

War between the Nationalists and the Communists, the latter having in the meantime formed their own militia to consolidate their foot-hold already gained in the country. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria and of the mainland of China led to a temporary cessation of hostilities between the Nationalists and the Communists when both the parties laid aside their difference and fought together for the defeat of the common enemy. During the period of the Second World War, Chiang aided by the Communists fought Japan as an ally of the Anglo-American Bloc but kept a sharp eye upon the Communists against whom he turned all his forces after the defeat of Japan. But Chiang's government was rendered so weak by long years of war and so diseased by nepotism and corruption that it could not withstand the hammering blows of the Communists in spite of the fact that Chiang had all along been patronised by the U.S.A. in his ruthless campaign against the Communists. Chiang practically did nothing for the peasants and the workers who had been smarting under a grievance and the situation was fully exploited by the Communists who bit by bit took over China and drove Chiang and his party to Formosa where Chiang's government still functions as an exile. The Communists have established their sway over the whole of the mainland of China. Communist China known as the People's Republic of China is now a full-fledged state. She is not only a member of the United Nations but she is also one of the big five powers having a permanent seat on the Security Council of the U.N.

China today is only one of the very few countries where a communist government on the Russian model is in power. But Chinese communism though a close imitation of the Russian model is not altogether without its own characteristic features. Chinese communism like Russian communism is anti-feudal, anti-capitalist and anti-imperialistic in its policy and programme. But Mao Tse-tung, the leader of the party, has introduced certain modification in applying communist principles to China.

The Chinese Communist Party is virtually the single political party which determines the policy of the state. Rigorous methods are followed, as in Russia, to deal with oppositions. But the government may be said to be a multi-party government as it includes representatives of other political parties. In this respect Chinese Communists are not so ruthless as the Communists in the U.S.S.R. Even capitalists who are genuine patriots and stand for prosperity of China are allowed to exist and work for the good of the state. Thus Mao has replaced Stalin's principle of 'liquidation' by that of 'collaboration of classes'.

Chinese Communism differs from the Russian model in another important respect. Mao has solved the agrarian problem of China in a way different from that adopted in Russia. In Russia, the problem was solved by the establishment of Collective Farms which the peasants were forced to join. But in China, the Communists instead of blindly imitating the Russian model of collectivization of farms, turned to peasant-proprietorship in accordance with the principle—He who cannot cultivate land by himself neither can he own land, thus eliminating the middle class. Development of basic and key industries side by side with small industries is also a part of the communist programme. Chinese communism like its Russian counterpart has also accepted the principle of equality of women who are admitted to all jobs on an equal pay with the males. In international relations the Chinese Communists advocate peaceful 'co-existence' with other nations. But how far their profession corresponds to their practice is a debatable point.

Chinese communism like Russian communism has not yet been able to achieve any striking success in any sphere of life in the country. The chronic poverty

of the Chinese people is still there. Agricultural and industrial production has not shown any remarkable progress. The Chinese perhaps lack the initiative, vigour and ruthlessness which the Russians possess in abundance in spite of their internal conflict and foreign hostility. After Mao, Chinese communism is in a state of unstable equilibrium. Its progress has not only been halted by infighting among the leaders but also by its hostile attitude towards the Soviet Union.

Democratic Socialism. It is difficult to understand what is exactly meant by democratic socialism. The concept implies that neither democracy nor socialism is perfect and as such socialism should be diluted with democracy. On the other hand, it also implies that democracy is not enough, it should have a socialist bias in respect to its economic programme.

Those who do not believe in Marxian socialism advocate democratic socialism as an alternative to Marxian socialism. The greatest advocate of democratic socialism is Bernstein who has criticised the Marxian doctrine as defective as Marx has unduly emphasized the importance of economic factors to the utter neglect of other factors like morality, religion, influence of great personalities in shaping the course of human history. But this is not a fair way of criticising Marxian theory. Marx simply laid stress on, we may say, greater stress on economic factors but did nowhere minimise the importance of other factors.

The Fabian Socialists in England like Sydney Webb, H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw and others were great exponents of democratic socialism. They advocated that socialism might be established by peaceful method by abjuring violence or in other words the road to socialism was evolutionary and not necessarily revolutionary in character. They asserted that socialisation of the means of production might be introduced in those fields of production where such socialisation would be conducive to social interests. They were opposed to the system of private ownership of land which gave rise to a leisured class living on unearned increment. The Fabian socialists may therefore be credited as the inventor of what is now called Mixed Economy—a system in which public ownership and public management go side by side with private ownership and private management. This is a sort of a compromise between socialism and capitalism which reaps the benefits of both the systems by avoiding their evils. The Labour Party in Great Britain adopted some of the programmes of the Fabian Socialists, such as, nationalisation of coal mines. The Government of India is also moving in the same direction. So democratic socialism means a government based on democratic principles combined with socialist programme.

The main difference between Marxian Socialism and Democratic Socialism lies in the method of achieving the socialist goal. Marx believes in compulsion while democratic socialists believe in persuasion. Socialism of the Marxian type lays great stress on economic rights while the other type seeks to make a compromise between economic rights and civil and political rights. The Democratic socialists also do not believe in the ultimate withering away of the state as advocated by Marx.

As an ideal, democratic socialism may be said to be better than the ideal of Marxian socialism because the former avoids the path of blood-shed. But the verdict of history does not support the ideal of democratic socialism. The slave-master, the feudal lord and the capitalist—none of them has voluntarily surrendered his right to exploitation. They had to be dragged down from their position of pre-eminence by the application of force. Great Britain, the U.S.A. and

young India in spite of their adoption of some of the principles of democratic socialism, have not been in a position to root out inequality, exploitation and class-struggle.

Fascism. Fascism is not a form of Socialism, although it bears some superficial resemblance to Communism. Fascism comes from the Roman word *fascis*, which means a bundle of rods and axes. These symbolise the authority of the state. To understand the Fascist philosophy in its true significance, it is necessary to go back a little in Italian history. The Italian Government which was set up on the basis of the constitution of 1848 was modelled on the Government of Great Britain with a constitutional monarchy and a ministry responsible to Parliament. But it became evident even after the unification of Italy in 1871 that the British model did not suit the genius of the Italian people. The rise of multiple party-groups was a detriment to order while ministerial instability acted as an impediment to progress. The result was inactivity and inefficiency on the part of the Government which miserably failed to tackle the problems that came in the wake of armistice after the First World War. There was chaos everywhere in Italy during this period. Workers began to seize factories, peasants forcibly took possession of their landlords' land and the rail-road workers abstained from their duties. The ministry did nothing to bring things to their normalcy and the inevitable happened. Instead of going the way of Russia, Italy chose to be a Fascist state under the leadership of Benito Mussolini, who promised the Italian people the restoration of order, national solidarity and above all, a strong government for the revival of Italy's lost position in International politics. Thus Fascism, like Russian Communism, was born of the conditions created by the First World War. It came by way of protest against the injustice and incompetency of post-war democratic government of Italy. Hence it is no wonder that Mussolini, the Fascist dictator, had nothing but absolute contempt for Parliamentary democracies of England and France.

Fascism is a political creed which believes in the Totalitarian State. The state is identified with society and both of them are regarded as the ends. According to the Fascists the state is "the recapitulating unity of an indefinite series of generations." A nation does not belong to the people who inhabit it at a particular time. The present generation simply holds it as a trust. Thus Fascism regards the nation as the ultimate thing in evolution. The nation is something more than a mere aggregate of individuals who come and go without affecting the social unity. But the nation endures and is always identified with the social unity. Fascism does not brook Individualism in any form. The individual is merely a tool in the hands of the state which can use him for furthering its ends. Political authority, according to the Fascists, is with the national state and not with the people. It is essentially aristocratic and autocratic in character because only a minority of the nation has the competence to speak and act for national interest. In a Fascist state, individual rights are recognised in so far as these rights coincide with the interests of society and the state as a whole. Fascism, therefore, differs from modern cults in this that it does not believe in the rights of citizens either in their individual or collective capacity. It rejects the notion of popular sovereignty for state sovereignty which is to be exercised by the chosen few capable of subordinating their individual interests to those of society. Fascism is also opposed to all forms of Pacifism and preaches Imperialism through war. "War is to man what maternity is to woman." Fascist advocates functional representation not of individuals but of groups and corporations which are to be

organised for safeguarding the various interests of the different classes in society. It is also anti-Communist in the sense that it does not support the doctrine of class struggle, nor does it permit a single class to rule. The government must be supreme and it should be so constituted that every class and every interest get a fair share of representation on it. Fascism resembles Communism in this that both of these creeds are based on the dictatorship of a single party which ruthlessly exterminates all other parties. Political power in both the systems is seized by force and is also maintained by force. It has often been asserted that "Communism is a dictatorship of the worker while fascism is a dictatorship of the employer." But this is not true. Fascism is intolerant of rule by any particular class, either workers or employers, rich or poor but it makes the Government supreme and which should be so constituted as to represent all classes and interests, not only in political affairs but also in the social and economic life of the people. Fascism is, in every way, opposed to the ideals of Democracy which seeks to establish a regime of equality and freedom for the individual. It is based essentially on force and an authority which is based solely on force without any reference to common good, is sure to perish by force. Italian Fascism, in spite of its brilliant success in certain respects, ended in a tragic futility and was interred with the bones of the *Duce* in the Italian plains where it was born.

