

The Sociology of Entrepreneurship: The Historical Positioning of the Entrepreneur and his Role in the Demise of Capitalism

Akachat Lyamine*

University of Oum El Bouaghi
Laboratory of Communication
Sociology for Research and
Akachat.lyamine@univ-oeb.dz.

Received: 26/09/2023

Hafidi Lilia

University of Oum El Bouaghi
Affiliation (Lab)
(Algeria)
Lilia.hafidi@univ-oeb.dz.

Accepted: 21/05/2024

Published: 10/12/2024

Abstract :

Since the appearance of the entrepreneur as the first time until he reaches the type in which capitalism ends, there are several positions, descriptions and social roles governed by the development of his concept and person, which were commissioned to present and interpret many sociological and economic theories in particular, based on the above, this article aims to monitor the positions of the contractor within the prevailing social and economic systems in society in addition to explaining the contractor's undermining of the capitalist system that incubates him, relying on the descriptive approach and sociological analysis as an aid in that, Therefore, the problem is: What are the historical positions of the entrepreneur within the prevailing social and economic system? And how does he end capitalism in its subsequent development?

Key Words: The culture of entrepreneurship; creative destruction; the entrepreneur in socialism; culture of mass; the demise of capitalism.

* Akachat Lyamine

Introduction.

Human history is governed by the law of evolution open to the possibilities of positive and negative, and at every stage of its development a social actor emerges into existence that constitutes through a number of teleological interactions a group of social phenomena whose classifications vary according to the behavioral meanings of each actor belongs to society, while the characteristics of the social actor differ by virtue of the field from which he emerges, one of the most social actors was the economic elite in the language of Schumpeter, which is within the framework of an interactive relationship between them and the cultural and social structures of the masses, a system of cultural economy called capitalism was built, starting with a mass of values and ending with economic practices that build a kind of society that differs from the destructive type of society.

The economic elite represented in entrepreneurs has always been a common field of research between sociology and economics, so if the economic theory focuses in the field of entrepreneurship on the study of the entrepreneurial act in terms of linking it to the idea of balance and imbalance in the economy or in terms of stability of economic activity and linking it to the idea of exploiting resources, whether scarce or abundant, and linking all this to the idea of general progress of society and achieving the state of well-being of society, one of the biggest concerns of sociology was to explain the relationship of the prevailing value system in society with the emergence of the entrepreneur, or in the analysis of the role that the cultural paradigm poses on the entrepreneurial orientation and the form of the enterprise itself and the way it is run, not to mention the exposure to the cultural features that are embodied in the person of the entrepreneur, at the beginning of economic sciences specifically the entrepreneur appeared into existence as a central economic factor to operate the exploitation of resources was scarce or abundant, and the form of the entrepreneur at that time was embodied in the concept of capitalism, and this represented a confusion in concepts and roles later between the capitalist and the entrepreneur. This view is attributed to classical thinkers in sociology and economics such as Marx, And Adam Smith, despite Marx's interest in the entrepreneur or the capitalist, as he put it, was dimmed by the fact that the main theme of Marx was to talk about capitalism, its dynamics, and theorizing its end, and as an idea of the Marxist proposal that theorized at a socialist society built on the collapse of capitalism, it seems clear that talking about the entrepreneur and his role is primarily related to the type of economic and cultural system prevailing in society simply because it differs according to the types of systems, the entrepreneur under socialism is different from the entrepreneur under capitalism, this is due to the different value model that each entrepreneur is saturated with, so the individual who is rooted in the mentality of cultural values such as associativeness, administrative participation and fair distribution in owning the means of production is not an individual modeled in the form of a capitalist entrepreneur imbued with cultural values Such as

individualism and freedom in the establishment and management of entrepreneurship and non-participation in the collection and ownership of wealth, and as a result the enterprise has become a focal point in the understanding of economic processes on the one hand, which in turn requires an explanation of the role of socio-cultural factors in the formation of the individual entrepreneur.

Through this scientific paper, we will try to answer the question of who is the entrepreneur and what does it represent for the development of societies from capitalism to socialism and then to post-socialism in the event of the transformation of society from socialism to capitalism, and what is his role in the progress or collapse of capitalism? And this was done by using the descriptive approach and using sociological analysis as a tool to achieve these goals.

1. Three basic concepts related to entrepreneurship (entrepreneurial act, entrepreneurial culture, entrepreneur)

1.1 Entrepreneurial act:

The term of the "entrepreneurial act" necessarily refers to the so-called "entrepreneurial intention" and the meaning here is primarily related to the proactive component of the entrepreneurial act, namely "intention", which is a form of tendency and internal desire and orientation towards entrepreneurship and it is being formed based on several socio-economic strategies, foremost of which is the provision of a number of educational programs (Belmahoub & Ben katroaa, 2022, p. 288) that work in some way to enrich the habitus of the individual entrepreneur or in another form, such as providing material support, whether in the form of subsidy or financial lending to the individual entrepreneur.

In short, the entrepreneurial act represents all the processes and procedures carried out by the individual aimed at achieving profit, social status or self-realization using coordination and organization through the exploitation of economic and individual resources (Al Eid, 2023, p. 449) in a context full of uncertainty and risk.

1.2 Entrepreneurial Culture:

When we discussing the concept of the culture of entrepreneurship without a doubt, must be paid attention to a certain idea in defining the concept and is mainly related to differentiating between the entrepreneurial Culture in the presence of enterprise and the entrepreneurial Culture in the absence of it, in the first case (in the presence of the enterprise), the concept is related to talking primarily about the cultural mass of the individual that he interacts with within the enterprise itself, which is the result of the act of interaction outside and inside the entrepreneurial organization, and therefore the culture of entrepreneurship becomes: "a set of value and practical rules that are shared by all individuals who belong to the enterprise, and by which they overcome the problems faced by the enterprise and achieve the goals of different kinds, and those values include organization, ethics, professional competitiveness, efficiency, renewal and others" (Boufalta & Azizi, 2019).

