

CHAPTER- II

NON-VIOLENCE: THE DEMAND OF SOCIETY

Had the society been formed on the basis of violence, it would have been futile to have a dream of a non-violent society. That is why our primary task is to see whether non-violence is the necessary condition or at least one of the necessary conditions for the formation of the society. Thus, we should first examine the established theories regarding the genesis of human society with the hope to find out whether non-violence is a cementing factor in the building of society.

To trace the origin of a phenomenon is a difficult task. Especially, when the social phenomena are our object of enquiry, its origin in the darkness of human society is difficult to trace. Still, thinkers have through the centuries, taken pain to dig out the secrets of the origin of the society. There is no doubt some ideas like the argument of the social contract theory reflects speculations on the nature of the society. But before we discuss the Social Contract theory, it is very essential for us to focus on some fundamental questions that arise regarding the origin of society, which may also reflect man's true nature in society. In what sense man is a social animal? In what sense do we belong to society? In what sense does society belong to us? What is the nature of our dependence upon it? Why shall we interpret the unity of the whole to which our individual lives are bound? These questions are aspects of one fundamental question – the relation of unit, the individual, to the group and society as a whole. This question is the starting point and the focus of all sociological investigations, and to a great extent, fruitfulness of any sociological study is measured by its contribution to the problem of the relationship of individual and society.

The theory of social contract, which is a mechanical theory based on a number of a priori assumptions, staged a retreat with the growth of historical and empirical thinking in

politics. But human thought and actions in period from sixteenth to the eighteenth century were profoundly influenced by the ideas of some contractualists, who sought to trace the origin of the society and explain the nature of relationships between the rulers and the ruled.

The theory of social contract assumes the existence of a state of nature as the initial condition of mankind where man was subject to no political control, and postulates the emergence of the state voluntary agreement or contract by the inhabitants of the state of nature. According to some writers, this state of nature was pre-social; some other considered it to be a pre-political condition. The code of regulations which determined man's behaviour in the state of nature was designated as natural law. Man in the state of nature used to enjoy some rights known as natural rights. But for some reasons, men in the state of nature were ultimately compelled to abandon it and establish a civil society through contract. In consequence the natural laws were replaced by human law and man began to enjoy civil and political rights.

History of the Social Contract Theory

The theory of social contract has a long history in political thought and received comprehensive treatment in the writings of Hobbes, Lock and Rousseau. This theory finds a prominent place in the political thinking of both the East and the West. The idea that the authority of the ruler is based on the some kind of agreement between him and his subjects is quite old. Its traces may be seen in the *Mahābhārata* and also in the *Arthasāstra* of Koutilya. This agreement can be considered as a form of social contract. The Sophist and the Epicureans of ancient Greek faintly subscribed to it by thinking state, in clear opposition to the views of Plato and Aristotle, as a conventional organization by the people. Plato and Aristotle dealt with the theory of social contract only to reject it completely. The Roman thinkers and lawyers like Polybius and Cicero took the same view. The Romans regarded people as the source of authority. The Tautens insisted that the kind was under the law of the folk and he was chosen by the people. Every lord (including the king above all) was bound by the oath of fealty. Utopia, the Roman Jurists

observed: “The will of the emperor is law only because the people confers supreme power upon him”.ⁱ The Christian thinkers subscribed to it in their own way. In particular, Richard Hooker set out to consider whether the subject should obey an authority which they themselves not established. And his answer was that the original contract obliged the people to obedience and the contract could not be revoked except by the general agreement. The feudal society, with the basis of contractual relationship between lord and vassal, was quite friendly to the idea of social contract. But its first definite and systematic discussion could be found in the writings of Manegold of Lautenbach. He held that if the king “violates the agreement according to which who was chosen...reason dictates that he absolves the people from their obedience, especially when he was himself first broken the faith which bound and the people together.”ⁱⁱ Among other who subscribed to this idea, we may refer to the names of Buchanan, Althusius, Grotius, Pufendorf and Spinoza.

However, a clear-cut and elaborate expression of this theory was furnished by the trinity of Hobbes and Locke of England in seventeenth and Rousseau of France in the eighteenth centuries. A faint idea assumed the form of an elaborate hypothesis to demonstrate that the existence of political authority of any king, what they call ‘state of nature’ and its termination by a covenant whereby the people surrendered their natural rights to be translated into civil rights by the action of a political authority instituted by them.

Social Contract Theory, nearly as old as philosophy itself, is the view that persons’ moral and political obligations are dependent upon a contract or agreement between them to form society. Socrates uses something quite like a social contract argument to explain to Crito why he must remain in prison and accept the death penalty. However, Social Contract Theory is rightly associated with modern moral and political theory and is given its first full exposition and defence by Thomas Hobbes. After Hobbes, John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau are the best known proponents of this enormously influential theory, which has been one of the most dominant theories within moral and political

theory throughout the history of the modern West. In the twentieth century, moral and political theory regained philosophical momentum as a result of John Rawls' Kantian version of social contract theory, and was followed by other revisiting of the subject by David Gauthier and others. More recently, philosophers from different perspectives have criticized Social Contract Theory. In particular, feminists and race-conscious philosophers have argued that social contract theory is at least an incomplete picture of our moral and political lives, and may in fact camouflage some of the ways in which the contract is itself parasitical upon the subjugations of classes of persons.

The classical representations of this school of thought, as we have already mentioned, are Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), John Locke (1632-1704) and J. J. Rousseau (1712-1778). The three of them taught in various ways that before the existence of civil society men lived in a sort of pre-social stages called the state of nature, and in virtue of a contract among them, society came into existence.

Though their views are different on different issues, they all assume the existence of a primitive pre- political condition of mankind escape from which “was effected by means of a contract, pact, or covenant, express or tacit, between each individual and his fellows, by which each surrendered his ‘natural’ right to do as he pleased and received in exchange ‘civil’ rights; that is, right created and protected by the state. This pre-civil condition of society was described as the original state of nature.”ⁱⁱⁱ

Since at least the fifth century before Christ, various philosophers have viewed society as a contrivance deliberately set up by men for certain ends. According to some, such as Thomas Hobbes in the seventeenth century, society is a means for the protection of men against the consequences of their own untrammelled natures. To others, society is an artificial device of mutual economy, a view suggested by the economic philosophy of Adam Smith and his followers. Similarly, the eighteenth century individualist maintained that a man was “born free and equal” in his state of nature and that his establishment of a social contract merely set up social conveniences of order and protection. All such theories view society as based on some kind of original contract between the individuals

themselves or between the people and the government. This view has been used as an argument for the “protection” of the individual “from society” and sometimes it has been used for the opposite purpose of enhancing the role of political organization in society.

The belief that society is an artificial invention no longer commands the influence it once possessed, but it has by no means entirely disappeared. Consider, for example, some of the current criticisms of government planning in this sphere or that based upon the argument that planning is an “artificial device” detrimental to the “natural order” of life. Or consider the nostalgic yearning of some persons to return to nature’s ways – ways assumed to have existed before burdensome society was erected by man. Thus certain fads of recent years prescribing diets of uncooked foods or extolling the virtues of nudity have echoed the eighteenth century conception of men’s pre-social idyllic state.

Socratic argument: In the early Platonic Dialogue, ‘*Crito*’, Socrates marks a convincing argument as to why he must stay in prison and accept the death consequence, rather than escape and go into exile in another Greek city. He humanizes the Laws of Athens, and, speaking in their voice, clarifies that he has learned a devastating responsibility to follow the Laws because they have made his whole way of life, and even the fact of his very existence, possible. They made it possible for his mother and father to marry, and therefore to have legitimate children, including himself. Having been born, the city of Athens, through its laws, then required that his father care for and educate him. Socrates’ life and the way in which that life has flourished in Athens are each dependent upon the Laws. Importantly, however, this relationship between citizens and the Laws of the city are not pressed. Citizens once they have grown up, and have seen how the city conducts itself, can choose whether to leave, taking their property with them. Staying at an agreement to abide by the laws of the state and accept the punishments in case the laws are violated. And, having made an agreement that is itself just, Socrates asserts that he must keep to this agreement that he has made and obey the Laws, in this case, by staying and accepting the death penalty. Importantly, the contract described by Socrates

is an implicit one: it is implied by his choice to stay in Athens, even though he is free to leave.

