, trends, and directions,” *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2020. doi: 10.3390/su12020492.

[8] B. Shanmugaraj, C. J. I. Bulaon, and W. Phoolcharoen, “Plant molecular farming: A viable platform for recombinant biopharmaceutical production,” *Plants*. 2020. doi: 10.3390/plants9070842.

[9] H. Ben Mahmud, V. H. Leong, and Y. Lestariono, “Sand production: A smart control framework for risk mitigation,” *Petroleum*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.petlm.2019.04.002.

[10] C. Durastanti and L. Moretti, "Environmental impacts of cement production: A statistical analysis," *Appl. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/app10228212.

[11] D. T. Zewdie and A. Y. Ali, "Cultivation of microalgae for biofuel production: Coupling with sugarcane-processing factories," *Energy. Sustain. Soc.*, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s13705-020-00262-5.

CHAPTER 6

BARGAINING AND COALITIONS IN POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Prof Minerva Das, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- minerva_das@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
In the framework of decision-making processes, this paper explores the meaning, workings, and results of bargaining and coalitions in political economics. The study looks at how coalitions and bargaining affect governance institutions, policy formation, and political dynamics. The study clarifies the tactics used by players in creating coalitions, making agreements, and pursuing their interests in political contexts by drawing on political science, economics, and game theory. The games for two players mentioned above are not cooperative. Stated differently, the underlying assumption is that the participants lack the capacity to bind themselves with respect to future strategic decisions.

KEYWORDS:

Bargaining, Coalitions, Decision-Making, Governance, Political Economics.

INTRODUCTION

The games for two players mentioned above are not cooperative. Stated differently, the underlying assumption is that the participants lack the capacity to bind themselves with respect to future strategic decisions. They could make declarations about intentions to use certain tactics, but these declarations are by nature non-binding. In many situations, binding obligations may be established during negotiations, deal-making, and bargaining. Put another way, once an agreement is formed under certain circumstances, the parties usually follow through on their commitments. For instance, in today's sophisticated labor talks, both sides are aware that they will have to deal with each other again in the not-too-distant future and that it would be counterproductive to back out of agreements made over the bargaining table [1], [2].

In different situations, there could be a body tasked with enforcing contracts that has the authority necessary to make sure they are followed. Therefore, it seems sense to research cooperative environments and reasonable conduct during protracted conversations. There are now five ideas on the table. Union 1 favors option number one because it promises a significant rise in pay along with improved job security and health insurance benefits. Union 2's plan, known as Alternative 3, calls for a little rise in pay together with a minor decline in benefits associated to the employment. Union 1 has offered Option 2 as a take-it-or-leave-it offer as soon as it seems that the bargaining window is closing and a strike is about to occur. This plan calls for a pay rise that is somewhat less than that of option 1 while maintaining current benefit levels for the duration of the contract [3], [4].

The negotiating set is made up of the results that meet both individual rationality and Pareto optimality. Each participant will get at least the same payout as the threat point if the negotiation set's outcomes are met. Furthermore, these results are Pareto optimum, meaning that raising one's own payout can only be accomplished at the expense of lowering the other player's payoff. The line segments r2 and 2s comprise the negotiating set. The region in two-dimensional space that meets the individual rationality requirement is defined by the horizontal and vertical lines that pass-through point q, the danger point. Individually rational payoffs are represented by outcomes that are above the horizontal and to the right of the vertical lines. The Pareto optimality criteria might further limit the individually reasonable region inside the

convex hull. At least one point along the line segments r2 and 2s dominates all outcomes within the region in a Pareto fashion. Stated otherwise, for any result x that falls within the quadrangular region qr2s, there exists an additional outcome on the two-line segments that provides a payment that is at least as high as x, and for at least one of the participants, strictly greater than x. It is evident that the negotiation set makes sense as a notion for solving two-person negotiating games. The fact that it offers a wide range of possible outcomes as solutions is its main flaw [5], [6].

The bargaining issue has given rise to several theoretical methods in an attempt to limit the number of possible answers. The Nash solution was the outcome of the first one. The Nash equilibrium, which deals with non-cooperative games, is unrelated to this. By placing limitations on results, or "axioms," the Nash solution to the bargaining issue may be achieved. One may look for additional limits that are mutually consistent and result in a manageable range of solution possibilities, just as individual rationality and Pareto optimality can be seen as limitations on conceivable outcomes. Nash demonstrates that there is a collection of these limitations that performs even better that is, it results in a special resolution of the bargaining dilemma. The technique that Nash uses is referred to as the axiomatic method. This has been widely used in several scientific fields, most notably in the measurement foundations in general and in the measurement of preference and probability in particular.

Pareto optimality is the first premise that we have previously come across. The independence of linear transformations is the second. It says that the solutions are linearly changed if the utility scales of the players are. Assume, for illustration purposes, that the participants' utility with monetary payouts is the same. When the values are stated in US dollars, let the point (x0, y0) represent the answer. Now convert the payouts into South African rand (linearly, i.e., multiply each amount by the same constant) and calculate the answer. Indicate it with (v0, w0). For linear transformations to be considered independent, the choices that result in the (x0, y0) outcome in the first scenario must be the same as those that lead to the (v0, w0) outcome in the second.

We refer to the third axiom as symmetry. It deals with solutions to symmetric games, meaning that if point (x, y) in the game indicates a potential result, then point (y, x) does as well. The symmetry axiom stipulates that in symmetric games, player payoffs from solutions must be the same, assuming q is on the diagonal. The fourth axiom—individual rationality is likewise well-known from the previous section. These four axioms describe a number of tenable solution theories. The Nash solution becomes unique when the next fifth one is added. The independence of irrelevant alternatives is the name given to this principle. It says that in the event that all other options were eliminated and the solution result is part of a subset of choice alternatives, then it should also be a solution. As an example, let's say that the participants bargain about how much money to put into a joint venture. The sums that are taken into consideration vary from $5,000 to $10,000. Assume that each participant must contribute a total of 7000 toward the answer. The answer should stay the same, i.e., 7000 from each, even if it turns out that one of the participants can only contribute between 5000 and 7000 due to the independence of irrelevant alternatives [7], [8].

When it comes to finding the Nash solution in a particular two-person bargaining game, the axioms are not very helpful. The calculation formula is required. The distances between the threat point and Pareto optimum locations serve as its foundation. More precisely, the Nash solution finds the single position that maximizes the product of the horizontal and vertical distances from the danger point among the set of Pareto optimum possibilities. This makes obvious sense since player 1's (player 2's) payout in relation to the danger point increases with increasing horizontal (or vertical) distance. Let (q1, q2) be the threat point's coordinates, and

let S be the convex hull produced by the choice options. By supposing that player 1's maximum conceivable payout is far less than player 2's maximum payout—let's say one percent—the argument may be reinforced. In these conditions, it may appear irrational that the better-off player in the appropriate game obtains all she can at the Nash solution, while the worse-off player must settle for less than her (very modest) maximum [9]–[11].

DISCUSSION

Such considerations cast doubt on the irrelevant alternative axiom's independence. Inter-player payoff comparisons should not be taken into consideration when finding the solution, according to a clear counterargument, if the maximizing of the Nash product is considered desirable in the first place. If so, they ought to be presented as axioms. In fact, there are rivals to the Nash solution in the literature. All but one of the Nash axioms—that is, the independence of irrelevant alternatives has been maintained by the competing solution conceptions in the majority of situations. The constrained monotonicity axiom is used in lieu of the independence axiom in the Kalai–Smorodinsky solution. According to this axiom, the payoffs associated with the solution of the bigger game may not be less than those of the smaller game if the maximum possible payoffs for both players are the same in two games, one of which consists of a proper subset of the other game's outcomes. To put it another way, players' strategic possibilities are always increased without resulting in lower solution payoffs.

In order to get the Kalai–Smorodinsky solution for a two-player negotiating game, one must first determine the highest possible payout for each participant. Refer to these numbers as c1 and c2, in that order. The vertical and horizontal lines x = c1 and y = c2 are then drawn. They come join at (c1, c2). From this point to the threat point q, one then draws the line. The Kalai–Smorodinsky solution is located at the intersection of this line and the negotiation set. For obvious reasons, the point (c1, c2) is commonly referred to as the utopia point since it symbolizes the scenario in which both players get the best possible result. This is only possible in very rare situations, namely when the choice alternatives cover a quadrangular region on the convex hull. Therefore, utopia point is a suitable term in general. The arrows indicate the KS solution, which differs from the Nash solution in the correct game. To put it another, the independence of irrelevant alternative axiom is not satisfied by the KS solution. This example makes it impossible to verify that the KS solution fulfills the constrained monotonicity postulate since player 2's maximum feasible payoffs differ across the two games.

Equilibrium states are characterized by some degree of stability. When it comes to the Nash equilibrium, this essentially means that players' strategy decisions must be the optimal reactions to one another. Stability issues are also crucial in multi-player games, sometimes referred to as n-person games. The core and the stable set are the original solutions to n-person games. We need some conceptual equipment in order to outline them. In most multi-player games, the focus is on the alliances that players establish and how they divide rewards among themselves. Although these games sometimes deal with tactics other than coalition formation, the traditional solution ideas only address coalitions. There are typically two categories for multi-person or n-person games: those with transferable utility (TU) and those without (NTU). In the earlier kind of games, the rewards that a coalition receives are distributed arbitrarily among its members. The payoffs in NTU games are not randomly divided; instead, each coalition has implications that correspond to a predetermined payout distribution among coalition members. We're concentrating on the TU games. The characteristic function, usually represented by v(S), where S is a coalition that is, a unique set of players is used to characterize the n-person games. The function v, given any coalition S, represents the coalition's worth, value, or reward. It is something that players inside S (individuals or sometimes smaller groups of them) may distribute among themselves without regard to what other players that is, people

outside of S—do. N-person game theory's primary objective is to provide solutions for games that are specified in terms of characteristic functions. The coalitions that will form and how the participants will split the payment are also specified in the solutions. The assumption that the games under study are cohesive is often used, meaning that the value v(N) of the coalition made up of every player is greater than or equal to the total of the values of every coalition in every division of the player set N. A partition is the assignment of every player to a subset (coalition) that is exhaustive and mutually exclusive. The formation of a grand coalition including all participants is the means by which players may get the most value in cohesive games.

C and D cannot refute this objection. In response, they would have to hold onto their two OM positions individually, leaving just PM to be given to the lone coalition partner A. Assumingly, this is strictly less than what B gives A in her protest. As a result, B's complaint is unavailing. Given that there is an objection that cannot be overcome, we determine that D's proposal is not part of the negotiating set. Assume that C suggests BC as a two-party system, with C receiving three OM positions and B receiving the PM and one OM seat. Given that both parties may refute any issue, this falls under the negotiating set. For instance, if B protests by suggesting AB, which would give A two OMs and B the PM job, C may counter this by offering A the PM post which, presumably, provides A more than B's objection gives A and taking the four OMs for herself. One from the Finnish government formed after the 1999 and 2003 elections, and the other from the Danish cabinet formed after the 1957 and 1960 legislative elections.

The earlier table is taken from the book by Laver and Schofield (1990: 174). It is possible to somewhat alter the content of the negotiating set by limiting the objections and counter-objections to certain participants or coalitions. Laver and Schofield concentrate on payment distributions where every single player's (parties') objections in the possible cabinet co If a game has a unique solution, then the participants are aware of what they stand to gain and lose by participating in the game, assuming that the game is complete. For them, the game's worth consists only of the reward that results from the answer. It is challenging to use this idea to give values to games in general, however, because of the abundance of solution concepts for n-person games and the fact that many of them do not generally lead to distinct results. Nonetheless, attempts to clarify value notions have been in the literature on game theory since its inception.

It makes sense to describe the value of the game in two-person zero-sum game theory as the lowest payout that a player can unilaterally guarantee to herself. Naturally, this idea might also apply to n-person games if they were specified in terms of strategies, that is, by enumerating all possible player strategy combinations and the corresponding rewards. This approach, however, is ineffective if the games are specified in terms of the characteristic function that indicates the value of each coalition, as is usually the case. In a nation that produces cement, three businesses let's call them Big, Medium, and Small have created a short-lived cartel. They don't compete with anybody in the country or outside. According to the existing agreement, their respective incomes in millions of dollars are 32, 23, and 6. When it comes time to revise the cartel agreement, the company CEOs have made the decision to hire a third-party consultant to do an examination of the benefits and drawbacks of potential merger opportunities.

It goes without saying that combining two businesses would increase profits for the merging partners at the expense of the third firm. T Subsequently, a new partner enters the coalition and contributes to its worth once again. The procedure keeps on until every player has allied with the group. The value of the coalition before and after a new member join is the difference, which represents the contribution that each new member makes to the coalition's value. For instance, if business Big searches for merger partners and discovers Small first, the latter's

contribution is 45-30 = $15 million. A player might anticipate receiving more value from the coalition game the more value she contributes to different coalitions, making her a more valued partner overall.

What, however, dictates the order in which the coalition members ally with one another? Generally speaking, one would anticipate that partners would be sought out and discovered among one's closest friends, or among people who share one's beliefs on the matter at hand. This would logically translate into ideological closeness in politics. In corporate merger procedures, partners with similar perspectives on market trends, technical advancements, etc., are probably going to be sought for. It is hard to foresee which search principle will take precedence in the future, no matter how tenable such ideas may seem.

Shapley's innovation, therefore, is to consider any coalition sequence to be equally plausible rather than concentrating on the handful that are most likely. Table 6.4 provides a list of all merger sequences in our example, as well as the average contribution of each player to the game's characteristic function and the total contributions made by the players to each coalition. Instead, we are aware that certain players have the combined might to force their will on the other players. Legislative decision-making, for instance, is governed by established decision rules that specify which actors may effectively direct the substance of legislation. It is clear that anytime a coalition including more than a majority of voters is established, the coalition decides which legislative ideas may succeed if the decision rule specifies that the proposals are to be voted on using the simple majority method. Although it is difficult to assign a value to these coalitions, all of them are essentially equally strong since no other kind of alliance is able to pass legislation.

Each of the aforementioned indices is a unique a priori indicator of voting power. Put another way, they have more to do with expectations than real player control over the results. They show the potential outcomes of altering the decision-making criteria and voting weights under the assumption that every player (or nation) takes part in every vote. These indices focus on theoretical coalition building processes since the player coalitions that form in any particular time period are usually only known after the fact. The player's value contributed to each coalition she joins is the focus of the Shapley-Shubik and Banzhaf indices, which assign this value a weight based on the chance that the coalition would form in the first place. The power index ratings of players in similar games may vary due to variations in the weights across various indices. Both Holler's index and the Deegan-Packel index focus on unique coalition kinds, specifically minimally winning ones.

Other than that, the concept is the same as it is in the Banzhaf and Shapley-Shubik indices. based on the coordinate axes' values. Consider the level of economic competitiveness and the average annual income of the lowest-income decile of the population as examples of axes. The options being considered determine how the important variables (coordinate axes) should be interpreted; nevertheless, in the spatial voting models, these dimensions are assumed to be the same for every participant. Thus, points in the space may also be used to describe the participants in addition to different policy options. In other words, every player has an ideal point that symbolizes the optimal set of variable values for that player. The dimensions are independent as it is assumed that the space under study is Euclidean. Some ideas from two-person game theory are extended to a new realm of many actors in the theory of n-person games. Nevertheless, this comes at the expense of narrowing down the players' range of strategies to two options: either a person joins a coalition or they choose to remain outside of it.

This configuration may be made more widely so that every participant has access to a wider range of tactics than the limited set of joins or stay options. However, this makes the theory fundamentally more difficult. We will now focus on a particular category of n-person games where players are often expected to have a wider range of options. One of the main tenets of contemporary political economics is the theory of this class of games, namely the idea of voting. As we will see in a moment, voting may be compared to an n-person game in which voters have strategies at their disposal. These tactics, together with other voters' strategies and the voting rule, decide the electoral results. Jean-Charles de Borda and the Marquis de Condorcet were the pioneers of the modern committee decision theory, which is also referred to as social choice theory, group choice theory, and collective decision-making theory. They offered their fundamental discoveries, contradictions, and suggested solutions in pre-revolutionary France. Borda had a pragmatic, "engineering" style of thinking. Contrarily, one of the most influential social theorists of the Enlightenment was Condorcet. Although it has been suggested that the theory's roots were established much before that time. Borda and Condorcet's work seems to be the oldest that is still relevant today.

issued or a group of people who are to be proposed. Usually, there is a definite set A of choice alternatives or concerns. Frequently, it is limited and comprises just a few options. Nonetheless, there is a sizable body of research on decision-making scenarios in which every option is shown as a point in a multi-dimensional Euclidean policy space. On the other hand, we clearly have an endless number of options if each point in the space is thought of as a potential policy alternative. However, we will concentrate on non-spatial models in this book, and for an introduction to spatial theory, please refer to Enelow and Hinich (1984). It is expected that each committee member has a viewpoint on the issues up for decision. It is believed that member I's opinion is consistent in the sense that it may be expressed as a full, transitive binary preference relation Ri over A. We thus begin from the same place as in game and decision theory.

However, it is often recognized that people's views are not always constant. Of course, it would be worthwhile to look for methods that might provide positive results even when there were conflicting parties engaged. The challenge would be defining "good outcomes" without taking into account the viewpoints of those involved. We presume that the committee members are consistent in the meaning mentioned above in the absence of such a definition. It would be difficult to expect individuals to make consistent choices as a group if they are inconsistent. As a result, we presume that the collection of personal preferences is known.

We define a preference profile as the last term in our set of definitions. The decision is made by nine voters. Four candidates rate the candidates in order of main relevance for academic excellence: A, E, D, C, and B. These rankings are based on a comprehensive review of citation indexes and other relevant data. The following three voters only consider the candidates' ability to instruct. As a result, A, who excels in academic achievement, has the poorest record as an instructor. These find out to be adversely connected with it. The three voters ranked each application in the following order overall: BCEDA. (From here on, we'll just write preference rankings in the order of preference, dropping the symbols for succinctness.)

Lastly, two voters believe that the sole factor that matters for the current work is administrative expertise. After reviewing the resumes of the candidates, they come to the following conclusion: Assume that the department does not currently have a formal voting procedure. Instead, it is up to the voters to choose their preferred voting method. In this case, it turns out that five standard voting processes result in five distinct winning candidates, providing that the voters vote in accordance with their preferences. Put otherwise, any candidate may become the department chair, subject to the voting procedure.

CONCLUSION

In political economics, bargaining and coalitions are crucial because they are tools for power-sharing, consensus-building, and negotiation in political systems of government. Actors use strategic bargaining to obtain resources, promote their interests, and influence policy outcomes; coalitions, on the other hand, provide a way for groups to act together and have an impact on decision-making processes. Policymakers, academics, and practitioners may better navigate complicated political contexts, promote collaboration, and solve social issues via inclusive and collaborative ways by understanding the dynamics of bargaining and coalitions. Therefore, in order to improve our knowledge of political economics and develop useful governance measures, further study into the dynamics of bargaining and coalitions is still essential.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. Quick, "Radical Political Economics," *Am. Rev. Polit. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.38024/arpe.211.

[2] D. G. Taylor, "The political economics of cancer drug discovery and pricing," *Drug Discovery Today*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.drudis.2020.09.007.

[3] A. V. Timchenko and A. Timoshenko, "Digitalization in the understanding of philosophy, law, political science, and economics: an interdisciplinary approach," *Russ. J. Leg. Stud.*, 2020, doi: 10.17816/rjls46386.

[4] O. Mutlu, "Review of Classical Political Economics and Modern Capitalism: Theories of Value, Competition, Trade and Long Cycles by Lefteris Tsoulfidis and Persefoni Tsaliki," *World Rev. Polit. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.13169/worlrevipoliecon.11.2.0270.

[5] X. Yang and He Zongshu, "Basic Exposition of National Political Economy," *Glob. Econ. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.37256/ges.122020120.

[6] B. Akbulut and F. Adaman, "The Ecological Economics of Economic Democracy," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106750.

[7] M. R. I. Talukdar, "Examining the implications of classical budget theories in the local government budgeting process: Union councils in Bangladesh," *J. Local Gov. Res. Innov.*, 2020, doi: 10.4102/jolgri.v1i0.22.

[8] J. Guild, "The political and institutional constraints on green finance in Indonesia," *J. Sustain. Financ. Invest.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/20430795.2019.1706312.

