CHAPTER VI

KARL MARX
In the masterpiece book on class conflict - 'Manifesto of the Communist party' Marx and Engles open, "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles". They specially point out that this struggle has been carried on between "Freeman and Slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guildmaster 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".

To understand the concept of class-conflict fully one must know in brief the dialectical materialism of Karl Marx, as his friend and co-author - Engles wrote, (Historical materialism is ) "that view of the course of history, which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historical events in the economic development of society, in the changes in the modes of production and exchange, in the consequent division of society into distinct classes, and in the struggles of

1. Manifesto of the Communist Party (Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1957), p. 46(Hereafter referred to 'Manifesto')
2. Ibid., p. 47.
these classes against one another"¹.

Marx's conception of history is known by a variety of names, of which the most common are the materialist conception of history, historical materialism, the economic interpretation of history and economic determinism. Marx has, no doubt, taken the dialectical method from Hegel, but his approach is quite different. In the preface to Capital Vol. I he wrote, "My dialectic methods is not only different from Hegalian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegal, the life process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of "the idea", he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of "the idea." With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought".² Thus, in the Preface to the Critique of Political Economy he writes, "It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but, on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness."³


³. Karl Marx and Fredrick Engles - Selected Works in Two Volumes (Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, 1950), Vol. I, p. 329 (Hereafter referred to as 'Works').
He agrees with Hegel that men make their own history but differs in the approach in his 'The Eighteenth Brumare of Louis Bonaparte thus, "Men make their own history, but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past". 1

Marx's dialectical materialism may be briefly summarised as follows:

Marx called the underlying economic forces - the modes of production or productive forces, and these constitute the economic foundation which is said to determine the entire superstructure of society. This productive force or mode of production shape the conditions of social, political and intellectual life process of the society as a whole. 2

Corresponding to any particular set of modes of production there are appropriate relations of production or property relations. Thus, "In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces." 3

3. Ibid., p. 328
The modes of production gradually change and come into conflict with the existing and more static property relations. In his words, "At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production or what is but a legal expression for the same thing - with the property relations within which they have been at work hitherto." These conflicts create revolutions and change in the entire superstructure of society.

The historical conflict expresses itself in practice in the form of a class struggle, so that the "history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles".

To sum up, we can say that the whole thesis of Marx dialectical materialism can be reduced to, firstly - mode of production as a foundation-stone of the form of society and secondly, the dialectical phenomena brings in its train the phenomenon of class conflict. The classes, their relations with each other, their interests etc., are thus, determined by the mode of production.

Marx has tested his thesis of dialectic materialism on all the stages of human societies. In the Preface to the Critique of Political Economy he divides the economic formation of society "In broad outlines Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production..."  

Every important point to note is that in communist Manifesto, Marx recognizes only three forms of class society: the slave society of antiquity, feudalism and bourgeois society.

We must note here that Marx and Engles observations on pre-capitalist epochs rest on far less thorough study than Marx's description and analysis of capitalism. Marx concentrated his energies on the study of capitalism, and he dealt with rest of history in varying degrees of detail, but mainly in so far as it bore on the origin and development of capitalism. However, their work German Ideology of 1945-6 is a good source of pre-capitalist society. One more important source is Marx's unpublished work, "Formen die der Kapitalistischen Produktion Vorhergehen (über den Prozess der der Bildung des Kapitalverhältnisses oder der ursprünglichen Akkumulation vorhergeht)."

The first form of human society is known as communal corresponded to the underdeveloped stage of production where a people sustains itself by hunting, fishing, cattle raising or at most by farming. Broadly, speaking, there are now three or four alternative routes out of the primitive communal system, each representing a form of the social division

---


of labour already existing or implicit within it: the oriental, the ancient, the Germanic and a somewhat shadowy Slavonic which is not further discussed, but has affinities with the Oriental.

The ancient stage is a stage of classless society. Every member of the community is an important and equal link in the chain. The tribes, communes are interlinked. The purpose of labour is not the creation of value, but "Its purpose is the maintenance of the owner and his family as well as of the communal body as a whole"¹ whereupon private property co-exist with the independent individuals, the unity of the society is preserved in the common pride - 'the safeguard of ager publicus'. We must however, note that in this classless society the common unity is positive as in the oriental mode, but sometimes it is negative as in the ancient and the Germanic mode. The absence of classes naturally leads to harmony and hence there is no question of class conflict.

