



The crisis of the formula of liberal democracy

Introduction

The text discusses the inadequacy of the formula of liberal democracy assumptions. Liberal democracy can be regarded as a kind of socio-political order, which is dominant in today's developed countries. The idea of liberal democracy can also be extended on account of an economic configuration which accompanies this order – that is, capitalist economy.

The title of the text refers to the crisis of ideas, and, therefore, there can be introduced a thesis that liberal democracy as a formula of assumptions of the socio-political order is becoming exhausted and inadequate. It should be noted that all the problems of modern democracy will not be discussed in this text. It is also not important to discuss every aspect of what might be called a model of liberal democracy. What would therefore the said crisis consist of? The first issue which will be addressed in the text concerns the adoption by the state and society of the logic of action, which is the 'modus operandi' of the capitalist economy. The second problem concerns the concept of re-evaluation of the concept of politics and adoption by the governing the role of managers in selected areas of the state, as they use the logic of 'mixed rationality' (i.e., 'the logic of power' and 'the logic of economic rationality'). The last issue concerns the growing problems of the governments of developed countries to avoid the problem of distribution of wealth in the context of social injustice.

The text quotes the achievements of I. Wallerstein¹ (in terms of rationality and development of the capitalist economy), M. Weber² (in terms of rationality and politics), L. Althusser³ (in terms of reproduction of labour and means of production, apparatuses of state violence and ideological state apparatuses), Ch. Mouffe (in terms of superficial understanding of the concept of agonism), N. Fraser⁴ (in terms of redistribution, recognition and participation). To better understand the applied concept of

¹ I. Wallerstein, *Koniec świata jaki znamy*, Warsaw: Scholar, 2004; I. Wallerstein, *Europejski uniwersalizm. Retoryka władzy*, Warsaw: Scholar, 2007.

² M. Weber, *Gospodarka i społeczeństwo*, Warsaw: PWN, 2002.

³ L. Althusser, *Ideologie i aparaty ideologiczne państwa*, in: <http://www.filozofia.uw.edu.pl/skfm/publikacje/althusser05.pdf>, 20 October 2011.

⁴ N. Fraser, A. Honneth, *Redystrybucja czy uznanie? Debata polityczno-filozoficzna*, Wrocław: DSzWE TWP, 2005.

'logic of economic rationality' the text also refers in a synthetic way to the dissertations of M. Friedman⁵ and R. Nozick⁶. Moreover, to describe the political phenomena and processes the text uses terms from other disciplines, such as 'dementia praecox'.

Rationality, the logic of the capitalist economy – the 'modus operandi'

The concept of 'modus operandi' was applied by an Austrian judge H. G. A. Gross, who wanted to determine in this way the characteristics of the criminal conduct of the perpetrator in which the specificity of human nature can be traced. In this case, the modus operandi applies to the characteristics of the impact of the capitalist economy on socio-political systems. The starting point are the processes of rationalization, which were analysed among others by I. Wallerstein and M. Weber.

In the dissertation of I. Wallerstein rationality has become a determinant of human possibilities, which was associated with optimism for a better management of society. Rationality, which was established through the development of science and the capitalist economy, represented the promise of change – economic well being, freedom, hope of egalitarian society⁷. However, all this was not possible to be reconciled with the logic of capitalist economy, which was based on the acquirement of surplus value. For I. Wallerstein, it is important to link the development of science and technology with greater possibilities of capital accumulation in capitalist economy. The increase in capital accumulation was possible due to greater efficiency, in turn, this efficiency was made possible by changes in the production forces and production relations.

I. Wallerstein in his analysis uses the Weberian concept of formal and material rationality and the concept of goal-instrumental and value-rational actions⁸. In the first case we deal with the economic sphere, while in the latter case, with the social sphere. For the rationalization of the whole social sphere, formal rationality is of importance, which means the choice of appropriate measures for the purposes in the context of current standards and principles. As an example of formal rationality we can give supra-individual forms, e.g. bureaucratic structures, law, capitalism. Distinctive features of formal rationality include among others: efficiency of measures, measurability, standardization, calculability, predictability, limitation of over-rational factors, technologization, transparency. Described in this way formal rationality stands in contradiction to the material rationality and introduces some kind of dynamics in the processes of rationalization⁹. Material rationality determines the fact that the reference point for every choice of objectives and measures is a collection of the highest values. The very set of values is based on the consistency, it determines efficient operation of rationalization processes.