In Plato's most well-known Dialogue, *Republic*, social contract theory is represented again, although this time less favourably. In Book II, Glaucon offers a candidate for an answer to the question "what is justice?" by representing a social contract explanation for the nature of justice. What men would want is most to be able to commit injustices against others without the fear of reprisal, and what they want most is to avoid being treated unjustly by others without being able to do injustice in return. Justice then, he says, is the conventional result of the laws and covenants that men make in order to avoid these extremes. Being unable to commit injustice with impunity and fearing becoming victims themselves, men decide that it is in their interests to submit themselves to the convention of justice. Socrates rejects this view, and most of the rest of the dialogue centers on showing that justice is worth having for its own sake, and that the just man is the happy man. So, from Socrates' point of view, justice has a value that greatly exceeds the prudential value that Glaucon assigns to it.

These views, in the *Crito* and the *Republic*, might seem at first glance inconsistent: in the former dialogue Socrates uses a social contract type of argument to show why it is just for him to remain in prison, whereas in the latter he rejects social contract as the source of justice. These two views are, however, reconcilable. From Socrates' point of view, a just man is one who will, among other things, recognize his obligation to the state by obeying its laws. The state is the morally and politically most fundamental entity, and as such deserves our highest allegiance and deepest respect. Just men know this and act accordingly. Justice, however, is more than simply obeying laws in exchange for others obeying them as well. Justice is the state of a well-regulated soul, and so the just man will also necessarily be the happy man. So, justice is more than the simple reciprocal obedience to law, as Glaucon suggests, but it does nonetheless include obedience to the state and the laws that sustain it. So in the end, although Plato is perhaps the first philosopher to offer a representation of the argument at the heart of social contract

theory, Socrates ultimately rejects the idea that social contract is the original source of justice.

Hobbes' Argument: Unlike most defenders of despotic government, Hobbes holds that all men are naturally equal. In a state of nature, before there any government came into the scene, every man desires to preserve his own liberty, but to acquire dominion over others; both these desires are dedicated by the impulse to self-preservation. In other words, in a condition of state prior to the formation of a political state, everyone, according to Hobbes, would seek his own preservation, and the gratification of his own desires for selfish pleasures, such as gain and glory. There would be no morality such as we know. Everybody would have a perfect right to whatever he could get and keep. The inevitable result would be a war of all against all; men would perpetually either be actually fighting or in constant fear of being attacked. For war consists not only in the fighting, but also in constant dread and preparation for conflict. "...for as the nature of foul weather lieth not in a shower or two of rain but in an inclination thereto of many days together, so the nature or war consisted not in actual fighting but in the known disposition thereto during all the time, there is no assurance to be contrary."^{iv}

In the second part of Hobbes' *Leviathan*, he tells how men escape from these evils by combining into communities each subject to a central authority. These are represented at happening by means of social contract. "It is supposed that a number of people come together and agree to choose a sovereign body, which shall exercise authority over them and put an end to the universal war. I do not think this 'covenant' (as Hobbes usually calls it) is thought of as a definite historical event; it is certainly irrelevant to the argument to think of it as such. It is an explanatory myth, used to explain why men submit, and should submit, to the limitations and personal freedom entailed on submission to authority. The purpose of the restraint men put upon themselves, says Hobbes, is self-preservation from the universal war resulting from our love and liberty for ourselves and of dominion over others".^v

The Social Contract theory on the origin of state/ society has a framework of its own. The starting point of Hobbes' philosophy is the analysis of human nature in terms of an egoistic psychology, which postulates that self-interest is the main spring of human action. According to Hobbes, "it is a very horrible condition in which man is the enemy of man. Man being a selfish, egoistic, brutal, covetous and aggressive creature is free to defend himself either by running away from the scene or in confederacy with others. There is nothing like peace, security, order, property, justice, industry, learning, trade and anything what we find now in a state/ society. There is all but fear and danger of a violent death. The law of nature informs man to be in competition with others and so invade others for some gain, or live in difference so as to be in search of safety, or seek glory so as to secure same reputation. In short, life of man is solitary, nasty, poor, brutish and short."^{vi} In a state of nature, there is no property, no justice, no injustice as well; there is only war and 'force and fraud are, in war, the two cardinal virtues'.

To terminate this state of nature, contract is made by the people. According to Hobbes, law of nature informs the people to surrender their all natural rights in favour of a man as the price for living in a commonwealth that ensures them liberty, property and the entire paraphernalia of a good life. By such contract society, state and government (commonwealth) came into being: a common power is instituted that would keep all in awe and ensure security of their life and possessions. Each man addressed every other person: " I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or to this assembly of man, on this condition, that thou, give up thy right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner."^{vii}

A natural law is a precept or general rule which man discovers by his reason that it is his interest to obey, and so it is his obligation to do so. (Interest and moral obligation are identical in this naturalistic system of ethics.) The first and the fundamental natural law is that men should "seek peace and follow it". From this ensues the second law, "that a man be willing, when others are so too, as far-forth as for peace and defence of himself he shall think it necessary, to lay down this (natural) right to all things, and be contented

with so much liberty against other men as he would allow other men against himself.”^{viii} This is Hobbes naturalistic interpretation of the Golden Rule. The mutual and voluntary renunciation of natural rights is elected through a covenant or contract. So Hobbes is one of the first enunciators in modern times of the doctrine that the state owes its origin to a social contract. The third natural law is “that men perform their covenants made,” without which contracts would of course be futile. The other natural laws follow: the obligation of good will; mutual accommodation; pardoning the offenses of the repentant; inflictions of punishments only for the correction of offenders or deterrence of others, and not from vengeance; avoidance of contempt or hatred of others; acknowledgement of all men as one’s equals; abstinence from reserving any rights for oneself, that one is not content should equally be reserved by others; a just or proportionate distribution of goods held in common; save conduct; and settlement of disputes by judicial process. “These laws of nature are immutable and eternal; for injustice, ingratitude, arrogance, pride, iniquity, acceptance of persons, and the rest, can never be made lawful. For, it can never be that war shall preserve life and peace destroys it.”^{ix}

Thomas Hobbes starts his argument by discussing the nature of mankind. One man can be better in something than another man, but in the end their positive and negative qualities add up to make them equal. This equality brings fear to men. They begin to suspect and hate one another, which brings them to war. When men are at war; morality, values and injustice vanish. The lack of a central governing system allows men to act according to their understanding.

Hobbes states three main principles that drive a man to war are Competition, Fear, and Glory. "The first maketh men invade for gain; the second, for safety; and the third for reputation".^x Wars last for a long time regardless of the reason. Neglectful of how successful a war is, there are always losses. Furthermore, if man is always at war, he loses culture, resources, time, society, and morality. He starts relying on animal surviving instinct, always keeping his guard against every other man.

Fear of death prevents men from constant involvement in war. There is little time for building and civilizing the world or to enjoy life. In this state of anarchy, where your and other lives are in permanent danger, one realizes that it is in everyone's best interest to make a contract to claim peace, sustain a minimal morality of respecting human life, keeping covenants made, and obeying the laws of the society. These Contracts are mutual transferring of rights between two parties. They can range from deciding on peace between two quarrelling parties, with demands and peaceful sacrifices from both ends, to an agreement between two merchants for goods and services. Hobbes goes deeper by demonstrating different kinds of contracts such as covenants, and Natural Laws that are kept with contracts. He also demonstrates that social contracts improve our way of lives, by keeping peace and setting up morals, laws, values, and compromises. To enforce such contracts, Hobbes suggests imposing severe penalties on those who disobey the laws and/or break the contracts.

According to Hobbes man in the state of nature was in perpetual conflict with his neighbours; his life was 'solitary, nasty, brutish and short'. Moving in the midst of such unenviable conditions, he decides to make a contract with his fellowmen in order to form a society and live in peace with all. Fear, therefore, is the root origin of society. As a result of this pact a government arises sovereign and absolute, containing in itself the wills of all. "Hobbes considers the question why man cannot co-operate like ants and bees. Bees in the same hive, he says, do not compete; they have no desire for honour; and they do not use reason to criticize the government. Their agreement is natural, but that of men can only be artificial, by covenant. The covenant must confer power on one man or one assembly, since otherwise it cannot be enforced. 'Covenants, without use the sword, are but words.'"^{xi} The covenant is not, as afterwards as Locke and Rousseau, between the citizens and the ruling power; it is a covenant made by the citizens with each other to obey such ruling power as the majority shall choose. When they have chosen, their political power is at an end. The majority is as much bound as the majority, since the covenant was to obey the government chosen by the majority. The government has been

chosen, the citizens lose all rights except such as the government may find it expedient to grant. There is no right of rebellion, because the ruler is not bound by any contract, whereas the subjects are.