While the "culture of entrepreneurship" before the existence of the enterprise is somewhat different from the previous one simply because it is more related to the

focus on the values and perceptions that the individual builds before choosing to establish a business, and it promotes and desires towards the entrepreneurial orientation and it represents: a set of values, beliefs, perceptions, ideas and knowledge that the individual possesses through life experiences or through education that build his perception and orientation about the establishment, management and development of the enterprise.

1.3 The entrepreneur as a cultural reserve

Before talking about the entrepreneur through historical tracing it was a priority to talk about the entrepreneur as a social actor before he carries any other characteristic, it is obvious when trying to build a concept for the entrepreneur to read it according to the social context and from the sociological perspective in particular, in this aspect, it is not possible to neglect or skip the first sociologists who talked about the entrepreneurial act and the characteristics and qualities of the entrepreneur in itself, "Max Weber" this sociologist discussed the meaning of the entrepreneurial act, which is in its simplest form an expression of the economic system prevailing in society in order to talk about "the "entrepreneurial culture", which he did not move towards economists before him and limits his reading only to the analysis of some outputs and inputs of the economic process as a whole, but in economic sociology he gave top priority to values, standards, social controls and cultural terminology and their role in building the entrepreneurial orientation, and he was not like the economists before him and confines his reading only to the analysis of some of the outputs and inputs of the entire economic process but in an economic sociology he gave high priority to values, norms, social controls and cultural terminology and their role in understanding the entrepreneurial process, not only that, but he also built the entire economic conception called capitalism on some cultural values with a limited religious orientation and considered it the first nucleus from which capitalism originated, not only capitalism, but all the economic processes and phenomena that occur in society intentionally or unintentionally has a certain social extension, and the matter here means linking those aforementioned values with transformations that have a wide impact on the structure and arrangement of society such as the social revolution, which was embodied in particular by the social rearrangement of classes, this was represented in the emergence of the bourgeoisie class as a class with a sovereign position in society, which was interested in moving towards industry and establishing pioneering industries such as textile and iron and their material and social investment in them, which led to a kind of accumulation of capital, and all of this means the proliferation of that kind of social actor embodied in the concept of capitalist entrepreneur or capitalist entrepreneur (Bouزيد, 2014, p. 292).

The transition in the prevailing economic model in society from feudalism to capitalism, which was caused primarily by the impact of the industrial revolution on society, had a number of behavioral transformations of an economic nature in

particular, with the beginning of the tyranny of material profitability and the emergence and spread of institutions of a familial nature have clearly shown the role played by social institutions such as the family in preserving or in moving the status of class or in the existence of an economic type of behavior and molding it according to a certain ideological orientation, whether it is inherited or socially productive, all of this is ultimately related to the formulation of the "culture of entrepreneurship", which abbreviates all the terms associated with the act of entrepreneurship. Therefore, all the proposals that seem for a moment to be purely economic proposals that explain the tendencies of individuals to one side at the expense of another or the predominance of a behavioral orientation at the expense of another orientation are in fact related in one way or another to some generalized sociology in society and between intellectual circles, whether or not, and it is not possible for an individual to act without invoking a set of cultural controls and values or without positioning the group with the meaning of the term in all his behavior. Generally, the moral presence of the group in building the individual perceptions of entrepreneurs refers in some way to talk about the concept of Habitus of Bourdieu, which expresses the stock of values, perceptions and even experiences acquired in the daily life of the individual and which are formed in the cultural and collective memory of society, not just their cultural memory as individuals or as groups, which transcends them to even control their ways of thinking and determine their behavior (Bouzid, 2014, p. 298).

The book "Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism" was the most famous sociological work that focused on research and investigation of what is later called the culture of entrepreneurship, based on linking it to the social and cultural dimension of the individual, to be understood later in the rest of the book as a productive act according to a cultural and social structure before it is an embodiment of economic behavior with a purely material purpose, as promoted by most economists researching in that field who have a rampant materialism in seeing and interpreting things and phenomena of an economic character. According to the sociological vision of the enterprise, the entrepreneur is a cultural carrier governed by ethnic, cultural and even religious tendencies, and is also governed by space-time hierarchies, social transformations and cultural changes that are not of a holistic nature, in which behavioral responses often differ of individuals also differ even the concepts that make up the paradigm based on which the meaning of the entrepreneur is recognized, and the following is a presentation of the conceptual changes of the entrepreneur according to his historical developments:

A-Pre- Cantillon phase

The first writer to narrow the meaning of the term entrepreneur and give it accurate economic content and analytical fame was Richard Cantillon, despite the tyranny of feudal practices as a model for many economic operations by virtue of the general economic orientation of society at the time, but he is considered a turning point in developing the theory of entrepreneurship because it has focused in its

presentation directly on the commercial aspects in the person of the entrepreneur to accomplish things in the economy, even if it is linked to land as a basic resource for wealth creation and not on the urban and construction character based on the concept of commissioning by higher authorities

in society as it was in force in the Middle Ages, so it is considered an intellectual reference based on this and in this title the distinction has been made between two stages in the history of entrepreneurship in particular, namely the pre-Cantillon phase and the post-Cantillon phase, and this reading, which separates two stages in the process of the entrepreneurial process, historically existed to indicate that what was written before Cantillon in relation to the entrepreneurial process was a kind of impolite thought, while what was written in the stage of Cantillon and beyond represents a state of polite thought where he began to deal with research and scientific rigor with the entrepreneurial process on the one hand and on the other hand trying to accurately determine what the entrepreneurial process means with all its components in general.