[9] M. Van Vugt and C. R. von Rueden, "From genes to minds to cultures: Evolutionary approaches to leadership," *Leadersh. Q.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101404.

[10] E. Colonnelli *et al.*, "Long-term effects of teacher performance pay: Experimental evidence from India," *J. Public Econ.*, 2020.

[11] B. Brevini and F. Pasquale, "Revisiting the Black Box Society by rethinking the political economy of big data," *Big Data and Society*. 2020. doi: 10.1177/2053951720935146.

CHAPTER 7

EXPLORING THE PROCESS OF DESIGNING FOR ELECTIONS AND PUBLIC GOODS PROVISION

Dr. Pradeep Kumar R, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.pradeepkumar_r@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
This paper explores the several methods, elements, and concerns that are involved in the design process of electoral systems and mechanisms for the provision of public goods. The research explores how public goods provision mechanisms are created to maximize resource allocation and effectively meet societal needs, as well as how electoral systems are constructed to ensure fairness, representation, and accountability in democratic processes. It does this by drawing on political science, public administration, and design theory. The issues that arise while designing electoral systems are similar to those that were previously covered in relation to committee voting; however, there is sometimes a new task at hand, which is the creation of a multi-member representative body. Stated differently, there is an extra factor to take into account about the relationship between the elected officials' opinions and those of their constituents.

KEYWORDS:

Design, Elections, Public Goods, Provision, Process.

INTRODUCTION

The issues that arise while designing electoral systems are similar to those that were previously covered in relation to committee voting; however, there is sometimes a new task at hand, which is the creation of a multi-member representative body. Stated differently, there is an extra factor to take into account about the relationship between the elected officials' opinions and those of their constituents. The issue of selecting an election system is divided into two sections by Michael Dummett (1997) in his book Principles of election Reform. First of all, who or what parties ought to speak for the general public? Which election system, secondly, would most effectively ensure the intended distribution of elected officials and parties? He continues by claiming that the first question's solution is really much harder to figure out than one may first think. Moreover, the solution to the second issue is often very straightforward after the first one is resolved, even if it can call for the creation of new election systems. Dummett focuses on electoral reform, particularly the kinds of improvements that have been discussed throughout the years in the UK [1], [2].

But his research also highlights a crucial preliminary finding from the broader viewpoint of constitutional design: defining one's own requirements is crucial to creating institutions that behave rationally. Specifically, it is important to provide clear standards for assessing the suggested changes. Selecting the right institutions is a rather simple process once they have been established and prioritized. The challenges surrounding the establishment of such performance standards for political institutions will be covered in broad terms in the sections that follow. Of course, characteristics of effective and democratic institutions are of special relevance. We should make a few observations on the viewpoint from which we approach the institutions before delving into the specifics of those criteria [3], [4].

In some ways, our methodology is comparable to that used by the social philosophers of the tradition of the social contract. In other words, we will look for reasons for the institutional

arrangements that result from a "neutral" environment that comes before them in history. Practically speaking, this method is obviously impractical since institutional changes always occur within certain socio-political situations. That is, a status quo scenario that naturally serves as a foundation for comparison always comes before real-world scenarios requiring institutional design or transformation. Therefore, various sorts of changes usually favor particular player groups (interest groups, parties, ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities), while some others may suffer as a result. Because of this, the real-world institutional design scenarios resemble strategic games.

For instance, the United Kingdom's transition from the current first-past-the-post election system to a proportional representation system is probably going to result in parliamentary seat losses for both the Labour and Conservative parties. This hypothesis is predicated on the idea that the regional breakdown of support for each party in Britain stays mostly unchanged. All parties participating in the institutional design are presumed to be uninformed about the matters up for decision-making in the future, their own roles within the new institutional framework, their own capabilities, etc., hidden behind a curtain of ignorance [5], [6]. Certain institutional matters are amenable to abstracto discussion that is, without reference to a specific constitutional starting point. They address the different attributes that people would want to see in institutions, or the desiderata. T From an alternative vantage point, the expenses an individual bears while acting in a group rather than alone may also be used to support the majority rule.

There is no way for the person behind the curtain of ignorance to predict what types of matters would be discussed by the group that makes decisions collectively. She may, however, expect that certain choices made as a group will be detrimental to her interests and others would be beneficial. It goes without saying that the person wants to increase the likelihood of the latter choices and decrease the likelihood of the former. External costs are what Buchanan and Tullock refer to as the expenses incurred by the person as a result of their poor judgments. These so sum up the detrimental impacts of actions made by the group on an individual when they are against her interests. However, it is evident that the person is eager to support group choices that align with her interests. She pays for it in the process. We refer to them as decision-making expenses. Although each person's function has a different exact shape, the aforementioned qualitative characteristics make intuitive sense. Since the person has the right to reject any proposal that is in opposition to her interests, it is evident that the external costs are kept to a minimum when a motion needs unanimous support to succeed. Likewise, these expenses reach their maximum when the decision-making process is dictated by the smallest feasible group. When a person just has to convince one person to accept her proposition, there aren't many decision-making expenses [7], [8].

Regarding the first point, the main distinction is that real-world applications of collective decision making usually include more than two possibilities, sometimes even many more. This is because the majority rule is specified for just two alternative choice settings. Naturally, one may continue to behave as if the majority rule definition and the decision-making situation were the same. For instance, pairwise comparisons of alternatives serve as the foundation for the amendment process in many modern parliaments, with the winner of each comparison being decided in accordance with the majority rule definition. However, as shown by Condorcet's paradox, the result of this process could be basically random. McKelvey's theorem further demonstrates that when the majority rule fails, it fails totally in the sense that it is impossible to guarantee that the results will be even close to the optimal points for the voters [9], [10].

Using the amendment process is one method of applying the majority rule in a variety of different contexts. However, the one-person, one-vote principle often seen as the cornerstone of democracy might be a more well-known approach This concept states that each voter should only vote for one option out of numerous. Following the voting process, the option that has received the most votes overall is declared the winner. The plurality technique that was previously explained is this system. It is certainly possible for the plurality winner to get less than 50% of the vote when there are more than two options.

DISCUSSION

However, there's a chance that this obviously democratic process will clash with the majority principle from the previous section. In pairwise comparisons with other options, it is possible that the plurality winner is not always the best option. For instance, the British parliament's elections use the plurality system. One representative is sent to the parliament by each constituency. The plurality runoff systems are motivated by the possibility that the elected member may get less than 50% of the vote. When more than 50% of the votes are cast for one candidate, they operate just like the plurality system. In other situations, a runoff between the top two vote-getters is scheduled.

One of them will undoubtedly get the majority of votes. Thus, the runoff ensures that at least half of the registered voters have endorsed the elected candidate. In actuality, this alliance would control all societal decisions if it were to become a permanent coalition with 51% of the vote and the majority rule implemented. This outcome is undoubtedly very unfavorable when considering the majority rule as a representation of popular rule. It is common sense to believe that 51% of voters should make around 51% of the choices, not 100%. Thus, democracy seems to include the concept of proportionality. Majoritarian regimes are known to fail to provide proportionality. This was made clear in the 2000 US presidential election, when George W. Bush was elected president despite receiving less popular votes than Al Gore, his opponent. This type of result is entirely feasible under the US constitution since the Electoral College, which chooses the president while fairly representing the states, operates on the "winner-take-all" theory. As a result, every state's electorate casts their ballots for the candidate who has the support of the majority of the state's voters.

In actuality, Bush defeated Gore by 271 electoral votes to 267. Gore, however, earned around 300,000 more votes than Bush in the popular vote. Therefore, it was (and still is) possible to claim that Bush received "too few" votes to be declared the true victor of the race. The fundamental features of the US majoritarian system are overlooked in this argument. Even with a far reduced number of votes, Bush would still have prevailed. Since they did not boost Bush's electorate, all of the votes he obtained in those states where Gore earned the majority of the vote were, in a way, unnecessary. Similarly, all the votes that Bush obtained over the majority in those states were unnecessary since he would have still won all the electors in those states had they not been cast.

The single transferable vote (STV) method is used to elect collective bodies in some municipalities in New England, Malta, and Ireland. Members of parliament (MPs) are chosen from multi-member constituencies in the Irish parliamentary elections; however, the method may also be used in single-member districts. Under certain conditions, it's often referred to as Hare's system or the alternative vote. This was covered in the last discussion. Although STV isn't the only option, it is often considered the primary competitor of the first-past-the-post system in the United Kingdom. STV's comparatively high level of minority protection is one of its key benefits. Put differently, it ensures that, when working together, even relatively tiny voter minority may get representation in the elected bodies. tiny minority' ability to do this,

however, is based on the number of MPs elected from the constituency; the more MPs elected from a bigger district, the greater the likelihood that even tiny minorities will be represented.

STV functions as follows. Each voter is asked to rate the candidates in order that they are presented with. The preference profile that was utilized to determine the winners is the set of these rankings. Assume that the constituency we are interested in produces k Members of Parliament. The Droop quota, D, is defined as the lowest integer strictly greater than n/(k + 1), where n is the total number of voters in the constituency. This is the initial step in deciding the election outcome. The next step is to determine which candidates at least D voters have rated highest.

Candidates that fit this description are deemed elected. The number of candidates who may be proclaimed the winners is limited to k due to the rounding up process in the calculation of D. After the first count, the number of winners is often strictly smaller than k. The contender with the lowest number of votes cast is removed once the candidates who have received the highest ranking from at least D voters have been identified. This indicates that the candidates listed in second place on those ballot slips are the ones who would get the votes that were cast for her. Additionally, the votes that are cast for candidates other than D are distributed to them according on the percentage of voters who mark those candidates as their next choice on their ballots.

The calculation of winners in a two-member constituency with 100 voters and four candidates. The electorate may ensure representation via coordinated action (k signifying the number of members chosen from the district). In certain situations, this is undoubtedly a crucial component. The fact that it is impossible to gain from lying about one's genuine preferences is another benefit of STV. To effectively capitalize on it, one must possess extensive knowledge on the electorate's preference ranking distribution. Although there are certain situations in which strategic voting may be effective under STV, election system specialists generally agree that attempts at deception are likely to be unsuccessful. STV has a number of significant disadvantages that offset these benefits. Doron and Kronick (1977) have identified one of them: non-monotonicity. To put it another way, in some situations, more support may make a candidate less likely to win than more likely. More precisely, under a non-monotonic system like STV, a candidate may be enticed to encourage some of her supporters not to vote for her in order to protect her chances of winning. It goes without saying that this is not a desired voting system feature.

However, others contend that the conditions under which STV generates these incentives are significantly. The divisor approaches have the benefit of being monotonic in general. However, the presence of several districts is the primary cause of disproportionality. If there are no surplus or compensatory seats to be distributed to parties based on the overall support, the national allocation of parliamentary seats may seriously diverge from proportionality, regardless of how candidates are chosen in districts. Therefore, eliminating districts and treating the whole nation as a single district is the simplest method to achieve proportionate distributions. The Netherlands and Israel are two countries that use this technique. The drawback of this is that it minimizes the significance of regional or local factors in determining the makeup of the legislature. This is obviously not totally realistic in systems that are huge and diverse geographically. Using a set proportion of parliamentary seats based on party support throughout the nation as has been done, for example, in Germany is a more tenable approach. The response to this query varies according on one's voting power calculation. A few of them were covered in the previous section. In situations when voting coalitions are expected to develop in certain ways, these metrics conflate voting power with party prominence. The Banzhaf index, for instance, operates on the oversimplifying and sometimes empirically

incorrect premise that all victorious coalitions have an equal chance of forming. Assuming this, it counts the number of winning coalitions in which a party is non-redundant, taking into consideration the distribution of seats and the number of votes needed to approve legislation. The swings of the party are these alliances. The normalized Banzhaf index value of a party is obtained by dividing its swing count by the total number of swings of all parties.

Among the several metrics used to quantify a priori voting power is the Banzhaf index. Its benefits and drawbacks in comparison to other comparable measurements have long been up for discussion. Despite its flaws, it is unquestionably a more insightful and practical way to gauge voting strength than the system of allocating seats to parties based on the percentage of the population that supports them. The fact that choices in collective bodies are always taken in compliance with decision rules is something that this approach overlooks. These generally list the minimum number of votes required to enact new legislation. It should be quite evident that a measure that considers these criteria is preferable to standard procedure. Whether or not power measurements should include additional institutional data is still up for debate. One such feature is the presence of a spatial continuum along which the parties have relatively stable locations, as was previously covered in the previous paragraph. Obviously, the conventional left-right continuum makes sense for this kind of spatial dimension. It is rather debatable, however, whether it still limits the parties' coalition conduct today. Creating voting procedures for committees and the general public is a specific instance of an institutional design issue, which is more widespread. Which kind of institutions would result in the desired political and socioeconomic outcomes? This is how the institutional design challenge is often expressed. The issue of what is meant by desired results is raised by this phrasing. It also doesn't clarify what is meant by "bring about."

The definition of the term "desired outcome" might vary greatly depending on the situation. When designing voting systems, for instance, it might be deemed ideal if the process consistently yields a Pareto optimum result. Alternatively, we may consider it beneficial to choose the ultimate Condorcet winner provided by the people. These tactics often referred to as messages in the literature can take the form of votes, bids, or other actions. After the participants have selected their own methods, a system just decides what happens. Therefore, a mechanism is "almost" a game as it is a game type in which there are no preferences or utilities attached to the results. Now imagine a social choice function that gives each person's preference profile a result.

This property is used by many livestock owners. Every cow owner has an incentive to grow her herd since the land is quite big and each extra animal only uses a little amount of the available grass. The number of creatures that the commons can support, nevertheless, has a maximum. When this threshold is reached, the commons' ability to produce meat starts to decline, which lowers the revenue of all cattle owners who use the commons. However, every cow owner is faced with a conundrum: not adding additional animals to the commons improves the wellbeing of the cattle who are now grazing there, but only if other cattle owners do not abuse this by adding their own new animals to the commons. Thus, it seems that cooperation and contract enforcement are necessary for the upkeep of the commons.

We have previously covered a few basic game theoretical models of public goods supply in the previous section. Both PD and Chicken take place in a scenario where a "lumpy" public good a lighthouse or bridge is the main emphasis. This is a little bit of a limitation. Thus, we now extend the view by bringing in public goods that may be supplied in different proportions, such as security. T Therefore, the quantity of public benefit delivered is probably not going to be at its best without coordination. However, achieving optimality requires more than just cooperation. The incentive issue makes it probable that, for instance, agreements whereby

participants would indicate to a coordinator their utility functions with respect to the public good. The coordinator would then decide how much public goods would be provided and divide the associated expenses among participants. The person has an incentive to downplay her contribution to the common good when questioned. A significantly below-optimal amount of public goods is likely to result if everyone takes advantage of this incentive. Is it impossible to link people's actual preferences for public goods to the price they pay for them, or is this something that cannot be avoided? It turns out that a reasonable relationship may be established between payment shares and utility levels. T The formation and predominance of political decision-making systems, such as governments, may be explained in part by the temptation to free ride as well as the suboptimal level of public goods supply. Nonetheless, government actions often have the effect of eliminating or reducing negative externalities, or the adverse external repercussions of actions taken by one group of people on another group of people.

For instance, the government could intervene to limit industrial operations that result in significant adverse externalities for the populace, such as harm to the environment. In fact, Pigou (1929) contended that, without government intervention, interactions between people and groups often result in worse than ideal results due to the externalities associated with production, consumption, and leisure activities. But are they the only significant justifications for governments' existence? The theory of the emergence of a state in a hypothetical scenario where people have certain natural rights like the right to personal freedom, the product of their own labor, or the income that is freely transferred from one person to another will be covered in the next chapter. In the first stage, groups of people realize they need to protect their belongings from theft and robbery, so they band together to protect each other's property. Protective agencies eventually arise in response to the need for security services. Security services become marketable as a result. A dominant protective agency arises as a result of the relative character of the services offered, i.e., the degree of service quality is dependent on the resources of other agencies. This is referred to as the ultra-minimal condition by Nozick. It is the outcome of a process in which every player attempts to maximize her own usefulness.

Contract theories are distinguished by their image of states arising from voluntary contracts between persons in an initial position in Rawls' example, a "Hobbesian" conflict with all parties fighting each other. Instead of searching for mechanisms that may result in the establishment of a state in this scenario, Rawls aims to identify the norms that logical people would willingly accept as standards for their collaboration. Nonetheless, freely accepted principles are not always fair. It is unrealistic to assume voluntary agreement to address bias in resource distribution, for example, if the initial position prior to the agreement was skewed. One may anticipate that the contract will probably be prejudiced in favor of the controlling actor if, for example, two people are about to create a contract on the principles of work pay and one of them initially controlled the other's food supply. Thus, Rawls presents the idea of "justice as fairness," which holds that agreements freely accepted by reasonable parties at an impartial starting point have to be seen as just since they were made under fair circumstances. This raises the issue of what constitutes a just first stance.

The key component of the original stance is the ignorance veil, which implies that the players are unaware of their intended role in the emerging society. They don't even know their own traits, which might influence how they feel about certain justice-related ideas. In reality, there is a comprehensive list of personal information that people are intended to keep private, including their likes, money, generational affiliation, and more Because the initial stance was impartial, Rawls contends that any principles of the allocation of rights and obligations that are freely agreed upon under the guise of ignorance are fair. Likewise, these agreements are reasonable. This provides the theory its categorization, which is fairness as justice. It is not so

asserted that the dominant norms of justice were the product of such bargaining, but in assessing the standards that now exist, the concept of a fair initial position is crucial. Justifiable norms are those that might have been established by rational agents acting in ignorance and leading to an observable norm. As a result, the theory gives us a standard by which to compare current standards. According to Rawls, the fundamental standards of equality and liberty will be decided upon behind the curtain of ignorance.

The latter has garnered the greatest attention among them. Specifically, the interpretation Rawls provides for the need that disparities, when justified, serve the interests of everyone. The difference or maximin principle is the name given to this view. It states that disparities must help the most vulnerable members of society in order to be justifiable.

It is possible to arrange political systems or social states according to this criterion. Assume that there are two systems, A and B, such that the worst-off person in A has a welfare level that is strictly greater than the worst-off person in B. At that point, the difference principle will firmly favor A over B, independent of other people's welfare states.

By following this idea in order, one may maximize the wellbeing of the person with the least amount of money or belongings. Thus, the phrase "maximin principle." A lexicographic ordering is included in the difference principle. First, one considers the welfare status of those who are least fortunate. If they are the same in A and B, attention is then turned to the next group of people who are the poorest off. B should be chosen if it results in a better level of wellbeing for them than A.The next group to be considered are those whose welfare level is third-lowest, and so on, if even these levels in A and B are the same.

CONCLUSION

It takes careful consideration of a variety of elements, including as institutional structures, social preferences, and resource restrictions, to design for elections and the provision of public goods. Good design makes ensuring that democratic values like equity, inclusiveness, and openness are upheld in election systems, and public goods supply mechanisms work to provide resources in an economical and socially responsible manner. Policymakers and practitioners may create novel methods to electoral system design and public goods supply, promoting democratic government and societal well-being, by using ideas from political science, public administration, and design theory. To improve our knowledge and the efficiency of governance systems in democracies, further investigation into the intricacies of design processes in these fields is needed.

REFERENCES:

[1] J. Trounstine, “The Geography of Inequality: How Land Use Regulation Produces Segregation,” *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/S0003055419000844.

[2] K. Tajbakhsh, “Authoritarian state building through political decentralization and local government law: Evidence from the Islamic Republic of Iran,” *Onati Socio-Legal Ser.*, 2020, doi: 10.35295/osls.iisl/0000-0000-0000-1029.

[3] B. Magaloni, A. Díaz-Cayeros, and A. Ruiz Euler, “Public Good Provision and Traditional Governance in Indigenous Communities in Oaxaca, Mexico,” *Comp. Polit. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0010414019857094.

[4] F. Revelli, “The electoral migration cycle,” *Eur. J. Polit. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2019.05.007.

[5] K. Templeman, "Blessings in Disguise: How Authoritarian Legacies and the China Factor Have Strengthened Democracy in Taiwan," *Int. J. Taiwan Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1163/24688800-00202003.

[6] J. G. Forand, "Civil service and the growth of government," *J. Public Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jpubeco.2019.07.004.

[7] P. Kukołowicz and M. A. Górecki, "When incumbents can only gain: economic voting in local government elections in Poland," *West Eur. Polit.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/01402382.2017.1403147.