Hobbes finds three basic causes of the conflict in this state of nature competition, diffidence and glory. His first law of nature that "...that every man ought to endeavour peace, as far as he has hope of obtaining it; and when he cannot obtain it, that he may seek and use all helps and advantages of war. In the state of nature, every man has a right to everything, even to one another's body but the second law is that, in order to secure the advantages of peace, that a man be willing, when others are so too... to lay down this right to all things; and be contented with so much liberty against other men as he would allow other men against himself."^{xii} This is the beginning of contracts/covenants; performing of which is the third law of nature. Injustice, therefore, is failure to perform in a covenant; all else is just. However, Hobbes also posits a primitive form of the inalienable rights—which would later be restated by John Locke implying that some covenants may be derived axiomatically, and consequently held to be universally true.

Locke's argument: Locke's *Treatises on Civil Government* were written, as he says, in the Preface, "...to establish throne of our great restorer, our present King William; to make good his title in the consent of the people; which being the only one of lawful governments, he has more fully than any other prince in Christendom; and to justify to the world the people of England, whose love of their just and natural rights, with their resolution to preserve them, saved the nation when it was on the brink of slavery and ruin."^{xiii}

Locke's picture of state of nature is completely different from Hobbes. It is pre-political not a pre-social condition. People live peacefully and collectively and enjoy three natural rights relating to life, liberty and property. As he says "The state of nature has a law of nature to govern it which obliged everyone and reason, which is that law, teaches of mankind who will but consult it, that being all equal and independent, no one ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty and possessions."^{xiv} It is 'a state of peace,

goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation' in contrast to 'a state of enmity, malice, violence and mutual destruction.' Yet the source of inconvenience is that each man is a policeman as well as a magistrate, the maker and the enforcer of the law of the state of nature. "...each man was necessarily the judge as to what it permitted and what is forbade and he was also the 'executioner' of the law. In this circumstances, there was a need of a common judge it interpret the law and a superior authority to enforce it, considering that man are biased and not, therefore, competent judges in their own cases." ^{xv}

In other words, it is a state of perfect freedom to order their actions, and dispose of their persons and possessions as they think fit, within the law of nature without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man. Obviously, it is not a condition of perpetual welfare; it is condition of equality wherein all the power of justification is reciprocal, no one having more than other. The law of nature wills the peace and preservation of mankind and puts into the hands of everyone a right to finish the transgressor to a degree as it might render its violation. However in case of transgression, it sanctions that one man can come by power over another but only to reattribute to him so far as calm, reason and conscience distaste, what is proportionate to his transgression which is so much as may serve for reparation and restraint.

Like Hobbes, Locke thinks of the establishment of the civil state as the result of a social contract and that the state of nature that preceded it was one of perfect freedom and equality. Unlike Hobbes, however, he does not believe that the state of nature was a condition of license. In it men knew that no person ought to harm another in his life, health, liberty and possessions. As evidence, Locke cites the reports of travellers, and uses as an analogy the tacit recognition and occasional compacts that independent government's make with one another. In the state of nature, in which there was no constituted authority to redress wrongs, it was the right and duty of every man to protect himself as well as he could, and to inflict punishment on evildoers. In regard to the state of nature, Locke was less original than Hobbes, who regarded it as one in which there was war of all against all, and life was nasty, brutish and short. But Hobbes was reputed

as an atheist. The view of the state of nature and the natural law which Locke accepted from his predecessors cannot be freed from its theological basis; where it survives without this, as in much modern liberalism, it is destitute of clear logical foundation.

The belief in a happy ‘state of nature’ in the remote past is derived partly from the biblical narrative of the age of the patriarchs, partly from the classical myth of the golden age. The general belief in the badness of the remote past only came with the doctrine of evolution. The nearest thing to a definition of the state of nature to be found in Locke is the following:

“Men living together according to reason, without a common superior on earth, with authority to judge between them, is properly the state of nature.”^{xvi} If the state of nature is not a condition of violence and anarchy, it is constantly upset by the corruption and viciousness of the degenerate man. So the law of nature that sanctions three national rights informs man to have a social compact for the better and more effective protection of these rights. Locke says: “The state of nature had the ill-condition, which was full of fear and continual dangers and suffered from three main shortcomings. These are the existence of an established and settled legal system, the absence of an appropriate authority to execute the laws, and they want of an impartial judge to give and endorse just decisions. Hence, in order to escape from this ill-condition and gain certainty and security, men make a contract to terminate the state of nature and enter into the civil society or commonwealth. Thus the men living in the state of nature voluntarily compacted and agreed to join and unite into a community for their comfortable, safe and peaceable living, one amongst another, in a secure enjoyment of their properties and greater securities against any that are not of it.”^{xvii}

Locke supposes the making of two contracts. The first is the social contract whereby civil society is established to meet the deficiencies of the state of nature. By it each individual agrees to give up not his all natural rights but the only one right of interpreting and executing the law of nature and redressing his own grievances. Besides, the right is given to the community as a whole and that too on the understanding that the

natural rights be guaranteed and preserved. The second is the governmental contract. When civil society is established, another contract is made by the community (in a corporate capacity) with a ruler who takes upon himself the responsibilities of removing the ill-condition once existing in the state of nature. The second contract is subordinate to the first; because government has only a fiduciary power to act for certain ends and its act are confined to securing them well.

Locke's view of the origin of property rights runs as follows. "In primitive conditions, when there was land in abundance, the man who enclosed piece of land and cultivated it acquired a moral right to the ground as well as to its produce. (The American homestead laws, under which many settlers acquired titles to land which they had occupied and improved, were an application of Locke's theory.) With the invention of money, Locke observes, that men become able to accumulate wealth which need not be immediately consumed." ^{xviii}Locke was the one of the forerunners of the science of the political economy and wrote a treatise on the consequences of the lowering of interest and raising the value of money. His view that capital is the product of labour was in the nineteenth century to give rise to socialistic theories of which Locke would have thoroughly disapproved.

Rousseau's argument: *The Social Contract* of Rousseau is comprised of four books, each of which is subsequently divided into several chapters. In my discussion on non-violence in Rousseau's thought, I shall confine myself in the Book-I only and I will try to depict that how in the evolution of society non-violence has taken an important role as against force and the chains of slavery. In the first chapter of Book-I, he starts with a statement that became one of the most famous comments afterwards, "Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains."^{xix} He goes on saying, where a man thinks only himself to be free and consider others as slaves, he fails to see that it is he himself a slave. One man thinks himself the master of others, but remains more of a slave than they are. Liberty is the nominal goal in Rousseau's thought, but in fact it is equality that he values and that he seeks to secure even at the express of liberty. It is true that when a man is

born in slavery, he is born slave but this does not prove that his slavery is natural. When a man is chained in slavery all the way he loses everything in life, even he loses his hope to get rid of slavery. Between freedom and slavery force takes a significant role. The force is compared to a war and it is one of the reasons for the rise of slavery. In Rousseau's view, man is a 'noble savage'. His life was very simple and happy in the oldest phase of civilization; but was perverted by the growth of 'reason' and inculcated the sense of distinction between 'mine' and 'thine'. A few persons created their own property so as to deprive others of the pleasures of a primitive communistic life. The origin of civil society and of the consequent social inequalities is to be found in private property. "The first man who, having enclosed a piece of land, bethought himself of saying 'this is mine', and found people enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society."^{xx}

Rousseau's conception of social contract seems, at first, analogous to Locke, but soon shows itself more akin to that of Hobbes. In the development from the state of nature, there comes a time when individuals can no longer maintain themselves in primitive independence; it then becomes necessary to self-preservation that they should unite to form a society. But how can I pledge my liberty without harming my interests? The problem is to find a form of association which will defend and protect with the whole common force the person and the goods of each associate and in which each, while uniting himself with all, may still obey himself alone, and remain as free as before. This is the fundamental problem of which the Social Contract provides the solution.

