

cf. Adam Smith, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, W.Strahan and T.Cadell, London, 1776, Book I Chapter 7 : Of the natural and market Price of Commodities.

G.W.F.Hegel, *System der Sittlichkeit*, in: *Hegel Gesammelte Werke*, hrsg.v.Manfred Baum und Kurt Reiner Meist, Band 5, Hamburg, 1998, S.350ff.

3. Human beings have the right to live. The right to live is absolute essence in Human beings and civil society must consider this essence. The standpoint as a Human Being, Citizen, and Nation.

cf. G.W.F.Hegel, *Vorlesung uber Naturrecht und Staatswissenschaft*, a.a.0.S.160.

4. Present Japan is camouflaged, filled with generalized deception, moral hazard, false subcontracted works, sham buildings, insider trading, swindles etc.

5. Duty and Reviving of Modern State Regulation of all Evil - establishment of Watching Organ by fair third party and Punishment of all dishonesty Establishment of the ministry new labor employments - making new positions for youngsters.

[CN] LEI ZHAO

Contact Information:

Address: 1303 Guanghua Building, Journal of Economist, Southwestern University of Finance and Economics, 55 Guanghua Village Rd., Qingyang District, Chengdu, Sichuan 610074, P.R., China

Telephone: 028-87099451

Mobile:13018246739 (M)

Fax: 86-28-87352023

Email Address: zxl@swufe.edu.cn

Lei Zhao was born in Hunan province in January, 1957. He is a professor in Economics at Southwestern University of Finance and Economics and the director of editorial office at Journal of Economist. He has worked as director of editorial office at Journal of Economist since 1997. He has been invited as Doctor Tutor since 2002. He was elected to vice-president in Sichuan Research Association of College Arts Journal in 2000. He has been author of over 200 publications in major economics, philosophy, history and sociology journals. His research interests include Macroeconomics, Theories of Income

Distribution and so on.

His recent papers include:

1. “Is Transaction Cost the Standard of the Institution Evolution ?” *Academic Monthly*, 11(2006).
- 2 . “Several Misunderstandings about Marxism” *Philosophical Researches Journal*, 4(2006).
- 3 . “Toward Misunderstandings on Modern Economics” *Modern Economic Science Journal*, 3(2006).
- 4 . “Interpreting the Problems Facing Agriculture, Rural Areas and Farmers from the Perspective of Market Economy Theory” *Academic Research*, 05(2005). *Xinhua Digest*, 15(2005).
- 5 . “The Historical Missions Of the Labor Value Theory” *Academic Research Journal*, 4(2005).

His books include:

- 1 . “Approaching Power”.
- 2 . “China: Don’t Turn Around”.
- 3 . “On Transformation Mechanism of Economic Growth Mode in China”.

A Query to “Farewell to Proletarian”

[CN] Lei Zhao

Since reform and opening-up over more than 20 years, people’s living level and living state have got widespread improvement. Under this background, the topic about whether “proletariat” is still existent appeals to concern again in academic communities. What’s the actual divisible standard of “bourgeoisie” and “proletariat “? How to understand the enlargement of recent “middle-class”? These problems are not only related to whether Marxist original standpoint and conclusion still keep applicable, but also deal with whether Marxist basic analysis methods always keep credible. This text will emphasize on the followings:

I. Is “Productivity Standard” Reasonable or Not?

Quite a few people think that extensive masses has already said goodbye to "proletarian" due to the exaltation of people's living condition and improvement of people's income level. In a word, there is no "proletarian" in most people's eyes because of continuously development of productivity level. Obviously, if we deny "farewell to proletarian", it means we take no cognizance to the fact of "development of productivity level". Positively as it does, this standpoint seems to get more and more person's approval.

It is not difficult to see, the divisible standard of "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" above-mentioned is "productivity standard", "income standard" and "living standard" and the connotations of "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" are "means of subsistence" or "means of livelihood". I call this standard "productivity standard" briefly, but I doubt whether this standard can define "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat".

Horizontally, working class in developed capitalism nations not only own their housing, but also have their cars, savings, credit cards and even a mount of stocks. Measured by the "productivity standard", they essentially should have no difference with their bosses (capitalists) and all of them are "proprietors" and "comrades in the same boat". However, the problem is that essential differentiation of employ and under-employ between the owner and worker still exist after all and this differentiation wouldn't never disappear even they become "proprietors".

Vertically, compared a tenant farmer in feudalistic society with a slave in slave society, the former owns both certain human freedom and certain implements of production and housing. A few of farmers even may have a little range of land. According to "productivity standard", since the tenant farmer's living condition and income level had enormously improved compared with the slave, the tenant farmer seemed to be "farewell to proletariats" and became the class of "proprietor". Unfortunately, according to history analysis or logic analysis, it is hard for people to regard a tenant farmer or a "proprietor" (landlord and nobility) as "comrades in the same boat". If carry on "productivity standard" completely, perhaps "nothing is not contradict". Then how to see its objectivity?

Now let's see from the aspect of development trend. If productivity standard was used to measure "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat", such a logic conclusion will appear: "proletariat" should become "bourgeoisie" so long as we improve their relative income level and living condition since the differentiation between "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" lies in income level and living state. That cause changing the status of "bourgeoisie" and "proletariat" has nothing to do with ownership and the whole effort to destroy private ownership to establish and perfect public ownership (there is really long way to go) will be in vain, moreover, "farewell to proletarian" still means "farewell to revolution". While the problem is: if we continue to admit that CPC's maximum program is to replace private ownership gradually and realize communism finally, how can we say "farewell to the revolution of ownership".