⁵ M. Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.

⁶ R. Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*, Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd., 1999.

⁷ I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, Warsaw: Scholar, 2004, pp. 171 – 183.

⁸ *Ibidem*, pp. 173 – 179.

⁹ R. Brubaker, *The Limits of Rationality: An Essay on the Social and Moral Thought of Max Weber*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1984, p. 9.

However, this action must be put aside during the growth of the logic of efficiency of capitalist economy.

Goal-instrumental actions are based on selection of measures for the purpose and heeding the negative effects of their implementation. An individual will take action in the context of the anticipated consequences, which constitutes the optimal strategy. However, value-rational actions are based on assigning a kind of value to them. To work towards the realization of a particular purpose a certain set of standards, rules, etc. must be accepted. The type of values can be diverse. Only a belief or conscious faith of the individual in these is of importance¹⁰.

According to I. Wallerstein formal rationality presupposes engagement in social value-rational actions. Although Weber assumed formal rationality in management, which is based inter alia on a technically feasible calculation, according to I. Wallerstein, economic activities involve engagement in value-rational actions. This stems from the fact that the assumptions of the hierarchy of objectives which should be realised according to priorities of satisfying needs must be established by someone, hence the one who sets out the hierarchy ultimately determines the order of needs¹¹. Assuming that socio-political systems are based on dominant values or the values of dominant actors in the system, an individual will rather use existing sets of rules and their hierarchy. In the context of liberal democracy the values which are imprinted through different mechanisms of reproduction of the social order (e.g., education), will be the efficiency and profit, which means that they will represent the logic of economic rationality.

I. Wallerstein points to an instrumental use of rationality, with which we deal when reducing the axiological arguments in political actions. Of course, I. Wallerstein has in mind the removal of axiology, but not the one which is based on the logic of economic rationality. It is difficult to say that the removal of actions based on material rationality is complete; it should be rather treated as an ongoing process. It stems from the fact that it is impossible to say that in politics we do not deal with maintenance of conflicts based on axiology, as exemplified by the distribution of recognition. However, in our opinion, the use of axiology in distribution of recognition by the governing is instrumental. And the instrumentalism is described by reversing the attention by the governing from their own devoid of values nature, also from the political conflicts in the process taking over the state structures. Moreover, the governing gaining a way to draw citizens in a 'festival' of agony vision of social discourse. All these mechanisms can be used in pacification of social groups, which I. Wallerstein called 'dangerous classes'.

The Wallerstein's concept of universalism should also be indicated here, which itself can be specified by a global ideological formula, which is reflected in the practices and ways of conducting

¹⁰ M. Weber, *op. cit.*, Warsaw: PWN, 2002, pp. 18 – 19.

¹¹ I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, Warsaw: Scholar, 2004, pp. 178 – 179.



discourse, means of persuasion, rhetoric, language of power, etc. The modern varieties of universalism are: (1) consolidation of human rights and democracy, (2) assumption of the superiority of the Western world and the values it represents, (3) economic liberalism as an inevitable solution for the market¹². For our considerations the most important are the assumptions in the consolidation of democracy and economic liberalism. In the first case we deal with the reproduction of democratic governance in a variety of liberal democracy, while in the second case with the consolidation of liberalism as an inviolable paradigm of socio-economic development, which affects the adoption of strategy in accordance with the logic of economic rationality.

In addition to the reproduction of social order we deal with the reproduction of labour for the capitalist economy, which, according to L. Althusser, is done by (1) providing the material means of production, (2) providing a variety of qualifications, and (3) applying mechanisms of social subordination¹³. In the first case the material means for the labour include among others wages, in the second case, ensuring qualifications is carried out in various ideological forms of state apparatuses (e.g. education system, the system of higher education), while in the third case we deal with the reproduction of subordination, which is based on consolidation of a particular ideology by the ideological state apparatuses. Depicting the mechanism of reproduction of labour can facilitate understanding the actions based on the logic of economic rationality.

