

# ATHEIST SEARCH FOR MORALITY IN 19<sup>TH</sup> CENTURY

MALABIKA CHAKRABARTI

**Key Words:** 19<sup>th</sup> Century, Nietzsche, Marx, Darwin, Morality, Ethics, Atheist

## 1. The Conflict

Theist emotion prioritizes God in every aspects of life. They develop some images based on that emotion and furnish God as the lord of this world who produce and protect life on this earth. They think that someone has to obtain the ingredients of life from him and even the peace of life can be obtained through his merciful flair. But such thinking basically paves the way of escape from anyone's guilt by involving God in that act. As ethics can judge the merit or quality of only the human acts and actions, if we accept God as the master of all who prompts us to do our deeds, how can one judge the ethical values of those acts? Where human are the puppets of omnipotent God, they can have hardly any responsibility of any of their actions and therefore nothing can be judged for ethical standards. They opined that the level of real existence is there where human beings entangle with the almighty in a close bondage and real Christians fall in love of God beyond rationality. But skeptics never left any stones unturned in such acceptance of God particularly in the domain of ethics or morality.

Human life is made up with different values. Among them moral values are one of the fundamentals which make human realizing the acceptance or rejection of human actions in any circumstances and in life also. We appreciate that any kind of livelihood can never be acknowledged. There may be many options in life like good or bad, honest and dishonest, true or false, loyal or disloyal and so on, but morality teaches us to accept the first options for each of them. Moral values are those which train us to restrain our actions, prevent us to act falsely or treacherously. Thus, to an intelligent man, life is not only for living but to build properly, to act rationally, to contribute rightly for others and

for the betterment of future. In contrast, theists impose objection here. According to them God leads human beings in the path of advancement with his own judgment.

In any moral decision the role of decision maker is essential. At the same time, the decision maker must be someone with enough knowledge, rational mind and judgmental capacity. If we release the responsibility of judgment by accepting the almighty and do the sin acts there will be no use of morals or ethics. Instead of it, if we consider the conscience as judge then only we can proceed for ethical interpretation or moral judgment for a situation or act, because conscience is such a quality of human mind which possess the spontaneous ability to analyze the moral values. If so, then person will be the fulcrum or decider of his own act. Contrary to the so called popular believes of entanglement of theism and ethics, if we deeply analyze the ancient Indian and modern Western philosophical thoughts it can be understood that basically theism and ethics are not synonymous.

Morality and ethics has emerged from logical judgment. It is true that we may not explain everything around us always with proper logic, nor even in this age of modern scientific advancement. That's why the life is mysterious and beautiful, it is not predictable. But the progress of human civilization depends on logical development of scientific knowledge and we have to proceed rationally to meet every problem. If rationality fails for a moment in any situation we should not submit before that, rather our effort must continue in search of rationality or to make logical explanation. Human existence can be proved neither in acceptance of defeat nor in believing anything beyond logic, but to establish logic to cross the barriers and discarding illogical submission.

Actually the concept of ethics or morality is complex. So it can be discussed from various perspectives. Ethics changes its dimension from point to point, situation to situation. It may differ its stand for an anthropologist to a sociologist, again for a psychologist to a Marxist or even to a Darwinian evolutionist. The subject is flexible as per the analyst's perspective; decisions may change accordingly. Hence, no single and specific definition or decision may be possible for the ethical and moral values. This fluidity or dynamicity of morality depending on the situation or need and the person's analytical exercise make

ethics a challenging subject. So it is something immature to introduce someone supreme to impose morality. Our act is our doing and there is no point to pray to someone to inoculate someone's morality. Rather human act in any moral ground according to his or her own virtue, emotion, situation and mental ability. To accept this view, we need to establish the fact with the proper logical contexts and from different philosophical backgrounds.

In the present discussion we will consider how the perspective to morality evolved from individual to collective or social dimension; and how the prominent contemporary philosophical thoughts of 19<sup>th</sup> Century tried to address the issue of morality. In this process, we will look upon the approach of Fredric Nietzsche, who was one of the strongest flag bearers of atheist existentialism from the nineteenth century. While Nietzsche emphasized on individual empowerment to counter the social enigma, Karl Marx argued for social revolution by introducing the class concept and his perception of morality came from collective or social status. In contrast to both, Charles Darwin came with his theory from a completely different sector where observation on natural world instigate him to develop his theory which is now actively practiced in explaining different phenomena of life forms and now extended as 'evolutionary psychology' to explain human behavior. All these three philosophical schools originated in 19<sup>th</sup> Century and refuted God to explain their thoughts. These three philosophers had their interest to others theory, but were considerably differed from others in their thoughts and approaches.

