

An Overview of the Main Theories Regarding the Role of the State

Alina Tătulescu

Phd. Student, the Bucharest University of Economic Studies, 6, Piata Romana, 1st district, Bucharest, Romania
e-mail: alina.tatulescu@gmail.com

Abstract

In the context of an increasing importance granted to the interventionist measures of the state, partially due to the current economic and financial crisis, the study of the origins and role of the state appears to be necessary in order to facilitate the understanding of the reasons and of the consequences of such measures. Thus, starting from the individual as the fundamental unit of society a review of the different philosophical approaches on human nature and the necessity of the state will be conducted. Furthermore, the different types of rights (natural/positive) will be presented, since they determine the role that the state has come to play in the economy. The final part of the study will focus on the perspectives of the liberal, neoliberal, social democratic and Marxist theories regarding state involvement in the economy and the fundamental differences between these approaches.

Keywords: Liberalism, state formation, interventionism, Neoliberalism, Marxism

JEL Classification: P16, P51, Y6, Y8, Y30

Introduction

Nowadays, the state is most commonly defined as “a politically organized body of people, usually occupying a definite territory”¹, but this is only one of the definitions that have, in time, been linked to this term. Its origins can be found in Latin (“status; stats rei republicae”²), having been used since the 13th century to define the “state of a country” related to its form of government and its prosperity³. The meaning of “sovereign power that passes laws and objectively decides for the benefit of the community, with regard to external problems as well as internal ones”, which is similar to the current image of the state, was put forward by Nicolo Machiavelli⁴.

¹ Merriam-Webster Dictionary, available on Merriam-Webster Dictionary: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/> [accessed on January 5 2013].

² The Republic’s Constitution.

³ Online Etymology Dictionary, available on Online Etymology Dictionary: <http://www.etymonline.com/> [accessed on January 7 2013].

⁴ P i s i e r, E., *Istoria ideilor politice*, AMARCORD Publishing House, Timișoara, 2000, p. 35.

In order to identify the limits that the state must respect in influencing important areas such as the economy, it is necessary to have a clear overview of the main theories regarding the origins and the role of the state. Such an overview will facilitate the understanding of the role that the state has in its relation with individuals. The main objective of the study of the origins of the state is to establish if man, by his nature, requires the intervention of the state in order to flourish (Plato), or if the state appears as a consequence of a tendency to create communities (the social instinct that is described by Aristotle, the expansionist tendencies described by Oppenheimer). The utility of this study is given by the influence that these arguments have had on economic doctrines and on the way these were approached in the relation between the government and the economy.

In order to have a clear overview, the study will use sources such as Aristotle, Plato, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Edith Stein, Franz Oppenheimer and John A. Hall and John Ikenberry.

Different Views on the Role of the State

In antiquity, the debate on the role and organization of the city is best represented by Plato and Aristotle, who have two diametrically opposed views on how the city should be structured and managed.

In the Republic, Plato proposed a rational model of man and of the State, as well as models for Education and Science, starting from the question “What is justice?” and then developing concepts through Socratic dialogue with interlocutors who propose different variations of the instrumentalist and formal ethics. For Plato, the city should be a place that allows people and the society to have access to understanding and to apply the concept of “righteousness”.

In the second part of the book, Socrates develops an analogy between the soul and the city, building a parallel between the “inner constitution of the individual’s soul” and the “constitution of the state”⁵, suggesting that for a better understanding of concepts such as justice and righteousness an initial analysis must be done on the state⁶ and then extrapolated to the individual soul.

Regarding the genesis and role of the state, it can be seen that Plato proposes an initial version of the organicist theory of the state in which the city was seen as a collective body composed of three classes, with each class having a defining virtue. The leading class, also called “perfect guardians”, was composed of the best guards, having wisdom as their main characteristic. Actual guards (“auxiliaries”) were defined by courage, and the third component of the city was made up of the lower classes - workers, farmers, etc. There were two virtues that were common to all citizens - temperance and justice⁷. In this context, justice is defined as the principle that requires individuals to do only those activities for which they are most qualified.

Thus, in Plato's view, a city will be righteous only through labor specialization and perfect acceptance by citizens of the tasks they have been assigned. Their tasks and lifestyle are detailed in the third book, in which Plato, through the voice of Socrates, proposes a structure for the city

⁵ Ștefan-Scarlat, L., *Dicționar de scrieri politice fundamentale*, HUMANITAS Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000, p 317.