The main experiments in the introduction of liberal economy took place away from the Western world. The ideas of M. Friedman on free market were implemented by military dictatorships in Chile and Argentina in the 70s of the 20th century, which was paid with murders and affected substantial social inequalities in these countries¹⁴. The effects of some liberal experiments can be observed even today. An example of these was the Chilean students strike in 2011, which lasted several months. The students demanded changes in the higher education system, which had been introduced during the rule of Pinochet. The demonstrations which took place in different cities of Chile, were the largest since 1990, that means since the restoration of democracy. In 2011 the Chilean students failed to win a free state system of higher education¹⁵. The struggle of the students was of different kind: (1) an attempt to implement the demands of social justice (the school system is responsible for the reproduction of social inequality in Chile, the costs of study in this country are the highest, just after the U.S.), (2) better distribution of wealth within the country's improved economic situation, (3) elimination of the remnants of legal solutions established in the days of the dictatorship of Pinochet.

¹² I. Wallerstein, *op. cit.*, Warsaw: Scholar, 2007, p. 12.

¹³ L. Althusser, *op. cit.*, in: <http://www.filozofia.uw.edu.pl/skfm/publikacje/althusser05.pdf>, 20 October 2011.

¹⁴ N. Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*, London: Penguin Books Ltd., 2008; N. Klein (interview: K. Gawlicz, M. Starnawski), *Zapełnić moment próżni (Fill the moment of void)*, in: (<http://www.recyklingidei.pl>) http://www.recyklingidei.pl/klein_gawlicz_starnawski_zapelnic_moment_prozni, 30 September 2011.

¹⁵ M. Stasiński, *Chile za studia nie zapłaci (Chile will not pay for studies)*, *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 2 December 2011.

As an example of the deteriorating situation of the young generation in relation to the situation on the labour market and the depreciation of higher education may serve a negative example of the logic of economic rationality. There will be no exaggeration to say that the countries which could not cope with their own social and economic policy found a subject which could be co-responsible for the lack of tools which could shape the market. Liability for failure to create job places was shifted onto the universities which are accused of inadequate training in relation to the labour market requirements. The accusation itself is bizarre because the primary function of universities did not include the assumption of reproducing labour for the economy. Any kind of colonization of the sphere of research, including the higher education system, by the capitalist economy resulted in the imposition of the logic of economic rationality on universities. The logic of economic rationality in this area was also adopted by the governing who permanently transformed higher education into vocational schools reproducing the labour force for capitalist economy. In this regard, the governing became representatives of the economy and not the people. Politicians, accepting the logic of economic rationality in the system of higher education, became nothing but a sales representatives of the profit and efficiency strategy. The very idea of interference in free market - with prevailing liberal discourse – would not be acceptable by the governing. The only paradigm in the discussion on higher education which is discussed in the Western world comes down to the notion: how to change schools for the benefit of the market. We can say that there are too few questions 'to the market' in this discussion, i.e. how to change the market and the governing it principles so as to serve people not only to implement the basic relationship between supply and demand. Lack of such discourse is due to two issues: (1) the dominance of the liberal paradigm in socio-economic life, (2) the weakness and indolence of the state in relations with capital.

The result of alienation of work, maintaining the myth of worker flexibility and the dictate of liberal paradigm is growing frustration of subsequent young generations. Subsequently excluded groups of young people started to be called 'precariat', i.e. quasi class whose identity is based on a sense of weakness, lack of social security, exclusion from the welfare of developed countries, working on the so-called 'junk contracts', weak financial security¹⁶. As an example of a bad situation of young people on the labour market can serve the European Union data on the unemployment of people aged 15 to 24 [see Table 1]. It should be noted that the bad situation on the labour market also applies to young people between 25 and 35.

¹⁶G. Standing, *The Precariat. The New Dangerous Class*, London: Bloomsbury, 2011.

Table 1. Youth unemployment in 2011 Q2.

State	Youth unemployment rate
Spain	45,0
Greece	42,9
Lithuania	33,2
Slovakia	32,7
Latvia	30,2
Ireland	29,8
Portugal	28,7
Italy	27,7
Bulgaria	27,0
Hungary	25,1
Poland	24,9
France	23,3
Romania	22,8
Sweden	22,8
Estonia	21,8
Finland	20,1
Cyprus	20,0
United Kingdom	19,6
Czech Republic	18,7
Belgium	18,3
Malta	14,7
Slovenia	14,3
Denmark	14,0
Luxembourg	14,0
Germany	8,9
Austria	8,3
Netherlands	7,0

Source: Based on Eurostat data.