The Primitive stage could not keep pace with the growing needs, and was followed by the next stage of human history known as the slavery-system. The increase in population compels the primitive mode of production to change and with the change in the mode of production the

---

¹ Economic Formation, p. 68.
former relations are transferred in the new one. For example "Once the city of Rome had been built and its surrounding land cultivated by its citizens, the conditions of the community were different from what they had been before"\(^1\) The increase in population increases the burden on land and "If this is to be overcome, colonisation will develop and this necessitated war of conquest. This leads to slavery, etc., also, e.g., the enlargement of the ager Publicus, and hence to the use of the Patricians, who represent the community".\(^2\) Thus "With the conquering barbarian people war itself is still, ... a regular form of intercourse, which is the more eagerly exploited as the population increases, involving the necessity of new means of production to supersede the traditional and, for it, the only possible, crude mode of production".\(^3\)

The foundation of the production relations of this system was private property not only of the means of production but also of the workmen themselves - of slaves. The community is now divided into antagonistic classes - the class of slave-owners and the class of slaves. "... a tribe conquered and subjugated by another becomes propertyless and the part of the inorganic conditions of the conquering tribes

---

1. Ibid., p. 92.
2. Ibid., pp 92-93.
reproduction, which that community regards as its own\textsuperscript{1}.
The epoch of slavery placed terrible burdens and hardships
on the working people, "The lowest interests - base greed, brutal sensuality, sordid avarice selfish plunder of common possession - usher in the new, civilised society, class society; the most outrageous means - theft, rape, deceit and treachery - undermine and topple the old, classless, gentile society".\textsuperscript{2} Thus Engles describes the period of transition from the primitive communal system to that of slavery.

The class-conflict and the brutal exploitation of the slaves evoked bitter opposition on their part. In order to crush this opposition a special apparatus of coercion - the state, had to be created in place of the former tribal institutions of administration. "As the state arose from the need to hold class antagonism in check, but as it arose, at the same time, in the midst of the conflict of these classes, it is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class."\textsuperscript{3} or "the state is an organisation of the possessing class for its protection against the non-possessing class".\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1. & \textit{Formen} (Quoted in \textit{Economic Formations}) p. 91 \\
2. & \textit{Works Vol. II}, p. 231. \\
3. & \textit{Ibid.}, p. 290. \\
\end{tabular}
Nevertheless the slave system was an important step forward in human progress. It brought a full development of the social division of labour - between agriculture and town crafts, and also between the various branches of handicrafts. In its turn, the division of labour entailed specialisation, improvement of tools, and an increase in skills. The class-conflict is seen in the antagonism of town and country; later the antagonism between those states which represents town interests and those which represent country, and inside the towns themselves the antagonism between industry and maritime commerce. The class relations between citizens and slaves is now completely developed.

The slave mode of production soon exhausted its capacity for further development of society. Having in their possession cheap slave-labour, the slave-owners never made efforts to improve the instruments of production. On the other hand, as the slave had no personal interest in his labour, never bothered to become more and more economical and efficient. This brought the old mode of production in contradiction with the growing needs of productive forces. The system was replaced by a new formation - the feudal mode of production.

The foundation of the production relations of this system lies in the feudal lord's ownership of the means of production primarily of land. The peasants depended on the
feudals, but were no longer completely their property. The
feudals had the right to the labour of the serfs, and the
latter were bound to the soil and were obliged to do service
to their lords "The relation of retainers to their lords,
or that of personal service, is essentially different... The
appropriation of another's will is presupposed in the relation
ship of domination. Being without will, like animals, may
indeed render services, but their owner is not thereby lord
and master." 1

The special character of the production relations
opened new possibilities for the growth of productive forces.
The producer - serfs, had a definite material interest in
the results of his work. Accordingly, he no longer broken
or spoiled his tools, but on the contrary, looked after
them carefully and went out of his way to improve them.

The replacement of the slave production relations
by feudal system brought about changes in the whole structure
of society. The principal change was the class structure.
The feudals - the owners of land, became the ruling class.
The other basic class was of the serfs. The relations
between these two classes were antagonistic in character
and based on an irreconcilable opposition of class-interests.
The serfs were cruelly exploited. Besides, contributions in
cast and kind, they were compelled to render personal services
to the lords, for which they received no reward. Here the

1. The German Ideology (Ibid., p. 125)
main incentive to work was fear of punishment, of physical violence, and also of the danger of losing all the personal property. "The hierarchical system of land ownership, and the armed bodies of retainers associated with it, gave the nobility power over the serfs".¹

Compared with that of the slave society, the class struggle in feudal society rises to a higher level. Peasants uprising sometimes embrace large territories. The strength of the peasant's resistance to the feudals is shown by peasant wars which shock one country after another: War Tyler's Rebellion in England (14th century). The Jacquie in France (14th and 15th centuries), The Peasant war in Germany (16th century) the uprising of Bolotnikov and Razin (17th century) etc.