With regard to the review of ancient and medieval literature on entrepreneurship before Cantillon, two main points can be drawn: One of the first special models that poured into the person of the entrepreneur was the merchant or adventurer, and it was common in ancient societies and medieval societies in particular, and the success or failure of this type of entrepreneur is related to the extent of its control and control of legal and institutional risks or restrictions, and on the other hand there is an early manifestation of entrepreneurship, which also involves taking risks on the one hand and taking the initiative on the other hand, and the matter here is about the practice of tax farming can be traced back to ancient Greece and may be older than this, and the model that can be described as a entrepreneur here is a tax farmer who represents the person who bids who bids for the exclusive right to collect taxes in the name of the king or in the name of the crown in general, and the amount of each offer is predictably linked to the bidder's assessment of the amount of taxes he can collect (F Hébert & N. Link, 17-05-2009, p. 04).

In general, the danger in this tax farm business was that it might collect less tax revenue than it paid for the concession to collect the same taxes, and his profit is of course related to the financial difference that is above the amount of what it offered for receiving the tax cultivation. Accordingly, the incentive that motivates each entrepreneur to work is the opportunity to obtain profits but make a profit, although it is a necessary condition in the contracting direction, but despite this is not a sufficient condition for entrepreneurial activity, so you find that as a second condition the entrepreneur must be reasonably sure that he can keep the profits he made from his projects and contracts without being confiscated by the ruling authority in his society. What guarantees encouraging the entrepreneurial orientation in any society is the availability of several foundations, including a free economy

provides the principle of equal entrepreneurial opportunities in addition to the availability of guarantees of ownership of the revenues gained from the entrepreneurial activity, and in comparison between the entrepreneurial entrepreneur and the tax farmer, you find that what encourages the entrepreneurial orientation is the second model of the tax farmer, this is because the model of the merchant and adventurer entrepreneur is a risky model that does not contain collateral because the merchant entrepreneur's goods can be subject to theft, damage, storms and many forms of destruction, whose profits do not always reflect his diligence in supervision or management (F Hébert & N. Link, 17-05-2009, p. 04).

The belief of the medieval society about the entrepreneur represented in the person of the clergyman, and his task was mostly related to large architectural works such as castles, public buildings, fortifications, cathedrals, monasteries, etc. to a more modern model of the entrepreneur that separates his being and existence from his functions, which were combined together in his person, and among these functions there is the inventor, the planner, the engineer, the employer and the manager, which were combined in one person, which is the entrepreneur, it is noticeable that there were not two qualities in the formation of his concept, namely risk and saving capital. Later, when capitalism began to replace feudalism, a clearer distinction emerged between the person performing artistic and technical functions and the person performing the commercial and architectural aspects (F Hébert & N. Link, 17-05-2009, pp. 05-06).

B- Post-Cantillon Phase

At this phase, many theories and ideas of temporal correlation emerged, which among the arrangements in its presentation was the adoption of the term school, and the following is a detail in that.

- French School

First, before talking about "Post-Cantillonian" thinkers, and as a brief introduction to Cantillon, his concept of the entrepreneur revolves around linking it to the concept of uncertainty and risk, he sees that "the person who risks his own money or borrowed money employed under a state of uncertainty and without guarantees In order to make profits from the returns of production or sale, which in turn cover the costs of production, and here he bears all kinds of risks, whether related to money or otherwise" (Sidi Saleh & Lounis, 2022, p. 555) , what Cantillon focused on is linking the concept of the entrepreneur with two other concepts, which stipulates that the status of the entrepreneur is granted only to those who try to create a non-fixed material income, which is a form of commercial or productive project in which they risk their money and they do not have any guarantees of profit, and it equates the concept of the entrepreneur with the pledged (Chadley, 2013, p. 289).

Then the concept of the entrepreneur developed somewhat and another characteristic or function was added to it, which is creativity, which reduces the

entrepreneur's expenses and increases his profits at the same time, according to Nicholas Boudou. Later, another thinker named Anne Robert Jacques Turgot added some modifications to the concept of the entrepreneur to become a capitalist and this is through the act of saving, which leads to the accumulation of money, which allows the entrepreneur himself to have the option of making investment decisions such as buying land and others, and the accumulation of money with the economic client leaves him with two options, the first is to stay to remain a lender of money and the second to become an entrepreneur according to the "Turgot's" concept and all this happens within the pursuit of profits (Chadley, 2013, p. 290).

Later, Jean-Baptiste Say concludes the views of the French school by amending the concept of the entrepreneur and adds that the entrepreneur is the focus of the economic process and has linked it to the industrial sector by virtue of its affiliation to it, and believes that the role of the entrepreneur is to apply the knowledge acquired for the purpose of producing a consumable product, here he reduces the role of the entrepreneur to a three-stage process that starts with acquiring knowledge, then collecting resources and potential, then creating the product. As a final stage, he supervises the implementation. He also believes that entrepreneurs are of three types: entrepreneurs in the agricultural industry, who are mine exploiters, landowners, and others, and entrepreneurs in the laboratory industry who produce an existing and familiar product, but with some improvements and modifications that raise its value. There are entrepreneurs in the commercial industry who transfer products from one party to another (Saybi, 2013, p. 207), these three types have in common that they are all self-employed.

In the previous presentation of the French economic literature in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, it is clear that the entrepreneur was considered a vital element and the most important link in the market economy. However, it is noted that the development of the concept was not subject to strict evolutionary intellectual foundations, but this did not prevent those thinkers from making predictions about what the entrepreneur will be in the future, they talked about some of the qualities and functions that will appear later in the entrepreneur, including the creator (F Hébert & N. Link, 17-05-2009, p. 22).