National Socialism or Nazism. There is very little difference between the ideals of Italian Fascism and German Nazism. The distinguishing mark or the German Nazism is the theory of purity and superiority of the Aryan race. The preservation of this racial purity is the governing principle of the Nazi state. But Fascism has no such doctrine of racial superiority, although Mussolini dreamt of the glorious days of the Roman Empire. Both regard the state as an end in itself and completely subordinate the individual to the state organisation which is supported by a single party. Both aim at national self-sufficiency and national supremacy. Both Nazism and Fascism leave little in the hands of the individual whose life in every sphere of existence is controlled and regulated by the state. Propaganda plays a very important part in disarming every conceivable form of opposition. Practically, they brook no opposition which is relentlessly political creeds rose with dramatic suddenness and had a meteoric fall. They were tried and found wanting in moral values and have therefore been given a decent burial.

Arguments for Socialism. The case for Socialism is based on the following arguments :—

First, Socialism challenges the Individualistic doctrine on the ground that the interests of the small producers and labourers are at stake under Capitalism which leads to the exploitation of the Proletariat class. Under the present system of economic organisation, the labourers are deprived of the legitimate share of the fruits of their toil and the Capitalist class thrives at the expense of the labourers. The inauguration of the Socialist regime will improve the condition of the have-nots by preventing their exploitation by the haves.

Secondly, the Socialists argue that there are wastes and extravagance involved in competitive methods of production. Over-production, under-scale, combative advertisements which are inevitable concomitants of the competitive methods lead to losses and economic wastes. Socialism seeks to replace competition by co-operation and thus to prevent losses and wastes.

Thirdly, the doctrine of Socialism is based on the principles of justice and right. The free-gifts of nature like the land and the mineral resources, under Socialism, will be owned and controlled by the state for general welfare and not for private gains as under Capitalism.

Fourthly, the Socialists argue that the welfare of the individual is inseparably connected with, and dependent upon, social welfare. The welfare of the individual can be best promoted by securing the greatest good of the greatest number. It is only in a Socialist regime that the ideal can be realised.

Fifthly, real Democracy is impossible without Socialism. The principle of Democracy has already been introduced in the political sphere, but political democracy is ineffective and unsatisfactory unless it is supplemented by economic democracy which implies "freedom from want and freedom from fear". It is only a Socialist regime which can help the growth of the democratic ideal by substituting state ownership and management for private ownership and management.

Finally, Socialism rightly emphasizes the value of co-operation in the methods of production. Co-operative methods have attained remarkable success in modern times and the system is being gradually extended to a variety of directions. The state has already eliminated competition in certain fields and state-ownership and state-management of certain industries have produced better results than private management. The theory is justified by the gradual extension of state functions in modern times. In conclusion, it may be pointed out that Socialism is based upon altruistic and moral principles inasmuch as it seeks to establish a regime in which everyone is given an opportunity to reach his best self, in which the governing principle of life is "Live and let live".

Criticism. The doctrine of Socialism has been assailed from many points of view. In the first place, it is pointed out that the Socialist ideal is harder of realisation in actual practice. The state is neither omnipotent nor infallible and there is a limit to its capacity. The Socialist therefore unduly exaggerates the capacity of the state as an agency for human welfare. *Secondly*, the abolition of private ownership is likely to kill the greatest incentive to work. Collective ownership will fail to stimulate individual efforts and prevent the unfolding of genius in different walks of life. *Thirdly*, Socialism will lead to the curtailment of individual liberty and demoralisation of his personality. Under Socialist regime, the individual will have little scope for self-development and self-expression owing to the growth of state paternalism. *Fourthly*, Socialism errs by regarding the individual more socially-minded and socially-conscious than he actually is. The average man has neither the inclination for, nor the consciousness of common good which ensures the success of the Socialist programme. Due to the lack of this common consciousness that some parts of the Communistic programme had to be abandoned in Russia. *Finally*, Socialism is criticised as being ethically unsound and socially pernicious. The ideal of Socialism has its origin in utilitarian and materialistic considerations, having no reference to any "eternal law of truth and rights". It is a doctrine which seeks to put a premium upon idleness, incompetence and chronic poverty while intelligence, boldness, self-help and industrial leadership are all at a discount. "Socialism makes it more profitable and pleasant to be a pauper than to be a producer."

Capitalism.

The term *capitalism* in the sense in which it is used now was practically unknown at any other time previous to the latter half of the nineteenth century. The term is now employed to denote a particular economic system to which is attributed all the evils of modern social organisation. Hence the term is very often used in a derisive or contemptuous sense. Generally speaking, the term *capitalism* is now used to denote an economic system which came in the wake of the Industrial Revolution in England during 1760-1820 and gradually spread all over the world. As a result of the great changes brought about by the Industrial Revolution in the field of production, small-scale production was gradually supplanted by large-scale production with the use of machinery and steam and electric powers. Large-scale production requires the investment of huge amount of capital and as the labour class is not in possession of the necessary amount of capital, a small number of persons becomes the owners of the necessary means of production and buys the services of labour with the capital at their command. In this way the whole system of production passes on to the hands of the small capitalist class and the labourers are reduced to the position of wage-slaves having no share either in the management or in the profit of production. This system of production gradually concentrates all economic powers in the hands of the capitalist class who with economic power at their disposal captures political power. Thus the rule of the capitalist class is firmly established in every sphere of social life.

Not only are the factors of production and the finished goods regarded, under this system, as the property of the capitalist class but the right to own also passes on to their heirs. Thus the hereditary right to own the means of production by one particular class places them on an advantageous position which enables them to perpetuate their hegemony by enriching themselves at the cost of labourers. In course of time, the system gives rise to two opposing classes in society—the haves and the have-nots—who fight each other, the former anxious to protect its vested interests and the latter to have an equal share in the profit of production which they consider to be their legitimate claim.

Capitalism may be easily distinguished from feudalism, the system which preceded it and also from socialism which is almost on the point of supplanting it by three of its characteristic features which are (a) Freedom of enterprise, (b) Private property, and (c) Sovereignty of consumers.

Under capitalism, any person may be engaged in any occupation of his choice which is not restricted either by the rigour of any hereditary caste or by any state law. The freedom of enterprise enables a man to enter into contract freely with other persons with a view to ensuring his personal gain. His right to own, inherit and transmit property is recognised by law and he is free to buy and sell in any market he likes. The system ensures not only freedom of the producer, it also ensures to the consumer full freedom of choice—to buy commodity in any market. Free competition between buyers and sellers brings about equilibrium between demand and supply by making one price prevail in the market. Under perfect capitalism, there is no central agency to regulate production and consumption and the absence of such an agency makes the free play of competition possible as a result of which production and consumption conform to price which, in its turn, attains normalcy by the interaction of the forces of demand and supply.

Modern capitalism is characterised by certain other features, the most marked of which is the rise of the entrepreneur class who organise the business but do not take the risk involved in it. The risk is borne by those who supply the capital but do not manage. Hence in modern business management, this separation of organisation from enterprise has led to some amount of irresponsibility on the part of entrepreneurs who are often callous to the interests of the shareholders. Although the Capitalistic system is marked by free competition between buyers, sellers and labourers, yet sometimes each of these classes combines together to safeguard its class interests. Such combination has given rise to trade union among labourers, producers' combination in the form of trust and cartels, and also various forms of consumers' association.

Merits of Capitalism.

The advocates of capitalism assert that free competition which is the characteristic feature of this system leads to the survival of the fittest producers. The most efficient producers can cut down their cost of production and thus the quantity of production increases and the quality improves as a result of which consumers can buy improved quality of goods at cheaper rates.

Secondly, the buyers under this system, can buy goods according to their free choice. The existence of full freedom to buy on the part of the buyers makes sellers produce goods according to the taste and demand of the buyers. This free competition between buyers and sellers may be said to be the basis of economic freedom.

Thirdly, under capitalism, the system of production is attended with great risk which makes it incumbent on the producer to conduct his business with great care and efficiency. Expert management prevents wastes by securing greater economies in production.

Fourthly, the system works automatically through price-profit mechanism. Hence incompetency, bias and nepotism which are the principal features of bureaucratic management, undemocratic socialism, are eliminated by ensuring the management of business by competent men.

Lastly, capitalism should not be condemned too severely in view of the fact that the quantity of production, quality of output and the standard of living of the people, have, under this system, improved far more than in the pre-capitalistic times.

Evils of Capitalism.

The greatest evil of capitalism is that it creates inequality of wealth which leads to the division of society into the rich and the poor. In course of time, the poor become the wage-slave of the rich.

Secondly, as a result of the great disparity of wealth, the poor do not get equal opportunity to develop their personality to the fullest extent. In the absence of proper opportunity to acquire efficiency, the poor cannot maintain even a minimum standard of life.

Thirdly, capitalism boasts of the full freedom which the consumers enjoy under this system but in reality it is a myth. Under capitalism, consumers' sovereignty is considerably curtailed by advertisement, false propaganda and producers, combinations which dictate price.

Fourthly, as has been pointed out above, capitalism operates through the price-profit mechanism and as such the quantity as well as the quality of production is determined solely with an eye to profit without any reference to the interests of the consumers.

Fifthly, competitive production can never secure economies of production as it necessitates the duplication of services and huge expenses on combative advertisement. The system is wasteful and often leads to overproduction.

Lastly, the most serious charge against capitalism is that it creates unemployment and brings in business cycles. If the system benefits any body at all, it benefits only the capitalists but ruins the labourers and injures the consumers.