The contract consists in the total alienation of each associate, together with all his rights, to the whole community; for, in the first place, as each gives himself absolutely, the conditions are the same for all; and this being so, and no one has any interest in making them burdensome to others. The alienation is to be without reserve. "If individuals retained certain rights, as there would be no common superior to decide between them and the public, each, being on one point his own judge, would ask to be so an all; the state of nature would thus continue, and the association would necessarily become inoperative or tyrannical."^{xxi}

This implies a complete abrogation of liberty and a complete rejection of the doctrine of rights of man. It is true that there is some softening of his theory. It is there said that, although the social contract gives the body politic absolute power over all its members, nevertheless human beings have natural rights as men. The social contract can be stated in the following words: “Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme direction of the general will, and in our corporate capacity, we receive each member as an invisible part of the whole.”^{xxii} This act of association creates a moral and collective body, which is called the state.

The conception of ‘general will’, which appears in the above working of the contract, plays a very important part in Rousseau’s system. The social contract involves that whoever refuses to obey the general will shall be force to do so. ‘This means nothing less than that he will be forced to be free.’ This conception of being ‘forced to be free’ is very metaphysical. The general will in the time of Galileo was certainly anti-Copernican; was Galileo ‘force to be free’ when the inquisition compelled him to recant? Is even a malefactor ‘force to be free’ when he is put in prison? Think of Byron’s Corsair:

“O’er the glad waters of the deep blue sea
Our thoughts and as boundless and our hearts as free.”^{xxiii}

Would this man be more ‘free’ in a dungeon? The odd thing is that Byron’s noble pirates are a direct outcome of Rousseau, and speaks like a sophisticated policeman. Hegel, who owed much to Rousseau, adopted his misuse of the word ‘freedom’, and defined it as the right to obey the police, or something not very different. The general will is not identical with the will of the majority, or even with the will of all the citizens. It seems to be connected as the will belonging to the body politic as such. If we take Hobbes’ view, that a civil society is a person, we must suppose it endowed with the attributes of personality, including will. But then we are faced with the difficulty of deciding what the visible manifestations of this will are, and here Rousseau leaves us in the dark. We are told that the general will is always right and always tend to the public advantage; but it does not follow that the deliberation of people are equally correct, for there is often a great deal of

difference between the will of all and the general will. How, then, are we know what is the general will? There is, Rousseau writes: “If, when the people, being furnished with adequate information, held its deliberations, the citizens had no communication one with another, the grand total of the small differences would always give the general will, and the decision would always be good.”^{xxiv}

Rousseau cites the primitive family as the original form of civil society and there can be noticed a seeming parallel between the father and the magistrate. He points to the fact that the father is in a sense naturally superior to the other family members and he is thus a natural ruler. However, Rousseau argues against extending this claim over human beings in general, a view, similar to Aristotle’s argument for natural slavery. According to Aristotle, men are not equal, but that some were born for slavery and others for domination. He similarly argues against Grotius, whom he sees as advocating that a hundred or so men rule the rest of the human race. And finally he argues against Hobbes, who he claims has placed the sovereign ruler in a position of ruling superiority over the people.

The primary mistake that Aristotle, Grotius and Hobbes all make, according to Rousseau, is to confuse the question of what is with the question of what ought to be. If we examine the world around us, we do see just the kinds of inequalities that these authors describe. This mistake can also lead us to another mistaken notion, one that many of us find compelling on some level: ‘Might Makes Right’. We may be inclined to think that the law of a given society is whatever rules the government lays down and that we are compelled to follow. Whoever has the power to enforce the rules decides what is right and wrong. Rousseau rejects this however. While it may be an apt description, it fails to establish anything other than obedience out of fear. ‘Might Makes Right’ can never give anyone genuine sense of duty. It is not sufficient so as to give me a real moral obligation. In a clever example Rousseau states, “If a thief surprises me in a corner of the woods, I am forced to give him when I could hide it?”^{xxv} The same is with the law of state. They

are unjust like the robber in the woods; I may follow them out of prudence, but I certainly cannot be said to be obligated. In both the cases we are simply surrendering to violence.

Force can't produce right and it is changeable. Today a man or a ruler who is on the throne of power, in the course of time he is dethroned and it happens because change is inevitable. Sometimes man is compelled to live under force but he never accepts force willingly. Force is a physical quality that carries violence with it. In the ancient period, rulers or the victorious used force to get the dominant position and the losers are made slaves by them. Nobody wants to be a slave willingly but to be free. So in the acceptance of slavery, a man is always reluctant; in accepting slavery the survival of existence works in one's mind. A man is made slave by force. But Rousseau has argued that no man can have any right to make the other slave because to think of others as slave is absurd. The equation Man=Slave is meaningless. Whenever a man opts for slavery, willingly or unwillingly, he loses his meaning because his meaning is freedom. As 'man' means 'freedom', according to Rousseau, Man=Freedom. Man cannot be subjected to the laws of any other man or authority. If he is a slave, he is a slave to him only and not to the others. This is self-slavery or self-freedom. The so called civilized man forgets this. Thus, Rousseau understands freedom in terms of autonomy of human beings. Thus, whatever may be the point of view; nobody has the right to consider others as slave. It is not only because there is no legal rule to consider others as slave, but also because 'I have no right to consider others as slave'. Nobody wants to lose his freedom. If "I make a convention with you which is entirely at your expense and entirely to my profit, which I shall observe as long as I please and which you shall observe as long as I please",^{xxvi} then this type of convention is considered as foolish. One always has to go back to a first convention where their freedom and equality remain unavoidable. Man wake up to relate the concept of freedom and equality and to give up the force.

Hobbes shows that, it is a very horrible condition in which man is the enemy of man. Man being a selfish, egoistic, brutal, covetous and aggressive creature is free to defend himself either by running away from the scene or in confederacy with others.

There is nothing like peace, security, order, property, justice, industry, learning, trade and anything what we find now in a state/ society. There is all but fear and danger of a violent death. The law of nature informs man to be in competition with others and so invade others for some gain, or live in difference so as to be in search of safety, or seek glory so as to secure some reputation. In short, life of man is solitary, nasty, poor, brutish and short. But in Rousseau's thought, man is after all man: they are altogether emotional, sympathetic and lovable with each other. But why man goes to make civil state rather than state of nature? Rousseau does not avoid this question. In the state of nature man enjoys his sovereignty and security, but for the increase of population and other reasons, the above security slowly withers. This is why man needed to form society to secure and guarantee his survival. Unlike Hobbes, Rousseau maintains that man-made civil society only because to secure his freedom, security and sovereignty.

But now the question arises – how? Rousseau supposed that it is through the way of social contract. In what way it is done? Did one man make this contract with the others? Certainly not. Rousseau talks about a contract whereby all surrender their all in favour of all as a result of which a new authority in the name of 'general will' is created. It is formed not under any type of force but willingly. In 1688, Locke said that the supreme authority is higher parliament, where Rousseau says that the real sovereignty is 'general will of the people.' In the transformation from the state of nature to civil society, there is an intrinsic change in man's mind. The inclination of man was transformed into morality. This is how the lack of morality in the earlier stage is abolished and man found himself as moral being. Therefore Rousseau shows that man is united to secure his freedom and he made contract on the basis of general will and started living in societies. It is always to keep in our mind that to be in society, love, sympathy and sense of unity are unavoidable. In conclusion we may say that men are united realizing the importance of non-violence. Violence in the form of force and the institution of slavery cannot pave the way towards the 'The Nest of Peace.'

We can now focus the main differences of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau regarding the social contract theory. According to Hobbes social contract is made to terminate the horrible condition of life whereby all individuals surrender their all rights in favours of one man (or assembly of men) who offers no pledge of any kind; hence contract is unilateral, it is not binding on the sovereign --the leviathan or the master less man. Locke mentions to terminate this condition, two social contracts are made. By the first or open contract, state is created; individuals surrender only three natural rights for their protection by the state; government of one man (king) is created by the second or tacit agreement. But from Rousseau a social contract is made by the individuals in their individual as well as corporate capacities; all surrender their all rights in favour of all, a corporate whole (body politic) is created with a will of its own desiring good of all.

Marx's argument: Karl Marx's one of the greatest thinkers of human history seems to be a preacher of violence due to his theory of class-struggles and armed revolution. However, in our opinion he is a preacher of non-violence. His theory of class-struggle is not normative but only a statement of the fact. And the armed revolution he talks about is only a means. We have to take in an extreme situation if the situation demands and that only for the sake of a society free of violence. Karl Marx speaks of violence to end violence against the dominated class. How far his theory is practicable is a different question. A discussion of his theory may clarify our stands.