- English School

For English school thinkers such as Adam Smith, David Ricardo, and John Stuart Mill, the entrepreneur is a concept synonymous with the capitalist, as well as some adjectives similar to what was proposed in the French school, such as risk-taking. Later, Jeremy Bentham focused on the creativity of the entrepreneur, while his predecessors from the aforementioned English school focused on considering the entrepreneur as an economic client who risks his capital and is also considered an adventurer, entrepreneur, coordinator and observer, as mentioned by Alfred Marshall later (Chadley, 2013, p. 291).

What is noticeable about this English proposal is their excessive tendency to consider the entrepreneur as a capitalist and the capitalist is a entrepreneur, and this increases the chaos about differentiating between the functions of both the entrepreneur and the capitalist, although Jeremy Bentham in particular has been opposite in most of his intellectual proposals about the entrepreneur compared to what was presented by the English school in general, but it did not have a significant impact on the re-circulation of its own concept about the relationship of creativity to the entrepreneur in the English proposal (F Hébert & N. Link, 17-05-2009, p. 35), but it somehow passed on to the thinker Schumpeter.

- American School

The most famous representatives of this school are Joseph Schumpeter and the economist Frank Knight, who share with their predecessors the thinkers of the previous school in placing the contractor at the heart of the economy and considering it the basis of economic life, but they disagree with the previous proposal, which is similar to the extent of conformity between the contractor and the capitalist, regarding Schumpeter, it will be detailed in a later title of this article. Knight took the same position as Cantillon regarding the separation between the capitalist and the entrepreneur, and both also agreed that the entrepreneur may or may not be capitalist and that it is not necessary for him to own some property. Frank Knight tends to formulate a proposal based on the classical French school in dealing with the entrepreneur, which links him to concepts such as indecency and risk, and adds some conceptual modification represented in the insured risk, Uninsured uncertainty means insured risk as a "set of uncertainty factors" that have been insured, whether uncertainty or insured risk, but they equally involve profit or loss (H'ébert, R, & N. Link, , 2006, pp. 345-347), and this uncertainty is associated with "unique events whose probabilities cannot be accurately estimated" (Chadley, 2013, p. 292).

What is noticeable about this American proposition of Knight is that it represents a station of thought in which, first, the separation between the entrepreneur and the capitalist has been further and furthered, and second, begun the process of abandoning the link between the concept of the entrepreneur with the concept of risk, which represents a break with the "contellonist" heritage, as Hebert put it (H'ébert, R, & N. Link, , 2006, p. 348).

- Austrian School

As is customary, the theorists of the Austrian school give the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurship in general a very important place in the economy and believe that it is the values of individuals, their choices and circumstances that produce economic events and phenomena such as supply, demand and others, its most prominent thinkers include Karl Menger, Ludwig von Mises and Israel Kerzner. Regarding Menger, he did not try to associate the entrepreneur with the capitalist, nor did he believe that his job was only to take risks, and he also did not elaborate much on the concept of the entrepreneur in his writings, but he always referred to

him as "the person who coordinates the time of the factors of production" therefore, the owner of the company faces a state of uncertainty related, for example, to the market, the type and quantity of goods produced, etc., which (uncertainty) is limited by the entrepreneur's knowledge of the production process and the extent of his control over this process (H'ebert, R, & N. Link, , 2006, pp. 319-320).

In another place, the thinker Mises also looks at the entrepreneur from the angle of improving the concept of the previous schools of thought of the entrepreneur, that is, he sees the entrepreneur as an actor, that he is an organizer of production, that he is also a renovator, and he has a special function, which is how to determine the exploitation of the productive resources he owns in order to reach his goals, in addition, he sees the economic behavior of borrowing as encouraging entrepreneurs to invest in production on the one hand, and encouraging consumers to consume on the other, while Kerzner also bases some of his theory of the entrepreneur on classical foundations in other schools, he adds the concept of vigilance to the entrepreneur to become "an attentive individual working in a completely uncertain environment" (Saybi , 2013, pp. 210-212), so he's always on the lookout for all the opportunities that give him money (Chadley, 2013, p. 294).

What is noticeable about the Austrian proposal of the entrepreneur is that it is a developed proposal in itself, so you find that the basic ideas in it are ideas contained in some other schools, such as linking the entrepreneur to the inadequacy, creativity and others, but with the addition of some concepts that are very important in defining the concept and function of the entrepreneur, such as attention and vigilance.

2. A reading of the entrepreneur 's position between socialism and capitalism

Talking about this part is primarily related to finding the answer to the question: Where can the value of equality, democracy and freedom, which is the core of socialism, be located in a enterprise that essentially requires inequality, democracy and freedom in another sense?

In the simplest concept of socialism, you find that it means that cultural, moral and economic orientation that seeks to achieve three basic values: equality, democracy and freedom, and all these values carry in one way or another talk about the meaning of matter, in short, democracy according to socialists it expresses a means of ensuring that the outputs of the economic process are under collective control, while talking about freedom requires differentiating between two types, negative and positive, and priority is given to the second type because the first type is achieved by spreading the value of equality, Passive freedom means the absence of coercion, which in turn means "the subordination of the environment and circumstances of a particular individual to the control of another individual, which makes him compelled to act according to the service of the other party and not according to his own coherent plan, in order to avoid greater evil" (Hindmoor, 2014, pp. 13-14), while the talk about equality often revolved around the distribution and

fair use of wealth, not to mention the idea of appearing before the law on one level without ethnic, class or other discrimination.