The governing are also responsible for maintaining the myth associated with functioning of the current market – that means the delusion of flexible education. The very need for flexibility cannot be denied; however, creating the myth of multidirectional character and flexible modes of study does not offer any security for the graduates. This stems from the market dynamics itself, which cannot be predicted, which was especially noticeable by negative effects of the financial crisis of 2008. The problem is that the markets of EU Member States are not prepared for such a number of educated people with whom we deal today. None of the politicians can say outright that nobody needs such numbers of educated people. Articulation of such a thesis would mean admitting that the belief in



social advance adjusted to somebody's own motivation and work, which was forced by the ideologies of liberalism, is only an illusion. It is easier for the governing to get bogged down in the logic of economic rationality, this time hidden under the mottoes of flexibility of education and flexibility of employment.

Politics – 'mixed rationality' and 'dementia praecox'

Mixed rationality concerns two logics of governing – (1) the logic of power, (2), the logic of economic rationality. In the first case we deal with the logic of traditional way of doing politics, based on the definition of politics of Weber, which is on the quest to gain and maintain power. This logic is expressed in the treatment of power as a goal, which becomes the dynamics of political processes within the structures of the state. A kind of paradigm of power becomes a determinant of political actions, where the public sphere becomes an area of influence and fighting for it. The authority will be treated as an opportunity to use coercive measures, while in the institutional dimension we will deal with ambitions of taking over the ideological apparatus and coercion of the state. The treatment of power as an end in itself causes that, to relieve social unrest, the governing will apply conflicting strategies. On one hand we will deal with not necessarily a rational distribution of wealth, which may end up with overuse of the state budget – the example of Greece in 2011. On the other hand, the poor economic situation, often being the result of mismanagement of the government, causes the intensification of the logic of rationality of capitalist economy, namely an 'escape' of the state from the responsibility for social security or the development of unprofitable spheres of public life.

The state's withdrawal from the market, i.e. the transition from rationing to regulation can be assessed as a process of weakening of the state. However, the transition of the state to the sphere of using its ideological apparatuses in order to have an impact on society is of crucial importance here. Any function of state security (the use of a coercive apparatus) still has a vital role, which results from invoking the security issues instrumentally when conducting difficult to accept reforms. Therefore we deal with an 'escape' of the state from the market, which is related, among others to the weakening position in relation to large businesses and financial entities¹⁷. This 'escape' and using the market as an 'excuse' suits the governing, because they can hide their awkwardness, even in developing new jobs. Additionally, the state reconfigures its functions, moving them to other institutions. This process can be defined by a term used in psychiatry - 'dementia praecox'. The term 'dementia praecox' (i.e., early dementia) was introduced to medicine by B. A. Morel (a French physician) and A. Pick (an Austrian neurologist and psychiatrist). This term underwent continuous development and generally referred to a mental dysfunction, manifested by closing oneself in one's own world and reduced activity in the social

¹⁷ Cf. U. Beck, *Władza i przeciwność w epoce globalnej. Nowa ekonomia polityki światowej*, Warsaw: Scholar, 2005.



life¹⁸. In fact, we deal with weakening of the state's role as a causative entity in the creation of the market; often this weakening becomes a veil and pretext to develop the logic of efficiency of capitalist economy in all areas of social life such as health care, labour market, education, higher education. The above-described weakening of the state and reconfiguration of its functions can be defined as dementia.

In everyday life people who live beyond their means act irrationally, but the governing who live beyond their means only 'manage a state'. Economic entities which spend more than they have – act uneconomically, which threatens with legal consequences; while governments doing the same thing 'realize the basic functions of the state'. Global crisis, with which we have been dealing at least since 2008 indicates that the governing, in order to maintain the power, use the argumentation of the logic of rationality of capitalist economy – that means the economic rationality. However, this logic of economic rationality did not motivate the earlier governments, because then they used only the logic of power – a desire to maintain the state structures.