[8] M. D. Ramirez and P. G. Lewis, "Beliefs About Corporate America and the Structure of Opinions Toward Privatization," *Polit. Behav.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s11109-017-9434-4.

[9] C. R. Seelke and R. M. Nelson, "Venezuela: Background and U.S. policy," in *Venezuela: Current Issues and Challenges*, 2018.

[10] I. Mikhail Soto-Zazueta and J. Rafael Figueroa-Elenes, "Estimación del efecto de la alternancia sobre la provisión de servicios públicos locales en México Estimated impact of alternation on the provision of local public services in Mexico," *Econ. Soc. y Territ.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 8

EXPLORING THE RISE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY AND CLASSES

Dr. Salma Begum, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- salma.begum@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
This research traces the development of private property rights and class inequalities from ancient communal societies to contemporary capitalist economies, examining their historical genesis and social ramifications. The study looks at how changes in production relations, legal frameworks, and power dynamics led to the emergence of private property and the creation of social classes. It does this by drawing on historical, economic, and sociological viewpoints. By means of a comparative examination of several historical settings and theoretical frameworks, the research illuminates the intricate relationship among property rights, class hierarchies, and social stratification in many civilizations and eras.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalism, Class, Private Property, Social Stratification, Societal Implications.

INTRODUCTION

Under matriarchy, a primitive communal community reached its peak of development. The patriarchal clan already hid the roots of the collapse of the rudimentary social system inside itself. Up to a particular point in time, the productive forces' state of development was reflected in the production relations of prehistoric communal societies. But when new, more advanced means of production emerged during the last stage of patriarch the Iron Age primitive society's production relations stopped keeping pace with the emerging productive forces. The creation of new productive forces started to be inhibited by the strict guidelines of community property and the equitable distribution of labor output [1], [2].

A field could previously only be worked by dozens of workers working together. Under such circumstances, communal labor was required. A family was now able to work a piece of land and secure the means necessary for its survival thanks to the advancement of production tools and increasing labor productivity. Thus, the development of individual economies which were more productive under specific historical circumstances was made feasible by the advancement of production tools. A shared economy and joint labor were becoming less and less important. Individual labor required private property, whereas common labor demanded shared property in the means of production [3], [4].

The social division of labor and the growth of commerce are inextricably tied to the genesis of private property. Initially, the chiefs of the clan communities the elders or patriarchs were in charge of the transaction. In their capacity as community representatives, they engaged in barter transactions. The community's property was what they traded. However, as trade increased and the social division of labor deepened, the clan leaders progressively started to see community property as their own. Cattle were once the primary commodity of commerce. Large herds of cattle and flocks of sheep and goats were common in pastoral villages. These herds were seen as the property of the elders and patriarchs, who were already powerful figures in society. The other community members acknowledged their legitimate right to get rid of the herds. As a result, all agricultural tools eventually became private property, starting with cattle.

The longest-preserved land was common property The dissolution of the clan was caused by the growth of the productive forces and the emergence of private property. The clan disintegrated into big patriarchal households. Subsequently, distinct family groups emerged inside the vast patriarchal family, turning the livestock, utensils, and tools of production into their own private property. The expansion of private property eroded the bonds between clans. The clan community started to make way for the village community. In contrast to the clan, the village, or neighborhood, community was made up of individuals who were not always related.

Each family had their own private residence, personal belongings, and animals. However, ploughland was shared property for a certain amount of time, along with trees, meadows, water, and other natural features. The ploughland was initially sporadically redistributed among the community's members, but eventually it started to go into private hands. The development of private property and trade marked the start of a significant shift in the fundamental framework of prehistoric civilization. Diverse groups within the communities developed diverse interests because of the establishment of private property and property differences. Under these circumstances, the community's elders, military commanders, and priests took use of their positions to enrich themselves. They obtained a large portion of the common property. The holders of these social positions started to stand out from the general populace, creating a clan aristocracy and increasingly delegating authority to their successors. The wealthiest households simultaneously evolved from aristocratic families. The majority of the community's residents progressively became economically dependent on the wealthy and aristocratic upper class [5], [6].

Man's labor in agriculture and cattle breeding started to provide more means of sustenance than were necessary to sustain human existence as productive forces increased. There was a chance to appropriate excess labor and product that is, labor and product above what was required for the worker to support himself and his family. Under these circumstances, it became more expedient to force captured men to labor and become slaves rather than to execute them as had previously been done. The wealthier and more aristocratic households took possession of the slaves. Slave labor, in turn, contributed to an increase in inequality as the houses who used slaves became very wealthy very rapidly. As property disparity increased, the wealthy started to turn into slaves, enslaving not just other captives but also their own destitute and indebted fellow tribe members. Slave-owners and slaves became the first class split in society as a result. The unpaid appropriation of some people's labor-produced goods by others, or the exploitation of man by man, emerged [7], [8].

The production relations that dominated prehistoric community life disintegrated, died, and were replaced by new production relations that were more suited to the nature of emerging productive forces. Clan culture gave way to class society, shared labor gave place to individual labor, and communal property became private property. Class conflict dominated human history from this point on, all the way until the establishment of socialist societies. Ideologists of the Bourgeois class portray things as if private property had always been. History debunks such myths and provides compelling evidence that everyone lived through a prehistoric period of communal civilization based on shared property, without any knowledge of private property. Although there is much to say about social justice, we may justify our emphasis on Nozick and Rawls since they roughly reflect the two main schools of thought about the nature of justice and governance. According to Nozick, discussing and assessing social situations in terms of fairness is absurd. According to him, states are not known for their justice. Merely examining the allocation of assets, privileges, and obligations at a certain moment in time is insufficient to assess their fairness. A historical record is necessary, and more especially, an explanation of how certain obligations, rights, and assets came to be. According to Nozick's theory, a

distribution is only valid if each person is entitled to the belongings, obligations, and rights that she has within that distribution. Rights or the concepts of acquisition (production, trade, and transfer) are central to the concept of justice [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

Conversely, the ideas of Rawls may be used to assess social conditions, or distributions in general. We can compare the systems right now as long as we can identify the worst-off person57. But the main distinction between Rawls and Nozick is that the former offers a normative theory, whilst the latter aims to delineate the moral boundaries of governmental action. Redistribution is beyond those bounds, but contract enforcement and theft protection are. Conversely, the central idea of Rawls' theory is redistribution. One of the responsibilities of governments is to reduce externalities. The people may differ on the best course of action, however. Tullock notes that claiming that governments execute citizen-approved policies is oversimplified. Frequently, opinions vary on what steps should be made to minimize externalities. In fact, there may not even be agreement on the presence of an externality. For instance, if someone is drinking beer and sits on a bench near a playground for kids in a public park, it's likely to have a negative externality on the parents of those kids, even if the individual may not see it. It takes governments to implement policies that are not universally accepted. Furthermore, there might be a benefit transfer as a consequence of the externality decrease. When a person is removed from a bench by the police, her welfare is likely to decrease, but the government's intervention raises the welfare level of her parents.

Governments coordinate political and economic activity by definition by enacting laws and taking other steps to establish norms. In most modern nations, economic activity is governed by a broad network of conventions. These rules are usually justifiable based on considerations of public interest. For instance, laws against fraud are likely to stimulate economic activity, which in turn generates wealth and prosperity by encouraging individuals to do business. The measure is thus in the public interest. But there are also socially useless rules, including legislative ones. A few of them have to do with rent. According to Hillman (2003), 447, these are "benefits that a person receives beyond what is necessary to provide incentives to perform particular tasks." Profits made by monopolists are a common illustration of the advantages. These are often greater than the ones that result from competitive pricing. Rent-seeking is the act of pursuing rents by whatever means possible, such as becoming a monopolist or monopsonist. Basically, everything that aims to limit competition is considered rent-seeking. For instance, groups that seek rents for their members are interested in labor laws, tariffs, and standardization all activities that are characteristic of the public sector. The broad definition of government makes them significant venues for rent-seeking activity, as seen by the vast networks of connections lobbying groups have developed with cabinet ministers, members of parliament, and other public servants.

Therefore, governments' efforts to reduce externalities may occasionally result in the creation of new ones. The state may create new externalities, such as rent-seeking, by decreasing or eliminating externalities by enacting laws to address coordination issues. Governments establish public policy as well. We will now examine these measures in more detail. While the techniques covered in this chapter are applicable to assessment in any area of public policy, we will use academic institutions as examples to demonstrate them. These days, it's typical for colleges and educational institutions as a whole to be evaluated in addition to individual academics and publications. Peer reviews still form the basis of the standard procedure. The assessment process is divided into many parts, including goal-setting, assembling the review board, the unit to be evaluated's self-evaluation, etc.

Peer reviews are also often utilized in research funding organizations for applicant and project assessments. Explicit criteria are often used in assessments that are repeated at regular intervals to ensure that the assessment is based on a relatively constant set of applicant or project attributes. Since the evaluators usually work in groups, peer evaluations therefore take the form of multiple-criteria decision making enhanced with group decision making. Typically, the committee aims to reach a consensus on projects to be sponsored or candidates to be recruited to research positions. Review groups go through two steps in the process: first, each member expresses their viewpoint on the alternatives second, the group votes or bargains to establish a consensus about the alternatives. This trend is also typical in other situations of appraisal. The first step of the process the stage when the alternatives are assessed in light of the applicable criteria N is the subject of this chapter. We will talk about a few seemingly contradictory occurrences that may arise throughout this policy review phase.

Nearly all institutional assessments have similar clear criteria. Nonetheless, there seems to be a trend for the lists of requirements to expand, sometimes for very understandable reasons. In an effort to improve the assessments' descriptive power and accuracy, additional criteria are often added. For example, in addition to the more conventional indicators of academic research production, research performance criteria at universities increasingly often incorporate measurements of scholar networking. The potential to provide a more complex picture of the units under evaluation is often used to justify the addition of additional criteria. Comparably, in order to cover more relevant parts of the units in the assessments, the evaluation boards are often expanded with additional members.

The challenge of creating an overall evaluation of the units to be reviewed based on a variety of criteria, however, coexists with this procedure. This situation presents us with the issue of information aggregation, or more precisely, the issue of selecting the appropriate aggregation technique. It is feasible to use strategies based on the majority rule or principle when our job is to choose the greatest option. This theory really works rather well when there are two options available. This is because it is human nature to choose the option that performs better over a wider range of performance metrics. However, the viability of this decision hinges on the evaluation's assumption that each criterion is given equal weight. When there are more than two options, the majority principle becomes less exact.

A further development of this idea would be the plurality rule, which gives preference to the option that ranks highest across the board across the majority of criteria. Another method to expand on the majority principle would be to mandate that the option that, in pairwise comparisons against every other option, is scored better than its rival on the majority of criteria be deemed the best. The best option in the plurality meaning could not be the greatest option in the pairwise sense, so these two extensions are not interchangeable. The vote paradox of Borda is a prime example. Most of the issues raised above are just voting paradoxes applied to multi-criteria decision-making situations. They demonstrate the fundamental similarities between multi-criteria decision making and social choice. Since the majority of this chapter has focused on a scenario in which a single decision maker is tasked with assessing a group of units or policy alternatives, it follows that the issues actually resurface in the "natural" voting theory setting, or when multiple decision makers must collaborate to produce an evaluation. It is evident that the social choice paradoxes persist even when a kind tyrant replaces the community decision-making process. The basic takeaway is positive even if many of the facts mentioned above are of the infamous incompatibility kind, i.e., one cannot have processes with all great features. Even while there are significant issues, some of them are preventable or at the very least less severe. Even when there isn't much that can be done, being aware of the issues might help to throw a healthy doubt on decisions that could otherwise be made at

random. To begin with, it is sometimes said that the more criteria used in the assessments, the more comprehensive the image of the organizations under review. This seems reasonable at first glance, but it ignores the additional challenge that comes with having several criteria namely, how to balance them? There is obviously no universal solution, but it makes sense to test out slightly varied weights and see how much of an impact they have on the final results of the overall review.

For over 200 years, there has been a controversy about positional vs pairwise processes, which is fundamental to preference aggregation theory. The discovery that the pairwise systems are as sensitive to changes in the criteria set as the positional procedures are to changes in the policy alternative set is one outcome of the argument. Both of these facts can obviously be strategically used in group decision-making settings, but in individual policy evaluations, their significance lies in emphasizing how crucial it is to concentrate solely on all viable options and all significant criteria (with appropriate weights). Once again, experimenting with slightly larger or smaller alternative or criteria sets may aid in determining how robust one's overall assessments are.

Because different subpopulations are not homogeneous, Simpson's paradox may be explained. Consequently, it calls into question any correlation found in a large population with potentially heterogeneous segments. This paradox may also appear in the form of implying that there is a relationship between policy variables when, in reality, there is none based on an association seen in all subpopulations. In this sense, Simpson's (1951) example is very helpful. When randomization and experimentation are disregarded, the contradiction becomes further perplexing. It is evident that the so-called "small-N" technique is especially susceptible to Simpson's dilemma.65 Once again, if possible, testing different subpopulations may provide clues on the validity of the results. A tour through the fundamental models of political economics demonstrates that the majority of these models are predicated on the ideas that people have linked, transitive preferences over alternatives and that decision-making is at the center of all political economy activity. When combined, these presumptions suggest that behavior maximization is central to political economics. Homo economicus has been under pressure for a considerable amount of time, as we saw in chapter 4, yet has surprisingly survived. This model's success may be attributed in large part to the dearth of reliable alternatives. Abandoning the thin-sense premise of rationality allows essentially arbitrary explanatory explanations of human behavior to proliferate. The straightforward elegance of the axiomatic choice theory is lost if the systematic violations of the rationality axioms are taken as the starting point, as in the case of prospect theory, and we are left with a confusing array of theoretical systems that explain specific kinds of violations of the standard theory.

The notion of Homo economicus is well suited to the school of thought known as constructivist rationality, coined by Hayek (1973) and described by Smith (2005). This tradition's central assumption is that social structures should be seen as products of deliberate human thought. Every time an institution arises, it is also the result of intentional agent design. The rationalist school of thought is the source of this tradition. Smith draws a distinction between this tradition and what he refers to as ecological rationality, which permits and is especially interested in institutions that possess rational qualities but were not created by anybody. The ecological rationality tradition studies how social systems evolve or form via the interactions of people and groups that adhere to their behavioral norms and tactics. It's possible that these people and organizations are unaware of the system or order that results from their interactions. Hayek and Smith's descriptions of constructivist rationality make it appear improbably limited. It is true that certain organizations were created with specific goals in mind and that those goals are ultimately met. On the other hand, some institutional designs may potentially inadvertently

alter other institutions. For instance, the way the labor markets are organized is changing as a result of trade barriers being lifted in Europe during the previous several decades. Likewise, national parliaments will surely mirror the creation of the European Parliament and its increasing influence in Union law. Hence, constructivist rationality reflects an overly limited perspective of institutions: very few, if any, have been meticulously planned to account for every possible impact on other institutions.

Embracing the ecological perspective on reason poses fresh obstacles for homo economicus as a descriptive framework. Section 5.4's discussion on PD tournament strategy serves as an illustration of them. In consecutive PD tournaments, the dominating approach in a one-shot PD result in an extremely low aggregate reward. In comparison to a population of players that only use the dominant strategy in each game, a population of TFT players achieves a greater degree of aggregated payout. It is clear that TFT as a standard has a higher chance of surviving than the prevailing tactic.

The concept of ecological rationality is fundamental to evolutionary economics. This technique, as its name implies, tracks how economic behavior, structures, and above all institution changes throughout time. It is distinct from neoclassical economics in that it emphasizes equilibria more than it does the rationality idea. Its emphasis is on the mechanisms by which norms, standards, and behavioral patterns develop over time via encounters between people going about their daily lives without always recognizing that they are part of an institution-building process. However, this method does not exclude logic as the main indicator of personal behavior. It focuses on how people and rules adapt to outside shocks rather than on one-shot or recurring games with constant rules. The emphasis that evolutionary economics places on out-of-equilibrium adjustments and learning processes that may ultimately lead to an equilibrium, rather than on equilibria and short-term behavior, is what distinguishes it from neoclassical economics. Thus, homo economicus plays a function in evolutionary economics as well.

But the "new political economy" goes beyond just resurrecting a previous school of thought in economics. The way the new political economics approaches the subject of how politics influences economic results defines it more than anything else, even if it is marked by a considerable interest in it. Its examination of the significance of politics for economics using the formal and technical instruments of contemporary economic analysis is precisely what defines it. In addition to being used formally as a mathematical technique, modern economic analysis is conceptual in nature, considering political events in terms of optimization, incentives, limitations, and other such elements. Therefore, the kind of study being done rather than the quantity is what really sets apart the new political economy.

Formal approach may obscure rather than clarify phenomena and seem to be used in place of insightful grasp of the subject under study. This issue may become more serious given how recent political economics is in its present state. It has given some people the false impression—which I believe is unfounded that the new political economy is just a clumsy formalization of what is already clear. Additionally, it has been said that recent research is too comprehensive and tries to cover everything, with wildly varying degrees of effectiveness. The necessity for a more structured approach is shown by the new political economy's advantages as well as disadvantages. In this book, I seek to both review and arrange contemporary work on political economy in macroeconomics. This puts the method in the middle between a textbook and a monograph. Like a monograph, it aims to give a very particular perspective on the topic in addition to summarizing, organizing, and critiquing the body of current literature in an effort to lead the reader through the wilderness.

CONCLUSION

Human Society's evolution, the emergence of private property and classes has shaped social structures, economic systems, and power dynamics. Class distinctions have emerged as a result of the transfer of property rights from collective to private ownership, since certain groups have benefited from control over productive resources and have amassed wealth and privilege at the cost of others. Although private property rights have been a major force behind innovation and economic progress, they have also contributed to social unrest, inequality, and exploitation. Addressing the current issues of economic inequality, social fairness, and democratic governance requires an understanding of the dynamics of property relations and class development. To inform policy responses and promote more inclusive and equitable societies, more study is needed into the historical origins and modern expressions of these phenomena.

REFERENCES:

[1] P. T. Leeson and C. Harris, "Wealth-destroying private property rights," *World Dev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2018.02.013.

[2] J. R. Toledano, "Private Property Concerning Digitized Cultural Goods: Artificial Scarcity and Appropriation through Reproduction," *J. Arts Manag. Law Soc.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/10632921.2018.1461724.

[3] M. G. Titiun, "The taking of ownership's essential attributions and powers as a control standard for interventions on the right to private property," *Estud. Const.*, 2018, doi: 10.4067/S0718-52002018000200271.

[4] P. T. Babie, "The Future of Private Property," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3284221.

[5] J. Sizek, "California's groundwater regime: The Cadiz case," *Resources*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/resources7010007.

[6] W. W. Bratton, "The Modern Corporation and Private Property Revisited: Gardiner Means and the Administered Price," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3247924.

[7] M. Y. Pavlov, "Creative economy: How loss of knowledge could be stopped," *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*. 2018. doi: 10.7868/S0132162518030170.

[8] L. Mora, "Estructura socio-espacial y narrativa social en centro habana. la subjetivación de formas capitalistas en Cuba," *Confluenze*, 2018, doi: 10.6092/issn.2036-0967/8859.

[9] G. Warren-Myers, G. Aschwanden, F. Fuerst, and A. Krause, "Estimating the Potential Risks of Sea Level Rise for Public and Private Property Ownership, Occupation and Management," *Risks*, 2018, doi: 10.3390/risks6020037.

[10] J. R. D. de Souza, R. A. de Andrade Plácido, E. Guilherme, and T. N. de Melo, "First record of the Pyrrhura lucianii deville, 1851 (Psittaciformes, psittacidae) in Acre, Brazil, with notes on the consumption of salt," *Check List*, 2018, doi: 10.15560/14.2.285.

CHAPTER 9

DETERMINATION OF THE SLAVE-OWNING MODE OF PRODUCTION

Dr. Sarangapani Nivarthi, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.sarangapani.nivarthi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
This study explores the socioeconomic dynamics and historical evolution of the slave-owning method of production, emphasizing its inception, use, and effects in various historical situations. The study examines the institution of slavery as a key component of certain societies, notably in ancient civilizations and colonial empires, using a multidisciplinary approach that combines historical research, economic theory, and sociological observations. It looks at the economic justification for slavery and how it contributes to social stratification, money accumulation, and worker exploitation. Additionally, the study looks at how slavery affected political systems, cultural norms, and interpersonal relationships, emphasizing the ways in which it supported oppression, inequality, and resistance.