Mostly, talking about equality within the socialist paradigm necessarily means the idea of the final exclusion of the concept of class in the capitalist sense of it, and talking here certainly means the category of entrepreneurs that stand out for history as a group of individuals who are condemned to profit obsession and are gifted in a certain way, whether in their productions or in their cultural and psychological characteristics. They stand arrogantly above society to push the wheel of economic progress towards transformation and permanent mobility from the core of their identification, it seems clear that their position in the socialist framework does not seem right at all on the one hand and on the other hand the issue is related to the fact that the meaning of their existence necessarily undermines the great basic principles of the socialist system itself. For example, in the issue of income or material return, which is one of the main pillars on which the entrepreneur moves, when the financial income of the individual increases whenever he moves in the class order and the more it distinguishes itself, whether as an individual or as a small group, from the rest of society, which means achieving a lower percentage of equality in the use of wealth among other individuals, which is contrary to the basic principle of socialism for its fair distribution. However, not allowing such practices, which are out of the scope of repetition and perpetuate exclusivity, reduces the generation of the category of entrepreneurs in society with functions and capital values.

The second thing in the site of the value model of the entrepreneur in the socialist system is related to the extent of the presence of the concept of "collective" in the enterprise, which represents the concept of "individual" in a more precise sense. What cultural compliance imposes in the socialist system is the permanent evocation of the collective management model for all economic forms, and this is contrary to the model of uniqueness in the establishment and management of enterprises, which always means limiting the spread of collective control over the activity of the economy as a whole and not only the contracting side. In the end, this leads to a direct contradiction between socialism, and the existence of the entrepreneur who bears the value of individualism and the independent individual management, the third thing is related to freedom itself. Socialism is compatible with the establishment of entrepreneurial projects that contain a zero degree of coercion. When coercion increases, so does the degree of conflict between a free and financially privileged entrepreneur who does not believe in equality in the distribution of wealth, but believes in seizing opportunities and many other cultural traits, and the grand principles of the socialist system.

Therefore, the entrepreneur's project in the sense that values such as initiative, innovation and freedom are represented in the development of new means of production, in the exploitation of community resources and in the representation of the value of individualism in the management of the enterprise in itself is a form that

cannot be contained in any way under the representation of the triad of values (Equality, Democracy and Freedom) of the socialist system. Accordingly, this model of economic orientation grants only a small amount of the aforementioned values (and sometimes not at all) because the flow of the economy must remain in its simple, circular and controlled form due to internal forces represented by the largest group. But is there no model of the entrepreneur suitable for the socialist system? Later this question will be answered and now the entrepreneur will be talked about in light of the existence of capitalism as a system adopted by society because it seems that the modern concept of the entrepreneur cannot in any way be molded within the socialist system without making significant modifications to the concept and the entity itself of the entrepreneur because this system, based on its basic values, stands in conflict with the values held by the entrepreneur, this system represents in all its cultural features a contrast with the new representative of capitalism, who is the entrepreneur by virtue of the similarity in belief in values.

The distinguishing feature of capitalism according to Weber and Schumpeter, which can even be adopted mainly in its definition, is "the pervasive spirit of acquisition and the constant desire to improve", in this regard, Cohen believes that one of the biggest reasons why capitalism is existentially abandoning its place in favor of socialism is its access to the fulfilment of all material desires, which pushes the value of the "desire to acquire" on which capitalism is based to disappear (Hindmoor, 2014, p. 40), if we borrow the following definition of the entrepreneur, which contains that the entrepreneur carries one of these values: the entrepreneur, the owner of the capital and the investor in it, the innovator, the unique and most important of all is to be the person who carries the desire to obtain profits" excluding.

Except for the entrepreneur of Schumpeter because he believes that his entrepreneur model is not governed by the desire to make a profit but instead by his desire "to conquer and fight and also the pleasure of creativity" (Hindmoor, 2014, p. 50), in the context of the last value, there are thinkers who canceled it and only compensated it with the desire to "rejoice" (Chadley, 2013, p. 292), while there are those who stressed the value of "desire for profits" for the entrepreneur, such as Robinson, in his writings on the enterprise, when he said that "all available research shows that the motive for wealth is the main motive for entrepreneurship" as is the case for capitalism itself, it represents the infinite desire to hoard profits based on class exploitation, and this is largely identical between this system and the entrepreneur as a cultural bearer with that concept. In the end, when comparing the cultural and value load of the entrepreneur with the cultural and value load of the capitalist system, it seems clear to any thinker that the entrepreneur is the representative of capitalism and is responsible for its decline or continuation. Schumpeter spoke in the aforementioned position about this point when he linked it to the process of creative destruction.

3. Marx and against the entrepreneur

In most of Marx's writings, the word entrepreneur is mentioned very little, but instead he spoke of the capitalist to mean in particular the owner of the means of production, regardless of the difficulty that will come later in differentiating between the functions of the capitalist and the entrepreneur, this is in order to distinguish between the two concepts, but it has prevailed in that historical era that many of the philosophers agreed that the term capitalist is synonymous with the concept of entrepreneur, and this was common not only to Marx, but even to the English classicists to those who preceded him, such as David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill and Thomas, Matthews, they saw the entrepreneur as an economic customer, adventurer, contractor, (Chadley, 2013, p. 291), and all this is part of the so-called classical vision of the entrepreneur, which is different from the modern concept of the entrepreneur.