The evils of Capitalism may be removed in two ways: first, by introducing Socialism and secondly, by introducing *Mixed economy*, i.e., by striking a mean between capitalism and socialism. Socialist system has its defects too and so it is suggested that instead of uprooting capitalism, it would be better to introduce state control in certain spheres of production and distribution. With this end in view, many of the modern states have introduced taxes on income at a progressive rate, inheritance tax or death duty and a tax on the consumption of harmful and luxurious articles. Many states have already adopted measures for combating unemployment problem, trade cycle and dispute between labour and capital. The crusade started in Russia and China against capitalism has already destroyed the capitalist system in those countries but in England and in the United States of America, there has not yet been any mass uprising against the capitalist system excepting occasional strikes on a gigantic scale. But the rulers of these countries, with a view to removing the growing discontent of the masses, have already adopted mixed economy in certain fields of production by making a compromise between Capitalism and Socialism.

Gandhism

Gandhism is not purely a political ideal, far less a distinctive creed which is followed by any sect of men. Unlike other modern '*isms*', Gandhism does not lay down any rigid rules for the guidance of individual or group conduct. What is known today as Gandhism is nothing but his experiments with truth and non-violence which, according to him, are not his own inventions but are 'as old as the hills'. He simply tried to apply these twin principles to the daily life and problems of mankind.

Politics was long divorced from religion and ethics and Gandhism seeks to purify the political life of man by the application of ethical principles which are inherent in man. He believed that the highest ideal of human life could be achieved only by practising truth and avoiding violence. In the field of politics, Gandhism seeks to lay the foundation of government solely on the basis of non-violence. Gandhiji characterised the so-called democracies of the west as so many instruments for the exploitation of the poor by the rich. Liberty, equality and fraternity—the watch-words of real democracy can never exist under a system

which is based on violence and injustice. A social order which seeks to create liberty and equality by the application of force can never provide opportunities to its members for the fullest development of their personality. The individual cannot realise his real will when he is coerced for that purpose against his will. Modern political organisations, according to Gandhiji, are based essentially on force which deprives the many from a share in ruling authority by concentrating power in the hands of the few. There is thus no scope for the application of force in Gandhism which seeks to reorganise society making it independent of the state. Gandhism like anarchism has no faith in state regulation. Society, according to Gandhiji, should be a voluntary association of free men on the basis of perfect equality among its members. Only a society thus organised on a voluntary basis by its members can ensure full liberty and equality to its members.

The economic organisation of such a society should be commensurate with its political organisation. Gandhism lays stress on small-scale and cottage industries based wholly on the principle of decentralisation of production. Gandhiji was definitely against the factory system of production which involves the use of machinery in production. The attitude of Gandhiji towards the use of machinery in production should not however be misinterpreted or misunderstood. Gandhism is not opposed to the use of small tools and machines which the workers can handle freely and which relieve the strain on their muscles. What it really opposes is that particular use of machinery which reduces the workers to the position of wage-slaves. Under the capitalistic system of production, the capitalists and the machine experts utilise the workers solely for the purpose of increasing their profit. They produce only those goods and in such amounts as are calculated to promote their class interests without any reference to social good. True it is that the workers are paid in money, but they are deprived of the pride and pleasure of creation which they cannot claim as their own. The aim and end of all production is consumption, and its main purpose is to secure maximum satisfaction for all. But a system of production which is directed mainly for augmenting the profit of the producer, a system of production which destroys the personality of man by reducing him to the position of a wage-slave can never enlist the sympathy and support of Gandhiji whose life was dedicated to the realisation of truth and non-violence in practical life.

Gandhism opposes the use of machinery in production on another ground. The use of machinery in production has led to the growth of production on a large-scale. The inevitable result of this system of production has been the concentration of economic power in the hands of the few who dominate the rest. Economic power tends to corrupt political power and the two together corrupt social life. Thus Gandhism advocates decentralisation of power in the economic as well as in the political system of a society. So Gandhiji advocated small-scale production in the economic system just as he advocated *Panchayet* form of administration in the political system.

Gandhism thus seeks to solve modern problems of life by ancient methods. It attempts to make a compromise between plain living and high thinking.

Gandhism aims at raising the moral standard of the individual and through the individual the moral standard of society. With this end in view, he recommended certain principles to which a man's conduct should conform. These principles are truth, non-violence and scrupulous regard for means. These principles are usually called Gandhian technique by means of which one can convert an enemy into an ally. Gandhism emphatically asserts that in realising desirable ends moral means must always be adopted. The Machiavelian maxim

that the end justifies the means found no favour with Gandhiji who regarded means and ends as convertible terms. This is evident from the method which he chalked out in attaining Swaraj in India. To him, the means to win Swaraj was as sacrosanct as Swaraj itself. So he prescribed the method of truth and non-violence in winning Swaraj for the country.

Non-violence as a Gandhian technique in winning Swaraj took the form of *Satyagraha* which assumed different forms as the expression of mass action. The different forms in which non-violence or the Gandhian technique of *Satyagraha* manifested itself were *strike* both by businessmen and labourers, *picketing*, *civil disobedience*, *Hijrat*, *Fasting* and *social boycott*. But in every phase of the application of the technique, it must be wholly non-violent because violence, according to him, is the very negation of truth.

Gandhism has not been accepted anywhere either as a creed or tried as a practical guide to the solution of social problems. Even in India, his own and of birth, Gandhism has not been accepted *in toto*. The adoption of the Gandhian system of production cannot possibly hold out any bright prospect in the matter of the economic progress of the country in the near future. The world might go a wrong way but India must keep pace with the progress of the world if she seriously means to improve the lot of her people. She cannot possibly make the Ganges flow back to the Himalayas.

Again Gandhism emphasizes the importance of the development of the individual without the interference of the state but how far such development of individual personality is possible under existing conditions is a debatable point.

But the greatest defeat of Gandhism lies in our renouncing non-violence within the country. The same methods of coercion are being followed in dealing with unrest as in other countries. His views on the economic organisation of the society has also not been followed in India.

Hence it has been cynically declared that Gandhism is meant for export, not for internal consumption. It is utopian, and has only a poetic appeal. Even in India opinion is divided regarding its efficacy.

Gandhian Concept of the State

Gandhiji did not develop any coherent and systematic political philosophy and hence he cannot be regarded as a political philosopher.

Though not a political philosopher in the real sense of the term, Gandhiji made a significant contribution to political science by suggesting the most effective way for bringing about change in the state and the society. Moreover, Gandhiji's political thought deals both with ends of political action and the means of achieving them.

Gandhiji did not make any direct reference as to the nature of the state. He made a clear distinction between the state and society. While most of the political philosophers put their primary emphasis on the state, Gandhiji treated the society with far greater respect and regarded it as the primary field of action. He was of opinion that the society can control the activities of the state. If the society is based on the ideals of truth and non-violence and if it is aware of its rights and duties, it will not be possible for the state to become despotic. The state power will be exercised in an irresponsible manner if the society is weak, unorganised and indifferent to the activities of the political system. Thus society can protect the individual from the tyranny of the state.

Gandhiji had an aversion to the state in any of its form. He regarded the state as an instrument of coercion, command and compulsion which is antagonistic to the free moral development of human beings. According to him, the individual has a soul but as the state is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from to which it owes its very existence.

Gandhiji therefore conceived of an ideal democratic society without state and political power. Such a true democracy or *Swarajya* of the masses could come through truthful, non-violent and self-suffering means. As such ideal society will be free from violence, command, oppression and exploitation, there will exist justice, equality, righteousness and happiness all around. Individual freedom, group autonomy and voluntary co-operation will be the watch words of such a society. There will be total decentralization of political as well as economic powers. There will be no system of punishment and as such jails, police and courts will not exist.

Failing such an ideal democratic society Gandhiji would prefer a non-violent state with minimum functions. While supporting that the less the state governed the better, he yet advocated that "there are certain things which cannot be done without political power". So long as the state continues, Gandhiji would welcome a decentralised parliamentary democracy in which ultimate authority resided in the hands of the ordinary people and where state action was likely to advance the welfare of the masses.

Gandhiji is often described as an anarchist. It is true that he sometimes conceived of the disappearance of the state as the ultimate goal towards which society ought to move, but he thought it only as an ideal. But he cannot be regarded as an anarchist because he believed in the state, in the political power exercised by the state and he made a clear distinction between the state and society.

Gandhiji was influenced to some extent by Tolstoy, who is regarded as a humanitarian anarchist and thus his political concepts were not akin to those of the anarchist of the extreme type. Like the anarchists, Gandhiji looked upon an augmentation of the authority of the state with great suspicion and believed in the greatest freedom of the human beings. While the Anarchists regarded the use of violent method by the state as wrong but supported in applying violence to destroy the state Gandhiji regarded violence by the state as well as the individual as wrong. Another point in which he differed sharply from the anarchists was that he evolved an instrument of mass awakening and mass action on behalf of society which could keep any state, however powerful, under proper control. The ideal of the Anarchists was, in short, to destroy the state, and not to reconstruct it. But Gandhiji wanted to reject the existing state because it was based on violence and exploitation and in place of it he wanted to build a new kind of socio-economic-cum- political system based on voluntary cooperation of each individual and which will work for the welfare "unto the last" individual.

Gandhiji's Concept of Sarbodaya. The word *Sarbodaya* is a combination of two words, namely, *Sarba* and *Udaya* which taken together mean the uplift or welfare or good of all. The inventor of this principle of universal uplift without the distinction of caste, colour or creed or without the distinction of high or low is the Indian who is more or less known throughout the world as Mahatma Gandhi.