⁶ In his analogy, Plato considers the city as being similar to a collective soul.

⁷ Strauss, L., *Cetatea și omul*, POLIROM Publishing House, Iași, 2000, p. 88.

⁸ The analogy with the individual soul involves dividing it into three parts similar to those that form the state: the rational part, characterized by wisdom, the passionate part, characterized by courage and the appetite, while temperance and justice are virtues that unify the parts. Vezi Ștefan-Scarlat, L., *op. cit.*, p. 318.

in which women and men in the leading class have similar tasks and education, and women and children become common possessions. The dissolution of the family and marriage by the state under a program of eugenics are added to these organizational principles⁹, in order to obtain, at the level the whole society, the psychological traits of an extended family. In addition, only the philosophers are able to occupy the position of “perfect guardians” since they are the ones who may know “Good”, being able to distinguish between appearance and essence¹⁰.

Due to his opinion on the organization and management of the city, Plato was the inspiration for those who adhere to trends with totalitarian tendencies such as fascism and communism, as well as for advocates of meritocracy and feminism¹¹.

In contrast to Plato, Aristotle believes that humans are by nature political animals brought together for the common benefit of living a noble life¹². In his view, the purpose of the city is “to live as a man should live” and that it is only within civil society that man can improve the qualities with which he was endowed. The city is defined as the political form that allows the community to form a correct order and in which the individual may have access to legitimate satisfaction through the existence of laws¹³. The purpose is the same as in Plato’s view, namely the accession of society and of the individual to adequate knowledge and to achieving Good.

Unlike Plato, in Aristotle's paradigm, the city does not rely on brute force or the prescriptions of the gods, because man is endowed with social instincts. Since social instinct is a product of nature, there is no need to set up a city, which means that the only thing required is its organization. Furthermore, it is argued that freedom of citizens is a prerequisite for any form of fair organization.

The city is formed from small associated groups and individuals that are different from one another. This is another point that differs from Plato’s view, because Plato tends to bring beings that are inherently different to an artificial equality and to impose a social order. In addition, the three classes proposed by Plato appear to be at odds with the city’s purpose that was postulated by Aristotle. According to Aristotle, law should reign in the city, aiming to provide freedom for all citizens, punishing criminals proportionally to their crime and returning the goods that were abusively taken, and distributing rewards according to merits¹⁴.

The city is in Aristotle’s paradigm an expression of the natural order, and its organization must take into account criteria such as the situation of the city, the history and the composition of the social body.

In the 17th century, the British philosopher John Locke saw people as free and equal by nature, being opposed the theory that God created humans as subordinate to the monarch. In addition, Locke introduced the concept of natural rights - the right to life, liberty and property, that have a foundation which is independent of the laws of any society.

Using the arguments of freedom and equality of men, Locke justifies the legitimacy of political governance through a version of contractualism in which people conditionally transferred

⁹ Ștefan-Scarlat, L., *op. cit.*, p. 318.

¹⁰ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available on Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://plato.stanford.edu/>. [accessed on January 20 2013].

¹¹ Ștefan-Scarlat, L., *op. cit.*, p 316.

¹² Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available on Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://plato.stanford.edu/>. [accessed on January 20 2013].

¹³ Pisiér, E., *op. cit.*, p 17.

¹⁴ Ibidem, p. 16.

certain rights to enjoy a stable life, freedom and their property¹⁵. Thus, in his view, the state is designed to protect individual rights and to promote the public good.

John Locke is also important for this analysis because he discussed the distinction between natural and positive rights. As previously mentioned, natural rights are the right to life, liberty and property, and are based on certain moral truths that apply to all individuals, regardless of their background or social conventions. On the other hand, positive rights are conferred by the laws established by convention and applied to the territory in which they exist. This distinction is crucial because most interventionist policies of the state in the economy are motivated by positive rights.

Like Locke, Thomas Hobbes considers the social contract as the justification of political principles through the consent of rational, free and equal individuals, who live in the same territory. However, unlike Locke, Hobbes sees human beings as evil by nature, and contrasts the society that is created through the social contract to a state of nature that hinders human development through the lack of security. In such a state, people could not live in a civilized comfort. In Hobbes' theory, the state is given a great importance and obedience to a higher undivided and unlimited authority is supported¹⁶.