KEYWORDS:

Exploitation, Labor, Slave-Owning, Social Hierarchy, Socio-Economic Dynamics.

INTRODUCTION

The ancient Eastern kingdoms were the first in history to undergo the shift from a basic community to a slave-owning society. In Mesopotamia (including Sumer, Babylonia, Assyria, and other regions), Egypt, India, and China, the slave-owning system of production predominated by the fourth millennium B.C. in some instances, and not later than the second millennium B.C. in other instances. In Transcaucasia (Urartu), the slave-owning method of production predominated in the first millennium B.C. From the ninth or seventh century B.C. until the fifth or sixth century A.D., Khorezm was home to a strong slave-owning State. The evolution of individuals in European countries was significantly impacted by the culture developed in the ancient East's slave-owning nations [1], [2].

In Greece, the ownership of slaves as a means of production peaked in the fourth and fifth century B.C. Slavery then spread to the States of Asia Minor and Macedonia between the fourth and first century B.C. Between the second century B.C. and the second century A.D., the slave system in Rome achieved its pinnacle of growth. Slavery originally had a domestic or patriarchal aspect. Slaves were few in comparison. Slave labor was still a secondary sector of the economy and was not the backbone of production. The economy's primary goal was still to meet the needs of the big, patriarchal family, which had few other means of trade. Although the owner had unrestricted control over his slaves, the use of slave labor was restricted [3], [4].

The foundation for society's shift to the slave-owning system was the continued expansion of productive forces and the evolution of the social division of labor and commerce. The progression from stone to metal tools for work resulted in a significant expansion of the capabilities of human labor. With the development of the blacksmith's bellows, man was able to produce labor-intensive iron tools of a hitherto unseen durability. The iron axe made it feasible to remove trees and other vegetation from the land so that it could be ploughed. Working relatively huge agricultural areas was made feasible by the wooden plow with iron share. Agriculture and cattle breeding replaced the prehistoric hunting and gathering economy. There were handicrafts.

The primary sector of production, agriculture, continued to benefit from advancements in tillage and cattle breeding techniques. New areas of agriculture emerged, such as the cultivation of oil crops, flax, and vines. The herds of the wealthy households grew. The number of laborers required to care for the livestock kept growing. Crafts such as weaving, metallurgy, ceramics, and others advanced throughout time. A craft had formerly been the husbandman's or herdsman's side job. These days, a lot of individuals work at it independently. A division was made between handicrafts and agriculture.

The second significant social division of labor was this one. N Production is split into two major fundamental branches: agriculture and handicrafts. This leads to the emergence of direct production for trade, although in an immature form. Due to the rise in labor productivity, there was more surplus product produced. When combined with private property rights over the means of production, this created a situation where a small minority in society could amass wealth and use it as justification to subjugate the majority of workers into servitude [5], [6].

When slavery existed, the economy was essentially natural. An economy that is considered natural is one in which the labor products are consumed locally rather than traded. On the other hand, trade was developing at the same period. Initially, artisans created their goods on demand before putting them up for sale. Simultaneously, a considerable number of them persistently maintained tiny land holdings and engaged in cultivation to meet their necessities. The peasants mostly maintained a natural economy, but they were forced to sell some of their crops on the open market in order to pay taxes and purchase the goods made by craftsmen. As a result, throughout time, some of the goods created by artisans and peasants were turned into commodities.

A commodity is a product that is ready for market sale or exchange rather than for personal use. The hallmark of a commodity economy is the production of goods for trade. Thus, the advent of handicraft as a separate profession from agriculture and its separation from it marked the beginning of the creation of commodities. One labor product was immediately traded for another as long as the transaction included a chance element. The emergence of a commodity for which any other commodity would be readily offered occurred gradually as commerce grew and became a regular occurrence. Money appeared as a result. Money is a universal good that acts as a mediator in transactions and is the standard by which all other goods are measured.

Towns were formed as a result of the growth of crafts and trade. Towns first appeared in far-off antiquity, with the start of the slave trade. Initially, there was no difference between the town and the village; but, over time, commerce and handicrafts were centered in the cities. The kind of work that people did and how they lived made the cities more different from the rural. This marked the beginning of the division between town and country and the emergence of their opposition. The boundaries of exchange grew along with the amount of goods that could be traded. In their quest for financial gain, traders emerged who bought goods from manufacturers, transported them to marketplaces, often very distant from the point of production, and then sold them to customers.

The growth of manufacturing and trade significantly exacerbated property inequality. Rich people amassed wealth in the form of cash, working animals, producing tools, and seeds. They were increasingly called upon by the impoverished to provide loans, mostly in kind but sometimes also in cash. Rich people gave them money, seeds, and production tools. They also transformed their creditors become bondsmen and, when the latter refused to pay, confiscated their land and turned them into slaves. Usury developed as a result. It resulted in debt bondage for some people and additional wealth development for others. Additionally, the area started to be turned into private property. It was put up for sale and mortgaged. A debtor was forced to

give up his land and sell himself and his children into slavery if he was unable to pay the usurer. Large landowners sometimes took portions of the meadows and pastures from the communes of the rural villages under various pretexts.

Thus, the wealthy slave owners began to concentrate their riches in the form of landed property, cash, and large numbers of slaves. The slave-owning economy became robust and expanded, encompassing all sectors of industry, whereas the tiny peasant economy gradually collapsed. There were two groups among the population under the slave-owning system: free men and slaves. With the exception of women, who were almost treated like slaves, the free had all civil, property, and political rights. All of these privileges were taken away from slaves, and they were not allowed to join the ranks of the free. The free were then split into two groups: a class of rich landowners who also owned a sizable slave population, and a class of small producers (peasants, craftspeople), who were also owned by the wealthy and used slave labor. Due to their position, the priests who were heavily involved in the era of slavery were linked to the group of wealthy landowners and slave owners [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

There was a class conflict between the big landowners and the peasantry in addition to the class conflict between slaves and slave-owners. However, as the slave-owning system evolved, slave labor which was also the least expensive embraced a greater portion of the production branches and emerged as the primary source of output. As a result, the conflict between slaves and their masters evolved into the central paradox of society. The division of society into classes made the State necessary. Unions were formed when distinct clans and tribes grew closer to one another as a result of the social division of labor and the expansion of trade. The institutions of the clan underwent a transformation.

The public appeal of the clan system's organs gradually diminished. They were turned into tools of tyranny and robbery of their own tribe as well as those of neighboring tribes, and they became instruments of rule over the populace. The clan and tribal elders and military chiefs rose to become rulers and kings. They used to have power because they were chosen by their clan or union of clans. They now started to utilize their influence to control the slaves, prevent their fellow clansmen from becoming impoverished, and protect the interests of the propertied top class. This was achieved by armed retinues, courts, and punitive apparatus. The foundation of the production relations in a society that owned slaves was the idea that the slave owners owned both the means of production and the laborers who used them. The slave was seen as a property. His owner had total and total control over him. Not only were slaves used for personal gain, but they were also bought and sold like livestock and executed without trial. While the slave had been seen as a member of the family during the patriarchal era of slavery, under the terms of the slave-owning mode of production, he was not even seen as a man [9], [10].

The whole output of slave labor was obtained by the slave owner. In order to keep the slaves from starving to death and to allow them to continue working for him, he provided them with as little food as possible. In addition to taking the excess output, the slave owner also kept a significant portion of the product that came from the labor of the slaves. With the growth of the slave-owning method of production came a rise in the market for slaves. Generally speaking, slaves in many nations had no relatives. Slaves were quickly physically worn out as a result of their voracious exploitation. The number of slaves has to be increased continuously. One key source of fresh bondmen was the war. The ancient East's slave-owning states waged ongoing conflicts in an effort to subjugate other peoples. Ancient Greek history is replete with conflicts between Greek and Oriental states, between cities and colonies, and between distinct city states. Rome waged wars without interruption, conquering the majority of the then-known

territories during her height. In addition to the soldiers who had been captured, a sizable portion of the inhabitants of the territories they had conquered were also sold into slavery. Another source for increasing the number of slaves was the provinces and colonies. Along with all other goods, they provided the slave owners with "living commodities." One of the most prosperous and thriving sectors of the economy was the slave trade. Specific hubs for the slave trade emerged: vendors and purchasers from far-off nations attended organized fairs.

Compared to the primitive society, the slave-owning form of production offered more opportunity for the development of productive forces. The use of basic labor cooperation on a broad scale was made feasible by the concentration of a large number of slaves in the hands of the slave-owning State and individual slave-owners. scale The enormous building projects that the ancient populations of China, India, Egypt, Italy, Greece, Transcaucasia, Central Asia, and other countries carried out testify to this: irrigation systems, roads, bridges, fortresses for the military, and cultural monuments.

The development of social division of labor led to the specialization of agriculture and handicraft production, which in turn created the conditions for increasing labor productivity. Slave labor was extensively used in Greek handicrafts. Large workshops known as ergasterias emerged, where several dozen slaves would labor at once. Additionally, construction, silver, gold, and iron ore mining all required the employment of slave labor. Slave labor was often used in agriculture in Rome. Thousands of slaves labored on the vast estates known as latifundia, which belonged to the R()man elite.

The expropriation of empty State properties and the lands of peasants resulted in the creation of these latifundia. Due to the low cost of slave labor and the use of the benefits of basic cooperation, the latifundia, who owned slaves, were able to produce grain and other agricultural products at a cheaper cost than the tiny farms owned by the free peasants. The little peasants were driven away, forced into slavery, or added to the ranks of the lumpen-proletariat, the town's destitute inhabitants. Deeper and deeper was the dichotomy between town and country that had previously developed during the shift from the antiquated communal system to the slave-owning system. The cities developed as the hubs for the concentration of the slave-owning elite, usurers, merchants, and state officials all of whom took advantage of the vast majority of the peasant populace.

Slave labor was the foundation for the ancient world's significant economic and cultural advancement. But the system of owning slaves was unable to provide the prerequisites for any significant advancement in technology. One characteristic of slave labor was its very poor productivity. The outcome of his labors had no attraction for the slave at all. The slaves detested working under the oppressors. They often spoiled the results of labor as a way to show their outrage and dissent. As a result, the slaves received only the simplest supplies, which were hard to ruin.

The production system based on slavery continued to operate at a very low level. The precise and natural sciences were developed to some extent, although they were scarcely ever used in industry. Some technological innovations were restricted to use in construction and warfare. Over the course of many centuries, the slave-owning method of production was limited to using hand tools that were borrowed from small-scale farmers and craftsmen, as well as basic labor cooperation. The physical prowess of men and cattle continued to be the primary driving factor. Due to the widespread use of slave labor, slave owners were able to fully delegate physical labor to their slaves and release themselves from it altogether.

The people who owned slaves saw physical labor as something unworthy of a free man, treated it with contempt, and lived parasitically. As slavery spread, an increasing proportion of the free

populace turned away from work-related activities. Only a small portion of the free people and the upper class, who owned slaves, pursued careers in public affairs, the sciences, and the arts, which developed to a significant degree.

The practice of owning slaves gave rise to the difference between mental and physical labor, or its antithesis. The primary aspect of the production relations in a culture where slavery is practiced is the exploitation of slaves by their owners. Simultaneously, the ownership of slaves as a form of production had distinct characteristics in different nations. Compared to the ancient European world, the natural economy was much more dominant in the ancient Eastern nations. Here, the economy of the State, the major slave owners, and the temples all heavily relied on the use of slave labor. Slavery inside the home grew significantly. Massive numbers of slaves and members of peasant communities were exploited in China, India, Babylonia, and Egypt's agriculture. In this case, the debt slavery system took on significant significance. A peasant community member who failed to pay their rent to the landowner or their obligation to the usurer would be forced to labor as a bond slave on their property for a certain period of time.

Both state and community types of land ownership were common in the ancient East nations that had slaves. The irrigation-based farming method was connected to the presence of various types of property. Building dams, canals, and reservoirs as well as draining marshes were necessary for the irrigation of agricultural fields in the East's river basins, which required a significant labor investment. Engels, Selected Correspondence, 1846-95, 1934, English version, p. 67.) With the rise of slavery, the communal lands were consolidated in the hands of the State. All of this suggested the need to centralize the. The unchecked monarch rose to become the ultimate landowner.

By consolidating land ownership, the State of slave owners levied heavy levies on the peasants and forced them to do various tasks, ultimately subjecting them to a state of slavish reliance. The peasants continued to live in the rural area. However, since the slave-owning State controlled a large portion of the land, the rural society served as a solid foundation for oriental despotism, or the unrestricted autocratic authority of a tyrannical ruler. An major role for the priestly elite was performed in the Eastern States that owned slaves. The large estates that belonged to the temples were kept up via the use of slave labor.

Under the slave ownership system, the majority of slave labor and its products were wasted by the slave owners in all countries on the gratification of their own desires, the amassing of wealth, the building of armies and military fortifications, and the construction and upkeep of opulent palaces and temples. The Egyptian pyramids, in particular, which have survived to this day, bear witness to the wasteful use of enormous amounts of labor. As a result, manufacturing expanded very slowly, with very little of the slave labor and its output going toward new levels of production. Devastating conflicts resulted in the annihilation of vast numbers of the peaceful populace, the destruction of productive forces, and the collapse of state cultures. The fundamental economic principle of the slave-owning system is the creation of surplus goods to meet the demands of the slave-owners through the rapacious exploitation of the slaves, on the basis of the slave-owners' complete ownership of the means of production and the slaves themselves, as well as the enslavement of foreign peoples through their conquest and enslavement of peasants and craftsmen.

The primary slave-owning economy maintained its organic qualities. Its manufacture was not intended for commerce, but rather for the direct consumption of the slave owner and his many hangers-on and retainers. Conversely, trade progressively started to take center stage, especially at the height of the slave-owning system's expansion. A certain portion of labor output was frequently sold on the market, or turned into commodities, in a variety of

manufacturing divisions. The role that money played grew as trade developed. The item that was traded the most often typically emerged as money. For many individuals, especially cattle ranchers, animals were originally used as a kind of currency. Among other things, money was made from salt, grain, and furs. All other types of money gradually disappeared as metallic currency took over. The Greek city states engaged in extensive international commerce, notably with the Greek colonies dispersed throughout the Mediterranean and Black Sea coasts. The colonies consistently provided food, livestock, fish, skins, wool, and other raw materials, as well as the primary labor force slaves. Aside from the trade in slaves and other goods, the commerce in opulent goods was quite important in both ancient Greece and Rome. These goods were mostly provided from the East in the form of various tributes obtained from conquered peoples. Trade was linked to colonial servitude, piracy, and pillage.

In the context of the slave trade, money had developed into a tool for more than just buying and selling goods; it was also used to appropriate other people's labor via commerce and usury. Spending money with the intention of obtaining excess labor and its output turns it into capital, or an instrument of exploitation. The first types of capital were historically the capital of merchants and usurers. Capital used in the trading of commodities is known as merchants' capital. A significant portion of the excess production produced by slaves, small farmers, and artisans was pilfered by merchants who bought and sold goods. Usurers' capital is capital used to appropriate the excess labor of peasants and artisans via the use of excessive interest rates. This capital may take the shape of loans, means of production, or consumer goods. Additionally, the usurers loaned money to the nobility who owned slaves, taking a cut of the excess goods that the latter group was given.

A civilization emerged on the remains of many generations of slaves, serving as the cornerstone for the advancement of humankind. Throughout antiquity, several fields of study including mathematics, astronomy, mechanics, and architecture saw significant advancements. Ancient cultural artifacts, literary masterpieces, architectural designs, and sculptures have all been inducted into the permanent record of human civilization. But the system of owning slaves has unconscionable flaws that ultimately caused it to collapse. The fundamental productive power of this society the slaves was continuously destroyed by the slave-owning model of exploitation. Armed uprisings were becoming a more common way for slaves to protest cruel kinds of enslavement. The survival of a slave-owning economy depended on the constant flow of new slaves and their low cost. War was the primary source of slave supply. The bulk of free small producers, including artisans and peasants, served as the foundation for the slave-owning society's military might. They were in the military and carried The primary financial burden of taxes which are necessary to wage war rests on them. But the peasants and artisans were destroyed due to the competitiveness of large-scale industry based on cheap slave labor as well as the weight of obligations beyond their capacity. The irreconcilable conflict between vast latifundia and small-scale farming operations persisted.

The extortion of the free peasants undermined the political, military, and economic might of the slave-owning States, especially Rome. Losses took the place of victories. Defensive conflicts took the place of conquest-based ones. The source of the constant flow of inexpensive laborers dried up. The drawbacks of using slave labor became more and more evident. During the latter two centuries of the Roman Empire's existence, there was a widespread decline in productivity. Trade collapsed into chaos, once wealthy areas descended into poverty, the population started to dwindle, craftsmen vanished, and abandoned towns emerged. Slave labor-based productive relationships had become a hindrance to society's growing productive forces. Slave labor had run its course and was no longer valuable, regardless of the output. Historically, it had become necessary to replace slave-owning production relations with other types of

production relations in order to alter the state of society. of the laboring people, which are the primary production power. Workers who were somewhat interested in the fruits of their labor had to replace slaves due to the rule of the compulsory connection between production relations and the nature of the productive forces.

The slave owners started freeing sizable groups of slaves whose labor no longer earned them any money when large-scale slave ownership became economically unprofitable. Big estates were divided into smaller sections. Plots like this were given out under strict terms, either to freed slaves or to free people who now had to do certain tasks for the landowner's benefit. The newly hired soil tillers were attached to the land parcels and may be sold with them. However, they were freed from slavery. This was a new class of small-scale producers who were somewhat interested in the fruits of their own labor and had a middle-class status between free and slave. They were referred to as coloni and were the ancestors of the serfs of the Middle Ages. Thus, within the framework of a civilization that owned slaves, the components of a new, feudal mode of production emerged. The history of slave-owning civilizations in the ancient East, including Greece and Rome, demonstrates how the class struggle of the oppressed masses against their rulers became more intense as the slave-owning economy developed. The fight of the oppressed little peasants against the rich landowners who owned slaves was associated with slave revolts.

CONCLUSION

A dark period in human history marked by the widespread commodification and exploitation of people for financial gain is represented by the slave-owning method of production. In certain cultures, slavery was the foundation that allowed elites to accumulate riches and power at the cost of enslaved people who were deprived of fundamental liberties and rights and forced to work in appalling circumstances. Although owning slaves made slave countries more prosperous economically, slavery also helped to maintain systemic brutality, racial prejudice, and social inequality. Although the outlawing of slavery was a major turning point in the fight for social justice and human rights, its effects may still be seen in the socioeconomic dynamics and patterns of inequality that exist today. In order to address the lasting effects of slavery and move toward a more just and inclusive future, we must comprehend the historical causes and ramifications of the slave-owning method of production. In order to solve the persistent issues of exploitation, racism, and social injustice in contemporary cultures, further study into the complexity of slavery and its aftermath is needed.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. P. Costa, “Rufina: A Slave-owning Female Slave in Pernambuco, 1853-1862,” *Rev. Bras. Hist.*, 2018, doi: 10.1590/1806-93472018v38n79-06.

[2] R. Mantovani, “Prisons in SÃo Paulo in the first half of the 19th century: Social demands, actors and contradictions,” *Rev. Hist.*, 2018, doi: 10.11606/ISSN.2316-9141.RH.2018.126685.

[3] C. Roth, “Black Nurse, White Milk: Breastfeeding, Slavery, and Abolition in 19th-Century Brazil,” *J. Hum. Lact.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/0890334418794670.

[4] L. F. da S. Telles, “Pregnant slaves, workers in labour: Amid doctors and masters in a slave-owning city (nineteenth-century Rio de Janeiro),” *Womens. Hist. Rev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/09612025.2017.1336844.

[5] C. Hall, “The Slave-Owner and the Settler,” in *Indigenous Networks*, 2018. doi: 10.4324/9781315766065-2.

[6] R. Lang, "Grant, Margaret Gordon MacPherson née (1834–1877), philanthropist and heir to a slave-owning fortune," in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, 2018. doi: 10.1093/ref:odnb/107342.

[7] J. Bodel, "Ancient slavery and modern ideologies: Orlando Patterson and M. I. Finley among the dons," *Theory Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s11186-019-09366-0.

[8] Y. Izzat Sultanovich, "The first stages of formation communication means in Khorezm," *Int. J. Integr. Educ.*, 2019, doi: 10.31149/ijie.v2i5.147.