We would like to discuss the pre-historic stages of culture before to discuss Marxist conception of class, class-struggle and socialist revolution. Engels in his book '*The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*' starts with the three main epochs: savagery, barbarism and civilization. Morgan was the first person with expert knowledge to attempt to introduce a definite order into the pre-history of man; unless important additional material necessitates alternatives, his classification may be expected to remain in force. Of the three main epochs, Morgan naturally concerned only with the first two, and with the transition to the third. He subdivides each of these two epochs into a lower, middle and upper stage, according to the progress made in the production of the

means of subsistence; Morgan says: “Upon their skill in this direction, the whole question of human supremacy on the earth depended. Mankind are the only being who may be said to have gained on absolute control over the production of the food. The great epochs of human progress have been identified, more or less directly, with the enlargement of the source of subsistence.”^{xxvii} The evolution of the family proceeds concurrently, but does not offer such conclusive criteria for the delimitation of the periods.

In the course of discussion the poem of Homer, particularly *Iliad*, we find the upper stage of barbarism at its zenith. “Improved iron tools, the bellows, the hand mill, the potter’s wheel, the making of oil and wine, the working up of metals developing into an art, wagons and war chariots, shipbuilding with planks and beams, the beginnings of architecture as an art, walled towns with towers and battlements, the Homeric epic and the entire mythology-- these are the chief heritages carried over by the Greeks in their transition from barbarism to civilization.”^{xxviii} If we compare with this Caesar’s and even Tacitus’ descriptions of the Germans, who were on the thousands of the threshold of that stage of culture from which the Homeric Greeks were preparing to advance to a higher one, we will see how rich was the development of production in the upper stages of barbarism. We can generalize Morgan’s periodization of three stages as follows: Savagery- the period in which the appropriation of natural products, ready for use, predominated; the products of human art are chiefly instruments which assist this appropriation. Barbarism is the period in which knowledge of cattle breeding and land cultivation was acquired and in which method of increasing the productivity of nature through human activity was learnt. Civilization is the period in which knowledge of the further working-up of natural products, of industry proper, and of art was acquired.

After that Engels tries to connect the transition into these stages with a change in the way that family is defined and the rules by which it is governed. “The Family” says Morgan “represents an active principle. It is never stationary, but advances from a lower to a higher form as society advances from a lower to a higher condition. Systems of consanguinity, on the contrary, are passive, regarding the progress made by the family at

long intervals apart and only changing radically when the family has radically changed.”^{xxix} And Marx adds ‘the same applies to political, juridical, religious and philosophical systems generally.’ Morgan acknowledges four stages in the family. These are the consanguine family, the punaluan family, the pairing family, and the monogamous family. We are confronted with a series of forms of the family which directly contradict the forms of hitherto generally accepted as being the only ones prevailing. The traditional conception knows monogamy only, along with polygamy on the part of individual man, and even perhaps, polyandry of the part of individual women and hushes up the fact - as is the way with moralizing philistines- that in practice these bounds imposed by official society are silently but unblushingly transgressed. The study of the history of the primitive society, on the contrary, reveals to us conditions in which man live in polygamy and their wives simultaneously in polyandry, and the common children are therefore regarded as being common to them all; in their turn, these condition undergo a while series of modification until they are ultimately dissolved in monogamy. These modifications are of such a character that the circle of people embraced by the tie of common marriage -- very wide originally becomes narrower and narrower, until, finally only the single couple is left, which predominates today.

In a small family the need of property never arises. When the members of family are increased day by day and one family mixed up with another family and with their ideas then consistently the idea of property is came into existence. Engels ideas on the role of property in the creation in the modern family and as such modern civilization begin to become more transparent. Engel discussed the early human history, following the disintegration of the primitive community and the emergence of a class society based on private property.

The early socialists, notably Saint Simon (1760-1825), attacked the liberal conception of property along with concepts like liberty, equality etc. Saint Simon declared that the liberals were deceiving themselves with abstract fictions. He was not in favour of total abolition of private property; in fact he was in favour of drastic reform of

ownership in the form of land than property held as capital. His followers, however, opposed property both in the form of land and capital. They felt that property inculcates habits of idleness and fosters a practice of living upon the labour of others. The liberal view of sanctity and inviolability of property was thus seriously questioned.

In consonance with the early socialist thinkers, Marx and Engels carried the attack on private property further by making it an integral part of their attack on capitalism of 1860s. The capitalist society according to Marx was divided into two poles-at one pole there was accumulation of wealth and at the opposite pole there was misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality and mental degradation. The capitalism was ‘dripping from head to foot, from every pore, with blood and dirt’. According to Marxist theory of surplus value, the labourer was producing more value than was necessary to keep him and his dependence alive, for this labour the worker did not earn more than a subsistence wage and this resulted in exploitation and alienation of the great mass of people. This alienation is the direct outcome of property, helplessness, division of society into classes and such other factors which isolate working people in a capitalist society. The principal evil force behind this degradation is the institution of private property.

In *Das Capital*, Vol. I. Marx wrote: “Just as every qualitative difference between commodities as extinguished in money, so money, on its side, like the radical leveller that it is, does away with all distinctions. But money itself is a commodity, an external object, capable of becoming the private property of any individual. Thus social power becomes the private power of private persons. The ancients therefore denounced money as subversive of the economic and moral order of things”.^{xxx}

Shakespeare, in ‘*Timon of Athens*’, depicts a picture how money does away with all distinctions:

“Gold? yellow, glittering, precious gold?

 Thus much of this will make black white,
 foul fair,

Wrong right, base noble, old young, coward
 valiant

 This yellow slave
 Will knit and break religions, bless th'
 accurs'd',
 Make the hoar leprosy ador'd, place thieves
 And give them title, knee, and approbation,
 With senators on the bench. This is it
 That makes the wappen'd widow wed
 again-
Come, damn'd
 earth,
 Thou common whore of mankind,
”xxxix

As the division of labour, the use of money and growth of private property increase, man's alienation becomes more acute and reaches its zenith in the modern capitalist society.

The above discussion shows that in the pre-historic stages of culture how private property came into existence. Now we shall try to discuss the genesis of the society in the light of historical materialism and our attempt also consists in classifying the production, class, class-conflict, class-struggle and socialist revolution.

The concept of history of Karl Marx is known as historical materialism. Historical materialism is a Marxist theory of society. While Darwin described the evolution of species, Marx describes the evolution of society. Marxist sociology refers constantly to the 'development of society'. Thinkers earlier to Marx consider that society was established mechanically. But Marx does not agree with this view. According to him, society is not the product of will of man or groups of man. For the survival of their existence men were involved in work for production. Men knew well that food, cloth and

shelter are the essential for survival. They also agreed to accept that it is not possible for a single man to produce these essential things. Thus united they formed society. Marx was the first to put sociology on a scientific basis by establishing the concept of economic formation of society as the sum-total of given production relations. "In the social production which men carry on, they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society-the real foundation on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determine their existence, but on the contrary their social existence determines their consciousness".^{xxxii} At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come into conflict with the existing relations of production with the property relations within which they had been at work. From forms of development of the forces of production, these relations turn into their fetters. With the change of economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformation the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic, in short ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out. Just as our opinion of an individual is not based on what he thinks of himself, so we cannot judge of such a period of transformation by its own consciousness; on the contrary this consciousness must rather be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflict between the social forces of production and the relation of production. No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces, for which there is room in it, have been developed and the new higher relations of productive never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore, mankind always takes up only such

problems as it can solve; since looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem itself arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. In broad outlines we can designate the Asiatic, the ancient, the feudal and the modern bourgeois methods of production as so many epochs in the progress of the economic formation of society.

In his *Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx differentiates between various stages of human history. Just as Auguste Comte differentiated moments of human evolution on the basis of ways of thinking, Marx differentiated stages of human history on the basis of their economic regimes and he distinguished in his terminology four modes of production which he called the Asiatic, the Ancient, the Feudal and the Bourgeois.

Thus the history of society is the development and law-governed succession of the modes of production. This succession passes through five stages or five consecutive modes of production: Primitive Communal, Slave, Feudal, Capitalist and socialist.