The capitalist maximizes his capital by employing what means of production he has in enterprises in which the process of class exploitation of a very large group of workers who naturally belong to the working class and so is the capitalist system of production, which is characterized by being based on two elements, according to Marx, namely capital and wage labor, so the ruling class is the class that owns the capital and the class that receives the wage is the class of workers (Shweimat, 2014, p. 131), It is a controlled class that is exploited by the ruling class, and Marx, in his book "Capital," when talking about the entrepreneur, presents the idea that he is not born an entrepreneur but is born a capitalist, and he is not free as it seems to be understood, but he is bound by the same process that made him a capitalist. Therefore, he is stuck in an endless spiral of capital and wealth expansion and still wants to obtain surplus value, and the coercive law of the market and the economic and industrial structures within it impose on him a kind of behavior direction and choice setting (Al-Dawi, 2005, p. 26), and limit their ability to take initiative (Boutillier & Uzunidis, 2014, p. 21), All of this is a logic that entrepreneurs cannot control it, but can only go along with.

Marx often considers entrepreneurship to be one of the organizational forms of society of an economic nature and one of the social spaces that embody conflict (Bokmish, 2012, p. 108), based on this he describes the entrepreneur as "a fanatical factor of accumulation that forces men without mercy or truce on production for the sake of production, this is its basic law", which represents the cultural and ideological counterpart against the concept of the government employee, and this is for several considerations, foremost of which are two basic considerations: the margin of freedom and private ownership of the work space, but in another view, he sees him as the main engine of the economy, and based on being the most important link in capitalism, it contributes to its survival through a partial function that is specifically related to it, which is competition (Boutillier & Uzunidis, 2014, p. 21).

4. Entrepreneur in post-socialist societies

The concept of post-socialist societies means in particular the stage that came immediately after the collapse of the socialist system of control over the economic life of many countries of the world, the same term also represents a transitional phase in which not only economic trends and systems have been destroyed and rebuilt in line with the market economy, but also through various institutional reforms, social arrangements, and changes in attitudes and personal behaviors towards enterprises in the private sector which was illegal during socialist rule of the economy in those countries and whole society (Ovaska & Sobel, 2005, p. 08).

As has been concluded previously, the entrepreneur model in the modern sense is a cultural form that contradicts in most parts with socialism and most of the societies in which this model of the economic system was printed on all its members, it undoubtedly molded the whole cultural structure of these groups according to its own model in the sense that all post-socialist societies are characterized by informal characteristics that are unified among themselves, even if they differ among themselves geographically, linguistically, and even in their customs, traditions, religious affiliations, political loyalties, etc. All these "informal characteristics," which, as Trumpel Zerb pointed out, stem primarily from its shared socialist heritage are characterized by, for example, low levels of perception of opportunity, cultural support (Ammy, 2017-2018, p. 07), and a lack of sufficient need for achievement that society has a role in shaping. All of this ultimately leads to the "inhibitory society" model, one that places restrictions on the organization and creation of entrepreneurial projects per se and allows only a few cultural traits to seep into individuals who make them entrepreneurs identical to the model allowed by the prevailing socialist system in the pre-transformation phase and often ends up reproducing a model of entrepreneur that has historically existed, especially in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which implies a government entrepreneur, meaning that he is the one who undertakes some tasks for the state, and most of these tasks are limited to military fortifications, construction, building and others (F Hébert & N. Link, 17-05-2009, p. 05).

Values and standards are always of the same importance compared to formal institutions and even the existence of authoritarian practices of an economic or political nature, as Lippenstein said, such as the promise of profits, credit and venture capital, rigid and impartial laws and well-defined private property rights (Ovaska & Sobel, 2005, p. 14) play a major role in shaping an individual's economic behavior and attitudes, and this is the same basis that can discourage or encourage entrepreneurship. The same applies to post-socialist societies, values and norms created or developed by socialism control many of the life practices of the individual within society, in this regard, Stompka argues that communism has left what is called mass culture, a legacy of norms and values that govern the social life of individuals, from which they interact and complain based on a social reality that does not end with the trend towards the establishment and organization of entrepreneurial projects

in the capitalist sense of the term, and among these values that prevail mostly in post-socialist societies is the provision of the value of compliance over individualism, rigidity over innovation, extremism over tolerance, and a value that Howard talked about can also be added, which is the value of what he called generalized trust (Ammy, 2017-2018, p. 07). There is also the value of withdrawing from free economic action, by which we mean the excessive non-interference of the individual in contributing to economic processes that are of a subjective nature away from dependence on the state.

5. Fall into the law of contradiction: the Schumpeterian entrepreneur ends capitalism

Karl Marx is considered the indirect professor of Schumpeter, and this is in particular with regard to the intellectual propositions associated with the theorizing of the transformations of capitalism in particular and the development of enterprise in the general sense, this means that both thinkers have made a set of predictions with one end but different ways of ending. Marx predicted the demise of capitalism and the overthrow of all the prevailing values in a society dominated by capitalist values and cultural patterns, liberal ways of thinking, and all distorted behavioral and economic forms distorted by individualism, and this can only be done through a revolution carried out by the working class in society that drops from it all the material and symbolic existence of capitalism to replace socialism as a cultural and belief value model, and all of this is governed by an ancient and eternal law, which is the law of change.

Schumpeter does not see the demise of capitalism as implicated in the revolution of the working -proletarian- class or even in the revolution of other classes, but sees it as an inevitable historical consequence of the successes and development of the system itself. The summary of this statement is the fact that the demise of capitalism for Marx is linked to the influence of external forces, namely medicine, for Schumpeter, the demise of capitalism is linked to internal forces, and all this transition will lead to economic and social deterioration and stagnation of the individual's life, contrary to what Marx said that it would improve the life of the individual (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, p. 01), much like the concept of self-destruction, once summed up by Marx's own idea that everything carries within it the seeds of its own annihilation.