## **2. Nietzsche: Attempt to Disprove Theism in Ethics**

The philosophers who vehemently disapproved God have tried to established morality in different ways. The forerunner among such philosophers was Nietzsche. Philosophers like Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Sartre were familiar as Existentialist, because they proposed that existence is the fundamental of any philosophical discussion. This 'existence' of them was actually meant for human existence. So the famous quote of Sartre was 'Existence precedes essence' (1) and all three of them denied the existence

of God. As per Nietzsche, the rituals of churches are only some external engagements which have no use in human existence, life and values. As per his version the 'God is dead', and with the acceptance of this Christianity with its external ornamentation will be finished. With this disprove the avenue for freeing the human existence will be achieved, a new year will bear with a new realization of moral standard. But the obvious question arises that when there is no God to judge the morality whom to answer, or in other word, to whom human will be liable for his ethical or unethical act. Will there be any urge or obligation to be moral? We will discuss this issue keeping this dilemma in mind and try to find how theists established their views overcoming this.

Nihilism is one of the fundamental problems in Nietzsche's philosophy and he tried to cross such problem in his thoughts and deliberations. It includes also ethical nihilism. Actually with the death of God a void has been created and to get rid of it Nietzsche tried to establish morality on a behavioral foundation. As Nietzsche's morality is analytical and he analyzed it from the perspective of act or doing, his morality bears a pragmatic essence. As per his opinion pragmatic approach can bring the truth in human life and it can explain the morality. In the book 'Genealogy of Morals' Nietzsche introduced two types of morality, namely, the moralities of Master and Slave. According to him these two moralities express differently, but both of them are intended to achieve power (2). The philosophers who are reverend of power, Nietzsche was most prominent among them. He even believed that war is the means through which a world can emerge with superior values with courage, devotion, greatness and like values.

But critiques said that Nietzsche tried to deny God only depending on internal passion which was less logical at its base. It also is critically thought that our society is divisible into neither only master and slave as told by Nietzsche nor divisible into 'have' and 'have not' as designated by Marx. Our society is multi-layered and stratified. As Nietzsche was a strong opposition of Christian believes and rituals of Churches, his strong anti-establishment emotion mostly appeared to deny the existence of God. In contrast his denial to omnipotent God basically created a diverse and diffused idea of super human imaginary in the explanations of different issues by him, which is none

other than a different form of the idea of God as depicted in different writings of him. Basically Nietzsche had an alternative thought about God, who was 'Dionysus' and who amazed Nietzsche by his prompt existence (3). He thought that this was the actual truth of life which was not considered in Christianity. When Nietzsche declared that 'God is dead! God remains dead! And we have killed him' (4), then it expressed the anger, anguish, and may also be the hatred towards the system related to Christianity and Church. That intensity of negative expression might have achieved from the convictions of the then Christian societal conducts, sacraments with political systems in amalgamation of Nietzsche's personal antipathy. The normal virtues of human life like kindness, forgiveness, peacefulness, manners etc which are usually practiced to relate with God, had been blacklisted by Nietzsche and designated as inferior qualities which express weaknesses of human being. He introduced the concept of 'Superman', through a strong desire of this superman to become the contender of God and to uproot Him from his divine thorn had been expressed (5).

Nietzsche remained merely silent about the source of morality of his superman fantasy who by his immense power will do 'good' for this universe. If the ground of morality of this superman had not been established properly, this colossal power may turn to be good or bad both and thus may indulge evil at its own whims. It is to be explained properly that where Nietzsche's superpower be different from traditional God? Only because of his human nature as said by Nietzsche or somewhere else is not clear accurately. Nietzsche's version somehow seemed similar with the philosophy of enlightened monarchy or autocracy at the juncture of mediaeval and modern Europe which was formally named as the enlightened despotism where Kings exercised their political power for the benefit of people as 'Everything for the people, nothing by the people' (6)<sup>1</sup>. His superman characteristics sometimes resembled with the characters of Frederick the Great of Prussia, King Charles III of Spain and others in the 18<sup>th</sup> century Europe. Nietzsche probably could not imagine and extended his thoughts beyond his age. Later in the history of mankind we found such characters with political power again and again. If we look at Robespierre in French revolution and in post-revolutionary time

culminating into Guillotine rule, Hitler's strong ruling for the German superiority and dominance crushing into the extreme sacrifice of humanity or the autocracies of Ceaușescu in Romania, they all appeared as immensely powerful mass-leaders but fell down pathetically as the heated villains of the state, society and humanity. So these names with superman like power and activities who were believed to be the rescuers or relievers of some nations or states or sectors could never meet the ethical standard and ended their life with wretched consequences. We should remember that Nietzsche never prioritized the societal or state values and acts in execution of power by his superman like imaginary character, but freed him with his immense will force which is actually that conducive milieu where autocracy arise.

Basically from the discussion of Nietzsche's ethics it is clear that he was vehemently opposed Christianity. As per him, Christianity follows the 'morality of slaves'. In contrary, Nietzsche imagined such a powerful human being who never succumb to that morality of slaves, rather be a worshipper of 'morality of master'. Nietzsche told the love in Christianity is nothing but the expression of fear. Man being frightful about his neighbor in the thought that he might damage him, offers his fellow citizen the gesture of love to ensure his own safety. Nietzsche never thought that anyone spontaneously think about fraternity and love. That's why he expressed his opinion that, if he could become more strong and powerful, he could express his hatred about neighbors more openly. So his superman is without sympathy, he is cruel, cleaver, tricky and intoxicated with his power. Nietzsche never thought that his superman can be a cause of fear to common people. He admired such human power who achieved their greatness in demolishing other human entities who are not acceptable and this is the greatest demolition of ethical values. Thus Nietzsche's philosophy of morals avoiding the concept of God is basically indulging the darker sides of human values and cannot establish a solid moral basis to act upon.