1. Primitive Society: This was the first and the lowest form of organization of people. It existed for thousands of years. In this stage men utilized primitive implements. By these they improved their work. The relation of production and productive forces were on a lower level. Everything was done on communal basis. The people tilled the communal land together with common tools and living in a common dwelling, sharing products equally. The productive forces developed slowly. With the growth of the labour productivity the clan began to break into families. The family became the owner of the means of production. Thus arose of private property and with its social inequality. This resulted into the first antagonistic classes, masters and slaves.
2. Slave Society: The earlier stage of human society, called primitive communism by Marx, was a community in society. People were few. People did not have the sense accumulation. But when man started using the result of one day's

labour over a number of days, the tendency to accumulation increased. This was the beginning of the convention of wealth.

Ownership over objects spread to ownership over men because slaves helped to increase the inflow of objects. In this way slave and master classes came into being a society and consequently, grew master and slave morality. Slave morality was service of masters. There was a vast gulf between the lives of the two. This increased dissatisfaction which in its turn, led to class conflict. Slaves revolted against the masters for equal rights.

3. Feudal Society: As time passed the masters did concede some rights to slaves. They possessed some ownership over land but a major portion of the yield still went to the masters. It was the inception lordship society. In this society, too, there were two conflicting classes- serfs and lords. This society became more and more complex. Lords were superseded by lords and these by kings or emperors. The serfs laboured and the lords or kings benefited.
4. Capitalist Society: Thus the conflict became graver. The conflict rooted out the lordship system. On the other side, steam was discovered and the forces of production and factories worked on steam engines. This created the labour class. The lords abandoned their dukedoms and entered the industrial field. They created the capitalist or owner class. They joined hands with businessman and while collared middle class people. Thus society was again stratified into two layers or classes -- the bourgeois and the proletariat or labour class. This is the present state of society. In the bourgeois and proletariat morality too, there is a tremendous conflict as in all conflicting classes. The policy of the bourgeois is one of exploitation. They have nothing to do with the problems of the proletariat.
5. Communist Society: The fifth or the last mode of production, according to Karl Marx, is socialist. The socialist mode of production, in contrast to the capitalist, is based on social ownership. The productive forces and production

relations are governed by the socialist ownership characterized by cooperation and mutual assistance. In socialist society relations of production conform to the character of the productive forces. However, contradictions in socialism are only removed in communism which requires better forces of social production. This is the society aimed at after revolutionary overthrow of the capitalist society. It will be marked by the most perfect relations between free people and high intelligence and all-round development. This communist society, according to Marx, is the future society aimed at by all development and revolution. This is best defined by the Party Programmed in USSR in these words, "Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by growth of productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology: all the springs of cooperative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs will be implemented. Communism is a highly organized society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become life's prime want of everyone, a necessity recognized by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people."^{xxxiii}

In this way, according to Marx, the social ideals of an age depend upon its social and economic circumstances. Means of production and means of distribution undergo change and with them change the social order, as well as the form of conflicting classes and even the nature of morality. The true morality is exemplified only by the exploited class because it gravitates us towards the ideal society, a communist order. In the history of social evolution we discern that the exploiters of society were always conflicting whereas the exploited were always friendly and loving. This conflict can be resolved only

in a classless society. Capitalism will vanish effortlessly in time and the age of proletariat will come. According to Marx, the social order of such an age has two states- socialism and communism. In socialism every worker will get wages according to the work he does and in communism according to his needs. In the communist state the class struggle will come to an end. The disparity between mental and physical labour will lose recognition and the government and religion will be destroyed. Only then will true morality be conceived. As Engels expresses it, “A really human morality which transcends class antagonism and their legacies in thought becomes possible only at a stage of society which has not only overcome class antagonism but has been forgotten them in practical life.”^{xxxiv}

Establishing the theory of social classes Marx went to point out that there has always been class conflict among different classes. “The history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggle. Free men and slaves, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or in the common ruin of the contending classes.”^{xxxv} Marx’s original idea was that there is a fundamental contradiction between wage earners and capitalists. He was convinced moreover, that this fundamental opposition of interests dominated all the capitalist society and would assume an increasingly simplified form in the course of historical development. From another point of view, as an excellent observer of historical reality, Marx was aware of the plurality of social groups, a plurality, reducible to two large groups, namely, capitalist and proletariat. However, a capitalist society did exhibit these two features which should not be confused with social groups. In the case of the workers versus the owners of the means of production, the various inertia which may be invented or observed are identified.

Accepting the difference between the conflict among classes in ancient society and the modern society and the difference between the natures of exploitation Marx admitted,

“The fact that modern workers are formally ‘free’ to sell their labour while being existentially constrained to do so makes their condition historically specific and functionally distinct from that of earlier exploited classes.”^{xxxvi}

The industrial workers have a determined mode of existence which depends on the lot they are assigned in capitalist society. They are conscious of their solidarity; they become conscious of their antagonism towards other social groups, hence, become a ‘social class’ in the true sense of the term. The proletariat will plan it in fundamental opposition of the capitalists. There are sub-groups within each of these classes and also groups which are not yet identified into the camp of one or the other of two chief actors in the drama of history. But these exterior or marginal groups will gradually, in the course of historical revolution, be obliged to join one or the other of the two existing camps, of the proletariat or the camp of capitalists. The proletariat feels as like one of the most popular Bengali poem:

Our liberty will be gifted by none,
Neither God, nor any king or any leader,
Our liberation is our tusk,
Will have to win it by our hands.

Marx’s theory of class conflict requires the understanding of the development of the proletariat, the importance of property, the identification of economic and political power, the identification of authority, polarization of classes, theory of surplus value, alienation, class solidarity and antagonism, revolution, the dictatorship of proletariat and finally the inauguration of the communist society. The class conflict starts with the development of proletariat, the importance of property and the polarization of classes. It is a result of exploitation of the proletariat by the capitalist and their consequent pauperization. Exploitation leads to alienation. Class solidarity and antagonism leads to revolution. Revolution eliminates capitalism and establishes dictatorship of proletariat. The class conflict ends in the inauguration of the communist society. In fact, the most significant part of the social thought of Marx is the theory of class conflict. The above

mentioned factors may be classified in three groups: the development of social classes, the class conflict and finally the revolution.

Marx and Engels had no clear and unambiguous formula of revolution. Although in the Marxist system the idea of revolution is of decisive importance, neither he nor Engels attempted to define the precise significance of the concept. Adopting the radical revolutionary trend in the mood that prevailed before and during the year 1848, Marx and Engels declared themselves and declared socialism to be pre-eminently revolutionary, and yet they offered no exact analysis of this most important element in their system. We cannot attribute the neglect solely to regard for the censorship of absolutism for they were manifestly disinclined to say much about this serious theme. "A revolution is something to effect and not to talk about: for resolute practical men, the details are a matter of course: the prospects of success must be clear, or the attempt of revolution will not be made-this is the main point." (William Ebenstein, *Political Thought in Perspective*, McGraw hill book company, New York, 1957, p 287.)

In the above passage we have analysed the division among classes in society, the class-conflicts etc. But what is a class according to Marx? It is really sad that when Marx was about to answer this question in his *Capital* he died. Ossowski has rightly complained: "The role of class concept in Marxian doctrine is so immense that it is astonishing not to find a definition of this concept, which they use so constantly, anywhere in the works of either Marx or Engels." ^{xxxvii} David McLellan points out few features of Marx's theory of class. He says "Marx's definition of class seems to vary greatly, not only with the development of his thought, but even within the same period. Marx often uses the term, in common with the usage of his time, as a synonym for fiction or group."^{xxxviii} What McLellan wants to emphasize is that Marx did not adhere to any fixed notion about class. He viewed this as the background of existing conditions. With the change of economic conditions, structure and composition of class underwent changes. Marx had to accept it and incorporate it into his definition.

We have earlier noted that Marx views the concept of class in the light of struggle. We here hold the view that the question of struggle cannot arise without the rise of consciousness. That is class struggle is possible only when the members of the class are conscious of their position and condition. The condition can be designated in simple language as suffering or exploitation. Consciousness again leads hostility. A class according to Marx will always view its own interests and will give priority to the interests and when doing this a conflict with another opposing class becomes inevitable. Hence consciousness, conflict and struggle inevitably connected with the idea of class.

History of human civilization is the sequence of contradiction. It is a struggle between the classes. “Marx has held that the revolution will result from the development material forces of production as they come into conflict with the relations of productions. The economic contradiction is the prime cause of revolution, in turn leads to a radical change of society. The workers firmly believe that sporadic and piecemeal efforts cannot improve their conditions and left them from the morass of exploitation. The revolution is only the reply to the exploitation.”^{xxxix} Marx in this way has suggested that the class struggle is the motive force of development. The term “development” has a broader connotation in Marxism. It implies overall progress of society.