[9] J. Forret, "The Limits of Mastery: Slaveholders, Slaves, and Baptist Church Discipline," *Am. Ninet. Century Hist.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/14664658.2017.1278833.

[10] I. A. Ladynin, "'Soviet Antiquity': Looking for a Cohesive Theory," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3082156.

CHAPTER 10

INVESTIGATION OF THE FEUDAL MODE OF PRODUCTION

Dr. Shakeela Banu C, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.shakeelabanu@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
Slavery was abolished along with the authority of the slave owners. The extensive artisan enterprises and latifundia that relied on slave labor collapsed. The historical examination of the feudal system of production is explored in this work, along with its origins, traits, and socioeconomic ramifications. This study employs a multidisciplinary methodology that combines historical analysis, economic theory, and sociological viewpoints to investigate the feudal system as a prevalent socio-economic framework in medieval Europe and beyond. It looks at the basic elements of feudalism, such as the dynamics of agricultural output, the importance of land tenure, and the interaction between lords and serfs. The research also looks at how feudalism affected political authority, cultural traditions, and social structure, emphasizing how it shaped medieval countries.

KEYWORDS:

Agriculture, Feudalism, Land Tenure, Serfdom, Socio-Economic Structure.

INTRODUCTION

Feudalism lasted for a very long time. The feudal system predated civilization in China by about two millennia. Feudalism spanned several centuries in Western Europe, starting from the fall of the Roman Empire in the fifth century and ending with the bourgeois revolutions in England and France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; in Russia, it lasted from the ninth century until the peasant reform of 1861 in Transcaucasia, it lasted from the fourth century to the seventies of the nineteenth century; and among the peoples of Central Asia, it lasted from the seventh or eighth centuries until the proletarian revolution in Russia triumphed. The collapse of the Roman slave-owning culture and the deterioration of the invading tribes' tribal structure gave rise to feudalism in Western Europe [1], [2]. These two events interacted to create feudalism. As mentioned before, the system of coloni was the womb of a slave-owning society and had elements of feudalism. The coloni had many duties to do, including working the land belonging to their wealthy landowner lord and giving him a certain amount of money or a sizeable portion of the crop. However, since they owned their own estates, the coloni had more interest in their labor than the slaves did.

As a result, new, fruitful relationships emerged and reached their peak during the feudal era. The Roman Empire was destroyed by Germanic, Gaulish, Slavic, and other tribes from various areas of Europe. Large landowners (previously slave owners who had embraced the coloni system), liberated slaves, coloni, petty peasants, and craftsmen made up the population of the old Roman Empire. At the period of Rome's conquest, the conquered tribes had a collapsing community structure [3], [4]. These tribes' social life was heavily influenced by the village community, known to the Germans as the mark.

With the exception of the clan nobles' enormous landed holdings, the land belonged to everyone. There was shared usage of the ponds, meadows, heaths, and woodlands. Every few years, the community's members would redraw the boundaries of fields and meadows. But eventually, the homestead's surrounding acreage and eventually the ploughland were inherited by other families. The community assembly, together with the elders and judges chosen by it,

handled the distribution of land, the examination of issues pertaining to the community, and the resolution of conflicts amongst its members. The military chiefs of the conquering tribes, together with their entourages, controlled vast swathes of territory [5], [6].

A significant portion of the Roman Empire's State holdings as well as a portion of the major owners' properties were taken by the tribes who overthrew it. The ploughland was split up into several holdings, but the forests, pastures, and meadows were still used communally. Subsequently, the peasants' private property was the partitioned fields. As a result, a sizable class of autonomous small farmers was created. But the peasants couldn't hold onto their freedom for very long. Private land ownership and "other means of production" led to the inevitable development of property disparity between the various village residents. Among the peasants emerged families of all socioeconomic statuses. Rich community members started to gain influence over the rest of the community as property disparity increased. Rich families, the clan aristocracy, and military commanders held an increasing amount of the land. The great landowners became the source of personal dependency for the peasants [7], [8].

The dissolution of the clan structure among the conquering tribes was accelerated by the Roman Empire's invasion. The big landowners had to bolster the apparatus of State authority in order to preserve and consolidate their dominance over the subservient peasants. Military chiefs started to consolidate power and assumed the role of kings or monarchical rulers by enlisting the support of the clan aristocracy and the people in their entourages. A multitude of king-led states sprang from the rubble of the Roman Empire. The monarchs generously granted their attendants, who were required to serve in the military in exchange, hereditary ownership of the land they had taken for the duration of their lives. Much territory was given to the Church, which was crucial to the royal power's upholding. Peasants who had worked the land now had a variety of responsibilities for their new bosses. Massive landholdings ended up in the hands of the monasteries, the clergy authorities, and members of the royal entourage and slaves.

The territories granted under these terms were known as feods (fiefs). Feudalism is the term given to this new social order. The process of feudalization, which occurred in Europe over many centuries (from the fifth or sixth to the ninth or tenth century), included the progressive conversion of peasant land into the property of feudal lords and the enserfment of the peasant masses. Plunder, impositions, and unceasing military service destroyed the free peasantry. The peasants became the huge landowner's dependents by turning to him for assistance. It was common for the peasants to be forced to submit to the feudal lord's "protection" since in an environment of perpetual warfare and bandit incursions, an undefended man could not live.

In these situations, the feudal lord became the owner of the land plot, and the peasant could only labor his plot in exchange for doing different tasks for the lord. In other instances, the land of free peasants was taken by the royal lieutenants and officials by coercion and force, forcing the latter to recognize their authority. The process of being feudalized took varied forms in different nations, but the basic idea was the same everywhere: the once-free peasants became personally dependent on the feudal lords who had taken over their property. This reliance fluctuated in strength over time. Over time, the distinctions between free, coloni, and former slave peasants vanished, and they were all combined into a one group known as peasant serfs [9], [10] . The condition that the medieval proverb "No land without its lord" (i.e., without its feudal overlord) describes gradually came into being. The most powerful landowners were the kings. An important phase in the historical evolution of civilization was feudalism. Slavery has run its course. Under these conditions, the bulk of dependent peasants who owned their own land, their own means of production, and some degree of labor interest were the only source of labor that could support the further expansion of productive forces. However, as human history attests, it is not necessary for every population to go through every stage of societal evolution.

There are circumstances for several individuals whereby they may be able to skip a developmental stage and go straight to an advanced one. When Russia's primordial society collapsed, patriarchal enslavement emerged. But the path of social development here was primarily one of feudalization rather than slave ownership. Even though the clan system predominated among the Slavonic tribes, starting in the third century A.D., they attacked the Roman Empire that owned slaves, fought to liberate the towns under its control along the northern Black Sea coast, and were a major factor in the system's downfall. Russia saw the shift from a prehistoric society to a feudal one at a period when Western European nations had long ago abandoned the slave trade and had stabilized feudal relations.

DISCUSSION

Among the Eastern Slavs, the village community was referred to as verv or mir. Meadows, woods, and ponds were shared by the community, but different households started to acquire ownership of the ploughland. At the head of the community stood an elder. The village communities gradually disintegrated as private land ownership increased. The land was taken by the tribal rulers and elders. The community's peasants, or smerds, were initially independent, but they eventually became reliant on the powerful landowners, or boyars. By now the Church was the biggest feudal lord. It had vast holdings and the wealthiest estates of the day thanks to grants from the princes, bequests, and legacies. Grand Princes and Tsars started to "place" their attendants and serving people on the land during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when the Russian State was becoming more centralized. This meant giving them land and peasants in exchange for their military service. Thus, the terms pomeshchik and poets.

The peasants had the freedom to move from one lord to another at that time as they were not yet legally obligated to the landlord and the land. By the end of the sixteenth century, the lords were taking more advantage of the peasants in order to increase the amount of food that was being produced for sale. To that end, the State took away the peasants' ability to move from one landlord to another in 1581. The peasants were made into serfs because they were totally enslaved to the lords' land. Agriculture was a major industry throughout the medieval era, with tillage being its most significant subset. Over many decades, advancements in grain cultivation techniques led to the development of market gardening, fruit cultivation, vine cultivation, and butter production.

A democratic movement among free men emerged early in the development of slave-owning society as a result of the conflict between small producers and large, well-born landowners. This movement sought to abolish debt bondage, redistribute land, abolish the privileges of the landed aristocracy, and give the demos power. The exploited masses' uprisings, especially those of the slaves, severely damaged Rome's previous might. As time went on, punches from the outside started to become more linked with blows from inside. While their fellow tribesmen who had remained free stormed the borders of the Empire, broke into its territory, and overthrew Roman rule, the enslaved residents of neighboring regions rose up in rebellion in the Italian fields. These conditions accelerated Rome's system of slave ownership's demise.

The Roman Empire saw the largest expansion of the slave-owning form of production. The institution of slave ownership as a whole fell with the collapse of the Roman Empire. The system of slave ownership was replaced by the feudal system. The economic beliefs of slave-owning Babylonia are shown by the laws written by the eighteenth-century B.C. monarch Hammurabi. The wealthy and virtuous slave owners and landowners have their property and personal rights protected by the code. The legislation stipulated that the penalty for hiding a fugitive slave was death. If a peasant failed to pay the landowner's rent or the moneylender's obligation, he would have to enslave his wife, son, or daughter in bonds until the debt was paid.

The Code of Manu is an ancient Indian compilation that elaborates on moral, religious, and social precepts that legitimize slavery. These rules declared that a slave has no property. Anyone found guilty of "giving shelter to a runaway slave" might be executed by law.

In an attempt to boost their revenue, the feudal lords subjected the peasantry to various forms of exaction. They often had monopolistic control over smithies, mills, and other businesses. The peasant was forced to utilize them in exchange for astronomically large monetary or in-kind rewards. In addition to paying the feudal lord money or quitrent in kind, the peasant also had to pay various state imposts, municipal taxes, and, in some nations, a tithe a tenth of the harvest to the church. Feudal civilization therefore derived its existence upon the labor of peasant serfs. Peasants farmed more than just crops. They constructed roads, built castles and monasteries, and worked as artisans on the feudal lord's estates.

Peasant serfs were the ones who constructed towns. Especially in its early phases of growth, the economy of the feudal lords was essentially a natural economy. Every feudal estate, which was made up of the lord's demesne and his villages, led a solitary existence and seldom engaged in trade. Initially, the necessities of the several households and the demands of the feudal lord and his family were met by the output from the seigniorial economy, which was provided by the peasants who paid quitrent. There were enough craftspeople on quite large estates, mostly among the household serfs. These artisans crafted apparel and footwear, crafted and fixed firearms, hunting gear, and farming tools, and constructed structures.

Additionally, the peasant economy was a natural one. In addition to working in agriculture, the peasants also made handicrafts at home, mostly using the raw materials from their farms for weaving, spinning, and creating shoes and farm tools. The combination of domestic handicraft, which was an adjunct to agriculture as the primary economic sector, and agriculture itself was for a long time a feature of feudalism. Initially, it was up to roving merchants to provide the few imports that were essential for daily life, including iron and salt. Later, as cities and handicrafts grew, there was a significant advancement in the division of labor and the increase of town-country trading.

The primary characteristic of feudalism across all peoples was the exploitation of subservient peasants by feudal lords. Nonetheless, the feudal system had unique characteristics of its own in several nations. Feudal connections and slave relations were long mixed together in Eastern nations. In China, India, Japan, and many other nations, this was the case. Land owned by the feudal State was very important in the East. For instance, a significant portion of the peasant communities during the Bagdad Khalifate era, when the Arabs dominated the region (especially in the eighth and ninth centuries A.D.), resided on the Khalif's property and paid feudal rent directly to the government. The strength of patriarchal clan ties, which the feudal lords used to further their exploitation of the peasants, was another aspect of feudalism in the East.

The peasants in the irrigated agricultural regions of the East were enslaved to the feudal lords due to the fact that not only the land but also the water supplies and irrigation systems belonged to the feudal State or to specific feudal lords. For nomadic groups, the land served as grazing. The number of cattle dictated the extent of feudal land ownership. The big feudalists who had cattle were really large-scale pasture proprietors. They exploited and kept the peasants dependent. The fundamental economic principle of feudalism was the creation of surplus goods to meet the demands of the feudal lords through the exploitation of subservient peasants based on the lords' partial ownership of the workers engaged in production, known as serfs, and their ownership of the land. Communities had already emerged under the system of slave ownership. The Middle Ages took over numerous cities from the time of enslavement, including London in England, Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles in France, Rome, Florence, Venice, and Genoa in

Italy, Constantinople and Alexandria in the Near East, Samarand in Central Asia, and many more. Towns survived the fall of the slave system. The major workshops owned by slave owners collapsed, but the crafts persisted. Early Medieval cities and crafts grew slowly during this time. While town artisans made goods to sell, they also sourced most of the necessities for their personal use from their own properties. A large number of them owned animals, gardens, and tiny ploughlands. In order to create garments, the ladies spun wool and flax. This demonstrated the finite size of exchanges and marketplaces.

In the countryside, the husbandman's primary job at initially was the preparation of agricultural raw materials. Then, artisans who provided for their own hamlet started to emerge from among the peasants. The labor productivity of the artisans rose. Producing more goods than the feudal lord or the peasants in a single hamlet needed became feasible. The artisans started to congregate in big settlements, commerce hubs, along the walls of monasteries, and around feudal castles. Thus, new cities eventually emerged, mainly along the rivers (see, for example, Kiev, Pskov, Novgorod, and Vladimir in Russia). Over time, crafts emerged as an increasingly lucrative industry. The craftsman's ability was refined. The townspeople started selling their handicrafts to the feudal ruler. His dissatisfaction with his own serfs' labor had grown. At last, the most advanced trades were cut off from agriculture.

They held jurisdiction over the cities that had sprung up on the estates of lay and clerical feudal lords. The town-men were accountable to the feudal lord for a variety of tasks, paid him quitrent in cash or kind, and were under his jurisdiction and court. The town's residents quickly started fighting for independence from feudal reliance. The towns gained the authority to govern themselves, conduct courts, manufacture coins, and levy taxes, in part by force and in part via acquisition.

The majority of the people living in the town were merchants and artisans. Serfs who were fleeing from their landowners sought safety in numerous locations. In contrast to the countryside, where a natural economy predominated, the town served as the hub for the production of commodities. Craftsmen organized into guilds as a result of increasing competition from fleeing serfs who had swarmed into the cities and their resistance to feudal lords' exploitation and tyranny. In almost every nation throughout the feudal era, there was a guild system. One feudal system of craft organization was the guild system. During their first years of existence, they contributed positively to the growth and reinforcement of urban crafts. But as the market and commodity production increased, the guilds progressively stopped fostering the rise of productive forces.

The guilds' stringent control over the production of crafts limited the initiative of the artisans and impeded the advancement of their techniques. To restrict competition, the guilds started erecting various obstacles for those seeking to get mastery privileges. The prospect of becoming independent masters had all but vanished for the journeymen and apprentices, whose numbers had surged. They were forced to continue living as hired wage laborers for the rest of their lives. The relationship between a master and his subordinates no longer has the same, roughly patriarchal nature under these circumstances. The bosses increased the amount of time that their employees were exploited by forcing them to work fourteen or sixteen hours a day for pitiful wages. To protect their interests, the journeymen started banding themselves into covert fraternities. The brotherhoods of the journeymen were harassed in every manner by the guilds and local officials. The merchant class comprised the wealthiest members of the town's populace. Both the towns that emerged during feudalism and the ones that survived the era of slavery saw a growth in trade. The guild system for crafts found a corresponding structure in the trade guild system. During the medieval era, merchant guilds were present almost everywhere. They date back to the ninth century in the East, the ninth or tenth century in

Western Europe, and the twelfth century in Russia. The main responsibilities of the merchant guilds were to defend the rights of the merchants against the infringements of the feudal lords, regulate weights and measures, and fight off competition from foreign merchants.

The feudal countryside was profoundly impacted by the expansion of cities and commerce. The market started to infiltrate the feudal lords' economy. The feudal lords need money in order to buy opulent items and handcrafted goods.

The feudal lords found it simple to convert the peasants from week-work and quitrent in kind to monetary quitrent in light of this. With the shift to wealthy quitrents, feudal exploitation was further exacerbated. Under slavery, the conflict between town and country become even more pronounced.

The fundamental class conflict in medieval society was that between peasant serfs and feudal lords. Throughout the whole time of feudalism, the oppressed peasants fought the feudal lords, and this conflict reached a peak in intensity towards the end of the system, when serf exploitation had reached extraordinary proportions.

Rich townspeople, including merchants, usurers, town property owners, and substantial homeowners, held the reins of power in the towns that had been emancipated from feudal servitude. The majority of the town's residents were artists of different trades, and they often spoke out against the town's nobles to seek their place in the government alongside the aristocracy. The great craftsmen and merchants who were taking advantage of the little artisans and journeymen fought back.

The inhabitants of the town had already become significantly stratified by the end of the feudal period. There were wealthy businessmen and skilled artisans on the one side, and the town's impoverished journeymen and apprentices on the other. The towns' lower classes engaged in combat with the combined troops of the town's aristocracy and feudal lords. The fight of peasant serfs against feudal exploitation united these two streams of conflict into one.

The monarchs, first known as Grand Princes and then Tsars in Russia, were regarded as the ultimate authorities. However, the monarchs' influence was not very substantial in the early days of feudalism outside the confines of their own domains. This power often stayed minimal. All of Europe was split up into several small and major states. The big feudatories had total control over their own assets. They maintained their own armies, passed laws, oversaw their implementation, conducted courts of justice, imposed punishments, plundered their neighbors, and sometimes engaged in highway robbery. Numerous them struck coins on their own. The lesser feudal lords aspired to compete with the big lords and had very broad privileges over the subjects under their authority.

Over time, feudal relationships resulted in a very complex web of rights and responsibilities. There were constant arguments and disagreements among the feudal lords. In internecine warfare, they were often settled by force of arms. Compared to the era of slavery, a greater degree of productive forces was attained during the feudal period. Agriculture saw advancements in production techniques, with a greater reliance on the iron plow and other iron work tools. New agricultural specialties emerged, including market gardening, winemaking, and vine cultivation. Butter production flourished as livestock husbandry expanded, especially horse breeding, which was connected to the feudal lords' military duty. There was a prevalent practice of sheep breeding in many areas. Pastures and meadows were enhanced and expanded. The tools of the tradesmen's trade and the techniques for handling raw materials were refined throughout time. Earlier crafts started to specialize. Thus, all metal objects were previously made by the blacksmith, for instance. Over time, the trades of the locksmith, cutler, armourer,

and saddlemaker split off from that of the blacksmith, as did the trades of shoemaker and saddlemaker from that of the leather craftsman. The spinning wheel gained widespread use in Europe throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The ribbon loom was created in 1600.

The advancement of iron smelting and working techniques had a pivotal role in refining work tools. Iron was initially made using a rather antiquated technique. The water wheel was first used in the fourteenth century to power blast bellows and powerful hammers for crushing ore. A molten mass known as cast iron was produced in the furnaces as a result of the increased draught. Gunpowder was used in combat, and when guns were invented in the fourteenth century, a lot of metal was needed to make cannonballs. In the early fifteenth century, pig-iron was used to cast the balls. A growing amount of metal was required to produce agricultural and other tools. The first blast furnaces were built in the early part of the fifteenth century. The growth of navigation and sailing was aided by the creation of the compass, and printing was greatly influential in its dissemination.

CONCLUSION

A complicated socioeconomic structure with land-based income distribution, rural labor, and hierarchical connections was embodied in the feudal mode of production. Medieval communities were organized around the ownership and management of land under feudalism, with lords controlling enormous estates that were labored by serfs who were enslaved to the land. This structure supported the feudal order and the preservation of political authority by facilitating agricultural productivity for sustenance and surplus extraction. Feudalism, however, also brought about exploitation, social inequality, and restricted mobility since serfs had little autonomy and were under their lords' power. There was a dramatic change in social relations and economic structure when feudalism fell out of favor and capitalism emerged along with new manufacturing techniques. Feudalism eventually declined, but not before leaving a profound mark on European history and culture that still shapes ideas of power, property, and class. Understanding the complexity of historical transformation and its relevance to modern society requires further study into the dynamics of feudalism and its effects on socioeconomic progress.