In the Schumpeter theory, the entrepreneur is not the one who bears upon himself to face the risks of all kinds, financial, professional, family or physical, as Knight's theory has elaborated on before, but he is the standard-bearer of renewal within society and in whole economic life, in general, his theory is related to talking about the "elite enterprise" because he sees entrepreneurs as the elite of society and at the same time they have the advantage of leaders in addition to other advantages on top of which: he makes accurate and adapted predictions, he is extremely rational and does not base his calculations on imagination, this is on the one hand, and on the

other hand, he sees that the status of the renovator of the entrepreneur is not limited only to the market level, but goes beyond the history itself and to social and cultural transformations, and even the character of the initiator is not related to a specific economic type, the Schumpeterian entrepreneur initiates every economic type, whether capitalist or socialist or another type (Saybi , 2013, p. 205).

Perhaps the most famous concept in Schumpeter's thought is "creative destruction" and before it means what it means, it represents the outcome of a historical reading of economics that is not similar to the rest of the readings of his contemporaries, which start from the postulate that economics is a representation of a state of equilibrium in which economic phenomena are in a state of stability, while economic history represents for him the state that never stabilizes and is governed by the law of change and evolution, the most important link in the whole economy is entrepreneurs, in addition to considering them, according to Schumpeter, as shaping the historical course by improving living standards through their continuous introduction of goods, services, and even new production methods, they also represent one of the foundations that contribute to maintaining the historical dynamism of the economy, and this is through the innovations they offer to the market or forms of new commercial projects, Schumpeter believes that "creative destruction is the process by which innovations arise and through which the old way of doing things is replaced in a more modern and novel way" (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, p. 01), this destructive process is carried out by a group of entrepreneurs who are obsessed with making a profit to try a lot of resources, and this does not mean the success of all attempts, but it means the success of some and the failure of others, and this is within a process of right and wrong, and all these successful innovations described by the process of creative destruction contribute to the expansion and spread of capitalism in society more and more, which means that the long-term orientation of the capitalist class is linked to the interests and interests of the other lower classes, namely the middle and lower classes, this is at a more advanced stage of capitalism and this will eventually lead to the creation of a very large amount of wealth, which will eventually lead to its demise, and this proposition was related to Schumpeter while Marx was completely opposed to him or, let's say that Schumpeter's ideas in this regard opposed Marx's basic idea that the capitalist class in society serves only itself, that any rise of this class is by lowering the rest of the other classes, especially the proletariat, and that any creation of utility and wealth is linked only to the capitalist lobby itself (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, pp. 03-04), and all of this falls within the scope of the exploitation process.

Schumpeter argued that the demise of capitalism is linked to several factors, foremost of which is the existence of the entrepreneur in itself, in the sense that, for example, the process of creative destruction that contributes to the material enrichment of capitalism was found in the existence of the entrepreneur in itself, and here the actual existence of the entrepreneur cannot be referred to as the reason as it

seems in the context of the phrase, but the matter here means talking about the existence of the function associated with the entrepreneur or the transfer of the entrepreneurial function that historically changed from a model of a entrepreneur acting in some tasks for the state to a entrepreneur who can produce the process of creative destruction in itself.

The Schumpeterian vision has made the entrepreneur at the heart of the process of social and economic transformation, so the second reason for the fall of capitalism is directly related to the entrepreneur, and Schumpeter is considered in this regard as a second reason for that fall that "in the future the political and social class of small business owners will be replaced by contributing and emotionally unconnected employees and managers in large bureaucratic companies", this shift means that the entrepreneur will no longer remain at the top of the social pyramid of society and this is what is detailed even in the whole of society so that the ambition of children does not become linked to becoming entrepreneurs and instead directs their attention to becoming teachers, bureaucrats or even politicians; In later writings Schumpeter has put forward one of the most brilliant concepts, "crony or political capitalism", although it does not seem new to talk about the marriage that takes place between politics and the economy and in a more precise language between the capitalist class and the political class, this was once pointed out by Karl Marx, but according to Schumpeter, it is somewhat different from the Marxist thesis, which means "political capitalism" as a process that represents a defensive mechanism to maintain the social and class existence of the old entrepreneurs, so they resort to this to create brakes for whole entrepreneurial process in order to maintain their social and class superiority. These brakes represent the use of the political, that is, the use of the state itself, which makes it intervene and expand more in the "depth of the body of private economy" in an attempt to also regulate competition between entrepreneurs and not creating new competitors that threaten the initial existence of old entrepreneurs (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, pp. 03-04), in this way, they are similar to what Michel's put forward about the elite, and all their policies that enter into what the state calls the attempt to organize are in fact strategies carried out by that ruling material elite in order to impose its control on the widest scale and for the longest possible period and Limiting material excellence and owning the means of production only to the hands of a few of them, even if they have the same belief and cultural and economic orientation, therefore, one of these elite strategies is the idea of implementing a kind of political-economic integration that involves enacting laws and making changes that will achieve the goal of old entrepreneurs.