During the first quarter of this century, while in South Africa fighting against colour prejudice, he read John Ruskin's book 'Unto This Last' and was profoundly influenced by the doctrine inculcated in this book. He not only accepted the principle contained in this book but conformed his daily life to the norms laid down in this book.

Ruskin's Sarbodaya, if we may use the term, implies the interdependence of individual good and collective good, that is, individual good is inseparable from social good and vice versa. *Secondly*, the right to work is not the monopoly of one or a few but it is the universal right of all to earn one's bread by the sweat of his own brow. *Lastly*, highest importance is attached to the cultivator and the ordinary labour.

Gandhian Sarbodaya conceives of a society in which everybody works not only for his own good but for the good of all. In such a society, the principle of equality reigns supreme. Violence, exploitation, chicanery and fraud are conspicuously absent in such a society. The positive aspect of such a society is the duty to voluntarily work and to respect the equal rights of others and the negative aspect is not to practise violence in relation to other members of the society.

Gandhiji believed that such a society could be established through the moral elevation of the character of the people and this elevation was possible through purity of means, such as, practice of truth and non-violence. Gandhian Sarbodaya lays great importance to self-abnegation for collective good. In such a society, each person, to whatever station of life he may belong, is required to do his duty with a religious zeal. Sarbodaya society is established through moral means and continues in existence on a moral basis.

Gandhiji's Sarbodaya is mainly intended for the uplift of the rural-folk who constitute the bulk of the population and who have been the object of oppression, repression and exploitation for a long time. He wanted to improve the lot of these toiling and starving masses through the establishment of a system of society in which the people rule themselves through village Panchayets elected freely and not on party basis. It will be a rule of all by all—a rule analogous to Rousseau's rule by the General Will, Sarbodaya in the last analysis, implies a society in which the guiding principles are duty to work, service to the people, equality and above all self-sacrifice. Such a society is free from all sorts of meanness like hatred, sectionalism and fanaticism.

Sarbodaya is to be sharply distinguished from the utilitarian doctrine of the greatest good of the greatest number. But Gandhian Sarbodaya aims at the good of all and not only of the numerical majority. Sarbodaya also differs from utilitarianism in this that it rests wholly on a moral basis.

Criticism. The main criticism directed against Sarbodaya is that the ideal state of society depicted by Gandhiji is an utopia which is unworkable among imperfect men. Man is no doubt a rational creature but he cannot always rise above private self-interest and sectionalism. Marxian theory has taken concrete shape in the Soviet Union and China but the concept of Sarbodaya has nowhere been actualised.

Secondly, he describes his utopia as a partyless democracy which is inconceivable in modern times. There is a party in all spheres of life—a party in the church, a party in the university. The transformation of society into a partyless

organisation will lead to the suppression of individual personality. The right to differ is the road to freedom.

Thirdly, Sarbodaya is an admixture of religion and social ethics with a sprinkling of politics. Hence the idea of Sarbodaya is beyond the ready comprehension of the masses for whom it was mainly intended.

Fourthly, Sarbodaya aims at plain living coupled perhaps with high thinking shunning all the evils of modern civilization especially city-life and industrialisation. Modern civilization has its evils no doubt but one must not shut his eyes to its blessings. It is the fruits of industrialisation which can expedite the upliftment of village life. His suggestion for direct democracy is also equally impracticable. Gandhiji wanted to make the Ganges flow back to the Himalayas.

Gandhiji's intention was good but the means suggested by him was out of tune with the march of time. His cherished ideas like Sarbodaya, basic education, fasting, non-violence ended in utter futility. In public as well as in private sector of life in Indīā, Gandhism has been banished except for a few marble or bronze statue erected in big cities.

Gandhism and Marxism. Both Gandhiji and Marx were great thinkers and were regarded as prophets of their own time. But the differences between the thoughts of these two great prophets are more marked than the few likenesses.

Both of them are actuated by the noble ideal of improving the economic, social, and political status of the toiling and exploited masses. Both of them believe that the state is the result of exploitation and aggression. The remedy to these exploitation and aggression lies in the establishment of a stateless society where true equality of man can be ensured through the right to work.

But the affinity ends here and sharp differences begin. Marx was factual, realistic and materialistic whereas Gandhiji was an idealist. Gandhiji was an apostle of peace and non-violence but Marx believed in violence and hence he advocated the efficacy of the violent method, i.e., revolution without which rule of the proletariat could not be established. Marx advocated one party rule—that of the communist party but Gandhiji wanted a partyless society. Gandhiji wanted the development of individual personality without the coercion of a single party but Marx emphasized the importance of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gandhism like Marxism does not believe in the automatic termination of exploitation with the fall of the capitalistic state. Even under Marxian socialistic state, the tendency to exploitation by the bureaucracy and organisers will linger. Gandhiji had no faith in any system of government which resorts to the application of force in any form or for any purpose. Gandhiji was a Marxist only in so far as he believed in equality, co-operation and universal brotherhood of mankind.

Proper Sphere of the State. A critical examination of the two theories reveals the truth that neither Individualism nor Socialism represents the correct view regarding state functions. None of them in its extreme form can, therefore, have any application in practical life. The state is neither a mere police-man nor a man of all work; neither a huge 'power-system' for the preservation of law and order only nor exclusively a 'welfare system' for the manufacture of unmixed comforts for all. "If there could be an ideal at once individualistic and socialistic, that would be the best theory about the functions of a state." The actual functions of a modern state are largely determined by the social and

economic needs of different nations and is these vary from country to country, it is very difficult to draw a line of demarcation between legitimate and illegitimate state-functions. Thus in a backward country the state may have to undertake many functions which may be safely left to the individuals in a advanced community.

The democratic states of the present day have undertaken various functions that are more or less socialistic in character. Though Socialism in the extreme form has nowhere been accepted except in the U.S.S.R., the nature and extent of the actual functions of modern democratic governments are marked by the gradual transition from the Individualistic to the Socialistic state. Thus almost all the modern states have undertaken the management of some of the big industries, such as railways, transport and other means of communication. The production of commodities such as gunpowder, opium, intoxicating liquors is often a state monopoly. The Legislatures of modern states are passing laws which are socialistic in character. Factory laws, tenancy laws, laws making provision for social services in the form of free primary education, old-age pension and unemployment and health insurance benefits are cases in point. The individualistic idea that the state should keep itself aloof from social, religious and purely private matters of its citizens has not found favour with modern states. The passing of the Child Marriage Restraint Act, popularly known as the *Sarda Act*, in India, is another example of the marked tendencies of the time, viz., the drift in the direction of Socialism. Though much condemned by the conservative section of the Indian people this law succeeded in removing one of the gross social evils which was hostile to the national progress of the country. The question which naturally arises at this point is how far is the state justified in initiating social reforms? To this question, the individualists will at once give the reply that the state has no business in initiating social reforms which, it may safely leave in the hands of individuals who will take care of themselves. But modern states find it difficult to keep themselves aloof from these problems in view of the growing complexities of social life. Besides, as we have seen, the state has a function in relation to morality and that function is both positive and negative. But it should be remembered that the state can promote the moral sense of the people only by regulating their external conduct in so far as their external conduct is influenced by inward motive. The state should therefore pass such laws which are in accord with the best moral interests of the people or which remove the hindrances to the moral improvement of the people. Thus the state cannot directly make a man temperate even by imparting lessons on temperance but it can, by legislation, close down the liquor shops and remove the temptation to drinking. It is the duty of the state to secure the moral perfection of the community and to realise its end it must create and maintain those conditions in society in which the realisation of the moral ideal becomes possible. Thus laws introducing prohibition, restraining child marriage or making primary education compulsory are calculated to remove the hindrances to good life and hence they can be justified on all grounds.

Thus the modern state has made great inroads on the liberty of its citizen by prescribing for him even the minutest details of his life. In fact, the state follows a citizen from his birth to his death. The inroad is the greatest in the economic field where the government of every country is gradually extending its activities. States on a socialistic or fascist basis have already extended their long arm over the economic aspect of human life. Even in states like Great Britain and the U.S.A., state controls over the means and methods of production and on the

machinery of distribution is gradually on the increase. This increasing control of the state over every aspect of the citizen's life specially over the economic aspect stands in strange contrast to the individualistic view which did not permit the state to go beyond the limits of essential functions, namely, the preservation of law and order. Do all these imply a serious curbing of individual liberty and if so, is it not necessary to restrain the state from safeguarding liberty ?

The truth is that modern democratic states rest on the consent and co-operation of the people. The state is no longer considered as a power-system only; it is a welfare-system too. Thus it is aptly said that "the conception of the police-state has given place to that of the culture-state", and the state should therefore be guided by considerations of the greatest good of the greatest number. It cannot possibly limit itself only to the negative or police-functions. Besides these negative functions, the modern states have undertaken a large number of positive functions which are calculated to promote the well-being of the entire body of its citizens without unduly restricting their liberty. "The work of a modern state runs to the roots of life, liberty, property and pursuit of happiness."

What the State should not do ?-

An examination of the nature and extent of the functions which modern states usually perform is likely to create the impression that the state is a man of all work having no limits to its functions. But such an idea is essentially erroneous inasmuch as it is fatal to the development of individual personality, the promotion of which is considered to be the primary function of the state. It is the duty of the state to create that atmosphere in society in which the individual gets the fullest opportunity for self-expression and self-development. Any action of the state which impedes or in any way affects the development of individual personality should be considered as illegitimate action on the part of the state. The state therefore should not try to regulate any opinion held by the people so long as this opinion is expressed in a peaceful and constitutional method. A law may be denounced as unjust and injurious by a section of the people but so long as they confine their campaign against that particular law to peaceful persuasion of others, the state should not seek to control that opinion, no matter what that opinion may be. To suppress opinion is to suppress personality and suppression of personality defeats the very end of the state.