REFERENCES:

[1] F. Sugden, “A mode of production flux: the transformation and reproduction of rural class relations in lowland Nepal and North Bihar,” *Dialect. Anthropol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1007/s10624-016-9436-3.

[2] N. Adebanjo and S. Sodiji, “The bourgeois hawks in market arena: a Marxist reading of A Market of Betrayal,” *AFRREV IJAH An Int. J. Arts Humanit.*, 2017, doi: 10.4314/ijah.v6i3.9.

[3] P. Nikolaidis and A. Poullikkas, “A comparative overview of hydrogen production processes,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.rser.2016.09.044.

[4] R. Geyer, J. R. Jambeck, and K. L. Law, “Production, use, and fate of all plastics ever made,” *Sci. Adv.*, 2017, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.1700782.

[5] J. F. Buyel, R. M. Twyman, and R. Fischer, “Very-large-scale production of antibodies in plants: The biologization of manufacturing,” *Biotechnology Advances*. 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.biotechadv.2017.03.011.

[6] U. Dombrowski, T. Richter, and P. Krenkel, "Interdependencies of Industrie 4.0 & Lean Production Systems: A Use Cases Analysis," *Procedia Manuf.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.promfg.2017.07.217.

[7] V. S. Sikarwar, M. Zhao, P. S. Fennell, N. Shah, and E. J. Anthony, "Progress in biofuel production from gasification," *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*. 2017. doi: 10.1016/j.pecs.2017.04.001.

[8] X. Liu, W. Ding, and H. Jiang, "Engineering microbial cell factories for the production of plant natural products: From design principles to industrial-scale production," *Microbial Cell Factories*. 2017. doi: 10.1186/s12934-017-0732-7.

[9] J. Reed *et al.*, "Trees for life: The ecosystem service contribution of trees to food production and livelihoods in the tropics," *For. Policy Econ.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.forpol.2017.01.012.

[10] R. A. Gonzalez-Garcia, T. McCubbin, L. Navone, C. Stowers, L. K. Nielsen, and E. Marcellin, "Microbial propionic acid production," *Fermentation*, 2017, doi: 10.3390/fermentation3020021.

CHAPTER 11

ANALYSIS OF THE PRIMITIVE CAPITAL ACCUMULATION

Dr. Sumbul Samreen, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.sumbul_samreen@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Two fundamental prerequisites for capitalist production are the following: first, a large number of propertyless individuals who are both individually free and deprived of their means of subsistence, forcing them to hire themselves out to capitalists for work; and second, the accumulation of wealth in money required to establish substantial capitalist enterprises. This study examines the historical relevance, economic mechanics, and socio-political ramifications of the process of primitive capital accumulation. An interdisciplinary method based on social studies, economic theory, and historical analysis is used in this research to investigate the dynamics and causes of primitive accumulation, a crucial phase in the growth of capitalist countries. Important topics covered include forced labor, colonial expansion, land expropriation, and the development of wage labor systems. Furthermore, the study takes into account how governmental authority, technical development, and international commerce have contributed to the facilitation of primitive accumulation processes in various historical settings.

KEYWORDS:

Colonialism, Capitalism, Dispossession, Labor Exploitation, State Power.

INTRODUCTION

Capitalism was nourished on the small-scale, privately owned production of commodities, and its competition enriched a select few while bankrupting the vast majority of small producers. However, this process's slowness could not meet the demands of the newly formed global market brought about by the major discoveries made at the end of the fifteenth century [1], [2]. The bourgeoisie, huge landowners, and the State, which was controlled by the exploiting classes, used the most brutal techniques of violence to accelerate the establishment of the capitalist mode of production. Marx said that force acted as a kind of midwife, bringing the new capitalist mode of production to a quicker start.

A few historians from the bourgeois school romanticize the development of the working and capitalist classes. They claim that a group of diligent and cautious individuals who amassed money by labor existed in ancient times. However, there were also a lot of idlers and sluggish people who wasted all of their wealth and became property less proletarians. These myths propagated by proponents of capitalism are unrelated to reality. In actuality, the process of forcibly depriving small producers of their means of production led to the creation of the proletariat, the bulk of people without property, and the concentration of wealth in the hands of a select few. An unending string of acts of violence and pillage followed the process of separating the producers from the means of production (the land, tools of production, and so on). Because it took place before large-scale capitalist manufacturing, this process is known as primitive capital accumulation [3], [4].

The first country where capitalist production saw significant growth was England. There began a torturous process of forcing the peasants off their land at the end of the fourteenth century in that nation. The immediate cause of this was the growing demand for wool from the big fabric manufacturers, which initially appeared in Flanders and then spread across England. Large flocks of sheep were raised by the landowners. In order to raise sheep, pastures were required.

Massively, the feudal lords drove the peasants from the areas they had taken over, took ownership of the estates they had held, and turned the arable land into pastures.

There were other ways to force the peasants off the land, but the most popular one was the outright seizure of common lands. The landowners encircled these areas, demolished the peasant houses, and drove the people out under duress. The State's military forces supported the landlord whenever the peasants tried to reclaim the land that had been unlawfully taken from them. In the seventeenth century, the State authority started to pass laws on "enclosure," which served as justification for the peasantry's looting [5], [6]. The devastated and pillaged peasants created countless throngs of destitute beggars who clogged England's cities, villages, and highways. With no way to support themselves, they turned became beggars. Bloody laws were imposed by the State authorities against the expropriated individuals. These laws stood out for their extraordinary harshness. Thus, during the sixteenth-century English monarch Henry VIII's reign, 72,000 individuals were put to death for "vagabondage."

The separation of the producer from the means of production was carried out in Tsarist Russia in the same manner as in other nations, notwithstanding the country's later entry onto the capitalist growth path than other European nations. The Tsarist administration was forced to abolish serfdom in 1861 as a result of peasant uprisings. The expulsion of the peasants from the land had two benefits. One the one hand, a very limited number of proprietors acquired private ownership of the land. Land from a feudal estate was transformed into bourgeois property. However, there would be a steady stream of unpaid laborers entering the market, eager to work for capitalists. Aside from the availability of cheap labor, the development of capitalist production depended on the concentration of enormous wealth in a small number of hands. These riches took the shape of large quantities of money that could be used to employ labour and convert into any kind of production methods.

During the Middle Ages, usurers and businessmen amassed substantial wealth. Later, these riches served as the foundation for the establishment of many capitalist businesses. The conquerors gained enormous wealth from the conquest of America, which was followed by the widespread looting and annihilation of the native inhabitants. This wealth increased even more as a consequence of the exploitation of very rich gold and silver mines. The mines need hands to operate. The Indian inhabitants, who were native to the area, died in large numbers as a result of the hard-working conditions. The hunting of black people in Africa was organized by European traders, and it was done just as they were hunting wild animals. The export of African blacks for the purpose of enslavement was a very lucrative commerce. The wealth of the slave dealers reached incredible heights. African American slave labor started to be used extensively on American cotton plantations [7], [8].

Large fortunes could also be made via colonial commerce, which was a major factor. East India firms were established by Dutch, English, and French merchants to engage in commerce with India. Their governments provided backing to these enterprises. They also received the exclusive right to trade colonial goods and the freedom to employ any kind of coercion to fully exploit the colonies. The East India firms' annual revenues were estimated to be in the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Both the predatory trade with the Siberian populace and the corrupt system of liquor monopolies, which included the State giving private businesses the exclusive right to manufacture and market alcoholic beverages in exchange for predetermined fees, resulted in enormous profits for the Russian merchant class. As a consequence, a great deal of wealth was concentrated in the capital of traders and usurers. Thus, the money necessary for the establishment of massive capitalist businesses "was accumulated" at the cost of the pillage and demise of the vast majority of small producers. Over the course of the feudal era, the peasants engaged in a fierce battle against the landlords, but this conflict peaked toward the

conclusion of the period. France had the "Jacquerie," a peasant conflict that is remembered in history, during the fourteenth century. The towns' growing bourgeoisie initially backed this effort, but at the critical juncture they turned away [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

A peasant uprising that swept throughout the majority of England occurred at the end of the fourteenth century. Armed peasants led by Wat Tyler marched around the nation, pillaging the homes and monasteries of landowners before making their way into London. To put down the uprising, the feudal lords resorted to violence and fraud. Tyler was slain in a betrayal. The rebels scattered to their homes, believing the monarch and the feudal lords' assurances. Following this, punitive expeditions roamed the countryside punishing the peasants severely. A peasant war backed by the town poor rocked Germany at the start of the sixteenth century. The rebel commander was Thomas Münzer. The peasants called for an end to the landlords' brutality and license.

The peasant conflicts in Russia throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, led by Stepan Razin and Emelyan Pugachov, were notably extensive. The insurgent peasants demanded the end of landlord authority, the elimination of serfdom, and the transfer of government and landowner estates to themselves. A wide wave of peasant uprisings on the eve of the 1861 reform was a manifestation of the intensifying crises of the feudal serfowning system of economics in the 1850s. Peasant uprisings and conflicts in China have occurred on a massive scale throughout the millennia. Millions of peasants were included in the rise of the T'ai P'ing under the Tsing dynasty (middle of the nineteenth century). The rebels took control of Nanking, the former Chinese capital. In terms of land usage and other property, equality was declared by the T'ai P'ing agricultural legislation. In their own unique manner, the T'ai P'ing connected peasant democracy with monarchy in state organization, a feature shared by peasant movements throughout various nations.

Peasant uprisings were revolutionary because they upended the underpinnings of feudalism and ultimately resulted in the abolition of serfdom. Bourgeois revolutions brought about the nations of Western Europe to move from feudalism to capitalism. The emerging bourgeoisie took advantage of the peasant movement against the landlords to seize control of the system, substitute capitalist exploitation of serfs, and expedite the end of the feudal order. The majority of people battling against feudalism in the bourgeois revolutions were peasants. That was the case throughout the sixteenth-century Dutch bourgeois revolution. That was the case throughout the seventeenth-century English Revolution. That was the case during the French bourgeois revolution at the close of the 1700s.

The bourgeoisie ascended to power by using the gains made by the peasants during their revolutionary battle. The peasants had a fierce animosity for their oppressors. However, the peasant risings had an organic quality. As a class of tiny private proprietors, the peasantry was fragmented and unable to form a cohesive organization or a well-defined plan of action for the conflict. The only way for peasant risings to succeed is if they join forces with the workers' movement and take the initiative. But even throughout the bourgeois upheavals of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the working class remained small, disorganized, and powerless. More or less full versions of the capitalist system developed in the womb of feudal society. The proletariat, a vast group of individuals devoid of the means of production, emerged concurrently with the rise of the new exploiting class, the capitalist class. During the bourgeois revolutions, the bourgeoisie employed the economic law of the necessary correspondence between the character of the forces of production and the relations of production to subvert feudalism. They dismantled the feudal production relations, established new bourgeois

relations, and aligned production relations with the traits of the forces of production that had developed within the confines of feudalism. The feudal system was ended by the bourgeois revolutions, which also solidified capitalism's hegemony. The feudal era's economic beliefs mirrored the prevailing social structure of the time. Because the clergy controlled mental life in medieval society, it was primarily expressed in religious and scholastic contexts. Special parts of religious tracts were devoted to considerations of the economic life of the period.

Chinese economic beliefs were shaped by Confucius's teachings for many generations. The theological philosophy of Confucianism emerged as early as the fifth century B.C. Confucianism's social and economic theories mandate the rigid upholding of the feudal state hierarchy in both the family and the state. Confucius once said, "The aristocrats and wise men should be obeyed by the unenlightened people." Disorder starts when common people disrespect their superiors. In addition, Confucius urged the "nobles" to treat the impoverished with compassion and to refrain from using excessive force. Confucius argued that China, which had previously been split, ought to be brought back together and ruled by a king. Confucius and his adherents glorified the "golden age" of the patriarchal past and idealized outdated economic systems. Despite the fact that Confucianism did not represent the class interests of the peasants, the peasantry, crushed by the feudal nobility and the merchants, inserted their own goals and expectations for improvement of their lot into the teachings of Confucius. Confucianism changed throughout time to become the recognized ideology of the feudal elite. It was used by the governing classes to instill in the populace a sense of obedient obedience to Thomas Aquinas, a thirteenth-century European feudalist, tried to use divine law as a justification for the need of feudal society. In contrast to the historical slave owners, Thomas Aquinas said that feudal property was essential and rational and that peasant serfs were slaves. He also claimed that "in his soul the slave is free" and that a master had no authority to execute a slave. Work was no longer seen as beneath a free man. According to Thomas Aquinas, cerebral labor is lofty while bodily labor is low.

He recognized the rationale for society's separation of labor into estates in this division. In his opinions on wealth, the feudal estates' perspective was adopted in a similar manner. Every individual should own money according with their standing on the hierarchical feudal ladder. From this vantage point, the theologians of the Middle Ages taught something recognizable about the so-called "just" price. The amount of labor required to manufacture a product and the producer's estate should be reflected in the "just" price.

The "just" price's supporters in the Middle Ages had no objections to commercial profits. Their main goal was to keep earnings within reasonable limits so as not to jeopardize the other estates' ability to make ends meet. They denounced usury as a dishonorable and unethical profession. However, as commodity production and trade increased, the clergy themselves started to lend money, and the Church's view of usury became more tolerant of this practice.

For numerous centuries, the downtrodden and exploited masses' class fight against the ruling classes of feudal society took on a religious shape. Many of the requests made by journeymen and mistreated peasants were based on passages from the Bible. Sects of every kind were fairly common. Through the Inquisition, the Catholic church ruthlessly persecuted "heretics," burning them at the stake. The religious aspect of the oppressed masses' movement faded into the background as the class conflict intensified, leaving the revolutionary nature of the movement increasingly more apparent. The peasants sought the end of serf slavery, the elimination of feudal rights, the creation of equal rights, the dissolution of estates, and other things. The radicality of the rebels' slogans increased throughout the peasant conflicts in England, Bohemia, and Germany. The desire for community of property is an expression of the aspiration for equality that the oppressed masses of both town and country feel. This

represented a desire for parity in the realm of consumption. Despite its impossibility, the demand for shared property was revolutionary at the time because it mobilized the populace against feudal rule.

feudalism, the goal of accumulating riches in gold and silver via the development of foreign commerce, colonial pillage, commercial conflicts, and the slavery of people from backward cultures. They started to demand that the State authorities safeguard the growth of industrial companies, or factories, in tandem with the spread of capitalism. There were established export bounties, which were given to traders who sold goods on international markets. Import taxes quickly became even greater importance. The most common way for domestic industry to protect itself from foreign competition as factories and thereafter manufacturers expanded was to impose taxes on imported goods.

We refer to such a defensive strategy as protectionism. When England faced threats from the more advanced Dutch manufacturers in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, protective tariffs were very important. England began to take the lead in industry gradually starting in the seventeenth century. She was too strong for other, less developed nations to match. As a result, the concept of free trade started to spread across England. Countries that adopted capitalism later than England found themselves in a different predicament. Consequently, Colbert, the minister of Louis XIV, who really dominated France in the seventeenth century, established a complex network of state sponsorship of manufacturers.

High import taxes, a ban on raw material exports, the development of many new industrial sectors, the formation of businesses for international commerce, and other measures were all part of his system. For its period, capitalism had a constructive role. The expansion of industries was significantly aided by the protectionist policies that were derived from mercantilist principles. However, the mercantilists' conception of wealth at the time mirrored the lack of advancement in capitalist production.

The flawed ideas underlying the commercial system became more apparent as capitalism expanded. The main economic structure in Russia throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was the feudal serf-owning system. In a sense, the economy developed naturally. At the same time, a national market was established, factories started to appear, and commerce and handicraft both saw significant growth. The country's economic transformations contributed to the rise of absolutism in Russia. Certain mercantilist theories were created by Russian economic thought leaders in response to the historical and economic characteristics of their nation. But unlike many mercantilists in West Europe, they also placed a high value on the development of industry and agriculture in addition to commerce.

The collapse of the slave-owning civilization and the dissolution of the tribal village communities that overran the slave-owning States were the primary causes of eudalism. Feudalism developed in the nations without a system of slave ownership as a result of the dissolution of the prehistoric communal structure. Large tracts of land were seized by the clan nobility and tribal military chiefs, who then divided them among their adherents. The peasants were progressively enslaved. The foundation of production relations in feudal society was the land ownership of the feudal lord and the partial ownership of the worker engaged in production, the peasant serf. In addition to the feudal property, there was the personal labor-based private property of the artisan and peasant. Feudal society came into being as a result of the labor of the peasant serfs. The way that the peasants were forced to either labor seven days a week for the feudal lord or give him quitrent, which might be either cash or kind, was an example of serf exploitation. The burden that serfdom and slavery placed on the peasantry were sometimes extremely similar. But since the peasant could work a cer, the serf system created

certain opportunities for the growth of the productive forces. The fundamental economic principle of feudalism is the creation of surplus goods through the exploitation of subservient peasants in order to meet the demands of the feudal lords. This is done on the basis of the lords' partial ownership of the serfs, who are the workers in the production process, and their ownership of the land. Feudal society was divided into tiny princedoms and states, especially during the early Middle Ages.

In feudal society, the governing classes were composed of nobles and clergy. Peasant estates were not granted political privileges. Throughout the whole history of feudal civilization, there was a class conflict between peasants and feudal lords. The feudal State, which represented the interests of the clergy and aristocracy, was a powerful factor behind their efforts to strengthen their feudal ownership rights over the land and to further exploit the downtrodden and destitute peasants. Agriculture was the main industry throughout the medieval era, and the economy was essentially natural. Old cities that had survived the collapse of the slave-owning system came back to life, and new towns were created, thanks to the growth of the social division of labor and trading. The towns served as hubs for commerce and handicrafts. The crafts were arranged into guilds that made an effort to avoid rivalry. In merchant guilds, traders came together. The natural economy was disrupted by the rise of commodity production, which caused a divide between the artisans and the peasants.

The emergence of capitalist enterprises, such as factories, was aided by merchant capital, which also accelerated the loss of crafts. Commodity production was restrained by geographical divides and feudal restrictions. The creation of the national market occurred throughout the course of further growth. The absolute monarchy gave rise to the centralized feudal state. The early capital accumulation laid the groundwork for capitalism's development. The means of production were taken away from a vast number of small producers, including artisans and peasants. Large landowners, merchants, and usurers became the proprietors of a great deal of financial wealth that was acquired by taxation, slavery, colonial commerce, and the forced expropriation of the peasants. As a result, the emergence of the capitalist class hierarchy—wage workers and capitalists—was expedited. Within the womb of feudal society, more or less full versions of the capitalist social order developed and matured. The poor productivity of the peasant serfs' forced labor and guild limitations prevented the productive forces from developing further. These factors combined to create the production relations of feudalism. Peasant serf uprisings caused the feudal system to collapse and resulted in the end of serfdom. In the fight to end feudalism, the bourgeoisie assumed the lead. In order to seize control for itself, it capitalized on the peasant movement against the feudal masters. The growth of the forces of production was made possible by the bourgeois revolutions, which ended the feudal order and instituted capitalism.

The foundation of the capitalist mode of production, which replaced the feudal method of production, is the class of capitalists' exploitation of the wage-worker class. The cornerstone of the capitalist system is commodity production; under capitalism, everything is a commodity, and the buying and selling principle permeates every aspect of society. This is the first and most important thing to keep in mind while trying to comprehend the nature of the capitalist mode of production. Production of commodities predates that of capitalism. It existed in a civilization that practiced feudalism and owned slaves. Capitalist production emerged as a result of basic commodity manufacturing at the time when feudalism was disintegrating. The social division of labor, in which individual producers specialize in producing certain goods, and the presence of private property in the means of production and labor products are prerequisites for simple commodity production. The fact that the basic commodity production of artisans and peasants is dependent on the individual labor of the commodity producer sets it

apart from capitalist commodity production. However, inasmuch as private property in the means of production forms its basis, it is essentially comparable to capitalist production. Competition between commodity producers, which results in the enrichment of a few and the devastation of the majority, is an inevitable byproduct of private ownership. Thus, the emergence and growth of capitalist relations originate from small-scale commodity production.