Jean Jacques Rousseau opposed the school of natural law, believing that the right that grants the political power, whose task is to pass laws, is based on conventions - on the existence of a social contract.

According to Rousseau, "man is born free and everywhere he is in chains"¹⁷, and the only way he can break free is by adopting social order. In his view, the need for the social contract, and of course, for setting up a form of political order (state) occurs because people get to the point where they can not overcome the obstacles that are detrimental to well-being in the state of nature and are forced to join forces¹⁸. Thus the need for the social contract - the foundation of society - arises, which is defined by the author as:

"A form of association which defends and protects with all common force the person and goods of each associate, and in which all individuals join, yet each listens only to himself, remaining as free as before."¹⁹

Thus, by giving up natural freedom through the social contract, the civil liberty and equality of those who are associated is established.

Unlike Hobbes, Rousseau does not support allegiance to an absolute power, considering that the state should be organized as a republic that respects the principle of the division of powers. The ideal republic is presented as a small state that rejects luxury, trade and financial speculation and in which public affairs are managed by the people. All functions are elective, and people regularly gather to ratify laws²⁰.

Contractualism was criticized by Edith Stein in her paper entitled "An Investigation Concerning the State". She defines the state as:

¹⁵ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available on Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://plato.stanford.edu/>. [accessed on January 20, 2013].

¹⁶ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available on Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://plato.stanford.edu/>. [accessed on January 20, 2013].

¹⁷ Rousseau, J.J., *Despre contractul social sau principiile dreptului politic*, Nemira & Co Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008, p. 48.

¹⁸ Ibidem, p. 61.

¹⁹ Ibidem, p 61.

²⁰ Ibidem, p 33.

“A fairly closed community with a well-defined organization of its members, but especially its global actions. (...) A state cannot be regarded as such if its sovereignty is not part of its ontic structure.”²¹

According to the author, the foundation of the state is independent from the association of persons, but only makes sense as an act of the state itself, which can be applied only if a person or group of persons acts as an organ of the state. In addition,

“State power (...) is based on the collective entity that is established, that makes decisions in a collective way, not for itself, but for the entire state, in order to put in place a legal system that represents it”²²

The state appears as a result of an evolutionary process of a community within which social institutions are formed. These are defined as invisible and temporal goods whose existence is manifested through individuals²³ and that are generated by an act of will. Then, during the evolutionary process, the public entity is transformed into a state entity when it is sovereign and can take any desired action, including creating its own institutions.

The opposition towards contractualism manifests itself in terms of the view on human freedom and the need for approval of the free actions of social entities. Edith Stein believes that individuals do not lose the rights they have outside the state because there are no natural rights, just pure rights²⁴ and positive rights²⁵. Furthermore, it is shown that when contractualism proposes legislation as a free act, its decisions can only be taken in conditions of freedom, while JJ. Rousseau supports giving up certain forms of freedom. This raises the need to stipulate the difference between the purpose of the state and the means for enforcing laws - the state is meant to serve free people, but can use coercive means to enforce the law.

Another way of interpreting the origins of the state is through the evolutionary approach. An exponent of this theory is Franz Oppenheimer, through his anthropological study entitled “The State - Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically”.

In his work, Oppenheimer defines the (initial) state as a social institution imposed by the victorious group on a defeated group, with the sole purpose of regulating and ensuring the rule of the group against internal rebellions and external attacks. The author also identifies the economic and political means as the only possibilities that individuals have in order to satisfy their needs - the economic means are represented by labor, the results of labor and mutual exchanges, while the political means consist of the expropriation of the fruits of labor of others.

Throughout its development, regardless of the stage identified²⁶, the state is regarded as the organization of the political means, so that the state can not occur until the economic means have created a basis for the satisfaction of needs, which can be expropriated²⁷.

Oppenheimer identified as the final stage in the evolution of its state, a form in which the “society” will be led by self-government, which the author called “citizenship free men.” This new form of the state will be characterized by the development of a society without a ruling

²¹ Stein, E., *Un studiu asupra statului*, Carmelitan Publishing House, Snagov, 2011, p. 54.

²² Ibidem, p. 84.

²³ Ibidem, p. 134.

²⁴ According to Stein, pure rights are defined by their independence from individuals and their organization. Vezi Stein, E., *op. cit.*, p. 84.