Schumpeter thinks that a third reason for the collapse of capitalism and its replacement by socialism is the fact that capitalism has liberated the workers more and more, and he disagrees with Marx, who sees it as an infinite state of exploitation of the worker and the eventual dissolution of his values, orientations and body, in the sense that its enormous productivity will provide a life of luxury that is not linked to

the constraints and toiling practices of workers in the fields, factories and others, especially since now the technical tendency has spread and the creation of a machine model that compensates for human effort in those fields and factories has made basic foodstuffs readily and cheaply available, so that the intellectual class can also get these advantages instead of being busy with production "so they are busy writing, thinking, discussing and organizing the others" and thus becoming separate from the actual process of entrepreneurship, and not only that, but all that exclusion that this class will form will make it somehow build an intellectual position against the philosophical foundations of the economic system and undermine free markets and private property systems, and they will also build a position that sees the existence of capitalism itself as hostile to whole society (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, p. 05), on the other side, he added to Schumpeter a great idea about the relationship between democracy and socialism, and this included linking it to the idea of the fall of capitalism. The matter here revolves around the attitude of the bourgeois class itself towards the capitalist system, which is contrary to what Marx put forward when he said.

that the bourgeoisie is the most supportive class of the capitalist system and this of course is related to the extent to which that class benefits from the capitalist system, and that the bourgeoisie itself will be turned against by the workers within the idea of rearranging the classes of society through the action of the revolution, Schumpeter believes that the bourgeois class will turn against capitalism, and this is in the sense of benefiting from "the will of the majority", and therefore in the long run there will be an orderly march towards the demise of capitalism, which reduces personal and economic freedoms, well-being, and this towards achieving "something" and in the language of Schumpeter will only be "taste and terminology" (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, p. 05), Here he expresses the reality of the system that succeeds the fall of capitalism, no matter how it is called, because it will only be related to taste or name, whereas in reality it will be in the concept of socialism or its functional equivalent.

Later in the writings of the mid-twentieth century, Schumpeter believed that the transition to socialism was indeed in the stage of incarnation, and he gave this opinion based on the rapid growth of government regulations and controls, price, labor markets, etc. He also referred to special interest groups to control the political process through the use of government power, which is expressed in the emergence of a "regulatory state" that placed broad restrictions on business and thus spread its control over economic life (Anka & Claudiu Mursa, 2020, p. 06), this is within the scope of bias and to protect the special interests of these groups from competition and everything that is seen as their uniqueness in the market and the achievement of material returns even by those who are in the same economic cultural orientation.

Conclusion

The character of the entrepreneur varies from one historical stage to another, and this is based on the sum of the cultural values prevailing in each era, and it is not only about the formation of cultural deposits that are isolated from the interactions of individuals in society, but it is related to the fact that these deposits govern and regulate the processes of social interaction which ends in the form of individual or collective behaviors with an end based on the material or moral benefit they achieve for the ego or the other, in the end insofar as society represents a homogeneous form of cultural values at one stage may constitute at another stage the set of inhibitory values that were evident in the form of post-socialist societies with a "mass culture" which made the existence of the entrepreneur in the capitalist as long as impossible and made him a distorted entity since his main function was to preserve the actual existence of capitalism and to push the bourgeois class, of which he represents a guardian class with distinction linked to the extent to which the bourgeoisie itself ascended to the top of society, otherwise the entrepreneur under socialism is not confined almost exclusively in the form of a state entrepreneur, or more precisely, he is subordinate to the major basic principles of the prevailing system in society, and the matter here is about embodying the basic values, whether in the orientation towards the act of entrepreneurship, or by applying these principles in the management of the enterprise itself, which belongs to the ruling socialist regime.

References

- Al-Dawi, S. (15-06-2005). The development of the concept of the institution and the concept of the entrepreneurs in economic thought and management. *Annals of the University of Algiers*, 15(01), pp. 07-33.
- Ammy, w. (2017-2018). *The Cultural Legacy of Communism in Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Perceptions and Activity in Central and Eastern Europe*. Economics Claremont McKenna College.
- Anka, E. L., & Claudiu Mursa, G. (03-2020). Entrepreneurship under socialism: the case of former soviet economies. *LIBERTAS*, 05(01).
- Belmahoub, K., & Ben katroaa, N.-H. (12-2022). The impact of higher education on the entrepreneurial behavior of the university student A case study of a sample of college students. *Namaa Journal of Economics and Trade*, 06(02), pp. 285-300.
- Bokmish, L. (01-12-2012,). Contributions of the Marxist trend to the study of the organization: a critical reading. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 13(27), pp. 97-113.
- Boufalta, M. S.-D., & Azizi, N. (2019). Problems of spreading contractual culture in university student-case study to students in the Department of Management Sciences at Constantine University. *Journal of Human Development*, pp. 81-97.
- Boutillier, S., & Uzunidis, D. (2014). The theory of the entrepreneur: from heroic to socialised entrepreneurship. *Journal of Innovation Economics* (02), pp. 9-40.

- Bouzid, N. (31-12-2014). The entrepreneurial phenomenon: between the theoretical approach and the specificity of the Algerian experience. *Journal of the Truth* (31), pp. 289-314.
- Chadley, N. (08- 01-2013). Historical readings to prolong entrepreneurial thought. *Journal of economics, management and business sciences*, 11(01), pp. 287-300.
- F Hébert, R., & N. Link, A. (17-05-2009). *A History of Entrepreneurship*. London: Routledge.
- H'ébert, R., F. , & N. Link, , A. (06-2006). Historical perspectives on the entrepreneur. *Foundations and trends in entrepreneurship*, 02(04), pp. 261-408.
- Hindmoor, A. (2014). *Socialism and entrepreneurship: A Rational choice Approach to an Issue of Compatibility*. London school of economics and political science: proquest llc.
- Ovaska, T., & Sobel, R. (2005). Entrepreneurship in post-socialist economies. *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 21, pp. 8-28.
- Saybi, S. (12-2013). A theoretical approach to the development of entrepreneurial thought. *Journal of the Humanities* (40), pp. 199-228.
- Shweimat, k. (01-01-2014). Socio-economic resources effective in the realization of the enterprise project. *Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 01(07), pp. 127-134.
- Sidi Saleh, S., & Lounis, A. (25-12-2022). Entrepreneurship: Concept, mechanisms and decisions taken by the Algerian state. *Al-Saoura journal for Humanities and social studies*, 08(02), pp. 553-572.