The feudal organisation of land-ownership had its counterpart in the towns in the shape of cooperative property, the feudal organisation of trades. Here property consisted chiefly in the labour of individual person. "The necessity for association against the organised robber-nobility, the need for communal covered markets in an age when the industrialist was at the same time a merchant, the growing competition of the escaped serfs swarming into rising towns, the feudal structure of the whole country:

¹ The German Ideology (Ibid., p. 125).
these combined to bring about the guilds.\textsuperscript{1} and "Further, the gradually accumulated capital of individual craftsmen and their stable numbers, as against the growing population, evolved the relation of journeyman and apprentice, which brought into being in the towns a hierarchy similar to that in the country."\textsuperscript{2}

The greatest division of material and mental labour is the separation of town and country. "It is the most crass expression of the subjection of the individual under the division of labour, under a definite activity forced upon him—a subjection which makes one man into a restricted town-animal, the other into a restricted country-animal, and daily creates anew the conflict between their interests."\textsuperscript{3} This must have been the cause of the separation of capital and landed property, as the beginning of the existence and development of capital independent of landed property.

In the towns itself the seeds of class-conflict and antagonism were sown. The serfs, seeking for their independence from the yoke of the feudal lords, pulled towards the towns. "These serfs, persecuted by their lords in the country, came separately into the towns, where they found

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] Ibid., p. 126
  \item[2.] Ibid., p. 126
  \item[3.] Ibid., p. 127.
\end{itemize}
an organised community, against which they were powerless in which they had to subject themselves to the station assigned to them by the demand for their labour and the interest of their organised urban competitors. The guild masters bent them to their will and organised them according to their interest, if their labour was not such as had to be learned, and therefore, not as the guild type, they became day-labourers. Thus "The journeymen and apprentices were organised in each craft as it best situated the interest of the masters" The journeymen were interested to become masters themselves, and hence they organised revolts against the whole system of the guilds. But, "revolts which remained completely ineffective because of their powerlessness, the journeymen never got further than small acts of insubordination within separate guilds,..."

Thus, the feudal system consisted on the one hand the landed property with serf labour chained to it; and on the other hand the individual labour with small capital commanding the labour of journeymen. The conditions of production were not fully developed because of the small-scale and primitive cultivation of the land, and the craft type of industry. The division of labour was also primitive.

1. Ibid., p. 128  2. Ibid., p. 129.  3. Ibid., p. 129.
However, there was a conflict in the country and town interests. In country itself there was a class conflict between the lord and serf, and in the towns between guild-master and the journeymen.

In the course of time the feudal mode of production came into conflict with the growing needs of the time. As it is well known that in "the Middle Ages the citizens in each town were compelled to write against the landed nobility to save their skins".\(^1\) Trade extended and the towns entered into relations with one another, new tools were brought from one town into the other and the separation between production and commerce soon called forth a new division of production between the individual towns, each of which is soon exploiting a predominant branch of industry. The local restrictions of earlier times began gradually to be broken down. These towns united themselves for the common interests in the struggle with the feudal nobility.

"Out of the many local corporations of burghers there arose only gradually the burgher class".\(^2\) This may be called a prelude for the capitalistic form of production, because "From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burgerses the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.".\(^3\)

---

1. Ibid., p. 131  
2. Ibid., p. 131  
Thus the feudal mode was out of date. "At a certain stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, the conditions under which feudal society produced and exchanged, the feudal organisation of agriculture and manufacturing industry in one word, the feudal relations of property became no longer compatible with the already developed productive forces, they became so many fetters. They had to be burst as under; they were burst as under."¹

Feudalistic mode of production gave birth to capitalistic mode of production which ultimately resulted in the birth of capitalistic society. Marx wrote "The economic structure of capitalistic society has grown out of the economic structure of feudal society. The dissolution of the latter set free the elements of the former".² The expanding needs for trade with other towns gave birth to manufacturing system and "The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle class; division of labour between the different corporate guilds in the force of division of labour in each single workshop".³ This resulted in the separation of production and commerce and in the formation of a special class of merchants. Discoveries of new countries and colonisation expended the sway of bourgeoisie production.