²⁵ Positive rights are defined as the applicable law, which exists only through legislation that grants individuals certain rights.

²⁶ The stages of state development identified by Oppenheimer are: the primitive feudal state, the developed feudal, the industrial state and the constitutional state.

²⁷ Oppenheimer, F., *The State - Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically*, VANGUARD PRESS Publishing House, New York, 1926, p. 85.

class, which will guarantee individuals, in addition to political freedom, people's economic freedom of movement.

Franz Oppenheimer is quoted by Ikenberry and Hall in the "The State", as one of the representatives of the German social theory, which they consider to be close to the realist current. The entire work on the genesis of the state classifies the approaches into three categories - the liberal approach, the Marxist approach and the realistic approach. They defined the state as a sum of elements:

"A group of institutions (...) led by personnel belonging to the State. The most important institution of the state is the means of repression and coercion. Secondly, these institutions are located in a geographically circumscribed area, which usually refers to the name of the society. (...). Thirdly, the state monopolizes the process for passing laws on its territory."²⁸

The discussion of these state formation theories includes the liberal theory which holds that the state emerged in functional terms in order to meet common goals, the Marxist theory that maintains that the state is formed by the first class recorded in history²⁹, and the German social theory presented above through Oppenheimer's view.

To these three main theories, they add their own paradigm, claiming that the early state formation required two preconditions: the existence of agriculture, that forces people to settle permanently in one area, and a religious doctrine that identifies the leaders as the representative of the gods. They explain the evolution of states through the creation of secondary states for the military benefits brought by centralized systems³⁰.

The Role of the State in the Economy

In order to have an overview of the effects that state intervention has on the economy, it is necessary to discuss the fundamental views of different political platforms regarding the role that the government should have in the economy.

Thus, the initial overview will be expanded through a presentation of the principles and arguments proposed by the exponents of classical economic liberalism, neoliberalism, the social democratic doctrine and the Marxist doctrine.

Classical Economic Liberalism

The two fundamental criteria of classical liberalism are individual freedom and efficiency, while the intervention of the public authority in the economic area is almost completely rejected³¹. The arguments in favor of limiting state intervention focus on their negative consequences on the economy and on the undermining effect that they have on efficiency and freedom, that occurs after the consolidation of state power through repeated actions.

The liberal theory illustrates that decisional power generates incentives that urge its holders to abuse it. For this reason, the representatives of this doctrine generally support a form of minimalist state, where the state's powers are limited to certain areas, such as defense and contract enforcement institutions.

²⁸ Hall, J. A., Ikenberry, J., *Statul*, DU Style Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998, p. 27.

²⁹ Ibidem, p. 44.

³⁰ Ibidem, p. 49.

³¹ Iancu, A., *Bazele teoriei politicii economice*, IRLI & ALL BECK Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998, p. 82-87.

Adam Smith supported the “night watchman state” as the form of administration that best stimulates growth, considering that trade will facilitate the existence of a functioning political system³². In his view, the state should ensure peace, and the administration of justice, while using a low tax system:

“Little else is requisite to carry a state to the highest degree of opulence from the lowest barbarism, but peace, easy taxes, and a tolerable administration of justice: all the rest being brought about by the natural course of things.”³³

A similar approach to the role of the state is used by Robert Nozick, who argued that the state should have as its main objectives the defense of private property and the maintenance of individual liberty. Moreover, state intervention is seen as a moral mistake, since it has no right to redistribute income or wealth³⁴.

If in Nozick’s view state intervention is analyzed from a moral point of view, in Hayek's argument, state intervention is considered an economic element that reduces total welfare. Hayek sees the market as an impersonal force, similar to an economic game with winners and losers³⁵. The author analyzes the role the state should play in the economy through the critique of interventionism and offers three main theoretical arguments. Thus, Hayek argued that state intervention eliminates the spontaneous order that is formed in a free market economy, which means that decisions cannot be taken correctly and efficiently due to the inability to access all the necessary information that would help decision makers assess the consequences that the intervention might have. In addition, an intervention creates advantages for certain individuals at the expense of other individuals.