The class struggle effects the development of productive forces. It speeds up the improvement of the means of labour. When the workers will demand for shorter working hours and through struggle they will realize it, the manufacturers will be compelled to introduce higher and improved technology. Otherwise they will not be able to keep intact or expand the surplus value. The struggle of the workers is everywhere the prime cause of introducing new machines. So the class struggle has positive effects. It provides the greatest inspiration for development.

The class struggle also gives an impetus to the development of production relations. Obsolete production-relations are not automatically changed under the impact of productive forces that have developed within their framework. The ruling class will resist any change in the relations of production. This class will support the old production

relations. In order to overcome the resistance of the ruling class a more powerful force is required and that force is class struggle.

The ruling class is a very powerful force and it has at its disposal enough strength to nullify any progressive measures. It will always adhere to the out dated measures and techniques. Only a class struggle can bring about the change. The ruling class does not want any development, because they may not maximize its profit or surplus value. The bourgeois theoreticians enthusiastically pled for reforms and compromise. But Marx summarily discards them. Without a struggle leading to revolution, progress of development, is impossible.

Although the ultimate purpose of class struggle is development, its history reveals that this was not achieved in past as a single event of class struggle. The class struggle proceeded step by step towards its apex goal. It can be illustrated in the following way. In the slave-society the slaves fought against the slave owners not for the changing the ownership of means of production or relations of production but for the abolition of slavery. The uprising of the slaves forced the slave-owners to accept the major demands of slave such as ownership of land. That is, the slaves were awarded the ownership of land. This system converted the slaves into small peasants and serfs. Thus, arose feudalism.

The peasants after that struggled against the landlords to the end the exploitation. The end of slave system and advent the feudalism could not draw a curtain over the exploitation. Hence the class struggle continued through the different forms and between different types of classes. It is to be noted here that the feudal system in comparison with the slave-system, was a better and an improved class system. The class struggle made this possible. The peasants' struggle in the feudal period played a very important part since it promoted the abolition of feudal mode of production and feudal production relations. Thus the peasants' struggle against the feudal lords created certain positives steps for the advancement of society. The slaves in the earlier epoch even could not imagine of changing the relations of productions and overthrowing authority.

Then comes industrialization which changes the whole panorama of society completely. The industrial proletariat appeared and asserted itself as an independent force. The misery leads the proletarians to demand for the abolition of private property. When the property is released from private control its full utilization becomes possible. The whole system of property or the sources of production are used for the development of society as a whole. Only the class struggle makes it possible.

We have so far discussed several aspects of class struggle. Now time has arrived to explore the causes of class struggle. The class struggle, which occupies such important place in Marxism, is not due to the cantankerous nature of classes or people. The bourgeois ideologist admit the existence of classes but do not say that there classes are involved in irreconcilable conflicts, though there might be sporadic clashes. The prime cause of this clash is the misunderstanding and it is resolved without disrupting the normal functioning of society. Bourgeois theoreticians do not fell the necessity of revolution for the settlement of disputes between the classes. Again, they do not think that struggle is the potent force of development. Peaceful coexistence causes the development of society.

Marx and Engels have held that mere communication gap is not the cause of conflict. The class struggle is caused by the diametrically opposed social positions and contradictory interests of the different classes. What is a class interest? It is determines not by the consciousness of the class but by its position and role in the system of social production. In the capitalist system of production the proletariat is deprived of the ownership of the means of production and is thus deprived of all privileges. The workers are also subjected to exploitation. So the workers feel that it is capitalism which is the source of misery and suffering. Not any particular worker is victim of capitalist exploitation, but the working class as a whole. But the consciousness cannot be exited from the domain of class interest. The working class must be conscious of the extent and the nature of exploitation and must also be conscious that only the overthrow of

capitalism can emancipate this class. Hence the class interest and consciousness are inextricably connected.

The cause of class struggle is the opposition of interests. The interest of the capitalist class is to maximize the profit, whereas the interest of the working class lies in the enhancement of wage sufficient for the comfortable living. Workers' demand is quite rational in the sense that wage must always be proportionate to the contribution of production. To put the matter in simple language-maximization of profit is the objective of one class and maximum wage is another class.

These diametrically opposite interests cannot be reconciled. The socialist predecessors of Marx, particularly the utopian socialists, heavily depended upon the goodwill and philanthropic mentality of the capitalists and they believed that the capitalists would concede some of the basic and legitimate demands of the working class voluntarily. Adjustment and conciliation, they thought, were sufficient weapons to improve the economic conditions. But Marx and Engels have discarded this as absurd. It is impossible to think or assume that the capitalists will part with a portion of their profit. The capitalists cannot deviate from the path of profit motive. The surplus value is the source of capitalist formation. Again, the exploitation swells the surplus value. On the other hand, the working class resorts to struggle not simply for survival but for the realization of their legitimate demands. Which the capitalists are not prepared to concede.

Class struggle in antagonistic capitalist society is not the result of any single factor. The immediate cause is the exploitation. But it is not happen always. The intransigence of the capitalists, the determination of the working class to abolish exploitation, rise of consciousness, the maturity of contradiction and the inability of the capitalists to provide long-term palliatives against the erosion of influence-all these combine together to precipitate struggle.

There is no country in the world which can arrive at socialism without first going through historical period of transition. According to Marx and Engels, revolution is the weapon to abolish capitalism and form socialism. Some thinkers considered that

revolution is nothing but the external or the accidental meter, but Marx did not consider revolution in this way. According to him, revolution is internal and it does not arise accidentally, it arises when the class struggle is evoked by diametrically opposed social positions and contradictory interests of different classes.

Bourgeois want to change the social system peacefully, rather than in violent way. They also consider that there is no difference between violence and revolution; these two are intimately related with each other. According to the bourgeois, revolution means violence; it creates great fear in the people. On the other hand, Aptheker, a prominent thinker, analyses Marxist view and says that violence is not identical with revolution. On the basis of Marx's comment that 'force is the midwife of every old society which is pregnant with the new', Bourgeois are conclude that revolution and violence are same. But we don't think that for the sake of revolution violence is the only way. Marx was not very much eager for violence, but he thinks that violence play an essential role whenever any revolution brought together in the world. Aptheker also says that 'force' and 'violence' are same to Bourgeois. But Marx does not used 'force' for 'violence', he considers 'force' as 'state force'. So it can be said following Marx violence is not essential part of revolution.

According to Aptheker, a revolutionist would not like to change the society in the process of malevolent. But in the earlier stages of revolution the supporters of society structure create obstacles against revolutionist to protect their existence and it is usually brought-together in the way of violence. Aptheker says, the source of violence is in reaction, it is in response to that challenge that resistance may be offered. But from this we should not conclude that revolution means violence. A revolutionist himself does not choose the path of violence. In the primary stage of revolutionist usually do not chose the path of violence. It is in reaction to the violent resistance, he or she chooses violence. This interpretation suggests that only when it becomes impossible to prevent injustice without violence, it is used. Again, we must keep it in our mind that violence as a means is taken only to establish non-violence at the end.

In the above the discussion we have seen that violence is not intimately related with Marxist revolution. We can conclude then that violence is not an organic part of the definition of the process of revolution and that the conventional presentation which equates violence with revolution is false. In fact, there is no revolutionist who says that violence is an inevitable part of revolution.

Marxist ethics regards conscience as an attribute of man's social nature, a subjective expression of a certain social and historical imperative. It, together with a sense of duty, makes man aware of his moral responsibility towards himself and towards the other people and the society at large. The idealist and the subjectivist thinkers hold it to be an individual affair. But this view ignores the fact that conscience serves as a vehicle for the different social and class substance and that it has emerged in history in the process of man's social development.

The morality of the communists is the basis for the formation of general human morality in a classless society. It is a qualitatively new ethical theory not only by virtue of its philosophical ground work but also due to its social class orientation. It represents the interests of the suffering humanity and opens up for men unprecedentedly broad and drastically new opportunities of moral advancement and activity.