¹. Ibid., p. 56  
³. Manifesto, pp 48-49.
"The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonisation of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave the commerce, to navigation to industry, an impulse never before known..."

The markets expended with an all round increase of demand for trade and exchange of commodities. Manufacturing became out moded. Thereupon, steam and machinery were introduced, which in their turn revolutionised industrial production...

"The place of manufacture was taken by the giant, Modern Industry, the place of the industrial middle class by industrial millionaries, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeois".

Barriers of trade have been abolished, means of transportation and communication developed. Even the barbarian nations have been remodelled into capitalistic mode of production. National industries have been destroyed. The new industries no longer work upon indigenous raw materials, but raw material drawn from various parts of the world. Their products do not suffice only the local consumption but of every quarter of the globe. Industrialisation has become the life and death question to all the nations. Thus bourgeois made is constantly expending and has

1. Ibid., p. 48.
2. Ibid., p. 49
created a world market. "It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere". Thus "In place of the old local and national seclusion and self-sufficiency, we have intercourse in every direction, universal interdependence of nations".

This cosmopolitan character of the mode of production has also created new values - barter system has been replaced by exchange through monetary unit. Money has become a medium of exchange. "It has resolved personal worth into exchange value". Every occupation has been converted into paid wage labour. "The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relations to a mere money relation."

The bourgeois mode has also resulted in the large scale production. This large scale in its turn resulted in the accumulation and concentration of capital in few hands. "It has agglomerated population, centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands."

These revolutions in the mode of production have also revolutionised the entire structure of society. "This development has, in its turn, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, 

1. Ibid., p. 53
2. Ibid., p. 54
3. Ibid., p. 51
4. Ibid., p. 52
5. Ibid., p. 55
railway extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into background every class handed down from the Middle Ages. It has created new situations "It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, ... Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilised ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West".  

The capitalistic mode of production has given birth to new classes - the bourgeois class on the one pole and wage-labour on the other. These two classes have their own history of development. These classes have not been created by Nature, but they are "the product of many economical revolutions, of the extinction of a whole series of older forms of social production".  

In his 'Expropriation of Agricultural Population From the Land (Capital I Chapter XXVII, p. 717) Marx has narrated how the prelude of capitalist mode was laid in England during the last third of the 15th century and the first decade of the 16th century. The breaking up of the bonds of feudal retainers, and confiscation of church property,

1. Ibid., p. 49.  
2. Ibid., pp. 54-55  
hurled on the labour market a mass of free Proletarians. These free proletarians could not possibly absorbed by the manufactures as fast as was thrown upon the world. "They were turned in masse into beggars, robbers, vagabonds" Legislation treated them as voluntary criminals. "Thus were the agricultural people, first forcibly expropriated from the soil driven from their homes, turned into vagabonds, and then whipped branded tortured by laws grotesquely terrible into the discipline necessary for the wage system" Again, to become a free seller of labour power the labour must have freed himself from the regime of the guilds, their rules for apprentices and journeymen, and the impediments of their labour regulations. Thus, to become a free-seller of the labour power, the workman must have been robbed off his property — his own means of subsistence and instruments of work. Marx thus wrote "Hence, the historical movement which changes the producers into wage-workers appears, on the one hand as their emancipation from serfdom and from the fetters of the guilds .. but, on the other hand, these new freedmen became sellers of themselves only after they had been robbed of all their own means of production, and of all the guarantees of existence afforded by the old feudal arrangements". We must also note that this change has not

1. Ibid., p. 734  
2. Ibid., p. 737  
3. Ibid., p. 715.
been automatic but through class-war and revolutionary process. Marx wrote "And the history of this, their expropriations, is written in the annals of mankind in letters of blood and fire."

Further let us read the origin of capital. The primitive accumulations, Marx wrote is "nothing else than the historical process of divorcing the producer from the means of production."

The spoliation of the church's property, the fraudulent alienation of the State domains the robbery of the common lands, the usurpation of feudal and clan property, and its transformation into modern private property under circumstances of reckless terrorism, were just so many edylic methods of primitive accumulation. Then came the usury capital, which, in its turn is bound up with the development of merchants capital and specially that of money dealing capital. "Both the ruin of rich landowners through usury and their impoverishment of the small producer lead to the formation and concentration of large amounts of money-capital."