A similar approach of defining the role of the state by analyzing the effects of interventionism was used by Ludwig von Mises, who argues that there is no “middle way” and that continuous economic interventions will inevitably lead to socialism³⁶. The main argument against a centralized economy consist of the fact that in a centralized economic system, due to the elimination of the free market, there is no pricing mechanism, which makes it impossible to achieve correct economic calculations. Consequently, decision makers cannot ensure the efficient organization of production conditions due to the absence of the capital market and of the incentives offered by profit^{37 38}. Thus, Mises supports the existence of a minimal state, whose role should be limited to the protection of citizens and of the institution of the contract, considering that individual freedom should prevail and that the free market is the best method of allocating resources in the economy.

Neoliberalism

Representatives of the neoliberal doctrine assign a more important role to the state, because they believe that the existence of market failures justify the need for interventions in the economy, which are encouraged by social pressures and by the specificity of certain goods.

³² Ibidem, p. 87.

³³ Stewart, D., *Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith*, Collected Works of Dugal Stewart, vol 10, 1793, p. 38-39.

³⁴ Iancu, A., op.cit., p. 83.

³⁵ Ibidem, p. 83.

³⁶ Mises, L. v., *Middle-of-the-Road-Policy Leads to Socialism*, Two Essays, The Ludwig von Mises Institute, Auburn, Alabama, 1992.

³⁷ Mises, L. v., *Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth*, Archiv für Sozialwissenschaften, no. 47, 1920.

³⁸ Mises, L. v., *Birocrația și imposibilitatea planificării raționale în regim socialist*, Ludwig von Mises Institute Romania, Bucharest, 2006.

Thus, neoliberals complement the liberal doctrine by adding “fairness”³⁹ to the other two principles. This is one of the main characteristics of the neoliberal doctrine, which mainly focuses on five aspects: individuals, private property, real freedom, distribution of income and the principle of competition.

Individuals are seen as parts of communities and private property becomes a means by which the political and economic goals are achieved. Emphasis is put on the real freedom of the individual, which becomes the highest priority. Another vital principle is the redistribution of income in which the state is given responsibilities regarding welfare and equity. It also maintains the principle of competition, considering that the market is one of the mechanisms that ensure its effectiveness⁴⁰.

In other words, the neoliberal doctrine maintains that the state's role is to correct market failures and reduce social disparities through the redistribution of income and wealth.

In conclusion, one cannot overlook the fact that neoliberals inherently argue in favor of reducing individual liberty in order to obtain a greater degree of social justice, which may lead to distortions in the allocation of resources in the economy.

The Democratic Socialist Doctrine

The democratic socialist doctrine is defined, in the spirit of the French Revolution, by three fundamental principles: liberty, equality and fraternity, and proposes a new institutional structure.

Unlike the two doctrines discussed above, within this one, freedom no longer occupies a central place, but gained a wider connotation - freedom is considered to be closely linked to economic security. It is defined through the power held by individuals with regard to their working conditions, job stability and avoiding exposure to arbitrary decisions. The principle of equality is also extended to ensuring equal opportunities and the need to eliminate the causes of inequality. Thus, according to this doctrine, public property should be extended, some means of production should be nationalized and government control should be extended in the economy, even through planning⁴¹. The fraternity principle refers to cooperation in the political area and to social solidarity, requiring the replacement of individualism with altruism.

These three principles can be achieved by correcting the capitalist system through state intervention in the economy.

One of the exponents of this doctrine is John Kenneth Galbraith, who believed that planned economy is superior to the free market economy. In addition, through public intervention the possibility of forming monopolies is eliminated, as well as the inequalities created by the laissez-faire principle⁴².

It can easily be observed that the powers granted to the state are becoming more extensive, requiring the creation of a new institutional structure in which resources are used especially in a collective way, the public sector is extended and coexists with the private sector. Thus, a mixed economic system appears necessary, in which employers cooperate with unions.

³⁹ Iancu A., *op. cit.*, p. 88.

⁴⁰ Iancu A., *op. cit.*, p. 88-90.

⁴¹ Ibidem, p. 98-100.

⁴² Ibidem, p. 100-101.

Marxism

Marxists invoke the same three principles of liberty, equality and fraternity, but give them new meanings. The Marxist doctrine interprets fraternity as social solidarity, while freedom and equality take on meanings specific to materialistic⁴³ and determinist⁴⁴ philosophical positions. Equality must be applied in the economy and the only way in which it can be achieved is through the total elimination of private property and its replacement with public ownership⁴⁵.