Secondly, the state should not also try to interfere with the customs and habits of the people which grow independently of the state and which have their sanctions in time-honoured popular beliefs. But this is not always tenable. True it is that the state cannot create custom but it is imperative on the part of the state to modify or alter or even to abrogate those social customs which impede social progress. The abolition of the *Suttee* and enactment of the *Child Marriage Restraint Act* in India illustrate the desirability of state interference in regulating social customs.

Thirdly, popular tastes and fashions should also be left free to grow. The state should not ordinarily prescribe the dress or the normal diet of the people. Prime Minister of a country may have a fascination for a particular kind of coat but this should not certainly be made compulsory. Fashion changes quickly and people find zest in accommodating themselves with the change of fashion spontaneously.

Lastly, the state is an organisation which can regulate only the external conduct of men and as such it should never seek to interfere with religion and morality which are subjective and hence should not be dictated by the state.

Classification of State functions. We have already seen that the functions performed by the state are not the same everywhere. But there are certain functions which every state must perform to ensure its existence. These functions are variously known as *Fundamental*, *Primary* or *Essential* functions. The other functions are termed as *Optional*, *Ministrant* or *Non-Essential* functions because the performance of these of neither necessary for the existence of the state nor essential to the liberty and security of its citizens. but they are considered as means to promote the material, moral and intellectual welfare of its citizens. The functions, essential and non-essential, may briefly be stated as follows :—

Essential functions. (i) The Preservation of internal peace, order and security ; (ii) The fixing of the legal relation of the family ; (iii) The determination of contractual rights between individuals ; (iv) The regulation of the holdings, transmission and interchange of property ; (v) The administration of justice in civil and criminal cases ; (vi) The determination of political duties, privileges, and relation of citizens ; (vii) The regulation of foreign relations ; and (viii) The preservation of the state from external danger and the advancement of its international interest.

Non-Essential functions. They include a large number of functions which may be summarised as follows :—

(i) *State management of industries* which are undertaken for securing revenues as well as for social purposes. Thus salt, tobacco-currency, etc., are state monopolies.

(ii) *The regulation of trade and industry.* These include the regulation of railways, bank, joint-stock companies, determination of fiscal policies, navigation laws, etc.

(iii) *The regulation of labour.* This relates to the enactment of factory laws and mining laws affecting the interests of all classes of labour, especially women and children.

(iv) *The maintenance of the Post and Telegraph system.*

(v) *Sanitation and Health.* These include those measures taken for the prevention of diseases and for ensuring the supply of good food to the people.

(vi) *Care of the poor and the incapable.* Every state considers it to be its duty to take care of the poor and the infirm by providing for free schools, asylums and hospitals.

(vii) *Education.* Ignorance and illiteracy are the greatest hindrances to good citizenship. A state which seeks to promote the welfare of its citizens must do everything for removing these hindrances. This may be done by the state either directly undertaking the function or by supplementing the activities of private organisations by giving them subsidies. The maintenance of libraries, museums, research institutes and other cultural associations constitutes an important function of modern states.

The Ultimate Problems of Politics

The ultimate problem of politics which has engaged the serious attention of all political thinkers of all ages is the reconciliation of authority of the state with

the liberty of the individual. The adjustment of sovereignty and liberty, reconciliation between authority and freedom is a problem the satisfactory solution of which can only ensure a stable and a progressive state. Friction between government and citizens has been mainly responsible for the downfall of many a political system and to avoid such friction, such political methods and devices should be adopted which can secure individual interest on the one hand and can definitely express and authoritatively enforce the commands of the state on the other.

Two questions are involved in connection with the activities of the state. The first question is by whom the state shall be governed and the second is : what is the extent of power which shall be vested in the state ? The first question pertains to the organisation of the state and is closely related to the distribution of political rights in the state. The second question is related to the functions of the state and depends upon the nature and extent of civil rights. Excess of either of the two—authority and freedom degenerates into despotism or anarchy. Liberty is at stake when there is too much of authority ; conversely unrestrained liberty degenerates into licence and creates anarchy. Thus extremes of either is fraught with dangerous consequences. Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher, was conscious of this problem and in his *politics* he suggested that moderation should be exercised in all political affairs and that extreme methods should be avoided. The English writers Hobbes and Locke tried to solve the eternal problem each in his own way but both of them failed. Hobbes inculcated a doctrine of royal absolutism which left no room for individual liberty while Locke advocated a theory which made government weak and unstable dependent as it was on individual caprice. The French writer Rousseau in his effort to combine authority and liberty created a system which was justly characterised as a crownless monarchy as monstrous as Hobbes' 'Leviathan'. Subsequently the different schools of writers such as the Jurists, the Utilitarians, the Idealists, Individualists, the Socialists, the Fascists—have suggested various political methods to strike a mean between the two but all attempts without exception have degenerated either into despotism or anarchy. In the organisation of the modern state, various devices such as, written and rigid constitutions, incorporation of fundamental rights, separation and decentralisation of powers and the like have been adopted to reconcile sovereignty and liberty but the problem still remains baffling and a satisfactory solution is yet to be made.

As a solution to this problem, Gettel remarks, "In its organisation the state must avoid such restriction of political rights as creates despotism, and such extension of political rights as creates mob rule. In its functions the state must avoid such excess of civil rights as destroys authority and creates anarchy, and such limitation of civil rights as leads to excessive paternalism."

But opinions differ with regard to both the problems, viz., extent of state functions and extent of civil rights. This difference has given rise to two extreme views, namely, extreme individualism and extensive state socialism.

The real solution of the problem perhaps lies in the establishment of a truly democratic form of government in which the people govern themselves. Under such a system, the government and the governed do not form separate classes and the interests of the governed being identical with those of the ruling class are better protected by a system of civil and political rights which general good permits. The Swiss experiment in democracy is a case in point.

SUMMARY

The Ends of the State and Functions of Government. The Greeks and the Romans regarded the state an end in itself. But the old idea has been replaced by a new and bolder one, viz., the state is but a means for promoting human welfare.

The True Ends of the State. Different writers have set forth different ideals for the state. Thus Bluntschli points out that General welfare is the true end of the state. The Utilitarian school regards 'Utility', i.e., greatest good of the greatest number as the true end of the state. But all these do not point to anything definite; they are rather vague. The views of eminent modern writers like Burgess, Garner and others are that the ends of the state are three-fold—primary, secondary and ultimate, i.e., good of the individual, good of the nation, and ultimately good of the humanity at large.

Theories of State functions; Anarchism. The Anarchists regard the state as an unnecessary evil and want to abolish it altogether. Anarchism has an exaggerated faith in the capacity of individuals to look after their own interests.

Individualism. The Individualists regard the state as a necessary evil and so advocate a drastic curtailment of the functions of the state which should be restricted only to the preservation of law and order and no more. Individualism is based on the following grounds;—ground of natural justice, scientific ground, economic ground, empirical ground and ground of state incompetency. Individualism lays too much stress on the liberty of the individual but overlooks the value of well-directed state-regulations.

Socialism. The Socialists hold that the state is a positive good and that the interests of the individuals can be best promoted by maximising the control of the state.

Forms of Socialism. There are different forms of Socialism of which the oldest one is *Utopian Socialism*. The modern theory of Socialism is based on the writings of Karl Marx. Different schools of Socialism grew out of the doctrine of Karl Marx. These are known as Collectivism, State-socialism, Fabian Socialism, Syndicalism, Guild-socialism, Christian socialism, Communism. Fascism and Nazism are two political breeds which flourished in Italy and Germany respectively as a protest against the injustice and incompetence of the then existing governments of the two countries. Both Fascism and Nazism deify the state and exalt the Nation above all individual interests. Fascism and Nazism are opposed to all that is democratic and liberal.

Socialism has done a distinct service by rightly pointing out the defects of Capitalism but it unduly exaggerates the capacity of the state.

Proper sphere of the State. The actual functions of a modern government are determined largely by the circumstances and needs of the time. The modern tendency of civilised states is to undertake a variety of functions which are considered necessary for the promotion of the material, moral and intellectual welfare of its citizens.

What the State should not do. Although the modern state is considered as a great social service organisation having practically no limits to its functions, yet in the interests of the development of individual personality, the state should not seek (i) to regulate opinion, (ii) to interfere with customs and habits of the people, (iii) to impose new fashions and tastes on the people and also (iv) to dictate religion and morality.

Classification of the State Functions. The functions of a government may be classified into essential or constituent and non-essential or ministrant.

Democratic Socialism.

Democratic socialism is a mild and modified form of socialism. Two of its main features are avoidance of violence and gradual and partial socialisation of the means of production. It advocates that the socialist ideal may better be attained by peaceful method than by the method suggested by Marx and that the scope of socialisation should be limited to certain areas of production so that private enterprise and public enterprise may go on side by side.

Democratic socialism may give civil and political rights to its citizens but not economic rights in the absence of which civil and political rights become meaningless. Socialist democracy, on the other hand, gives greater emphasis on the economic rights of citizens thus making civil and political rights meaningful and democracy real. This is done by large-scale socialisation of the means of production through collective farms, co-operatives and state planning, on the one hand, and by limiting the area of private property to a minimum so that none can live upon unearned income like rents, interest and profit.