Thus in the formen he writes "It is rather money accumulated by usury - especially usuary on landed property and mobile (monetary) wealth accumulated through mercantile profits, that turns into capital in the strict sense, into industrial capital." This form of capital sucks the blood of small peasants, producers etc. and once they fall into the

1. Ibid., p. 715  
2. Ibid., p. 714  
5. Formen(Economic Formations, p. 107)
clutches of the user can never extricate themselves. The user's capital form is changed into interest bearing Capital which presupposes that the borrower will function as capitalist and appropriate unpaid labour with the borrowed capital.

The capitalistic mode of production has created new conditions, new classes and has also extended the exploitation. It has not done away class antagonism. "It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones".¹

We have already seen that according to Marx the history of mankind had been a history of class conflict. The state of the class-conflict in the capitalistic mode has been peculiar and has its own distinctive features, which can be narrated as follows:

Firstly, we have two hostile groups - the bourgeoisie on the one hand and the proletariat on the other. Thus "Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat".² The other groups - the lower strata of the middle class - the small trade people shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the

¹ *Manifesto*, p. 47.
² *Manifesto* p. 48.
handicraftsmen and peasants - all these petty bourgeoisie sink into the working class, "partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which Modern Industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists", and "partly because of their specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production".¹

Secondly, the class struggle is of international character. The capitalistic mode has done away the national barriers and the means of transportation and communication has united the nations into one world. Bourgeoisie mode has spread all over the globe. The conditions of proletariats are the same every where and hence their interests unite the proletariats of the world. Let the workers of the world unite they will certainly fight with the bourgeois class as a whole.

Thirdly, the proletariat class has been trained for their class - struggle by the bourgeoisie themselves. The bourgeois - class had to fight with the landlords and petty bourgeois class for their victory. The working class became a party in the struggle but for the victory of the bourgeois class only because "the proletarians do not fight their enemies, but the enemies of their enemies, the 

¹— Ibid., p. 61.
bourgeois, the petty - bourgeoisie ". Thus, hitherto, the proletariat could not appropriate the fruits of their victory of class war but "The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own elements of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie".

The fourth very important feature of the class-conflict lies in the revolutionary character of the proletariat class. The petty-bourgeois class fight against the bourgeoisie to save their existing position or from the extinction their existence as functions of the middle class. Thus "They try to roll back the wheel of history". Thus proletariat class do not want to save the present position. They have no future in the capitalistic mode, no ray of hope to improve their position because "instead of rising with the progress of industry, sinks deeper and deeper below the conditions of existence of his own class". Therefore, they must destroy the bourgeois mode of production and its foundation. "They have nothing of their own, to secure and to fortify, their mission is to destroy all previous securities for, and insurances of individual property".
After discussing the theoretical aspects of class conflict, let us now see how the same is possible and carried on in the bourgeois society. In one word let us analyse the whole thesis of Karl Marx's phenomenon of class conflict.

Marx starts with the proposition that exchange is equal for equal i.e. \( C = C \) or \( C = M = C \). Commodity exchanged for money and then money into commodity. There is no question of the creation of surplus value. But in the capitalist mode of production the exchange starts with \( M - C - M' \) or \( M = C = M' \) (\( M + \Delta M \)). The capitalist exchanges his money into commodity and finds his original sum increased into \( M + \Delta M \). But this expansion cannot originate due to exchange function equal for equal. Marx's finds this expansion in the process of production. He narrates this in the expended form thus:

\[
\text{\( M \rightarrow C \rightarrow \frac{L}{MP} \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow P \rightarrow \ldots \rightarrow C'(C-C)-M' \rightarrow (M+m)^{\prime} \)}
\]

The capitalist in the first instance converts his \( M \) into \( M - L \) and \( M - MP \) i.e. he purchases labour power from the labour market and the means of production from the commodity market proper. The process of production starts. "The dots indicating that the process of circulation is interrupted."\(^2\)

---


2. Ibid., p. 23.
During the process of production the value of the raw material and of the tools or the fixed capital is preserved. Labour power is the only peculiar commodity which preserves its own value and creates a surplus value also. It converts the original $C$ into $C'$ i.e., $C + C$ or $(AC)$. The value equal to the original advance plus the surplus value.

Thus in the second stage in the processes of production the original sum of $C$ is transformed into $C + AC$. Now in the third stage the capitalist sells the $C'$ in the commodity market and gets $M'$ or $M + AM$ i.e., original amount of money plus an increment. Thus, Marx finds that surplus value is created by the labourer during the process of production.