However, at one point we can validate Nietzsche. When the world struck into the prejudices of past, the false external rituals become the face of religion and God, at that point someone is needed to appear who possess the power and will to build everything

in a newer form and have the ability to bring life in dead or wrecked remnants of mankind. So he might have some exuberant warrior attitude and may need some destruction to bring fresh life. Nietzsche dreamt to have an all new life and livelihood. As per him conservative past never accepts new or mankind always prefers limited entry of new things along with the older things, but dare to conceive all afresh and anew. Nietzsche tried to hurt that fear and for that he expressed his excess anger and harsh satire towards old. He tried to bring new in full form and for this he was never hesitant to face the extreme conflict and involve in full-fledged battle with the predecessors. Basically this warrior attitude was the actual theme of Nietzsche's moral (5, 7).

### **3. A Comparison of Nietzsche's Moral with Indian Thoughts**

In the Indian epic Mahabharata it was observed that when traditional practices indulge or coddle the sinful or evil forces, the demolition of such wicked become essential with the destruction of such traditions. Sometimes situation arises when such violence can neither be avoided nor be denied, because the destruction of one or few brings the good for the thousands or a big mass of people; truth has been established by wiping out the false. But in that case the sinfulness and malicious acts has to reach to an unbearable level and when all peaceful means fail to rectify the system or hold it within a bearable level, the force of destruction can come into act and, the words of Lord Krishna can be uttered as, whenever religion and righteous world got into extreme trouble, He appeared in the rescue of integrity by obliterating dishonest and diabolic sects to establish a good, lawful society again (ShrīmadbhagavadGītā, Verse No. 4/8) (8)<sup>2</sup>. When we need surgical interception to dissect out some body parts or tumors it cannot be an act of violence but essential for life, likewise who causes the wound of colossal evil and swamping corruption in the society they need to be exiled where use of arms can never be considered as violence. Therefore, in Indian epics, Lord Rama or Lord Krishna became those imaginary characters who pronounced the victory of truth defeating the extreme dishonesty and malicious, sinful societal state through the great wars to establish the religious, ethical state.

Nietzsche's imaginative ruler, whom we discussed earlier, had similarity with the Carvaka's concept of king. The similarity was external, rather in depth comparison showed very significant differences between the two. The king of Carvaka was the powerful executer and well-wisher of his people, and more importantly, he had to follow specific rules set by the society. He had the liability to become accepted by his creeds and society. In this case, as soon as specific rules came into play, the king became restricted from being willful on his own desire and whims. Though that king possessed the power of execution but the outline of that was well defined. Normally to introduce such rules or acts a conglomeration of wise people representing that society or state who were also well aware of the traditional and contemporary knowledge of that time took the charge. Therefore, on the basis of such outlines drawn by the prudent section of the state, the king who can catalyze the social prosperity and state's supremacy with advancement and happiness, he will be the most acceptable and powerful king as 'LokasiddhaRājāParameswera' (BārhaspatyaSūtra. 85) (9)<sup>3</sup>. We may remember such rulers like King Solomon of United Kingdom of Israel during 9<sup>th</sup> Century BC or Chandragupta the Second or Vikramaditya of the Gupta Empire in northern India during 4<sup>th</sup> Century AD, or like the legends of King Arthur during the mediaeval England; or Akbar the Great of 16<sup>th</sup> Century who not only established a great Mughal dynasty through a vast region of Indian subcontinent extended up to Afghanistan but also showed his responsible and responsive ruling accepted by the majority of the people of his kingdom. Here society and king developed a relationship of conflict and adjustment to mitigate the interest of both king and general people of his kingdom which was essentially depicted in Carvaka's hedonistic theory where such a comparable conflict comes in between one's own interest and collective interest of the group. The extract of such conflict is the education to distinguish between one's need and greed. We can remember the famous statement of Mahatma Gandhi that there is enough on this planet for everyone's need, but not for anyone's greed. Be a king or a common people, if someone become educated to draw the margin for greed and restrict him within his need, then the alliance or agreement may be possible between the interest of one and many

that will lead the path towards future sustenance and happiness devoid of glamour possessing moral values at its core.

