

Paul Scott
University of Glasgow

Neo-Republicanism as a Critique of the Market.

In place of a liberal focus on interference and subsequent concern with the means by which the state might be prevented from interfering with its subjects (constitutional rights etc), neo-republicanism substitutes a concern with domination. One part can be said to dominate another where it has the ability to interfere with that other party's interests on an arbitrary basis. This substitution allows for a neo-republican analysis of private relations: domination is potentially a facet not only of the relationship between state and individual, but also that between husband and wife, employer and employee, those who own property and those who do not.

Starting from the work of Philip Pettit, this paper examines the application of these neo-republican insights to the market as a system of human relations. On one hand Pettit himself has concluded that, "There is no particular threat to people's freedom as non-domination associated with participation in the market."¹ On the other, it has been claimed that neo-republican criticisms "add up to a rejection of the market as general model of worthy social intercourse,"² Distinguishing intrinsic and instrumental evaluations of the market, I discuss these alternative conclusions and relate the emerging neo-republican critique of the market to the work of Robert Hale which promotes the idea that all contract is based on coercion.

¹ Philip Pettit, *Freedom in the Market* (2005) Politics Philosophy Economics Volume 5 No. 2 131, at 142

² Gerald Gaus, *Backwards into the Future: Neorepublicanism as a Postsocialist Critique of Market Society*, 20 Social Philosophy and Policy 59 (2003)