The logic of power is a dominant political strategy, as it determines the dynamics of political processes in the country. Power becomes a goal of itself, which at the state level reflects a desire to take over all the state apparatus, while at the individual level is a desire to achieve one's ambitions. Regardless of whether they are individual ambitions or group (party) ones, the effect is that politics becomes a presentation of 'delusion' and a 'festival' of social vision of agony, which is maintained by giving away during the wealth distribution. Developed economies have different financial tools which enable the maintenance of this 'festival', which is expressed in incurring liabilities (bonds and other forms of external financial support) or creative accounting when creating a budget. The problem begins when the crisis starts, which prevents the distribution of wealth in order to sustain the festival of agony order. The strategy based on the logic of power is supported with traditional arguments of the state, that is the broad concept of security. In periods of crisis or to intervene in the freedom and civil liberties, the governing willingly use the arguments of security threats, which is an effective tool, because the concept of security itself is so broad that it fits into any situation – economic security, social security, national security, internal security, etc.

In the case of financial and/or economic crisis the state uses the argument of socio-economic security, which only leads to intensification of economic rationality in the spirit of capitalist economy. The threat to the socio-economic order is a sufficient argument (at least according to the governing) to reduce social or ontological security of an individual. Interference in the sphere of broadly understood social security is done by a withdrawal of the state from obligations to citizens. This withdrawal is conducted via the argument of irrational state actions, that means the irrationality is nothing but cost-

¹⁸ The term 'dementia praecox' historically preceded the term 'schizophrenia'. It was introduced and popularized by E. Kraepelin. See E. Bleuler, *Dementia praecox, or the group of schizophrenias*, New York: International Universities Press, 1950; R. W. Heinrichs, *In Search of Madness: Schizophrenia and Neuroscience*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2001, pp. 22 – 29.

ineffectiveness in the social sphere. In this situation, citizens should feel guilty that the state acts 'unreasonably', which fits the rhetoric of liberal democracy in the style of 'citizen, you are free, so you are on your own'. It cannot be called otherwise than a system of hypocrisy and an escape of the state from its responsibilities, which is not uncommon when it comes to the overall trend in this regard. Periods of crisis merely give a greater dynamism of changes and strengthen the escape of the state from the spheres where it recently claimed exclusive rights. Periods of crisis provide an opportunity of 'unnoticeable' (which does not mean imperceptible) changes, since the threat to security triggers all the state apparatuses (of coercion and ideology) in order to justify its retreat. Rationality is reduced to savings, and savings are nothing but the minimization of state spending on society. Of course, the governing use then the argument of cost savings within their own apparatuses; however, from the statistics of the employment growth in the state bureaucracy, for example in Poland in the period 2007 - 2011, nothing of that kind can be observed, on the contrary, in this period there is a proliferation of public administration¹⁹. It should not be expected that we will deal with a particular constraint of the state bureaucratic apparatus, which results from the proliferation of what M. Foucault called power of disciplining²⁰, and which in practice is manifested in control techniques, standardization, certification, measurability, counting, etc. The significant reduction in the size of the state apparatus was observed during the situation of 'escape' from the traditional state functions; however, due to the utility of arguments based on 'security threat' in the near future it will be impossible. Moreover, it should be noted that the 'escape' of the state from its duties does not actually change the function of the state, at most, there is its reconfiguration to reduce the hardships of governance or rather management of the state.

We deal with a kind of 'outsourcing of duties' of the state, which transfers its functions to other external institutions (while retaining the control function), or shifts its responsibilities to its own institutions which have not previously dealt with such tasks. An example of the latter is placing the higher education system in the framework of capitalist economy and burdening universities with the function of developing vocational skills of the graduates. The procedure is quite simple and depends on the fact that the state, which withdrew from shaping the market, cannot and does not want to conduct the employment policy. Universities, though it is not their primary function, become nothing more than vocational schools reproducing labour for the capitalist economy. On one hand, universities are accountable for research and quantitative indicators, on the other hand, they are loaded with the state social policy. The procedure of the governing, who show a lack of competence in creating jobs and 'escape' from the responsibility for these processes, is based on the logic of the market. The arguments are as follows: (1) individuals are responsible for their education and position in the labour

¹⁹ *Statistical yearbook of Poland*, GUS 2010; also data on the website of GUS: www.stat.gov.pl.