Gandhism and Sarbodaya. Gandhism contains certain principles, policies and methods or techniques which he himself practised and which he desired to be followed by others. These principles were truth and non-violence. His policies were non-co-operation and his techniques were such as, picketing, fasting and boycott. Society should be a free association of free men with perfect equality among its members. A society thus voluntarily organised without paternal care of the state can provide opportunity for the development of individual personality. In the economic sphere, he advocated small-scale and cottage industries based on the principle of decentralisation. He prefers small-scale production because this system does not reduce the workers to the position of wage-slaves and does not deprive them of the pride and pleasure of creation.

Sarboday means upliftment of all without any difference between man and man. Sarboday means a society of free men voluntarily organised on the basis of the principle 'Each for all and all for each'. Truth, non-violence, fellow-feeling are the guiding principles of Sarboday. This ideal of Sarboday can be realised through the establishment of Village Panchayats elected freely and not on party basis. It will be a rule of all by all without the coercion of a state.

QUESTIONS

1. Examine some of the essential and non-essential functions of Government with special reference to the Government of India. Why are they called essential and non-essential?
(C. U. 1946)
2. Classify state functions. What are the Individualistic and Socialistic theories of state functions? Why is it said that neither Individualism nor Socialism represents the modern view of the functions of the state.
(C. U. Hon. 1928)
3. Discuss the various theories of the end and purpose of the state.
(C. U. 1952)
4. Write an essay on Individualism.
(Gauhati, 1964)
5. What, in your opinion, should be the proper sphere of the state?
(C. U. 1961, 1974)
6. Discuss the theories of individualism and Socialism regarding the functions of government. What is the modern trend in the matter?
(C. U. 1963)
7. What is the purpose and end of the state?
(Gauhati, 1965)
8. Discuss critically the nature of communism as a social and political theory.
(C. U. Hons. 1966)
9. Discuss the philosophical foundations of Socialism and explain its weakness as a political ideal. Elucidate the proposition—"If we could imagine an ideal at once individualistic and socialistic, such would be the effective ideal for most thinking men". (Burns) (C.U.Hons.1961, 1988)
10. Discuss Gandhi's Concept of Sarbodaya.
(C.U.1980, 1990, 1992, 1994)
11. Discuss the nature and characteristics of the Capitalist system.
(C. U. 1980)
12. What is scientific socialism? Distinguish between scientific socialism and democratic socialism.
(N. B. U. 1980)
13. Discuss the functions of the Welfare State.
(C. U. 1984)
14. Discuss the main features of socialist democracy.
(C. U. 1984)

15. Explain the individualistic theory of state functions. (C. U. 1985)
16. Write a note on democratic socialism. (C. U. 1985)
17. State the essence and main features of democratic socialism. (C. U. 1987)
18. Analyse Gandhiji's Concept of the State. (C.U.1982, 1984, 1993)
19. Can Gandhi's theory of the State be called 'anarchist' ? Justify your answer.(C. U. 1986)
20. Analyse the concept of Welfare State. What are its functions? (C. U. 1992)

CHAPTER 18

MARXISM

References :

- Marx and Engels—The Communist Manifesto.
- Maurice Cornforth—Dialectical Materialism.
- David McLellan—The Thought of Karl Marx.
- R. N. Carew Hunt—The Theory and Practice of Communism.
- Ernest Mandel—The Marxist Theory of the State.
- Ralph Miliband—Marxism and Politics.
- David McLellan (Ed)—Marx : The First Hundred Years.

Introduction

Marxism is a scientifically based system of philosophical, economic and socio-political views. It emerged in the middle of the nineteenth century. The emergence of Marxism brought about a real revolution in the history of social thought.

The term 'Marxism' is obviously derived from the name of Karl Marx (1818-1883) who is the chief exponent of this doctrine. In the words of Lenin "Marxism is the view and teachings of Karl Marx." But Marxism should not be regarded as a system of thought belonging only to Marx alone. During the middle and the later part of the nineteenth century Karl Marx together with his associate and colleague Friedrich Engels (1820-1895) worked out "a general theory of the world in which we live, and of human society as a part of that world." At the end of the nineteenth and at the beginning of the twentieth centuries, V. I. Lenin (1870-1924) enriched the doctrine of Marxism, raised it to a qualitatively new level and defended it from attacks by its opponents. Joseph Stalin (1879-1953) and Mao Zedong (1893-1976) also made significant contribution in the analysis and expansion of Marxism in the twentieth century. The role of the modern writers like George Lukaus, Louis Althusser and Antonio Gramsci in the development of the theoretical aspects of Marxism cannot be ignored. The development of Marxism is still continuing. In the words of Lenin "In no sense do we regard the Marxist theory as something complete and unassailable."

Marxism is a typical combination of philosophical and revolutionary ideas. Marxism surveys past history and events on a purely scientific basis, avoiding all vagueness and idealism. This scientifically based philosophy is known as "scientific socialism" as opposed to the idealistic or utopian socialism. "The greatest contribution of Marxim" according to cornforth "was to develop scientific socialist theory and to introduce it into the working class movements". Thus the Marxists were not satisfied only with the scientific analysis of the laws of social development and of the injustices inflicted to man by man. They also tried to find out the way to end poverty, injustice and all kinds of exploitation.

Marxism is thus an attempt at a scientific analysis of the past and the present and also a forcast for the future which is to be realised through specific pre-conceived action. So Lenin says "Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action."

Marxism consists mainly of three elements—*first*, a dialectical philosophy

borrowed from Hegel but transformed into dialectical materialism. *Second*, a system of political economy, the parts of which are the labour theory of value and the theory of surplus value. *Third*, a concept of state and of revolution.

According to Lenin the first is derived from the German idealist philosophy, the second from the British school of political economy and French socialism and the third from the French revolutionary ideas. These are known as the "*three sources of Marxism*".

Thus Lenin remarks "Marxism continued and completed the main ideological currents of the nineteenth century belonging to the three most advanced countries of mankind." But to each Marxism brought its own interpretations and modifications. In this way Marxism became unprecedented and earth shaking in its implications. The key to realise this achievement can be found in one sentence in 'Theses on Feuerbach' where Marx says "The philosophers have only interpreted the world; the point is however to change it."

Thus Marxism has a dual nature, first as a science of society and history and second as a project to change the world for progress and betterment.

Dialectical Materialism

Marxism is a philosophy which seeks to interpret the world in order to change it and to shape and realise man's destiny in it. Dialectical Materialism may be regarded as a theoretical instrument in the hands of the people for application in changing the world.

In the words of Stalin our philosophy is regarded as Dialectical Materialism "because its approach to the phenomena of nature, its method of studying and apprehending them is dialectical, while its interpretation of the phenomena of nature, its conception of these phenomena, its theory, is materialism."

Maurice Cornforth rightly says "dialectical materialism" means : understanding things just as they are ("materialism"), in their actual connection and movement ("dialectics").

Materialism is opposed to idealism. The materialist way of interpreting any phenomena and pointing out their interrelations is opposed to the idealist way of interpreting.

The term 'Dialectic' may be generally defined as "the theory of union of opposites". The term is derived from the Greek word 'dialego' meaning to debate or discuss with a view to arriving at the truth by pointing out the contradictions contained in the arguments of the disputants.

The dialectical process comprises of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The thesis supports a proposition. The antithesis denies it. The synthesis points out the truth in both the thesis and the antithesis and thus brings as a step nearer to reality. But on a close analysis it is found that the synthesis is also defective and thus the whole process starts again with a thesis, negated by an antithesis and compromised in a new synthesis. This process of conflict and reconciliation goes on within human thought for reality.

In his Dialectical and Historical Materialism Stalin lays down some principal features of the Marxian dialectical method.

First, according to the dialectical method nothing can be considered in isolation. Everything should be considered in their interconnection with other things.

Second, dialectic considers things "not only from the standpoint of interconnection and interdependence but also from the standpoint of their movement, their change, their development, things coming into being and going out of being,

Third, dialectics looks upon development as "an onward and upward movement, as a transition from an old qualitative state to a new qualitative state as a development from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher."

Fourth, dialectics point out that "the process of development from the lower to the higher level takes place as a disclosure of the contradictions inherent in things as a struggle of opposite tendencies which operate on the basis of those contradictions."

This leads to a further dialectical feature of development—negation of negation. This asserts that thesis, antithesis and synthesis are different stages of development. The thesis breaks down by reason of its internal contradictions and give rise to antithesis. The antithesis is the negation of the thesis which tries to remove these contradictions. The antithesis also breaks down for the same reason and a synthesis is established which consists of the valid elements of both the thesis and the antithesis. The synthesis thus negates the antithesis, i.e., the first negation. This is called the 'negation of the negation.'

According to the Marxists the dialectics constitutes the only scientific approach to reality and it gives us valuable insights into the history of human development.

The Materialist Interpretation of history

The materialist interpretation of history means simply the application of dialectical materialism to the particular field of human relations within society. In the words of Maurice Cornforth "The general theory of the motive forces and the laws of social change, developed on the basis of Marx's discoveries, is known as the materialist conception of history or historical materialism." The term historical materialism was never used by Marx. He preferred to talk of the materialist conception of history: The materialist interpretation of history should be viewed as the Marxist approach or method on the laws of social development than a fully developed system of ideas.

The central idea of the materialist conception is that the principles which govern all human relations within society is *production* of the means to sustain life and next to production, the *exchange* of the goods produced. The key to fundamental change in society is to be found in the way of the changes in the modes of production. Thus the fundamental changes in human society are brought about by the material conditions of life. The mode of production in material life determines and influences the character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. Therefore, the social structure of a particular time, its arts, philosophy, law, religion, customs, manners and political structure all are shaped by material conditions by which the Marxists mean, production, distribution and exchange, more particularly production. This productive activity is fundamental and the socio-political and religio-philosophical ideas with which men interpret and organise this activity are only secondary.