CONCLUSION

The approach emphasizes how crucial basic capital accumulation was in determining how capitalist society developed. Early capitalist economies created the conditions for the rise of contemporary capitalism by seizing land, abusing workers, and concentrating wealth. Primitive accumulation was characterized by systematic violence, eviction, and compulsion, which nourished power disparities and injustices that still exist today. Moreover, the enduring effects of prehistoric accumulation persist in shaping modern economic frameworks, labor practices, and worldwide disparities. Knowledge the historical foundations of capitalism and tackling its current socio-economic effects need a better knowledge of primitive capital accumulation. Future studies need to keep delving into the intricacies of primitive accumulation and how it affects modern society.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. Tilley, A. Kumar, and T. Cowan, "Introduction: Enclosures and discontents: Primitive accumulation and resistance under globalised capital," *City*. 2017. doi: 10.1080/13604813.2017.1331562.

[2] C. Fairweather, "The Sharing Economy as Primitive Accumulation: Locating the Political-Economic Position of the Capital-Extractive Sharing Economy," *HPS J. Hist. Polit. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.25071/2291-3637.40227.

[3] S. Chattopadhyay, "Calibán y la bruja y las geografías corporales más amplias," *Gender, Place Cult.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/0966369X.2017.1298570.

[4] E. Okan, "How did it all begin? Adam Smith on the early and rude state of society and the age of hunters," *Eur. J. Hist. Econ. Thought*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/09672567.2017.1381134.

[5] B. Shakya and R. R. Pant, "Contribution of Api-Nampa Conservation Area on the Livelihood of Poor and Disadvantaged People of Darchula District, Nepal," *Himal. Biodivers.*, 2017, doi: 10.3126/hebids.v5i1.36154.

[6] O. U. Ince, "Between Equal Rights: Primitive Accumulation and Capital's Violence," *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2971324.

[7] S. Nair, "Introducing postcolonialism in international relations theory," *E-International Relations*, 2017.

[8] S. Sinha, "'Histories of Power', the 'Universalization of Capital', and India's Modi Moment: Between and Beyond Marxism and Postcolonial Theory," *Crit. Sociol.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/0896920516641732.

[9] P. Chatterton and S. Hodkinson, "why we need autonomous spaces in the fight against capitalism," in *Do It Yourself*, 2017. doi: 10.2307/j.ctt183q5zv.19.

[10] C. L. Hoyt and G. R. Goethals, "Women and Leadership: History, Theories, and Case Studies," *Forum on Public Policy Online*, 2017.

CHAPTER 12

COMMODITY AND ITS CHARACTERISTICS IN POLITICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Syed Kazim, Associate Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.syed_kazim@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
In the context of political economics, this research explores the idea of the commodity, looking at its traits, applications, and role in forming social structures and economic systems. The study investigates the nature of commodities as objects of trade, production, and consumption in capitalist society via an interdisciplinary approach based on literature from the fields of economics, sociology, and political science. Important areas of inquiry include the role of labor in the production of commodities, the connection between trade and use values, and the monetization of labor and natural resources. Additionally, the research looks at how power structures, social interactions, and market dynamics are affected by the commodification process in capitalist countries.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalism, Commodification, Exchange Value, Labor, Use Value.

INTRODUCTION

A commodity is anything that is created for trade rather than for personal use and that, in the first place, meets a need of humans. A object has use-value if it has the qualities that allow it to meet a need for humans. These qualities are known as its usefulness. A use-value may provide material riches via manufacturing, or it might directly fulfill a specific human need. For example, bread fulfills a need as nourishment and fabric as clothing, but a loom's use comes from the fact that cloth is produced on it [1], [2]. Over the course of human history, man has consistently found new and valuable properties in objects as well as new applications for them.

Many objects, like spring water or the fruits of natural trees, have use-value even if they were not produced by human labor in any manner. However, not all useful things are commodities. Something has to be the result of labor produced for sale in order to qualify as a commodity. The material foundation of wealth, regardless of its social form, is use-value. Use-value is the repository of a commodity's exchange-value in an economy based on commodities. The quantitative connection in which use-values of one type are traded for use-values of another kind is the earliest manifestation of exchange-value. One axe, for instance, is traded for twenty kilograms of grain.

The exchange-value of the commodities is also indicated in this quantitative connection. Since commodities are seen as being comparable to one another in certain amounts, they need to share a foundation. None of the inherent characteristics of goods, such as their weight, size, form, etc., can serve as this foundation [3], [4].

The utility and use-value of commodities are determined by their inherent qualities; hence, a difference in the use-values of the goods to be traded is a prerequisite for exchange. Nothing will be exchanged for commodities that are the same, like sugar for sugar or wheat for wheat. Because the use-values of various commodities vary qualitatively, they cannot be quantitatively compared. The fact that all commodities are the result of labor is the single thing that unites them and allows for comparison between them in terms of trade. The social labor

required to produce two commodities that are traded against one another lies at the basis of their equivalency. A commodities producer discovers that he can trade his axe for 20 kilogrammes of grain when he takes it to market. This indicates that 20 kilograms of grain are equivalent to the same amount of social labor as an axe. Value is the social labor that goes into producing a commodity and is embodied in it [5], [6].

Certain well-known facts support the idea that the value of goods represents the social labor required to produce them. Material riches, such as air, has no worth since it doesn't take labor to produce, yet being valuable in and of itself. Rich things that need a lot of labor are highly valued, such as gold and diamonds. Many formerly expensive goods have become more affordable as a result of technological advancements that have decreased the labor required to create them. The quantitative connection between these commodities when they are traded, or their exchange-value, often reflects changes in the quantity of labor used in their production. All of this suggests that a commodity's exchange-value is the form in which its worth appears.

The social division of labor between the individuals who possess these goods is concealed behind the trade of commodities. Producers of commodities are comparing their various types of labor when they compare one item with another. Value, thus, represents the production-relationships between producers of commodities. The trade of goods is one way that these relationships show themselves.

Commodities have two distinct personalities: they are values in one sense and use-values in another. The dual nature of the labor that is represented in the commodity is what gives rise to its dual character. The types of labor created are as diverse as the use-values that are generated. A joiner's labor differs significantly from that of a shoemaker, tailor, etc.

The objectives, approaches, instruments, and, in the end, the outcomes set each kind of labor apart from the others. The joiner uses an axe, a saw, and a plane to create wooden furniture such as tables, chairs, and cabinets, whereas the tailor uses a sewing machine, scissors, and a needle to create clothing. As a result, a certain kind of labor is embodied in each use-value: the labor of the joiner is embodied in a table, the labor of the tailor in a suit, the labor of the shoemaker in a pair of shoes, etc. Concrete labor is labor that is put out in a certain manner. A commodity gains its use-value via concrete labor [7], [8].

Commodities of the widest variety, produced by diverse types of concrete labor, are compared and measured together in the process of trade. Therefore, something common, something inherent in all types of labor, is buried beneath the many specific forms of labor. Despite the qualitative differences between the two types of labor, the labor performed by joiners and tailors is nevertheless considered to be homogenous human labor since it involves the productive use of human minds, nerves, muscles, etc. Commodity producers' labor is abstract labor as it is defined as the broad use of human labor, regardless of the labor's physical form. An abstract labor is what gives a commodity its worth.

The dual nature of labor contained in a commodity represents the conflict between the private and social labor of the commodity producers in a society where private property in the means of production is predominant. Private ownership of the means of production divides society and turns each commodity producer's labor into a personal matter.

Every producer of commodities runs his business independently of the others. On the level of the whole society, the labor of the individual workers is neither coordinated nor concerted. From a different perspective, however, the social division of labor implies that the producers who are employed by one another have broad ties to one another. The reciprocal dependency of the latter increases with the division of labor in society and the diversity of goods produced

by the many producers. As a result, the labor of every individual producer of a product is fundamentally social labor and makes up a little portion of the labor of society at large. In addition to being the result of many forms of specific, concrete labor, commodities are also the result of universal, abstract human labor.

Thus, the labor of commodity producers which is directly each person's private matter while yet having a social character constitutes the paradox of commodity production. The social nature of their labor throughout the manufacturing process is concealed since commodity goods are isolated from one another. It can only be expressed during the exchange process, which occurs when a commodity is introduced to the market and traded for another commodity. It can only be ascertained via the trading process if society will recognize and require the labor of a certain commodity producer [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

The value of a commodity is derived by abstract labor, a particular kind of social labor that is exclusive to the commodity system. It is a historical concept. In a natural economy, people make goods for their own use rather than for trade, making the social nature of their labor immediately apparent. For instance, a feudal lord directly seized the labor of serf-peasants in the form of labor services or specific goods when he extracted surplus product from them in the form of labor-rent or rent in kind. Social work in these situations did not take the shape of abstract labor. Products are made for sale rather than for personal use in the manufacture of commodities. Here, the social nature of labor is shown via contrasting one good with another, which is accomplished by reducing tangible forms of labor to the abstract labor that determines a good's worth. This process happens behind the producers of commodities, on its own initiative, without any kind of coordinated strategy. Labor-time is what determines how much a commodity is worth.

The greater a commodity's worth, the more labor-time required to create it. Naturally, in order to create one kind of item, different laborers must put in different labor hours and work under different circumstances. Does this imply that the value of the product an employee produces increases with his level of idleness or the unfavorable circumstances under which he works? No, that is not what it means.

The amount of labor that is socially required to create a commodity determines its worth, not the amount of labor that a specific commodity producer uses to make the good. The amount of time required to produce a good under typical social circumstances, that is, with average labor intensity, average skill level, and average technique level, is known as socially necessary labor time. It is equivalent to the production circumstances under which the majority of a certain category of commodities are created. Changes in socially required labor times brought forth by an increase in labor productivity.

The quantity of goods produced in a certain amount of labor time is the measure of labor productivity. The advancement of technology, the skill level of the workforce, the rationalization of work, the use to a greater extent of the manufacturing process, and other factors all contribute to a rise in labor productivity. It also depends, in part, on the state of the natural world. A given commodity's value decreases with increasing labor productivity since it takes less time to produce a unit of the good.

It's important to differentiate between the productivity of labor and its intensity. The quantity of work done in a certain length of time determines the intensity of the work. An increase in labor intensity corresponds to a corresponding rise in labor expenditure during the same time period. Compared to less intense labor, more intensive labor produces a higher quantity of

goods and adds more value in a given amount of time. A wide range of skilled laborers are involved in the manufacture of goods. Simple labor is what a worker who has not had any particular training does. Work that calls for specialized training is categorized as skilled or difficult work.

Greater value is produced in a given amount of time by complex labor than by simple labor. A portion of the labor used to train employees and increase their level of expertise also goes into the value of a product produced by complicated labor. One hour of complicated labor is equal to multiple hours of simple labor. Complicated labor is comparable to multiplied simple labor. With commodity production based on private property, different types of complicated labor naturally reduce to simple labor. The quantity of simple labor required by society determines the value of a commodity. Labor is the source of a commodity's worth throughout the manufacturing process, but exchange-value the process of comparing one commodity to another is the only way that this value can be expressed. A commodity's worth may be expressed in terms of another commodity in the simplest form possible, for as one axe=2.0 kilogrammes of grain. Let's look at this form. The axe's worth is stated in terms of grain in this instance. The worth of the axe is expressed via the grain. Only because labor is used in both the manufacturing of the axe and the grain can the worth of the axe be expressed in terms of the grain's use-value. The same amount of labor required to produce these goods is hidden behind their equality. A commodity has a relative form of value if it represents its worth in another commodity, in this case, the axe. There is an alternative form for a commodity whose use-value is used to represent the value of another commodity (in our case, the grain). The grain is valued the same as the other item, which is the axe.

Thus, the form in which the value of one item, grain, is conveyed becomes that of another, axe. The first forms of commerce were informal and included the direct trade of one good for another. They had their roots in prehistoric culture. All commodities start to be traded for a commodity that serves as a universal equivalent, which is a feature of the general form of value.By this point, however, no particular good had come to play the function of universal equivalent. Different commodities served as the universal equivalent in various contexts. It was cattle in some locations, furs in others, salt in still others, and so forth. Commodity production continued to expand, and the market grew as a result of the productive forces' continued expansion, the switch to metal tools, and the emergence of the second major division of labor the separation of handicraft from agriculture. The multiplicity of goods acting as universal equivalents clashed with the demands of the expanding market, necessitating the shift to a single equivalent.

The monetary form of value emerged when one commodity had come to play the function of universal equivalent. A number of metals have assumed the function of money, but ultimately gold and silver, the precious metals, came to dominate the market. All the qualities of metals that make them the best option to perform the role of money homogeneity, divisibility, durability, and small size and weight paired with excellent value are especially evident in silver and gold. As a result, the function of money grew to be closely associated with precious metals, particularly gold throughout time. Money's primary purpose is to be a unit of measurement for the worth of goods. Money facilitates the communal representation of a commodity producer's individual labor and allows for the impromptu computation and measurement of all commodities' values. A commodity's value cannot be expressed in terms of labor hours directly because, in an environment where private commodity producers operate independently of one another, it is impossible to calculate the total amount of labor required by society as a whole, not just a specific commodity producer, to produce a given commodity. Because of this, the only method to communicate a commodity's worth is indirectly, via the act of exchanging the

product for money. Money has to be a commodity and have worth in order to serve as a measure of value. The worth of a commodity can only be determined by a commodity that has value, just as the weights of bodies can only be determined by scales that have weights of their own.

Commodity values are measured in terms of gold even before they are converted to monetary values. It is not required to have cash in one's hands in order to communicate the worth of goods in money. A commodity's owner mentally represents the commodity's worth in gold when they set a fixed price for it. This is made feasible by the actual existence of a clear link between the value of gold and the value of the specific product; the labor that is required in society to produce these commodities serves as the foundation for this correlation. The price of a commodity is its worth stated in monetary terms. A commodity's price is its monetary representation of its worth. Commodities represent their worth in undefined quantities of gold or silver. These monetary commodity quantities themselves need to be quantified in turn. This results in the need for a monetary unit of measurement. This unit is made up of a certain weight-based quantity of the metal used to make money.

For instance, the pound sterling, which was once equivalent to a pound of silver, is the name of the currency unit used in Britain. Later, the units of money and weight stopped matching. This happened as a result of importing coins from elsewhere, switching from silver to gold, and, most importantly, because governments steadily decreased the weight of currencies by debasing them. Monetary units are split into aliquot portions for ease of measurement: the rouble is divided into 100 kopeks, the dollar into 100 cents, the franc into 100 centimes, and so on. The price standard is provided by the money unit and its components. When money is used as a standard of value, it has an entirely different function than when it is used as a measure of price. Money monitors the worth of other commodities as a measure of value, but it also measures the amount of the money metal itself as a standard of pricing. Changes in the quantity of labor socially required for the production of the money commodity affect its value. Gold's role as a benchmark for pricing does not adapt to changes in its value. No matter how much gold's price fluctuates, a dollar is still worth 100 times more than a penny.

The value connection between gold and other commodities cannot be changed by the State, but it may change the amount of gold in the money unit.In the event that the State were to decrease the quantity of gold in the money unit, or lower its gold content, the market would respond by raising prices, and a commodity's value would once again be expressed in the amount of gold that matched the labor required to produce it. All that would change is the number of monetary units required to describe the same amount of gold would increase. Money was directly represented by gold or silver bars when commodities were traded. This created some challenges since the money metal needed to be weighed, broken up into tiny bits, and tested. Coins gradually replaced the money metal bars. A coin is a piece of metal that is used as a means of exchange and has a certain weight, form, and denomination. The State had a monopoly on the minting of currency.

Coins lose some of their value as a result of wear and tear during circulation. Coins with wear might serve as a circulating medium just as effectively as coins with their whole worth, as shown by the practice of monetary circulation. This was due to the fact that money only has a temporary function as a means of exchange. Typically, a commodity seller will take payment in order to use the funds to purchase another commodity. As a result, money used as a means of exchange need not always have intrinsic worth. Governments started deliberately debasing coinage, lowering its weight, and lowering the quality of assay of the money metal without altering the nominal value of coins, or the number of monetary units imprinted upon them, in response to the practice of the circulation of worn coins. Coins started to become more and more into money tokens and symbols of worth.

Their real worth is much lower than what they seem to be on paper. The purpose of money is to facilitate accumulation and the creation of hoards. When money is removed from circulation, it becomes a hoard. Since money may be converted into any kind of commodity at any time, it is the worldwide symbol for wealth. It may be stored in any amount. Producers of commodities amass wealth, for instance, to purchase equipment for production or as savings. The manufacturing of commodities increases the power of money. All of this leads to the development of hoards and a drive for conserving money. Gold and silver coins, bars, and other items composed of gold and silver are the only money that can serve the purpose of a hoard. Coins made of gold or silver that are used as currency automatically adjust their value to meet the needs of the commodity circulation. A portion of the gold coins go into hoards and are removed from circulation as the output of commodities falls and their circulation contracts. When output increases and the flow of commodities Money serves as a way of making payments. When purchasing and selling goods are done on credit, or with a postponed payment, money is involved as a form of payment. When a product is purchased on credit, it is transferred from the seller to the customer without the buyer having to make an immediate payment. When it comes time to pay for the bought item, the buyer pays the seller with cash rather than transferring the item; this has already happened beforehand. In addition, money is used as payment for other expenses like rent and taxes.

Commodities are simultaneously purchased and sold in several locations. The overall price of the commodities in circulation, which in turn relies on the number of commodities and the price of each individual item, determines the amount of money required for circulation in a particular time. The speed at which money transfers is another important factor to consider. Less money is required for circulation the faster it goes, and vice versa. If, for instance, goods are sold for a total price of $1,000,000,000 over the course of a year and each dollar travels five times on average, then $200,000,000 is required for the whole mass of commodities to be circulated.

The total of the prices of commodities supplied on credit and the total of payments that mutually cancel out minimize the demand for money since commodity producers give each other credit. Only the payment of those financial obligations whose due date has come requires ready money. The quantity of money required for the circulation of goods must thus equal the sum of the prices of all commodities, divided by the average turnover of money units of the same denomination. This is known as the law of the circulation of money. In addition, the total of all commodity prices must be subtracted from the total of all commodity prices sold on credit as well as the total of mutually canceling payments. The total of all payments for the time to settle must then be added. When gold is exchanged in international trade, it serves as a universal purchasing power for goods imported into other nations, a means of paying off foreign debts, interest on loans from abroad, and other obligations. Additionally, gold is the universal symbol of social wealth when it is transferred in monetary form between nations, such as when capital is exported from one nation to another to be deposited in foreign banks, used for loans, or to cover contributions made by a defeated nation to a victorious one.

The evolution of money's role reflects the expansion of commodity production and the tensions that accompany it. Money has a class component in social structures founded on the exploitation of humans by humans as it is a tool for taking advantage of other people's labor. It had this function in feudal and slave-owning societies. As we'll see later, in capitalist society, the use of money as a tool for exploitation reached its pinnacle of growth. In industrialized commodity producing countries, paper money is often utilized in place of gold coins. The practice of circulating worn and devalued coins that had become into symbols of gold, or money, gave rise to the production of paper money. When it comes to paper money's role as a medium of exchange, citizens are obligated to accept money tokens issued by the government

in lieu of gold. There is no intrinsic value to paper money. It is thus unable to serve as a gauge for the worth of goods. No matter how much paper money is printed, it will only ever be worth the amount of gold required to keep commodities in circulation. Gold cannot be exchanged for paper money.

The buying power of paper money, or the quantity of goods it can be used to purchase, will match the purchasing power of gold money if paper money is created in line with the quantity of gold required for circulation. However, the State often prints paper money to pay for its needs, disregarding the requirements of the circulation of commodities, particularly during times of war, crisis, or other catastrophes. It is discovered that the amount of paper money created exceeds the amount of gold required for circulation when restrictions are placed on the production and circulation of goods.

CONCLUSION

The importance of commodities in political economics and capitalist societies is highlighted by the examination. Commodities are essential for economic activity, social interactions, and the continuation of capitalist modes of production since they are the basic units of trade and production. Commodification is the process by which products and services are turned into commodities to be traded, often at the expense of their inherent utility value. The contradictory aspect of capitalism is reflected in the dual nature of commodities, as market forces put profit maximization ahead of satisfying human needs. In addition, the monetization of work turns people into commodities, which breeds unfair labor practices and increases socioeconomic disparities. Analyzing the operation of capitalist economies and investigating solutions to solve social and economic inequities need an understanding of the properties and dynamics of commodities. Subsequent investigations need to continue in closely examining the function of commodities in political economies and championing measures that advance economic equity and social wellbeing.

REFERENCES:

[1] T. C. Lopes and H. D. Neder, “Sraffa, Leontief, Lange: The political economy of input–output economics,” *EconomiA*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.econ.2016.08.001.