#### **4. Western Philosophy after Nietzsche: The Dilemma for One to Many and Marx**

The conflict between one and many or individual versus group of people in the issues of morality became also prominent in the writings of Sartre in 20<sup>th</sup> Century. But, in the way of developing and defining the human existence, Sartre emphasized less on ethical background. However, an idea about Sartre's moral or ethical perspective can be extracted from his writings. One of the most prominent existentialist philosophers Sartre also cultured basically on individualistic human existence, but he introduced an idea of undesirable impact of individual liberalism on the group living or society. He added restriction or restrain within the explanation of individual freedom and liberalism. This is the binding for someone's own duty, the duty for his own self and for others, for the sum, for the society (10)<sup>4</sup>. Sartre's individualism is bound to own-self as well as humanity, it is inevitably entangled with the mandate to mature and fulfill others' freedom. His existentialism is humanitarian who rely on the idea of equality of freedom for him and for all. Therefore, here individual is very important who always holds the duty of selecting his own act and be responsible for the consequences. So, he has to be sensible and has to think that his act, by no means, can harm other person's liberty and comfort, not even it can scare the humanity. Thus individual decision should always be taken here caring for the society and sum. If any such decision be taken by the Monarch or learned assembly, according to Sartre's philosophy they should take care of every individual's liberty and well-being with the full attention to the requirement of society and state. Therefore, it requires the acceptance of both individual interest and collective interest. Overall, ethics will be created in amalgamation of individual and society, and any ethical verdict one can only accept on the basis of surrounding and circumstances.

In this way, ethics or moral emerges as a balance between individual and society. In this balance, when existentialists emphasize more on individual existence and interest, the

ethics evolved from materialistic dialectics introduced by Marx and Engels stands just in the opposite pole. Marx stated in his 'Thesis on Feuerbach' that, '*... the human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual.... [but] is the ensemble of the social relations*' (11). Marx actually opposed the idea of individualistic ethical standards, as did Engels. Engels stated that human happiness is not essentially dependent on personal ethics. Rather the materialistic status, particularly, the monetary affluence and the quality time derived from such affluence for enjoying arts and music, spending time with peers and opposite sexes and other activities of personal desire play the main role to achieve individual pleasure. According to them the basic difference between materialistic and ethical ideas is, for the first one, individual's monetary standard and desire collectively express his personality and morals. But for the second one, through some undefined and abstract imagination some psychological pleasure has been achieved and thus created some personal stratification. And therefore, Marx from his extremist standpoint stated to clear out other ideas and told that nothing will be meaningful without considering the conditions between the classes, that is, among bourgeois and proletariat (12)<sup>5</sup>.

As Marx assimilated individual existence within the socio-economic classes therefore ethics got less importance in respect to the totality of this system. Therefore, in every occasion when Marx tried to explain any social or historical events in the light of dialectic materialism, he tried to establish the ethics in favor of his proposed path of social evolution. The act which was capable of maintaining the path of his ideology had become acceptable and ethical, whether it had been the explanation of French revolution or the discussion of the history of India. Simultaneously, when Marx accepted a process of gradual increment of knowledge of mankind as an obvious process of his 'ism', the increase of moral values of mankind should also be accepted. But he never accepted such things parallel. In contrary he tried to explain morality or ethics as a comparative account on the basis of self-pleasure and class-stratifying index. Analyzing all these Howard Selsam stated '*... the ethics of the Manifesto is simply an expression of the needs, hopes and desires of the modern working class .... That it alone conforms to the necessary and desirable direction of social evolution.*' (13). Therefore, emphasizing on socio-economic

class system and their interplay this approach tried to ignore other generally accepted concepts of ethics and put forward a newer dimension of ethics on socio-economic perspective in an inadequate manner. Inadequate because that ethics was predetermined and biased to a specific sect of society and was less logically evolved, rather emotionally supportive to that sect. The concept of ethics, which was deployed from only economic stratification of society, was difficult to achieve the acceptable moral standard in general or through the looking glass of perception. It is comparable like those ethical believes where ethics is completely prejudiced with theism. Here only the ethical values were only prejudiced with proletariats and for their benefits.

### **5. Contrasting Philosophy of Nietzsche and Marx to Morality**

Marx and Engels discarded the existence of God based on perceptual evidences. Thereby, they wanted to make human free from all awe, superstition and binding to something beyond perception. They challenged all such ongoing ideas and rituals and inspired people to come out from such believe. Thus they wanted to extend the courage to the socio-economically downtrodden people, basically the large number of farmers and workers, to commit the great revolution. Here both Nietzsche and Marx-Engels discarded God very feverishly, but their way and purpose were different. The first one is to gain individual power or supremacy; whereas the second is for a particular social sect who they believe are the majority and they should be the maximum beneficiary in the societal system and thereby will make the society progressive in proper sense. In contrast, it should be taken into account that if all ethical or moral burdens will be absorbed for the sake of revolution or any unethical act become admissible with an excuse as the need of revolution for the betterment of backwardly socio-economic class, then how would be the consequences? How would be the shape of morals? Isn't it a vicious environment where the unethical acts of a person or group is being legislated in a hide of terms like 'revolution', 'social need' or more frequently used 'class struggle'? It appears to be another version of Sartre's 'bad-faith' where people search for a hide to avoid the responsibility of their 'karma' or acts and also adopt false values under an external circumstantial milieu (14). Therefore, we cannot support Stalin, cannot admit

the incidence in Tiananmen Square of China or the blood bath in the corners of Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh of India due to Naxalite insurgencies.