Two factors are connected with production. Over and above the natural resources, men possess certain instruments of production—their labour and skill and the tools and implements made by them. Society's means of production along with the men who use these means constitute its *productive forces*. But production also involves a relation between men and men. The relations individuals enter into of necessity in the process of production are called *production*

relations. Now the sum total of the productive forces and the production relations comprise a *mode of production* of the material wealth of society. These two elements of the modes of production are closely interrelated and inter-dependent. According to Marx there has been a succession of five modes of production : primitive—communal, slave owning, feudal, capitalist and communist modes. The replacement of an old mode of production by a new one is the inevitable result of the in aggravation of contradictions between advanced productive forces and obsolete production relations.

Production relations rely on productive forces and must correspond to them. This is called the law of correspondance of production relations to the level and nature of the productive forces. This is the core of human progress. Historical processes are shaped by the operation of the laws governing the development and change of the mode of production and also to the interplay of productive forces and production relations. These processes constitute the foundation of human history. This law of evolution in human history helps people to assess properly the phenomena of social life, to fight for social progress and consciously to control socio-economic processes.

Stages of Social Development—It is not definitely known when and how man appeared on the face of the earth and it cannot also be definitely ascertained whether the original man moved singly or in groups. But man's natural desire for company and abhorrence for loneliness, his hunger for love and affection, and the necessity for self-protection perhaps compelled him to lead a group-life. In such a group-life, food, shelter and self-protection were the three main wants of the primitive man and the satisfaction of these three wants was more effectively ensured under a system of group-life than under lonely life. His food consisted mainly of edible fruits of the forest, meat and fish which he used to procure by collective efforts, for, even at that stage, man realised that collective efforts were more productive than individual efforts. The implements for hunting and fishing were common possessions of the group. The fruits, meat and fish collected in this way were enjoyed by all. Men and Women were on equal status. Every group had its head—male or female whose directions were followed by the rest. Thus primitive societies consisted of groups of men, women and children whose efforts were common, whose possessions were common and whose enjoyment was common. There was no class division in such a society and as such the question of exploitation of one class by another did not arise. As man lived from hand to mouth there was no surplus and this factor prevented the rise of a leisured class who eventually became the exploiters.

Society developed stage by stage and not all on a sudden. All societies—developed, under-developed and undeveloped—have foundations in its economic structure, i.e., the mode of production, distribution and ownership of the produced goods. This economic structure of society changes from one stage to another. With every change in the economic structure of a society, the entire super-structure of the society, namely, its political, social, religious, cultural ideas and institutions change. Thus a society implies not only its foundation but also its external manifestations. Hence arise different forms of society because of the difference in their foundation as well as in their super-structure. It is in this way that society passed through different stages and the different stages have been classified as (1) Primitive Communal System, (2) The Slave System, (3) The Feudal System, (4) The Capitalist System and (5) The Socialist System.

1. Primitive Communal System—Satisfaction of hunger and self-protection were perhaps the primary necessities of life of the primitive man and these two made it imperative upon him to live together along with his other fellow beings. Hunting, fishing and gleaning of fruits constituted his main occupations of life. The application of physical labour was the mode of procuring food and also of self-protection and these two purposes were better served by collective efforts. But with the increase in number, as he realised that the amount of food procured by the application of physical labour was not adequate for the group he began to make implements which would help him to procure more food but require less physical exertion. In course of time he made implements made of wood, stone and at a later stage of bone. These were helpful not only for greater production but also for self-protection. The chief characteristics of primitive communism were collective efforts, collective ownership of the limited implements of production and collective enjoyment. Fruits of collective efforts were equally distributed among the members of a group. As there was no class-division, there was no scope for exploitation. In the absence of exploitation, the application of force to dominate others did not arise. It is natural that in such a society, the male being physically stronger of the two sexes used to do the harder work and the female was allotted the less arduous work. The social organisations in most cases were matriarchal because promiscuity prevailed and so children were known through descent from mother rather than from father. The position of women was therefore high in such a society.

Some writers say that primitive societies moved about in big companies called hordes but with improvement of the implements of production, the horde broke up into smaller groups called clans and several clans when united together for purposes of greater production, or for self-protection or as a result of conquest of one clan by another, a tribe was formed.

At a certain stage, the primitive man discovered fire and its use for various domestic purposes. The uncertainty of food was removed when man picked up the art of animal rearing. This process not only ensured regular supply of meat but also of milk, fur and skin with which they began to meet other domestic needs. Thus the hunter became the nomadic shepherd. The invention and use of metals brought man from stone age to metal age and the use of metal helped them not only to produce more food but also ensured greater self-protection.

The increase in production as a result of the invention of fire, cattle-rearing and use of metals including iron led to the production of more goods than was necessary for a clan or tribe, i.e., a surplus was left behind and this surplus became in course of time the source of all social evils. This created inequality between clans and tribes because one was richer in possession of its cattle, implements of production and also in implements of self-defence than the other. This difference in the possession of material means of life increased when man settled down to agriculture. The stronger tribe took possession of better class of land by driving out the weaker ones. Thus the seed of inequality was sown and it was a by-product of surplus. The surplus not only brought inequality but also opened the road to conflicts and quarrels between clans and tribes. The surplus also led to exploitation which implies the misappropriation of goods produced by another man's labour. So long as man lived from hand to mouth and produced no surplus there was perfect equality among the members of a clan or tribe. But as soon as he learnt to produce a surplus and hoard it, this surplus enabled him to bring others under his control. The surplus brought into existence two classes in society—the haves and the have-nots, the rich and the poor

and the master and the slave whose interests were different and difference in interests causes class-conflict.

2. **The Slave System**—Slavery in the wide sense of the term means the subordination of one man to another as a result of which the man subordinated loses his freedom of conduct and action. In this sense, the workers in the field and factory, in all offices, in the regiment and on board a vessel are slaves because while on duty they cannot act freely but are simply to carry out the orders of their official superiors. But outside duty hours they regain freedom of conduct and action. So this is a kind of slavery for the time being and this is a voluntary slavery good for the slave himself and society as a whole.

But slavery in its technical sense, means a stage in the process of social development in which a man could establish an absolute and unlimited control over another man by the application of brute force justified by the principle—'Might is right'. Ancient slavery was full and complete in the sense that the person enslaved was not looked upon as a human being. The slave was a class of domestic animals like cows and horses which were helpful to the slave-owner with this difference that the slave was a two-legged animal, could make articulate sound but could not work except under the guidance of his master. Thus the slave had no personality of his own. He belonged wholly to his master so much so that his life and death depended wholly on the pleasure of his master.

As has been said before, the mode of production at a particular stage of social development gave rise to a surplus over daily necessities of life and this surplus gradually bred inequality in society by creating two social classes, namely, the surplus owners and the surplus-less class. The latter being weaker of the two was easily subordinated to the former.

The system of slavery was practically universal in the ancient world. As a matter of fact ancient civilization was built upon the foundation of slave labour. The wondrous Pyramids of Egypt and the Hanging Garden of Babylon were built upon the blood of slave labour. Perhaps ancient India was also not free from this canker. The four-fold division of society, the rigour and ruthlessness of the caste system and the status of the Sudras—the lowest caste are all indications of the existence of some sort of difference among the different classes. The superiority of the Aryan group of men over the aboriginals still persists. Slavery in all its nakedness appeared in Greece and Rome. In Athens at one time, the number of slaves was many times more than that of the citizens. Slave population increased because it was customary at that time to take prisoners of war as slaves. The children of such slaves swelled the number of slave population. It was also customary in many societies to reduce a borrower of money to the position of a slave when the borrower was unable to repay the debt. Rome maintained a system which made Rome a highly prosperous society. The oppression, repression and exploitation practised on the slaves in Rome may be had from the story of Androcles and the lion. Slavery was a flourishing trade at one time.

But curiously enough, great thinkers of the ancient world like Aristotle found no fault with slavery. They defended the institution on the ground of social necessity and also on the ground of the superiority of the master over the slave. Aristotle defended the institution mainly on the ground of the supposed superiority of the Hellenic races over all other non-Hellenic races. At the same time Aristotle also suggested some reforms of the institution.

But it must be said that slavery produced, in a sense, great thinkers like Socrates; Plato and Aristotle in Greece, Cicero and Polybius in Rome and as has

been said before, many wonders of the world. The Greeks and the Romans developed a sense of dignity which made them averse to manual labour. They thought that manual labour and intellectual labour were incompatible and as such there must always be a class of slaves fit only for manual labour to free the masters from the drudgery involved in manual labour so that the masters might pursue other higher aims of life.

But slavery came to its end as a result of the moral degeneration of the slave-master class and revolt of the slaves, in many cases, synchronous with outside invasion.