The transition from capitalism to socialism is marked by a moral turning point in the relations among people. Inheriting the valuable experience of mankind in general it fosters humane incentives for men and society's moral improvement-there being no class inequality and no oppression of man by man. Free development of the individual is no longer a mere phrase but it becomes a reality. Thus a new morality emerges which declares man the supreme value, promotes the all-round development of each person and enrichment of human relations. It rests on comradesly mutual assistance, co-operation, friendliness; honesty and sense of duty-all men are friends, comrades and brothers. The communist humanism demands equal justice, equal right, equal freedom, equal opportunity for all keeping in mind that each man and every member of the society has an equal right to happiness. Its ideal is to fight for man for his free and harmonious

development. Not violence but love is the keynote of the communist society. Violence is justified only when it is unavoidable-it is not an end in itself, for it deprives us of our manhood. The communist social ideal will make it possible to put an end to all kinds of exploitation, oppression, poverty famine and open new prospects for moral evolution. Moral problems are to be solved with humanistic outlook, with more humane types of consciousness. Thus a qualitatively new stage of moral progress will begin with the emergence of a new type of man, a harmoniously developed socialist type of the individual. It indicates a major milestone on the road of humanity's moral advancement. The transition socialism to communism indicates more harmonious development of personality. There will be no hankering after wealth. The main objective of human activity is not to obtain material wealth but a man's life for the good of all - a life aimed at most fully developing the creative potential, original talents and abilities of each members of society. It is at this stage that man becomes the supreme value, the goal of historical and social development.

With the formation of classless society, state power would lose its function and the state would 'wither away'. The victory of socialism radically changes the character of the working people; they can no longer be called proletariat. There will be no distinction among men. The passage from socialism to communism is based on the gradual obliteration of essential distinctions among workers, peasants and intelligentsia. It establishes truly humanistic relations based on the principle that man is to man a friend and brother. It steers the colossal ship of the society against the natural currents and storms of history to the shore of living creative humanism.

Karl Marx was not a proletarian by birth or by his way of living. His open kindness, his profound sense of facts, his ardent desire to make man the master of his own social environment, his sympathy for the working community, his aim to give men more freedom, more equality, more justice and more security, the burning desire to help the poor and oppressed and genuine feeling for the whole mankind - all these made him one of the world's most influential fighters against hypocrisy and all kinds of exploitation

prevalent in the society. His humane appeal, the humanistic basis of proletarian movement appeals to many honest members of society. For this Marx left no stones unturned and he devoted immense labour to forging what he believed to be scientific weapons for the fight to improve the vast majority of men.

The above discussion shows that the aim of Marx is to establish a classless and communist society. In the Marxist thought violence is not a necessary means as well as the end for the formation of classless society. In the starting level of Marxist philosophy, some thinkers may think that violence is the unavoidable part of revolution, but the aim of Marx is to form non-violent society.

The teaching of Marx is all-powerful because it is true. It is complete and harmonious, providing men with a consistent view of the universe, which cannot be reconciled with any superstition, any reaction, and any defence of bourgeois oppression. It is the lawful successor of the best that has been created by humanity in the nineteenth century-German philosophy, English political economy and French socialism. Basically socialism is not identical with Marxism, but Marxism is an extremely important and significant socialistic system.

So far we have discussed the very notion of non-violence as a demand of society in the light of social-contract thinkers and Karl Marx. In our discussion we have analysed pre-social, pre-political social stage following Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. And in Marx's philosophy, we have found how society changes from feudal to capitalistic stage. Social contract is a cementing factor for the formation of society. By contract we may mean agreement in mutual cooperation. Non-violence cannot be enforced, because to enforce non-violence is also a form of violence. Violence, if at all justified, is only when it is unavoidable – it is not an end in itself, for it deprives us of our humanhood. Non-violence as a demand of society does not mean that there has been no violence in the genesis of society. Violence is animal instinct. But human beings survived only by forming a society and society makes it possible for humans to be more than mere animal. Society is sustained only by the principle of non-violence, by shedding of the animal

nature of human being. We have tried to justify this claim already with the help of the writings of the thinkers discussed above.

There is no doubt that feelings of men to act together or to do something in the way of unity, brotherhood or fellow-feelings is the seed of non-violence. Here, it is clear that if men only go through the path of violence, nothing could be formed. Though violence is the part of human nature, men have more than it. So before forming a civil society, at first they had to get united and give up hatred. Willingly or unwillingly, they realized that non-violence is the only way that could save men from extinction. Formation of society paved the way for human survival and non-violence is the condition without which it could not be formed.

ⁱ Amal Roy and Mohit Bhattacharya, *Political Theory-Ideas and Institutions*, World Press, Kolkata, 1969, p 71, as it is found in Gilchrist, *Principle of Political Science*, p 55

ⁱⁱ Ibid. as it is found in Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, p 241

ⁱⁱⁱ J. C. Johari, *Principle of Modern Political Science*, Sterling Publishers, Delhi, 1988, p 105

^{iv} William Kelley Wright, *A History of Modern Philosophy*, The Macmillan Company, New York, 1963. p 63-64, as it is found in Idem, Part-I, Chap-XIII

^v Bertrand Russell, *History of Western Philosophy and its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to Present Day*, Ruskin House Museum Street, London, 1961. p 535

^{vi} J. C. Johari, *Principle of Modern Political Science*, Sterling Publishers, p 105-106, as it is found in *Leviathan*, chap xvii

^{vii} *Political Theory- Ideas and Institutions*, p 72, as it is found in *Leviathan*, chap xvii

^{viii} *A History of Modern Philosophy*, p 65-66

^{ix} Ibid, p 66, as it is found in the thirteen laws of nature are stated and expounded in the *Leviathan*, chap xiii and xiv

^x <http://www.essayfrog.com>.

^{xi} *History of Western Philosophy and its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to Present Day*, p 535

^{xii} <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Leviathan>.

^{xiii} *A History of Modern Philosophy*, p 166

^{xiv} *Political Theory-Ideas and Institutions*, p 74, as it is found in Locke: *Second Treatise of Government*, chap 2. Para 5

^{xv} *Principle of Modern Political Science*, p 106

^{xvi} *History of Western Philosophy and its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to Present Day*, p 602

^{xvii} *Principle of Modern Political Science*, p 115, as it is found in Locke: *Second Treatise of Civil Government*, chap 2

^{xviii} *A History of Modern Philosophy*, p 168

^{xix} Victor Gourevitch, (edited and translated) Rousseau, *The Social Contract and the later political writings* Book-I, Chapter one, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, p 41

^{xx} B. Russell, *History of Western Philosophy and its Connection with Political and Social Circumstances from the Earliest Times to Present Day*, p 663

^{xxi} *Ibid*, p 670

^{xxii} D. Deol, *Liberalism and Marxism: An Introduction to the Study of Contemporary Politics*, Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, 1976, p 65

^{xxiii} *The Social Contract and the later political writings* p 671

^{xxiv} *Ibid*, p 672

^{xxv} James J. Delaney, *Starting with Rousseau*, New York, 2009, p 120

^{xxvi} *Rousseau: The Social Contract and the later political writings*, Book-I, chapter four, p 48.

-
- ^{xxvii} Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, 'Selected Works' in Two Volumes, (vol. I), Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1949, p 169
- ^{xxviii} Ibid, p 173
- ^{xxix} Ibid, p 175-176
- ^{xxx} Bidhuranjan Nath, *Marxist Ethics: an Evaluation*, Progressive Publishers, Calcutta, 2002, p 68, as it is found in *Capital*, vol. I., p 132
- ^{xxxi} Ibid, p 68-69. As it is found in William Shakespeare, *Timon of Athens*, Act IV, Scene-III, Complete works p 958
- ^{xxxii} Ram Nath Sharma & Rajendra K. Sharma, *History of Social Thought*, Media Promoters & Publishers Pvt. Ltd., Bombay, 1999, p 159
- ^{xxxiii} Ibid, p 164
- ^{xxxiv} Ibid, p 165
- ^{xxxv} Ibid, p 171-172, as it is found in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *The Class Struggle in Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni-Halevy (eds) Social Change* (New York, Basic Books, 1913), p 102
- ^{xxxvi} Ibid, p 172
- ^{xxxvii} *Liberalism and Marxism*, p 209
- ^{xxxviii} Prangobinda Das, *History of Political Thought*, New Central Book Agency (P) Ltd., Kolkata, 2006, p 596
- ^{xxxix} Ibid, p 602
- ^{xxxix} *Marxist Ethics: An Evaluation*, p 10, as it is found in *The German Ideology-collected Works*, vol 5, Progressive Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p 247