

Outline of the presentation for JSHET 2018, June 2018, Tokyo
By Gilles CAMPAGNOLO, Full research Professor, National Center for Scientific
Research and Aix-Marseilles School of Economics, France.
Sent to Tsutomu HASHIMOTO, Organizer JSHET 2018, as requested.

Paul Chamley considered the reading of Sir James Steuart's *Inquiry* by Hegel in his work *Économie politique et philosophie chez Steuart et Hegel* that was published in Paris by Dalloz publishing house in 1963. His results were insightful but his assumptions can be discussed, whether about the continuity in G.W.F. Hegel's views regarding economics (within 'objective spirit') or with regard to other stances, like the position of "inspirer" Steuart would have had for much later economists, like John Maynard Keynes (Chamley's text « Sir James Steuart, inspirateur de la *Théorie générale* de Lord Keynes ? » in *Revue d'économie politique*, 1962/3). One may ask for more caution with economic doctrines and we shall discuss here only the following point, as thoroughly as possible: how Steuart and the interest Hegel took in economic themes related, with the reading of Steuart by Hegel being the opportunity seized for commentary by Chamley, who achieved a great work also in editing related documents (such as the *Documents relatifs à Sir James Steuart*, Paris, 1965).

One key element is the archival sources: Chamley sought those regarding Steuart. Regarding Hegel, in his biography dated 1844 (*Hegels Leben*, published in Berlin), Karl Rosenkranz mentioned the existence of a running commentary of the *Inquiry* by Hegel during his stay in Frankfurt am Main. That was very unfortunately lost thereafter and has not been retrieved to this day. Yet Hegel's interest predated this and his journey into the Alps (also retrieved by Rosenkranz) gave some precious hints. We shall explore these, starting in Hegel's steps to see how his encounter with the science of political economy happened, was thereafter dependent on his reading of works by earlier German so-called "Camerallists", "late mercantilist" Steuart and "Classics" after Adam Smith. In a pivotal moment, this key relationship displays how to come to grips with the issue of Modernity.

In the presentation of the paper, we shall assess some convergences between Steuart and Hegel, being very cautious due to the lack of the main piece of evidence that the commentary must have been. It is probably some more caution that Chamley lacked, although his analytical work in comparing piecemeal various sections of the works remains interesting and stimulating. Some hypothesis are thus plausible, some other only possible, some probably a little overrated.

In Frankfurt/Main. Hegel did not yet distinguish between *Verstand* (the capacity of reasoning and computing that serves well economics as a science) and *Vernunft* (rationality *per se* in the philosophical meaning Hegel would thereafter always stress). Hegel was then conscious of how philosophy thus understood lacked the needed concepts (*Begriffe*) to grasp many human activities, *including economic life*? He was searching for such concepts that could conciliate any split between notions like "actual liberty" and "felicity". The universal traits he was looking for could, at least for some, and as far as economics is concerned, be found in the views put forth by Steuart. Thus Hegel hoped to dissolve abstract views and refer to the "real world" or *die Wirklichkeit*. What, later on, Hegel would mean by the identity relationship between rationality and effectiveness in reality was here in bud.

Even if the notion of "influence" deserves caution in its treatment, through reading Hegel's views we shall debunk the myth of Hegelianism as some abstract and outwardly view – for it is rather the opposite way around. And this is what Chamley insightfully intuited, even though facets of his detailed presentation may be discussed. At the epistemological level, it may remain unsatisfying, so notions of economic philosophy will be called upon to disentangle the matter.

To restrain this outline to two aspects of political economy, we shall also indicate that from the beginning it will be indispensable to face two alternative risks:

1. On the one hand, there exists a tradition (not unrelated to Marxists' later reading of Hegel) that spread the view that Hegel legitimated at a metaphysical level, the *bourgeois* world and views of his times, namely one possible interpretation of Classical economics that leads from Smith to the Manchester school. In a nutshell, Hegel would be apologetically supporting *bourgeois ideology*. This runs counter to the texts (and Marx knew Hegel's writings well, so his views were more accurate than some in this tradition). In any case, it is quite clear that the influence of Steuart demonstrates the reverse.

2. On the other hand, there is also a tendency to wish to analyze all of Hegel's works through the lens of his *Logic*, thus subordinating all philosophy (including the phenomenology, the philosophy of spirit and of right) to it and making those mere applied matters of one original sphere only. But the whole Hegelian system makes sense with regard to its goal (the so-called "Absolute spirit") and the economic and civil society sphere (*die Sittlichkeit*) makes sense in that regard as well. Hence, in our view, it is necessary to rebuke a mostly or exclusively « logicist » view of Hegelianism. And what Hegel could find in Steuart upon matters very practical and essential to his system: the organization of the City, the role of the Prince, the very idea of the modern State (among other main topics) are in line with such a corrective interpretation.

The paper will be made of three parts following a history of economic thought approach:

1. The first experience of economic life by Hegel in the Bernese Alps and the meaning of his early interest in genuinely economic themes *before* he read the work by Sir Steuart.

2. A notional analysis of what Hegel found in reading Steuart's *Inquiry* during his stay in Frankfurt, and also how it may have made its way in his own works, until much later writings where economics are given full standard: this influence is truly stimulating and partly on the point but needs qualified views.

3. A general line of commentary so as to reassess Chamley's stand and display the notions at stake in the view of the reading of Steuart by Hegel, but of other readings such as when Hegel refers to works by Smith (in his *Jenenser Realphilosophie*, for instance early in 1803 or much later in 1821 in his *Principles of the Philosophy of Right*), anyhow *after* Hegel had read Steuart.

These three parts will be served by work on archives, as mentioned before. Further discussion will be welcome.

For Japanese readers, it may be noted that it will also constitute a follow up to a previous work presented and published in Japan on the Young Hegel and Modernity in the productive economy 人間と経済をまじめに考えるー若きヘーゲルと近代の生産者たちー (*Saitama Daigaku Kiyo (Kyoyogakubu)*, 52/1, 2016).

In the same line, English readers may be interested to refer to the first part of my *Criticisms of Classical political economy. Menger, Austrian Economics and the German Historical School*, Routledge, 2010 (with a Foreword by Bertram Schefold),

Powerpoint shall accompany the presentation.