3. The Feudal System—The transition from the system of slavery to that of feudalism took a long time and this transition was not uniform or simultaneous everywhere. Slave labour was exacted from unwilling and discontented workers who had no interest in the work and had no share in the fruits of their labour. Naturally therefore, the quantity and quality of the product deteriorated. In order to increase the interest of the slave in production, their owners had to give some concessions to the slaves. Under the feudal system, land was completely under the control of feudal lords who gave some lands to their slaves for the sustenance of their families. The slaves could cultivate their own lands but they were under compulsion to cultivate the land of their master. They could not refuse to work under their master nor could they move elsewhere by giving up cultivation. They had no share in the product produced by their labour from the land of which the owner was the feudal lord. The slave appeared in the garb of a serf tied to the land of his feudal lord. The serf was a step removed forward in this that he had his own land and that he acquired the freedom of life. So the serf was neither a slave nor a freeman. He was intermediate between the two. But the serfs were like moveable properties. With every change in the ownership of land, the ownership of serfs passed on to the buyer. As a result of the invention of various metal and their use for productive purposes and with the introduction of division of labour, a number of handicrafts like weaving, making of various types of metallic instruments, production of contemporary luxury goods were developed and these were pursued side by side with agriculture. A section of the serfs joined these avocations of life.

The feudal system was a hierarchy of which the base was the serf and the king himself was at its apex. In between the two, there were many classes,—the feudal lords and the sub-lords. With state-power in their hands, the feudal lords oppressed and exploited the serfs ruthlessly. Revolts against this system in Germany, England and Russia by the serfs hastened the end of the system.

As in slavery so in feudalism, society was divided into two classes, namely, the exploiter and the exploited and as such inequality was inevitable. This inequality was the cause of class-war and the machinery of the state was necessary to protect the interest of the feudal lords. The feudal system may be said to be an improvement upon slavery in one respect only, namely, that under feudalism, the serfs were not considered as the personal property of the feudal lords.

4. The Capitalist System—Of the factors contributing to the evolution of the capitalist system, the rise of industrialists, merchants and traders played an important part. The Industrial Revolution in England introduced machinery in production and this in its turn changed the character of production in quantity as well as in quality. Industries developed at a much faster rate than agriculture which lost much of previous prior character. Labourers were attracted more to

these industries leaving the cultivation of land and townships side by side with slums built for the accommodation of the producers and workers came into existence. Thus field-workers in large number became industrial labourers. Under the changed condition of production, the surplus production found a market to be disposed at a profit. This necessity extended the market. Exchange of goods which was previously confined to a village now extended to towns and distant places and eventually to foreign lands. A class of people acted as intermediaries between the producers and the consumers. This class was the merchant class who used to buy at a cheaper rate from the producers and sell those goods—agricultural and industrial—at a higher rate to the consumers. Often companies were formed for trading purposes with the blessings of the ruling monarch. It is in this way that the British East India Company, Dutch East India Company were formed not only for commercial purposes but also for missionary purposes as well and gradually, they rose to be 'dealers in destinies and empires' from their position as 'dealers in spices and dyes'.

Thus merchants and traders acquired huge wealth out of their profit and this wealth invested in the new method of production brought into existence a new system of production which goes by the name of capitalist system of production. The capitalist system of production is a round-about way of production—it is a long-drawn-out process. The production of a commodity from start to finish takes a long time as the productive process involves many stages of incomplete production. Use of machinery, elaborate division of labour, investment of huge amount of money and employment of a large number of labour are the main features of this process of production and the entire process is under the control of a managing director. The capitalist class by virtue of their control over money buys the services of land, labour and organizing ability. But the capitalist class has to pay the full value of the services of land and organising ability but he does not and need not pay the full value of what the labourers produce because labour as a factor of production has less bargaining capacity than other factors. So labourers are paid less than what they produce. The full value of labour minus the amount paid to them represents a surplus value the whole of which is appropriated by the capitalist class. Thus labourers are exploited today by their employers in the same way in which the slaves were exploited by their masters and serfs by the feudal lords. Exploitation breeds discontent and spirit of revolt among the exploited and ultimately results in war between the exploiter and the exploited. The only remedy to this ruthless exploitation lies in the socialisation of the means of production in place of private ownership and private management. But it is easier to suggest socialisation as a remedial measure but it is hard to translate it into practice. The capitalist owners will not voluntarily part with their control over the good things of the earth unless they are forced to do so. The method of compulsion is to be applied where the method of persuasion fails. So workers are to unite for the purpose of pulling down the walls of the citadel of capitalism and this pulling down took place in Russia in 1917 by which the dictatorship of the proletariat was established. The Russian Revolution put an end to the age-old exploitation of man by man. The revolution is still acting as a never failing source of inspiration to the workers of the world who are fighting for their cause. As a result of the united struggle of the workers, the foundation of capital has been shaken and capitalism is now on the retreat.

5. **The Socialist System**—The socialist system is perhaps the culmination of a process of social evolution which may be said to have made a complete circle

from primitive communism to modern communism. Socialism is a reaction of many reactions. It is an extreme form of reactions against extreme individualism, capitalism, imperialism and fascism. It is a protest against exploitation, a protest against invidious distruction between man and man and a protest against class rule. It arose out of the united struggle of the many against the inordinate greed of the few.

Many thinkers of the past like Plato, Thomas Moor, Harrington and others had their ideas about states with a socialist basis but they were all utopias and as such never tried any where. But the socialist system as conceived by Karl Marx took a concrete form in Russia where the revolutionaries established a socialist system corresponding to Marxian socialism. The Russian Revolution therefore marks the end of the capitalist system and the beginning of a new era which has been characterised by some as a new type of civilization—a civilization which can cure all the past social evils. Marxian socialism as adopted in Russia had to face total annihilation at the hands of the world capitalism but it not only survived onslaughts from within and without but it was firmly entranced in the soil and today the Russian socialist system is regarded as a model to imitate.

Socialism is both a political creed and an economic programme. The age-old exploitation of the surplus owner class over the surplusless class brings inequality and sense of frustration in the exploited class. As exploitation grows from more to more conflict intensifies between the two classes resulting in the overthrow of the capitalist class from power. State-power now passes on to the working class who establish a dictatorship of the proletariat by eliminating the last remnants of capitalism, i.e., all sections of the bourgious class. The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary at this stage so that the reactionary forces like the landlords, industrialists and foreign imperialists may not restore back their process of exploitation again. The new state that emerges out of the proletarian revolution is not wholly a classless state but a state of one class, namely, a workers' state and in an one-class state, it is only natural that there shall be one party, namely, the communist party which is to carry on the economic programme of socialism.

Socialism in its first phase implies abolition of private property and law of inheritance which perpetuate the rule of the capitalist bourgeois class. All the means of production like land, mine, water, electric power, etc., are nationalised and placed under state control. The entire machinery of production, distribution and exchange are regulated and controlled by the state. The first principle of a socialist state is that every able-bodied man must work and 'he who would not work neither shall he eat'. Socialisation of all the means of production may not be possible during the initial stage and hence a programme of collective ownership in agriculture and industries is pursued in the form of collective farming and co-operatives in industry. This collective and co-operative system not only puts an end to exploitation but also increases production in quantity and quality. The aim of socialism is to raise the standard of living of the people by the production of more goods—capital goods and consumer goods of a better quality and to achieve this end in view, production under socialism is always a planned production adjusting supply to demand. Under socialism, the workers are the owners and organisers of a collective farm or industrial undertaking. They get back a share of their labour according to the quantity and quality of labour applied. The sense of inequality and frustration characteristic of workers under capitalism is absent under socialism. During the first phase of socialism, therefore, money

is used as a medium of exchange and inequality of income still lingers because full and perfect socialism has not yet been achieved.

Communism is the ultimate goal of a socialist society. But the transition from socialism to communism may take a long time. With the gradual increase of all productive goods, there will come a stage when need-based distribution will be possible in accordance with the principle—'From each according to his ability, to each according to his need.' When the socialist society will reach the stage of sufficiency not only the standard of living of the people will be at its highest but they will be in a position to enjoy rest, leisure and recreation. Sufficiency in material means, freedom from exploitation and a sense of dignity will increase their creative genius. Thus under communism, all people will be able to lead an honourable life. They will no more require even the dictatorship of the proletariat. Each one will be self-guiding. No external restraint will be necessary. Thus with the gradual extension of communism in all the fields of human relationships, the guardianship of the state, becomes superfluous and ultimately the state dies a natural death without the necessity of being killed. The state ultimately withers away.

Conclusion

Social evolution is a dynamic process in which many factors contributed to this evolution. In the long process of its evolution society passed from one stage to another from primitive simplicity to modern complexity of life but each of the stages should not be considered as mutually exclusive. Thus traces of primitive communism, the slave system and the feudal system are still discernible in a modern society. Common pastures in villages, common crematoriums and burial places, community worship and congregational prayers are remnants of primitive communism. Slavery in some form or other still persists in modern societies of which the most abominable form is the slavery of women. Apart from the social restraints imposed upon women by the male legislators, a section of the women of even civilized countries with the exception perhaps of the Soviet Union are compelled by force of circumstances to lead a life of shame. The welfare state plays the role of an abeter in this nefarious practice. The position of the share-croppers, factory, mine and tea-garden workers and domestic workers are not far removed from that of the mediaeval serf. This is evident from the frequent strikes and lock-outs resorted to by the warring interests. Even student uprisings throughout the world against inconsiderate and unsympathetic authorities tell the same tale of usurpation and exploitation giving rise to class-war. Modern war between civilized nations is a legacy inherited from our old societies. But there is a difference between tribal wars in primitive times and modern war between nations. The extent of the devastation, destruction of human lives and property including cultural centres and violation of all moral codes of human life caused by modern warfare would have put a tribal chieftain, or a slave leader like Spartacus or a feudal lord to shame.

THE MARXIAN CONCEPT OF CLASS AND CLASS-STRUGGLE

The Concept of class

The concept of class occupies an important place in Marxian view of history. According to Marx, classes are the basic social groups by means of whose conflict