In contrast, Marx in his 'First International' wrote about all people or groups that they all '*.... acknowledge truth, justice and morality as the basis of their conduct towards each other and towards all men without regard to colour, creed or nationality.*' (15) But the contradiction remained. As revolution ideally destroyed the older system including classes, casts, faiths, existing moralities and values, rule of laws, then how and where from the new 'truth, justice and morality' will come? How would be the structure of such new morality? The shape of ethics and morality of that class less society is not clear and no such in depth discussion was found about such new morality. It is now very clear that Marx had to reintroduce the morality in his new system, where during the phase of antithesis of older system or more directly speaking, during destruction of older system Marx avoided or diluted the moral issue. But he required morality during the synthesis phase of his desired society, hence cannot deny the morality in society. Therefore, in the development of society, for its existence, distribution and progression morality is essential, both individually and collectively.

Thus in the discussion of morality or ethics from whatever philosophical outlook, be it Nietzsche or Sartre or Marx-Engels, it has become clear that none of them cared for God. From this it has also been clear that ethics or moral has an individual perspective and a collective perspective. In some cases, needs from both standpoints may be same, but also for many instances they are different. There comes the conflict. This conflict is between individual and group. So to establish moral for both individual and society, where personal interest and societal interest differs, there needs some balance. More technically speaking, a 'tread-off' is needed between these two opposing forces. There are many examples of such trade-offs in different fields which are analogous to the moral verdict or decision in real life. Also we can conclude with several examples that God believe dose not bring morality neither in person, nor in society or state. So, like Nietzsche if we cannot say that 'God is dead', at least can utter that 'God is removed' from moral. If believe in God and his worship fetch moral standard then we do not need so many jails

and police forces, no homicide squad or human bomb gunmen roam around the world in the name of Allah or Christ or Rama or else, no terror attack in Mumbai, Karachi, Colombo or Auckland took lives of thousands, no Crusade would be there in history, no Shia-Sunni blood-shades would be there and so on.

But if we try to establish moral without God, the fundamental question that we face is about its origin or arrival. In the earlier sections we discussed how Nietzsche's philosophy tried to establish individualistic morals but shortfall in several aspects. One of the major point of criticizing Nietzsche's theory is his emphasize on superman or overman like image in morality which is similar to the concept of messiah of Judeo-Christianity (16)<sup>6</sup>. Also, if Nietzsche's thought has to accept, there will be conflict between one's desires of moral supremacy versus collective interest of upgraded moral. As inherent nature of Nietzsche's moral upgrading is dominative, so any evolution or upgrading of such moral in mass will obviously increase the conflicts among each other. In contrast, an effort was made in Marxian philosophy to show how collective social morals can be promoted but remained clueless about its advent amidst the social wreckage after a class conflict. If the violent proletariat mass uproots the exploiting bourgeois class how that violence automatically succumb to a peaceful society was not clear. Such incidence was found in the post-revolutionary days in 1790s in France or in between February to October, 1917 in Russia, and continued up to 1922 when a new state with strict law and order were imposed on the territory. So the practical situations and evidences neither show promises for Nietzsche nor for Marx. Even neither of them could properly address the issue of morality in one and many. So we have to search for a suitable explanation about the origin of morality and to find an answer about whether it may spawn as inherent nature or generate spontaneously. In other word '*.... Mankind may only hope to attain a knowledge of ethics unconsciously, or as a consciousness other than itself. Perhaps the time has come to stop searching for this other consciousness and return to the study of humanity and its ethics.*' (17). Also with the thinking that how morality can be threaded between one and many

we are going to discuss that whether believing in God is at all important for developing such morals, and if not, then how such morals come into existence.

## **6. Then Where Should We Search Our Source of Morality**

In modern ear the ethical values emerged mainly centering the man. The actual need of human with social requirement and consciousness gradually became the center of gravity of the emergence of modern value system. Denial of the values emerged from religious emotions and metaphysical entities and insemination of humanitarian thoughts first gave birth of 'Secular' and democratic approaches in our society. 'Secular' literally means earthly and rejecting any metaphysical existence. The concept of secular state developed with the idea that where the state affairs including social, economic, political and cultural lives will be independent of any religious interference. This is the basis of the development of religiously independent democratic and humanitarian social state. Karl Marx extended this view and showed that such humanity with detachment of personal wealth evolve into communism. With the ethical development and gaining of its gradually organized shapes showed some resemblance with the evolutionary theory of Darwin. Once Marx wrote a letter to Engels after reading Darwin's 'Origin of Species', where he wrote, '*...this is the book which contains the basis in natural history for our view*' (18). The famous evolutionary philosopher Ernst Mayr of twentieth century was one of the strongest supporter and elaborator of Darwinian Theory. He showed many reasons about why Marx was so enthusiastic about this theory. One of the main reasons was about the variation issue. At the core of Darwin's evolutionary concept was the presence of variations within population and that is the basic ingredient on which evolutionary mechanisms act. Here Marx found support of his dialectic materialism. But Mayr made it clear that the basis of this for Darwin is variations among each individual of every species including human where their genetic, morphological and behavioral variety counts; and such will be counted for morality also (19). Another Darwinian as well as Marxian philosopher J.B.S. Haldane explained that the genetic individuality and variety of each individual in a natural sense and providing social equity are two different issues (20).