Moreover, according to this doctrine the state has a dominant role, having control over all means of production, which allows the state to allocate and distribute all the resources available in the economy, according to political plans.

In “The Communist Manifesto”, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels propose a set consisting of ten measures that should be implemented in order to apply the principles of this doctrine:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the state, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste-lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal liability of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of the populace over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children’s factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production and so on, and so on”⁴⁶.

It can easily be observed that all these measures involve property rights, individual freedom and the management of the economy in a centralized manner. Therefore, we can conclude that Marxism grants the largest amount of power to the state, concentrating the decision-making power over the economy in the hands of the public administration.

However, the shortcomings of this form of organization were pointed out and criticized by authors such as Ludwig von Mises and Friedrich Hayek⁴⁷, whose opinions were presented in the previous sections.

⁴³ As far as freedom is concerned, the supporters of materialism consider that there is no free will, since all physical processes are determined by physical laws and, given the fact that decisions are considered to be physical processes, they are thus determined.

⁴⁴ In determinism, freedom and free will are eliminated because, according to this philosophical position, everything that happens has been determined by previous actions and circumstances.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, p. 102-104.

⁴⁶ Marx, K., Engels, F., *Manifestul Partidului Comunist*. Politics Publishing House, 1962, p. 30-31.

⁴⁷ Hayek, F. A., *Drumul către servitute*, HUMANITAS Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.

Conclusions

Throughout time, the role of the state has been a highly debated subject, in which the representatives of different schools of thought have put forward theories in which the role of the state varies from a minimalist approach to the centralized control of the economy.

This study presented, in a nutshell, the opinions of some of the most important philosophers and economists about the formation and the role of the state in the life of individuals. Furthermore, the second part of the paper focused on the role that is attributed to the state in the economy, by four main political and economic doctrines: liberalism, neoliberalism, the social democratic doctrine and the Marxist doctrine.

References

1. Hall, J. A., Ikenberry, J., *Statul*, DU Style Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998.
2. Hayek, F. A., *Drumul către servitute*, HUMANITAS Publishing House, Bucharest, 2006.
3. Iancu, A., *Bazele teoriei politicii economice*, IRLI & ALL BECK Publishing House, Bucharest, 1998.
4. Marx, K., Engels, F., *Manifestul Partidului Comunist*. Politic Publishing House, 1962.
5. Merriam-Webster Dictionary, available on Merriam-Webster Dictionary: <http://www.merriam-webster.com/> [accessed on January 5, 2013].
6. Mises, L. v., *Economic Calculation in the Socialist Commonwealth*, Archiv für Sozialwissenschaften, no. 47, 1920.
7. Mises, L. v., *Middle-of-the-Road-Policy Leads to Socialism*, Two Essays, The Ludwig von Mises Institute, Auburn, Alabama, 1992.
8. Mises, L. v., *Birocrația și imposibilitatea planificării raționale în regim socialist*, Ludwig von Mises Institute Romania, Bucharest, 2006.
9. Mises, L. v., *Economia în șapte lecții: Gânduri pentru cei de azi și cei de mâine*, Ludwig von Mises Institute Romania, Bucharest, 2010.
10. Online Etymology Dictionary, available on Online Etymology Dictionary: <http://www.etymonline.com/> [accessed on January 7, 2013].
11. Oppenheimer, F., *The State - Its History and Development Viewed Sociologically*, VANGUARD PRESS Publishing House, New York, 1926.
12. Pisier, E., *Istoria ideilor politice*, AMARCORD Publishing House, Timișoara, 2000.
13. Rousseau, J.J., *Despre contractul social sau principiile dreptului politic*, Nemira & Co Publishing House, Bucharest, 2008.
14. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, available on Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: <http://plato.stanford.edu/>. [accessed on January 20, 2013].
15. Ștefan-Scarlat, L., *Dicționar de scrieri politice fundamentale*, HUMANITAS Publishing House, Bucharest, 2000.
16. Stein, E., *Un studiu asupra statului*, Carmelitan Publishing House, Snagov, 2011.
17. Stewart, D., *Account of the Life and Writings of Adam Smith*, Collected Works of Dugal Stewart, vol 10, 1793.
18. Strauss, L., *Cetatea și omul*, POLIROM Publishing House, Iași, 2000.