²⁰ M. Foucault, *Nadzorować i karać*, Warsaw: Aletheia, 1998.

market (if they cannot be successful on the job market after graduation it is their fault, as they probably are not very flexible), (2) universities are responsible for the future of graduates, because that was accepted by the governing (if graduates are not absorbed into the labour market, it means that the studies are inadequate to the labour market or universities are not flexible enough). You could ask the question: If the state itself cannot effectively create labour market, to what extent can university graduates prepare themselves for the unpredictability of the market? In any case, at this point there is no discussion on the market or other mechanisms of influencing it by the state. This means that the logic of the market reached a position of an unassailable universe; the attempt to breach it ends up with ostracism or an accusation of 'irrationality'.

The process of reconfiguration of social functions of state is associated with the loss of state's position in relation to the dominance of the logic of capitalist economy. This means that the state withdraws to its own logic of power and the logic of economic rationality complements the new model of politics. The new model does not mean governing but rather administration or management. The old elements of politics remained only to struggle for the acquisition of state structures in accordance with the logic described by E. Canetti as the logic of actions of a hostile army²¹. Society participates in the 'delusion' and 'festival' of agonism to the rhythm of pluralism of discourse, which is served by the governing, which is an indicator of liberal democracy. This 'festival' can be interrupted only by a growing sense of social injustice. Economic crisis greatly frightens the governing (administration/management), as it deepens the sense of financial injustice, which at a certain level cannot be replaced by alternative themes of distribution of recognition. In such situations it is difficult to divert attention from problems related to social security. The mechanism which is a particularly negative solution for the social security is the system of socialization based on reproducing the logic of economic rationality as the only acceptable one.

Distribution of wealth and recognition

Problems of distribution of wealth and recognition should be considered fundamental to the concept of social justice. However, at this point we will not discuss concepts of justice characteristic for modern systems of socio-political or scientific discourse, because there is a more important issue, namely the processes of instrumentalization of distribution of wealth and recognition within the logic of power and the logic of economic rationality. We should mention here the main assumptions of justice in liberal conceptions which are part of the logic of capitalist economy. Main assumptions of the liberal concepts of distribution of wealth can be reduced to the following statements: (1) the state is needed to protect ownership rights, (2) state is the guarantor of proper functioning of the market

²¹ E. Canetti, *Crowds and Power*, New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1984.



(free market), (3) the state guarantees individual ownership, (4) redistribution of wealth violates ownership rights, (5) redistribution of wealth is harmful to effectiveness²².

To characterize liberal conceptions of justice we should refer to the achievements of two people – M. Friedman and R. Nozick. The purpose of a brief characterization of these two views of the two scientists is to complement the understanding of (the previously introduced) concept of 'logic of economic rationality'.

M. Friedman is a representative of economists, whose liberal ideas have found their actual application; however, before they were strongly associated with the so-called Western culture they had been introduced into systems being far from standard of liberal democracy – as it has been mentioned earlier. The very conception of Friedman was based on the assumption that there is a relationship between economic freedom, guarantee of individual ownership rights and political freedom. It would come down to the assumption that the mere fact of ensuring economic rights guarantees political freedom²³. To question this assumption it is sufficient to give the example of Argentina during the dictatorship, quoted by N. Klein. The example of the People's Republic of China may also be given here. Even M. Friedman points to the example of Nazi Germany; however, he claims in his thesis that no non-capitalist society managed to introduce political freedom.

The starting point for the concept of M. Friedman is the very concept of freedom, because it allows the individual to change and adapt the ideas and/or preferences. All of this constitutes our subjectivity in society, which cannot be limited by other people or social groups. Violation of freedom of the individual would be in breach of its prime mover. Market mechanisms are the only ones that properly (i.e. acceptably) redistribute wealth – except unique circumstances of interference in the market in order to guarantee its openness, competitiveness, or to protect the rights ownership²⁴.