Darwinian evolutionary thought accepted such individual variations at its core as natural phenomena and then tries to explain the collective moral fiber in evolutionary mechanisms by perceptible and logical approach. In contrary, Marxian thoughts and practices mostly showed an intention to impose equity and even asset allocation to establish socialism rather accepting and allowing variations to evolve, thus tends to achieve a state of lesser variance culminating into communism. So neither of these two philosophies basically mixes and proceeds for further development to explain morality. In contrast, Nietzsche criticized Darwin as he felt that Darwinian concept of survival is similar to that of the ‘will to life’ described by German philosopher Sopenhauer (21)<sup>7</sup>. Nietzsche opined that ‘will’ might be the elementary principle, but not the ‘will to life’ or in other word the willingness of survival. As Darwin’s major saying was ‘struggle for existence’ where organisms have to cope with the environment which has been described as adaptation (22)<sup>8</sup>, Nietzsche showed it as the submission of individual to the exterior and/or situations. But it can be said that he had not realized and interpreted Darwin’s theory properly. We will discuss and explain our standing on this point in the following sections.

### **7. Darwin: Design without Designer – Moral without Creator for Self and Society**

William Paley, one of the prominent philosophers of 18<sup>th</sup> century argued for the creator or intelligent designer to substantiate our origin and existence in his world through his ‘teleological argument’ (23). Paley’s argument of ‘Natural Theology’ elaborated that the complex features, structures and organs of specific functions in animal has been designed by an intelligent designer. He argued that such complex structure and precise functions which are be fitting perfectly with the requirement of the organism can never be spontaneously generated. Paley put the example of our eye or the eye of an eagle which are highly specific and complex organs for precise function. He made an analogy of existence of such structure with finding a watch on the pebbles in a field and argued that as that watch must obviously be crafted there, for our eye also there will be a craftsman or intelligent creator. According to Paley’s argument, there cannot be design

without designer and all the biological and anatomical sophistications are made by the creator. Therefore, all the attributes of human must be designed by the craftsman who is none other than God, and understandably our moral is also the gift of God. But the next century philosophy revolved around denying the God's grace and upholding the truth of human existence and society.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, after Marx, another predecessor of Nietzsche was Charles Darwin. Darwin developed this epoch breaking theory of evolution based on evidences from natural history. In contrary to the fixity of nature as was put forwarded by natural theological view, Darwin showed that the natural world and living things change over time. In establishing his evolutionary theory Darwin introduced the process of natural selection and argued that how this process works in the natural world and acts as the modifying force on the living forms in course of time. Darwin was influenced by the work of Charles Lyell, a Scottish geologist of that century who showed how earth surface forms and structures change over time due to natural events and forces (24). Influenced by his book 'Principles of Geology' Darwin realized that like the continued changeability of earth's crust which is perceivable with a reasonable time interval, animals are also changing through a long course of time. Collected specimens and fossil evidences in his five years long voyage in HMS Beagle (1831-1836) confirmed Darwin that animals and their morphological and anatomical designs are not fixed. He also deduces that animal changes in some specific patterns and trajectories which is designated as evolution. In finding the working force or reason behind such changes, Darwin had taken the idea from Malthusian theory of population and described how nature restricts the number of surviving individuals among many to fit the population size within the limit of available resources (25). Darwin, upon evidential proofs, established that animals evolve by 'natural selection' and develop complex structures in an incremental fashion over a long time without any designer and explained the 'Origin of Species' (26). Therefore, 'survival of the fittest' is actually a trade-off between options and resources by the nature where requirement for survival provide the impetus to move on through the evolutionary trajectory.

In this similar approach of argument, we may think that when complex design of life is possible without designer, then the moral of human as a living entity may be explained without God's influence. Ethics is the moral principle of human being which governs the behavior. Such ethics, i.e. doing right or wrong or appropriate act can be considered as situational reflex or cognitive output and to be judged by others. Any act can be judged for ethical values where there will be others to evaluate. So ethics is something which is applicable in a societal format or in an assembly of individuals.

Darwinian evolutionary thinking remained highly active in 20<sup>th</sup> Century and spread over other fields and faculties. O.E Wilson, the American evolutionary biologist, studied the ants and their behavior as a group of working individuals and extended his observations and interpretations for other animals. From him and other workers it was shown clearly that animals too remained in social form well before the human origin and remained associated with conflicts and cooperation and sharing. Wilson's classic work "Sociobiology: The New Synthesis" defined society as 'A group of individuals belonging to the same species and organized in a cooperative manner' and extended further that 'The diagnostic criterion (of a society) is reciprocal communication of a cooperative nature, extending beyond mere sexual activity (from the biological perspective)' (27). Therefore, the moral principle or ethical act is biologically possible without sophisticated cognitive function and evolution shows that biologically moral principles exist from an ancient time when no human were there in this planet. Also, this approach showed the promise to resolve the conflict between individual and society, and produced logical explanation of one's interest for own offspring or next generation as well as society.