[2] G. de Graaf and Z. van der Wal, “Without Blinders: Public Values Scholarship in Political Science, Economics, and Law—Content and Contribution to Public Administration,” *Public Integr.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/10999922.2016.1269277.

[3] J. O. Suárez-Valdés, “Economía política, desigualdad y liberalismo, 1750-1850,” *Historia Constitucional*. 2017.

[4] F. Obeng-Odoom, “Urban Governance in Africa Today: Reframing, Experiences, and Lessons,” *Growth Change*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/grow.12164.

[5] J. Mulderrig, “Reframing obesity: a critical discourse analysis of the UK’s first social marketing campaign,” *Crit. Policy Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/19460171.2016.1191364.

[6] K. A. Stepanovich, “Counterfactual thinking,” *Log. Investig.*, 2017, doi: 10.21146/2074-1472-2017-23-2-98-122.

[7] T. Zarsky, “Incompatible: The GDPR in the Age of Big Data,” *Seton Hall Law Rev.*, 2017.

[8] E. Charney, “Genes, behavior, and behavior genetics,” *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science*. 2017. doi: 10.1002/wcs.1405.

[9] H. Badinger and W. H. Reuter, "Determinants of fiscal rules," *Appl. Econ. Lett.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/13504851.2016.1173171.

[10] S. Dellavigna, J. A. List, U. Malmendier, and G. Rao, "Voting to tell others," *Rev. Econ. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/restud/rdw056.

CHAPTER 13

LAW OF VALUE-AN ECONOMIC LAW OF COMMODITY PRODUCTION

Dr. Uma C Swadimath, Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.uma_swadimath@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:
One of the fundamental economic theories governing the production and trade of commodities is known as the Law of Value. This paper explores this law's history, ramifications, and uses, highlighting its importance in comprehending capitalism economies and social systems. The study clarifies how the Law of Value regulates the distribution of wealth, pricing, and resource allocation in market-based systems by drawing on Marxist economic theory and classical political economics. The investigation focused on three main areas: the dialectical link between use value and exchange value, the expression of value relations in capitalist production processes, and the function of socially required labor time in establishing the exchange value of commodities.

KEYWORDS:

Capitalism, Exchange Value, Marxist Economics, Socially Necessary Labor Time.

INTRODUCTION

Private commodity producers work independently to generate commodities under a private property-based system of commodity production. There is a competition for dominance amongst these producers of commodities. To keep and strengthen his own place in the market, each person seeks to drive the others away. Without any kind of overarching strategy, production moves forward. All producers operate independently, with no knowledge of the demand for the product they are producing, the number of other producers engaged in the same production, the possibility that their product will find a market, or the possibility that they will be compensated for the labor they have invested [1], [2]. As commodity output expands, the market's influence on commodity producers only becomes stronger.

This indicates that the economic laws of competition and production anarchy are in effect in the production of commodities while private ownership of the means of production is maintained. This rule captures the impromptu character of commerce and production as well as the competition between private producers of commodities to provide better terms for the manufacturing and distribution of items. In the context of private property-based commodity production, when anarchy reigns, the law of value emerges as a spontaneous regulator of production, operating via market competition. The exchange of commodities is based on the quantity of labor that is socially and economically required for their creation, as determined by the law of value, an economic law of commodity production [3], [4].

Via the pricing mechanism, the law of value controls how social labor and production resources are distributed across the various sectors of the commodities economy on an as-needed basis. The prices of commodities continuously fluctuate above or below their value due to shifts in the supply and demand relationship. Contrarily, differences between prices and values are the only way the law of value may become effective and are not the consequence of a flaw in its functioning. In a society where private owners control production and act in a blind manner, commodity producers are only able to determine whether they have produced enough to meet the population's effective demand or not by the erratic fluctuations in market prices [5], [6].

Commodity producers are only obligated to increase or decrease the production of certain commodities by the natural variations in prices around values. Commodity producers are influenced by price variations, which force them to exit some branches where commodity prices are lower than their values and rush into those where prices look more lucrative at the time.

The growth of the commodities economy's productive forces is dependent on the application of the law of value. As we've seen, the amount of labor that is deemed socially required determines how much a commodity is worth. Producers of commodities who are the first to adopt a higher method create their goods at a lower cost than what is socially required, but they sell them for prices that reflect the labor that is socially essential. They make extra money when they sell their goods and become wealthy. This forces the surviving producers of commodities to advance their own businesses technologically. Thus, technological advancement and the development of society's productive forces occur as a consequence of the independent acts of independent commodity producers, each pursuing their own personal benefits.

The distribution of labor and means of production among the various economic branches and the development of the forces of production are achieved in a commodity economy at the cost of significant social labor waste, which leads to the competition and anarchy of production and the increasingly severe contradictions within this economy. Under private property-based commodity production circumstances, the application of the law of value causes capitalist relations to emerge and flourish. Unplanned swings in market prices around values, as well as differences in the expenses of individual labor compared to the labor that is socially essential and defines how much a commodity is worth, exacerbate the economic disparities and competition among commodity producers. Some producers of commodities are destroyed and turned into proletariat as a result of this competition, while others profit and become capitalists [7], [8].

As a result, the way the law of value operates causes a difference between the producers of commodities. The social bond that forms between individuals involved in the production process only appears via the exchange of commodities in situations where commodity production is based on private ownership of the means of production. It is discovered that there is a strong relationship between the producers of commodities and the commodities they produce. The cost of goods fluctuates constantly, regardless of consumer demand or awareness, but for those who generate the goods, price stability often means the difference between life and death. The social relationships between individuals are hidden by the ties between items. The value of a commodity therefore seems as a kind of natural attribute of the item, like, instance, its color or its weight, even though it indicates the social interaction between commodity producers. Marx said that it is a distinct social relationship between men that presumes what they perceive to be the fantastic form of a relationship between objects. Money is a particularly clear medium for the manifestation of commodity fetishism.

Money is a powerful force in commodity economies that grants authority over persons. You can purchase anything with money. It seems apparent that gold's ability to purchase everything and everything is a natural feature, but in actuality, it is the outcome of certain social relationships. The creation of commodities, in which a commodity producer's labor immediately manifests as private labor and only becomes apparent in the trade of commodities, is the source of commodity fetishism. Commodity fetishism won't go away until private property in the means of production is outlawed [9], [10]. The basic commodity production of artisans and peasants served as the foundation for the birth of capitalism. The foundation of simple commodity production is the individual labor of the commodity producer, which sets it apart from capitalism. In addition, because private ownership of the means of production forms

its basis, it is essentially of the same sort as capitalist production. Under capitalism, the production of commodities takes on a dominating, global nature when labor force as well as the results of labor are turned into commodities. A commodity is a good that is intended for trade; it has value from one perspective and a use-value from another.

The labor that goes into making a product has two distinct qualities. Concrete labor is labor that is applied in a specific way to produce a commodity's use-value. The use of human labor in general, or abstract labor, adds value to a product or service. Value is the social labor that goes into producing a commodity and is embodied in it. Value is a historical concept exclusive to the commodities economy.

The amount of labor required in society for an item to be produced determines how much value it has. In a basic commodity economy, the paradox lies in the fact that the labor of the commodity producers has a social component while still being closely related to their personal lives. Initially, capitalism uses the archaic methods of small-scale farming and handicrafts to shape production. It is only at a later stage of its own evolution that capitalism begins to reshape production on new economic and technological bases.

When the means of production are concentrated in private hands and workers are forced to sell their labor as a commodity because they are denied means of production, capitalism is in full swing. Capitalists establish rather big workshops for the production of handicrafts and peasant crafts. Without first altering the tools or the ways that small producers do their jobs, capitalists increase the scope of output. Capitalist basic co-operation is the term used to describe this first phase of capitalist manufacturing. Simple capitalist cooperation is a kind of social labor in which a capitalist takes advantage of a sizable number of wage workers who are all engaged in the same type of work at the same time and under the same conditions. Simple capitalist cooperation is based on the division of small-scale commodity production. The earliest capitalist businesses were started by moneylenders, merchant-engrossers, or rich master craftsmen and artisans. Along with the rural poor, those employed in these businesses were destitute journeymen and artisans who had lost all hope of becoming independent master craftsmen.

There are several benefits to capitalist simple cooperation over small-scale commodity manufacturing. Having a large number of employees in one company leads to economies of means of production. It is less expensive to construct, heat, and light a single workplace with twenty people than it is to construct and operate 10 workshops with two workers each. There are also less expenses for tools, storage facilities, and the transportation of raw materials and completed goods. An solitary craftsman's productivity is mostly dependent on his unique qualities, such as strength, dexterity, skill, etc. There are significant discrepancies amongst workers in various areas due to the use of antiquated techniques. A small producer's status is exceedingly perilous only for this reason. Producers of commodities that use more labor to create a single sort of commodity than is necessary under normal production circumstances will eventually fail. Individual disparities tend to equal out in a workshop setting when a large number of workers are present. Individual individuals' labor deviates from the average social labor in one way or another, but the collective labor of several people working at the same time roughly conforms to the average labor required by society. As a result, capitalist workplaces produce and sell goods in a more consistent and regular manner.

Simple cooperation results in an economy of labor and increases labor productivity.

Let us use the manual moving of bricks by a chain of laborers as an example. In this instance, each individual worker completes one and the same movement, yet his activities are a part of a single, shared activity. Consequently, the labor progresses far faster than if every guy were

to shift bricks independently. In a single working day, 10 men working together produce more than ten men working individually or one guy working for ten consecutive days of the same duration.

In addition to allowing work to be done simultaneously over a large area, as in the case of building dams, canals, and railroads, cooperation also allows for the concentration of a significant amount of labor in a limited area, as in the case of building construction or labor-intensive crop cultivation. When it comes to manufacturing, cooperation is crucial in areas like harvesting, shearing, and other tasks that need to be completed quickly. These tasks may be finished faster when several people are employed at the same time, which helps to avoid suffering significant losses. Cooperation therefore provided labor with a new social productive force. The productivity of labor increased only by virtue of the forces of independent workers being combined. This made it possible for the proprietors of the first capitalist workshops to effectively compete with the small producers by producing goods at a lower cost. The capitalists took advantage of the increased social production force of labor and used it to their own financial advantage without paying anything back. The emergence of manufacturing was a result of the development of basic capitalist cooperation. Production is a kind of capitalist collaboration that relies on the division of labor and handcraft methods. In Western Europe, manufacturing was the predominant mode of capitalist production from around the middle of the sixteenth century until the latter part of the eighteenth century.

There are two ways that manufacturing came to be. The initial method was a businessman gathering craftspeople with various skill levels in one workplace. Thus, for instance, a coach factory was created, housing artisans who had previously worked independently, such as harnessmakers, coachmakers, upholsterers, locksmiths, coppersmiths, turners, braidmakers, glaziers, painters, polishers, and so on. Each individual worker in the factory performed a variety of distinct, complimentary tasks that together comprised the manufacturing of a single coach. This led to a shift in the prior nature of the craftsmen's labor. For example, over an extended length of time, a worker engaged as a locksmith performed only certain tasks related to the construction of a coach; over time, the locksmith who had previously produced the final product entirely by himself progressively ceased to exist. The second method included a businessman gathering craftspeople with the same skill set in one workshop. In the past, every one of these artisans had completed all the tasks necessary to create a certain good on their own. The capitalist divided the manufacturing process in his workshop into a number of discrete tasks, each of which was given to a worker with a specialized role. Thus, for instance, the production of needles began. In a needle manufacturing facility, at least seventy-two people handled the needles in turn: one pulled the wire, another straightened it, a third sliced it, a fourth sharpened the ends, and so on.

In contrast to the division of labor in society between several businesses for the production of distinct commodities, the division of labor in manufacturing refers to the division of labor inside an enterprise for the production of one and the same commodity. In order for a factory to have division of labor, the means of production must be concentrated in the hands of a capitalist who also owns the goods that are produced. In contrast to the small-scale commodity producer, the wage worker does not create the commodity on their own; rather, they just turn the collective output of several workers' labor into a commodity. The division of the means of production among commodity producers who are distinct from and independent of one another is a prerequisite for the division of labor within society. The outputs of their labor, such as the labor of a soil tiller, cobbler, joiner, and tanner, appear as commodities, and the market serves as the conduit between the independent producers of commodities. A detail worker is an employee in a factory who does a specific task in order to produce a product. He spends less

time and energy doing the same basic activity over and over again than a craftsman who alternates between performing a full range of diverse tasks. Simultaneously with increasing specialization, labor intensity increases.

Previously, the worker had to set aside a certain amount of time to switch between tasks and change his equipment. This was less wasted working time at a manufacturing. Over time, specialization had an impact on both laborers and industrial tools, causing both to become more tailored to the precise task for which they were intended. Labor specialization in factories, coupled with a monotonous routine of doing the same simple actions over and over again, damaged workers' bodies and spirits. Workers had deformities such as curved spines and hollow chests. As a result, the worker suffered a crippling in order to increase labor productivity in industries. A universe of productive talents and instincts are sacrificed in the process of manufacturing, "converting the worker into a crippled monstrosity.

There are two types of capital in countries with slave ownership and feudalism: merchant and usurer capital. Industrial capital first appeared with the emergence of capitalist production. Capital used in the production of commodities is known as industrial capital. The tight and unbreakable bond between merchant and industrial capital is one of the defining characteristics of the manufacturing phase of capitalism. A factory's owner was nearly invariably also an engrosser. He acquired specific pieces of goods from small commodity producers, or he bought completed articles from them to resell later. He also marketed raw materials to small commodity producers and sent supplies to their homes for them to build up. The acquisition of goods from small commodity producers and the selling of raw materials to them got entwined with debt slavery, severely worsening the situation of the small commodity producer and resulting in longer workdays and lower incomes. The intermediate form that existed between the small-scale artisan and craftsman production and the large-scale capitalist machine industry was manufacturing. A factory was similar to a handicraft in that labor-intensive manufacturing relied on hand skills, and it was similar to a capitalist factory in that it used wage workers on a huge scale.

The division of labor in the manufacturing sector marked a significant advancement in the growth of society's productive forces. However, manual labor-based manufacturing could not replace small-scale production. A significant number of small businesses coexisted with a limited number of relatively big ones throughout the industrial phase of capitalism's growth. A significant portion of the goods were manufactured, but the vast majority were still created by craftsmen and artisans, who were to varied degrees reliant on capitalist manufacturers, putters-out, and engrossers. As a result, manufacturing was unable to control the whole of social production. It was a superstructure of sorts; the fundamentals of small-scale manufacturing with its antiquated methods persisted.

Manufacturing's historical contribution was to set the stage for the transition to machine manufacturing. Regarding this, three factors were particularly significant. First, manufacturing greatly streamlined several working processes by elevating the division of labor to a high degree. They were reduced to such basic motions that machines might take the role of the worker's hands. Second, the advancement from manually operated tools to machines was made feasible by the specialization and significant improvement of working tools brought about by the growth of manufacturing. Third, since they have long specialized in performing certain tasks, manufacturers have trained cadres of expert people for the large-scale machine sector. During the industrial era of capitalism's growth, industry and agricultural increasingly drifted apart. Commodities were created by the expansion of the social division of labor, which affected both industrial and agricultural goods. In agriculture, districts were specialized by crops and branches. Districts engaged in commercial agriculture began to arise; they included

areas used for dairying, cheese production, cotton and tobacco growing, sugar beet cultivation, and flax farming. This led to the development of trade not just between industry and agriculture but also between other agricultural specialties.

The rivalry between soil tillers became more intense as commodity production extended into agriculture. The market became more and more important to the peasants. The market's erratic pricing increased and exacerbated the peasantry's disparity in property ownership. A small group of wealthy individuals in the countryside amassed surplus money. They used this money as a way of enslavement and exploitation of the less fortunate peasants, turning it into capital. Buying the results of the peasants' labor for meager amounts was one method used to carry out this servitude. The peasants gradually became so bankrupt that many of them had no choice but to sell their labor force in order to entirely leave their properties.

Thus, the formation of capitalist relations in the countryside led to the emergence of new social classes within the rural population: the agricultural proletariat and the rural bourgeoisie. This process of differentiation of the peasantry coincided with the growth of commodity production and the social division of labor. The rural bourgeoisie, also known as kulaks, continue to produce commodities by using hired labor, taking advantage of day laborers and other temporary workers as well as permanent rural laborers who they contract for seasonal field work. A large portion of the land (including leased land), draught animals, and agricultural products are concentrated in their control. They also own businesses that operate mills, threshing machines, pedigree stock, raw material preparation, etc. They often serve as the shops and moneylenders for the community. All of this is done to take advantage of the underprivileged and a sizable portion of the middle-class peasants.

The vast majority of laborers who are exploited by landowners and the rural bourgeoisie and lack access to means of production constitute the agricultural proletariat. The selling of labor is the agricultural proletarian's primary source of income. The average proletarian in agriculture is a paid laborer with a set salary. This kind of peasant is ultimately forced to sell his labor force due to the little agricultural operations he conducts on his plot of land and the absence of draught animals and tools. The rural poor are quite close to the agricultural proletariat. The impoverished peasant has few livestock and a tiny piece of land. For such a peasant, the amount of food he can cultivate is insufficient. He must labor for wages to the greatest degree possible in order to earn the money required for clothes and food, as well as to operate his holding and pay taxes. Such a peasant is semi-proletarian in the rural areas and has long since ceased to be his own master. Like the rural proletariat, the impoverished peasant has a very low standard of life that is lower than that of the industrial worker. The numbers of the rural proletariat and impoverished peasants continue to rise as a result of the expansion of capitalism in agriculture.

The middle peasantry occupies a medium position between the impoverished peasants and the rural bourgeoisie. Using their own labor and means of production, the middle class of peasants continues to practice agriculture. The livelihood of his family is only guaranteed by the middling peasant's labor on his holding under favorable circumstances. This accounts for the middle peasant's precarious status. "This group's social relationships oscillate between the lower group that the entire evolutionary process is forcing it into and the higher group that it gravitates towards and only a fortunate minority is able to enter

CONCLUSION

As a basic economic principle supporting commodity production and trade in capitalist economies, the Law of Value arises. This rule sheds light on the mechanics of capitalism markets, worker exploitation, and capital accumulation by clarifying the quantitative link between socially required labor time and the exchange value of goods. The Law of Value draws

attention to the fundamental paradoxes of capitalism, which include the tendency for overproduction, underconsumption, and economic crises to result from the goal of profit accumulation. It also emphasizes the importance of work as the cornerstone of capitalism wealth production and the source of economic value. It is crucial to know and evaluate the Law of Value in order to advocate for alternative economic systems that put social welfare and equality ahead of profit in capitalist economies. Future studies should carry out further analysis of this economic law's consequences and applicability in modern socioeconomic settings.

REFERENCES:

[1] F. J. Garcia, "Globalization, inequality & international economic law," *Religions*, 2017, doi: 10.3390/rel8050078.

[2] M. Ji, "The principle of social responsibility in economic law based on the basic principles of economic law," *Agro Food Ind. Hi. Tech.*, 2017.

[3] W. Alschner, J. Pauwelyn, and S. Puig, "The data-driven future of international economic law," *J. Int. Econ. Law*, 2017, doi: 10.1093/jiel/jgx020.

[4] J. Zhao, "Topology of theory of economic law responsibility in the era of universal entrepreneurship," *Bol. Tec. Bull.*, 2017.

[5] Rudiana and A. O. Bustomi, "Dropshipping transaction in shariah economic perspective," *Munich Pers. RePEc Arch.*, 2017.

[6] J. Baümler, "Implementing the No Harm Principle in International Economic Law: A Comparison between Measure-Based Rules and Effect-Based Rules," *Journal of International Economic Law*. 2017. doi: 10.1093/jiel/jgy001.

[7] J. Chaisse and T. Y. Lin, *International economic law and governance: Essays in Honour of Mitsuo Matsushita*. 2017. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198778257.001.0001.

[8] T. Rensmann, *Small and medium- sized enterprises in international economic law*. 2017. doi: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198795650.001.0001.

[9] R. Moisejevas and D. Urbonas, "Problems related to determining of a single economic entity under competition law," *Yearb. Antitrust Regul. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.7172/1689-9024.YARS.2017.10.16.5.

[10] Z. Jurczyk, "The role of economic efficiency in competition law," *Yearb. Antitrust Regul. Stud.*, 2017, doi: 10.7172/1689-9024.YARS.2017.10.16.6.