R. Nozick's concept of justice is referred to as 'legalistic' or as based on 'entitlement'. The starting point for this concept may be the very individual (R. Nozick writes about the 'distinctiveness of the individual'). Each individual has equal importance from ethical point of view, which affects the kind of understanding of distribution of wealth. For example, something which might be called the common interest, or action for the benefit of society cannot be a justification for depriving individuals of their independence, or does not give a right to force individuals to sacrifice themselves for the public. Individualistic and subjective ontology of R. Nozick gives primacy or rather equal status of individual people. This assumption implies that individuals cannot be charged with all social costs, even when there are anticipated benefits for the society. In terms of ownership and rights thereto, R. Nozick writes that individuals are entitled to what they own, if they achieved these according to the law²⁵. In the case of legalistic concept of ownership the phenomenon of so-called original appropriation

²² H. Brighouse, *Sprawiedliwość*, Warsaw: Sic!, 2007, pp. 114 – 116.

²³ M. Friedman, *op. cit.*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002, pp. 7 – 21.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, pp. 22 – 36, pp. 161 – 176.

²⁵ R. Nozick, *op. cit.*, Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd., 1999, pp. 149 – 231.

becomes problematic. For example, the property and the wealth which belong to the British Crown can be understood in the context of ownership and splendour of a post-colonial state; however, it can also be seen in terms of murders and rapes committed by the British Empire, which acquired the property by means of violence and exploitation of others²⁶.

Both of the above concepts emphasize the significance of the individual as well as private property, which in a vivid manner appeals to modern societies. After all, who would not like to be free and who would not want to have their ownership rights respected? However, arguments present in both conceptions of justice become an instrumental tool in the process of insisting on the logic of economic rationality, both in a pure form and in the destabilization of economic order. In the latter case we deal with the logic of power, which, in the situation when it is necessary to maintain the political power by the governing, adapts in a broader sense the logic of economic efficiency. The concepts of individual liberties and warranty of ownership, present among others in the summarized above liberal conceptions of redistribution of wealth, provide ideological justifications for the mixed strategy and rationality. The best mechanisms for consolidation of this ideology are the systems of reproduction of social order (e.g., socialization, education) and systems of exclusion and depreciation of other views²⁷.

N. Fraser divides the issue of distribution to the problem of redistribution (i.e., fair distribution of resources and wealth) and the problem of seeking recognition. In the first case we deal with the classic problem of social security and equitable use of society resources. In the latter case, the distribution is limited to the social justice in its narrow sense understood as a process of appreciation of various minorities in the social majority. This form of social justice is to recognize different types of minorities such as ethnic, racial, religious, sexual, sex, etc²⁸. This problem can also include the concept of emancipation of particularism and identity of E. Laclau, who assumes within the socio-political discourse a clash of particular meanings demanding their subjectivity, legitimacy of their own interpretation or attention²⁹. N. Fraser herself concludes that the both types of distribution are important, because each of them individually is insufficient³⁰. However, the current dominance of the logic of free market forces the withdrawal of the issue of the redistribution of wealth in increased social discourse. It is impossible to refer in the text to all the considerations of N. Fraser; however, the importance of the issues which this author addresses should be emphasized.

For our discussion it is important to emphasize the division of distribution and the thesis that the logic of economic rationality enforces reducing the importance of redistribution of wealth and

²⁶ Cf. R. Gott, *Britain's Empire: Resistance, Repression and Revolt*, London: Verso Books, 2011.

²⁷ P. L. Berger, T. Luckmann, *Spoleczne tworzenie rzeczywistości*, Warsaw: PWN, 2010, pp. 136 – 250.

²⁸ N. Fraser, *Sprawiedliwość społeczna w epoce polityki tożsamości: redystrybucja, uznanie, uczestnictwo*, in: N. Fraser, A. Honneth, *op. cit.*, Wrocław: DSzWE TWP, 2005, pp. 27 – 97.

²⁹ More in: E. Laclau, *Emancypacje*, Wrocław: DSzWE TWP, 2010.

³⁰ N. Fraser, *Sprawiedliwość społeczna w epoce polityki tożsamości: redystrybucja, uznanie, uczestnictwo*, in: N. Fraser, A. Honneth, *op. cit.*, Wrocław: DSzWE TWP, 2005, pp. 28 – 29.

resources – at least this trend would be expected under the mixed political strategies of the state. Worth mentioning here are:

- (1) It is easier for the governing to deal with issues of distribution of recognition than redistribution of wealth, even if the issue of recognition will cause real and strong social conflicts.
- (2) The governing use the issue of distribution of recognition because focusing on a more equitable redistribution of wealth requires abandoning the logic of economic rationality.
- (3) Dealing with the issues of recognition and emphasizing it more than redistribution is an 'escape' from the responsibility done by the governing, which expresses their helplessness and indolence.