Now if we look at the moral perspective of survival and struggle for existence we found that Darwin in his 'Descent of Man' mentioned and tried to explain the origin and evolution of human psychology and morals (28). His writing on human psyche was also extended and established on his biological evolutionary theory. This is known as 'evolutionary psychology' by which he explained the origin and development of human cultural and ethical progression from the dawn of the advent of human species. He and

his followers even related this origin of moral thoughts with proto-humans or in other species close to modern humans as Darwinian evolutionary thoughts believe that origin of our species was the outcome of a continuous evolutionary process running in whole living world. This modern approach of evolutionary interpretation of morals, searching its origin and gradual modification in human species has now gained a significant and interesting position. Now we can try to search the reason behind our morality which is spontaneous discarding God from the business.

## **8. Conclusion**

In 19<sup>th</sup> Century, we found the strong ensemble of philosophical thoughts to establish the fact that moral act and sense of ethics was not dependent on God and being ethical from individual to social level was unprompted. The philosophers like Nietzsche, Marx and Darwin showed that the urge to be moral or immoral, to be cooperative or conflictive had their own proximate and ultimate agendas or causes. All three philosophers tried to establish morality without god in their own way and were aware about others work. Initially, Nietzsche criticized the Darwinian Theory with a thought that the theory could not be enough to disprove God (21). However, it was later observed that followers of Darwin developed a different way of argument to disprove God and establish morality in life which provide stronger logical background than that of Nietzsche's constant denial of God. On the other hand, Marx was initially interested on Darwin but was unable to successfully amalgamate its essence to his doctrine and social theory. All the theories exhibited potential to establish the principle of morality from different perspectives. Decent explanatory ideas came to resolve the conflict of one and many; comparisons and arguments within existentialist, socialist and evolutionary schools are continuously shaping such ideas of ethics. To mitigate the elusiveness of origin of morality these philosophers and their followers are relentlessly inspiring and intriguing present thinkers and fueling the school of atheist ethics. These studies are enriching our knowledge to explain human psyche and becoming instrumental to approach individual and social psychic disorders more logically than ever.

## Notes:

<sup>1</sup> [The creed of enlightened despotism was best summed up in the motto of [the] reforming monarch Charles III of Spain (1759-1788): ‘*Everything for the people, nothing by the people.*’ The enlightened despots represented a stage in the transformation of the personal monarchy of the old dynastic states to the impersonal rule of modern bureaucracies. (7)]

<sup>2</sup> [Shrīmadbhagavad (or Bhagavad) Gītā has been considered as one of the most famous and basic reference of Indian and Hindu Philosophy with 700 verses in Sanskrit that thought to be written by sage Vyasa and a part of the epic Mahabharata which had been thought to be written between two to five hundred BCE. In those verses the meaning of life, philosophy and duties of life had been described as the saying of lord Krishna to the epic hero Arjuna just before the great battle of Mahabharata at Kurukshetra. Several commentaries on these verses had been developed from different perspectives of Indian philosophy throughout the following centuries and remains as one of the backbones of Indian cultural heritage of thousands of years. The mentioned verse (originally in Sanskrit) and its translation has been adapted from the mentioned edited volume (8).]

<sup>3</sup> [CārvākDarśan or Lokāyata is one of the strongest ancient atheist philosophical school of India or probably the oldest Indian materialism developed around five to six hundred BCE or before by the priest Bṛhaspati, who may be more than one person. The primary text of such materialism and atheism had been lost, might be due to the rival philosophical schools of the regions but recovered from secondary literatures of later Indian śāstras, sūtras, purāṇas, epics, Buddhist and Jain literatures.]

<sup>4</sup> [‘..... as soon as there is a commitment, I am obliged to will the liberty of others as the same time as mine.’ (10)]

<sup>5</sup> [Marx’s view about pleasure experience of human has been expressed as ‘*The connection between the pleasure experiences of individuals .... could not be discovered until the conditions of production and communication of the traditional world had been criticized, and the opposition between the bourgeois view of life and the proletarian socialists and communist point of view created. There with all morality – whether it be the morality of asceticism or that of the philosophy of pleasure – was proved to be bankrupt*’ (12)]

<sup>6</sup> [‘*Atfirstglance, Nietzsche..... fought courageously to bestowuponhumanitythestrengthof will and intellectnecessarytoacquirea knowledgeofitsownemotions.ButNietzsche'sprojectfellshort,notbecausethe searchforknowledgecessarilyendsinmadnessbutbecausehewasunabletofreehimselffromhis esentfuldesiretoimitateJudeo-Christianity.Inhisimperativetoover-comemankind,Nietzscheduplicatesthesameideaofhumanina dequacyandweaknessheldbyhisrival.Nietzsche'scallforanovermanandthe Judeo-Christianbeliefinamesiahobeythesameimpulse,theimpulsetobringinaconscienceotherthanhum antoprovideethicswithanintelligentfoundation. Girard'sdivinerevelationofdesireandviolencealsoappearsatmomentstorelyonthetragiclaborofh uman intelligence, but it risks concluding, as does Nietzsche'swork,atthe pointwheretheselfsuccumbstoitsown scandalous nature.NietzscheanphilosophyandJudeo-Christianityarefinallyinadequateforanun-derstandingof*