II. Is “Standard of Production Relation” Dated?

Based on Marxist standpoint, the divisible standard of “bourgeoisie” and “proletariat” is people’s position in the relation of production instead of people’s living condition or income level (though this standard can be a referent index to divide the line of rank and stratum). This position is restricted by the ownership relation of the means of production. Its “proprietor” and “proletariat” aren’t “means of livelihood” or “means of subsistence”, but “means of production” or “capital”. I call it “standard of production relation”.

According to this standard, all people, who don’t own “means of production” (capital) but to sell their labor force (worker), belong to “proletariat”. Only those (bosses, capitalists) who own “means of production” (capital) and unnecessarily sell their labor forces belong to “proprietor”. Certainly, this standard is theoretically abstract. Strictly, “bourgeoisie” and “proletariat” are two extremes. A lot of persons are placed on these two extremes in reality. For example, farmers working in a city and managers or white-collars employed sell their labor force. They may own some means of production and capital. (Although these means of production or capital never make them avoid selling their labor force, they are more close to “proletariat”, not “proprietor”, so they should belong to “proletariat” in principle.)

Although “standard of production relation” is a theoretically abstract, but in complicated reality life, its reliability and depth go far beyond “productivity standard”.

In west developed capitalism society, with development of capitalism productivity and adjustment of production relation (such as the establishment of social security system, the emergence of state intervention, etc.), present working-class have lost their means of production, but it doesn’t imply they have lost minimum subsistence condition at the same time. Moreover, their living condition and income level have really enormously improved. It seems dated to use “penniless” to describe working-class. But it is a doctrine comprehension to “penniless” thought that contemporary working-class had already completely converted from “proletariat” to “bourgeoisie”. The truth is easy to see: under the structure and form of capitalism production relation, does recent working-class’s “subsistence condition” really make them be out of the destiny to be employed? As a person, may be possible, but as a rank, definitely impossible, which conduces that there has no essential differentiation between present working-class and initial proletariat.

In china, “bourgeoisie and proletariat” belongs to the category of “class” and “class” belongs to the category of “production relation”. It is obvious to objectively understand our society’s reality of the class or stratum and its development trend and tell which is more credible between “productivity standard” and “standard of production relation”. Since reform and opening-up, our country’s productivity has already improved world-shockingly, but it doesn’t mean productivity standard will become a unique yardstick to measure the whole thing; or “standard of production relation” will withdraw its history stage from now

on. Otherwise, how to give an authentic elucidation about the relationship between boss and personnel, employer and employee?

III. How to Understand “Middle-class”?

Facing the spread of “middle-class”, most people think that Marx’s compartmentalization and prediction about class structure has been dated in academe. For example, Mr. GAO Fang recently pointed out in his articles that “with the development of contemporary capitalism, the structure of class didn’t follow the way Marx had foretold (i.e. middle-class become less and less, society will be polarized and the pole of worker will exceed the role of capitalist), but shaped into olive type or rhombus type (i.e. middle-class become bigger and bigger). Contemporary working-class appears five trends: white-collar trend, multi-collars trend (besides white-collar and blue-collar, it also includes golden-collar as senior management, gray-collar like marketing personnel or maintenance man, pink-collar like woman worker), knowledge trend, intelligence trend (more and more workers provided with computers or electric appliances) and “bourgeoisie” trend (more and more worker are no longer completely proletariat, and more and more worker have small savings and stocks)”. In a word, according to Mr. GAO Fang, the spread of middle-class and working-class’s “five turn trend” implies that Marx’s definition and predict about working-class are not applicable any longer. But I think three following points about above-mentioned thesis from Mr. GAO Fang are worth discussing.

(1) From the aspect of absolute living standard, the changes of class structure in contemporary developed capitalism nations really have never presented a “absolute poverty” trend as Marx’s prediction. But, if the signification of “polarization” doesn’t indicate that “the poverty become poorer, the rich become richer”, but means “the gap between the rich and the poor become wider and wider”, according to the variety trend of income gap, is “polarization” no longer a denial fact to United Nations and authorities in recent developed capitalism nations?

(2) From aspect of “standard of production relation”, perhaps “five trends” of working-class does not change the structure of class in the present capitalism society. Contrarily, this variety trend is more close to the analysis and estimate from Marx that year. Because the trend of “middle-class becoming wider and wider” indicates that more and more different classes and stratum in the past have been integrated in the troops of “employee” or “sell labor force” and shared the same characteristic of “common class or stratum”. The division of labor is getting finer and finer, but class structure is becoming simpler and simpler. No matter you are a blue-collar or white-collar, pink-collar or golden-collar or not, all you are workers and employee who offer service for “capital” (the differentiation only lies in high class or low class). To ownership of means of production,

they are still “proletariat”.

(3) If working-class owns depressive and limited stock but can't hold company; this kind of “property” can't be equal to the “property” of capitalist. In the terrible hot competitions nowadays, savings and stocks don't change the position of the whole working-class to be employed although a certain worker may be one of members in the line of capitalists.

[CN] XIAOLIANG ZHOU

Contact Information:

Address: Room 102, Building 28, Tingfangyuan, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou 350002,
P.R., China

Mobile: 13859032429

Email Address: xlzfzu@163.com.

Xiaoliang Zhou, Male, born in 1963, Economics Doctor, Professor, Executive Vice Director of Fuzhou university- Research Center for Economic , the Director of Research Institute for Economic Management, Doctoral Supervisor, Principal of the master degree station for western economics and province key discipline, Director of Chinese Society for foreign economic thoughts research, the President of Fujian Province Society for capital operation research etc, mainly do research on the fields of Institutional Economics and