The recognition problem is characterized by a high degree of axiologization, and thus it is sufficiently suitable to replace the old, based on the problem of ownership and economic inequality conflicts within the social structure. The problem of recognition, significant and important from the social perspective, becomes, however, an instrument used by the governing to distract attention from economic disparities in society. Moreover, it enables the 'delusion' of the society and the agony 'festival', which, seemingly, may prove the plurality of social discourse. This action is so effective that it diverts attention from the struggle for dominance in the state structures between the governing in accordance with the logic of power. It also diverts attention from negative consequences of adopting the logic of economic rationality, as the problem of recognition fits perfectly into the liberal concept of individual freedom; however only on a superficial level. Argumentation of the governing at this point would be simple: 'citizen, if you chose liberation, you take the whole package'. The whole liberation package means that the state receives a '*carte blanche*' as far as the 'escape' from liability for the market is concerned, and the citizen must be flexible to the extent that the market is flexible.

Conclusion

The main issues contained in the text relate to: (1) adoption of the logic of economic rationality as the paradigm of conduct by the state and society, (2) redefining the concept of politics, which involves, among others, adopting by the governing the role of managers in selected areas of the state and with the use of their logic of 'mixed rationality' ('logic of power' and 'logic of economic rationality'), (3) challenges associated with distribution of wealth.

Capitalist economy affects all spheres of social life, which necessitates the presentation of its 'modus operandi'. The characteristic features of this interaction are: (1) formal rationality, (2) dogma of efficiency and quantitative measurability, (3) reproduction of the ideology of individual's free will,

regardless of social context, (4) enforcement of appropriate reproduction of labour, (5) colonization of subsequent areas of social activity (such as education and higher education), (6) impact on exclusion of social groups due to the level of financial security. All these can be reduced to the concept of the logic of economic rationality.

The governing use the 'mixed strategy', which is based on two logics of conduct - (1) the logic of power, (2) the logic of economic rationality. The logic of power is nothing but a desire to gain and maintain power, where power itself is the goal, and the structures of the state form an area which should be taken over or controlled. The governing, to hide their lack of ideals and conflicts in the struggle for taking over the state structures, cultivate the 'outside' policy, which takes the form of a 'festival' of discourse of agony. Such a policy is possible due to the distribution process during the redistribution of wealth (contrary to economic rationality) and/or owing to the instrumental treatment of the distribution of recognition. Due to the inability to maintain a high level of distribution, especially in the economic crisis, the governing willingly use the logic of economic rationality. Solutions based on economic rationality, despite their negative acceptance by the public, are introduced by using the argument of security threats (economic, social, national, etc.). Thus, the state withdraws from governing, changing it to managing certain areas of the state. This cannot be called otherwise as an 'escape' from liability, which is especially visible in situations of economic instability. In such situations we deal with the state 'responsibilities outsourcing', which may have various forms – (1) transferring functions to other institutions while maintaining the competence of controlling or (2) transferring responsibilities to its own institutions, which previously played a different role. All these can be called a reconfiguration of state functions connected with domination of the capitalist economy and the impact of the logic of economic rationality.

The text also describes the problem of distribution of wealth and recognition, but only in terms of its instrumentalization by the government. We can say that liberal concepts of individual's liberty and priority of ownership lead to ideologically simple justification for the application of mixed strategies and rationality. The text presents a thesis on the instrumentalization of distribution of wealth, i.e., the instrumental use of appreciation of various minorities in the political system. It should also be noted that the dominance of free market logic leads to depreciation of redistribution of wealth in relation to glorification of the issue of recognition.

The text merely sketches the problem of inadequacy of the formula of liberal democracy, as presented in selected issues. The discussed issue of liberal democracy does not focus on the attempt to reconstruct a model of democracy of this kind; it was rather more important to present the phenomenon of adopting in practice of what might be called the logic of economic rationality. It is worth to analyse further the very logic of 'mixed rationality', which was simplified to coexistence of 'logic of power' and 'the logic of economic rationality'.