*ethics, although they may be necessary to it, because they place ethical models beyond the scope of the human community and its representations.*' (16)]

<sup>7</sup>[As per Schopenhauer 'The will to live', forms the inmost core of every living being. Not only that he opined that will exhibits most conspicuously in the higher animals like man, in other term within the cleverer ones. In contrast in lower animals this will is less active, so observed less evidently. In the higher order of animals (in man) reason enters and with reason comes discretion, followed by the capacity of dissimulation, which can veil the operations of the will.]

## References:

1. Sartre. J.P., 1956. Existentialism and Humanism. *Tr. by.* Mariet. P. London: World Publishing Company.
2. Nietzsche. F., 1998. On the Genealogy of Morality. *Tr. by.* Clark. M., Swensen. A. Indianapolis: Hackett. p. I:13.
3. Nietzsche. F., 1954. Twilight of the Idols. *In.* The Portable Nietzsche, *Ed. & Tr. By* Kaufmann. W. New York: Viking. p. IX: 49.
4. Nietzsche. F., 1956. Beyond Good and Evil. *Tr. by.* Golffing. F. New York: Anchor Books. p.46.
5. Tobin. S., 1988. Resentment and Genealogy of Morals: from Nietzsche to Girard. *In.* The Ethics of Criticism. New York: Cornell Univ Press. pp. 150-54.
6. Greaves. R.L., et. al., 1997. Civilizations of the World: The Human Adventure. New York: Longman. pp. 694-699.
7. May. S., 1999. Nietzsche's Ethics and his 'Waron Morality'. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
8. (ShrīmadbhagavadGītā, Verse No. 4/8) *In* Ghosh. J., *Ed.* 1992. ShrīmadbhagavadGītā. Kolkata: Presidency Library, p.138.
9. (BārhaspatyaSūtra. 85) *In* Bhattacharya. A., *Ed.* 1412 (2005). CārvākDarśan. Kolkata: Sanskrit PustakBhandar. p.92.
10. Sartre. J.P., 1956. Existentialism and Humanism. *Tr. by.* Mariet. P. London: World Publishing Co. p. 52.
11. Marx. K., 1969. Thesis of Feuerbach. *In.* Marx-Engels Selected Works., Vol-I. Moscow: Progress Publishers. pp. 13-15.
12. Marx. K., 1958. Die deutschuzdeologic *In.* Hegel to Marx. *Tr. by.* Sidney. H. New York: Humanities Press. p.317.
13. Selsam. H., 1948. The Ethics of the Communist Manifesto. *In.* Centenary of Marxism, *Ed.* Bernstein. S. New York: Science and Society Inc. pp. 22-23.
14. Sartre. J.P., 1993. Essays in Existentialism. New York: Citadel Press. pp. 160-164.

15. Marx. K., 1933. Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association. *In. Selected Works., Vol-II.* New York: International Publishers. p.443.
16. Tobin. S., 1988. Resentment and Genealogy of Morals: from Nietzsche to Girard, *In. The Ethics of Criticism*, New York: Cornell Univ Press. pp. 157.
17. Ibid, pp. 158.
18. Mayr. E., 1997. Roots of dialectical materialism. *In. Напереломе: Советскаябиология в 20-30-х годах, Ed. Kolcinskij. E.I.* St. Petersburg: СПбФ ИИЕТ РАН. pp. 12-15.
19. Ibid, pp. 16-17.
20. Haldane. J.B.S., 1949. Human Evolution: Past and Future – Genetics Paleontology and Evolution. U.S.A.: Princeton University Press. pp. 405-418.
21. Schopenhauer. A., 1969. *The World as Will and Representation.* Vol. I and II. *Tr. by. Payne. E.F.J.* New York: Dover Publications.
22. Ridley. M., 2004. Evolution. *3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Co. pp. 256-59.
23. Paley. W., 1828. Natural Theology or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of Deity. *1<sup>st</sup> Ed.* Oxford: J. Vincent.
24. Lyell. C., 1830. Principles of Geology. *1<sup>st</sup> Ed.* Vol 1. London: John Murray.
25. Malthus. T.R., 1798. An essay on the principle of population as it affects the future improvement of society. London: J. Johnson.
26. Darwin. C., 1859. On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life. London: John Murray.
27. Wilson. E.O., 2000. Sociobiology: The New Synthesis. *25<sup>th</sup>Anniv. Ed. (1<sup>st</sup> Ed. 1975)* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. p.595.
28. Darwin. C., 1879. The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. *2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.* London: John Murray. *Intro. by. Moore. J., Desmond. A.* London: Penguin Books. 2004. pp.144-151.