The surplus value created by the labourer during the process of production costs the capitalist nothing whereas it

---

1. Marx clarifies that the raw material cannot be the source for the creation of surplus value because, "The value of the means of production is therefore preserved by being transferred to the product". (Capital Vol. I, p. 199) Similar is the case with the instruments of production. A part of their value passes on to the product, while the other remains fixed in the instrument of labour and thus in the process of production... its value having been distributed during a shorter or longer period over a mass of products originating from a series of constantly repeated labour processes" (Capital Vol. II, p. 158) It is therefore, apparent that these instruments cannot produce more than their own value "the means of production can never add more value to the product than they themselves possesses..." (Capital Vol. I, p. 205).

2. Marx says that the labourers is paid equal to the cost of production of his labour-power plus allowance for forstering the race of labourer and allowance for special training costs. He is bound paid the subsistence wage. But "the fact that half a day's labour is necessary to keep the labourer alive during 24 hours do not in any way present him from working a whole day" (Capital, Vol. I, p. 193.)
costs the labour his labour-power. Marx, therefore, sees that labourers is being exploited by the capital and "The rate of surplus-value is an exact expression for the degree of exploitation of labour power by capital, or of the labourer by the capitalists". ¹

The capitalist repeats this process of $\text{M} \rightarrow \text{C} \rightarrow \text{M}'$. The money comes out of circulation and enters into it again and again and becomes capital and it "preserves and multiplies itself within its circuit, comes back out of it with expanded bulk and begins the same round ever fresh $\text{M} \rightarrow \text{M}'$ money which begates money .." ² The labourer thus creates his own master that sucks the value creating power. The capital increases in bulk the more it exploits the labourer. Thus "capital is dead labour that vampire-like, only lives by sucking living labour, and lives the more labour it sucks". ³

The capitalist is constantly plans to increase the amount of the volume of the surplus-value. Two ways are open to him. Marx calls them as absolute surplus-value and relative surplus-value.

The capitalist has purchased the labour-power at its day rate and hence its use-value belongs to him during one working day. The capitalist has therefore, his own values about the extent of the working day. "As capitalist, he is only capital personified. His soul is the soul of capital."

¹. Ibid., p. 218  ². Ibid., pp. 154-155.  ³. Ibid., p. 233.
But capital has one single like impulse, the tendency to create value and surplus-value, to make it constant factor the means of production absorb the 'greatest possible amount of surplus-labour'.

What should be the length of a normal working-day is the question to be settled by opposite claims of the two opposite parties - capitalist and the labour. The capitalist

1. The greed for surplus-value through the increase of the working day is very much horrible in the capitalistic society. Marx has quoted many examples of England where the factory Act 1850 allows the 10 hours working day. The inspectors appointed under the home secretary has given regular and official statistics of the capitalistic greed for surplus-labour. The factory owners prolong the legal working-day also by 340 minutes weekly. Their tactics are called 'nibbling and cribbling at meal-times'. Marx quotes a mill owner who said, "If you allow me to work only ten minutes in the day over time, you put one thousand a year in my pocket." (Ibid., p. 243) Mr. Broughton Charlton, country magistrate, declared as chairman of the meeting held in Nottingham on 14th January 1860, "Children if nine or ten years are dragged from their squalid beds at two, three, or four O'clock in the morning and compelled to work for a bare subsistence, until ten, eleven, or twelve at night, their limbs wearing away, their frames dwindling, their faces whitening, and their humanity absolutely sinking into stone like torpor, utterly horrible to contemplate." (Quoted by Karl Marx, Capital, Vol.I, pp. 243-44.) Their brain ceased to think, their eyes to see. Mr Keys bore witness before the coroners jury that "Many Anne walked had died from long hours of work in an overcrowded work-room and a too small and badly ventilated bedroom." (Ibid., p. 255) The capitalists introduce day and night work by the Relay system. The duration of the process of production, unbroken during the 24 hours offers very welcome opportunities of exceeding the limits of the normal working day. These instances may be multiplied where the labourers - Men, women and children, were supposed to work beyond their
maintain his right of purchaser to utilise the maximum use-value of the commodity the labour-power "he tries to make the working-day as long as possible, and to make, whenever possible two working-days out of one".¹ The labourer on the other hand being a seller of his labour-power claims the right of a seller when he wishes to reduce the working-day to one of definite normal duration. "There is here, therefore an antimony, right against right, both equally bearing the seal of the law of exchanges. Between equal rights force decides".² We can therefore, trace that in the history of capitalist production, "the determination of what is a working-day, presents itself as the result of a struggle, a struggle between collective capital, i.e., the class of capitalists, and collective labour, i.e., the working-class".³

In England the force was with the bourgeoisie up to the middle of the 18th century. They enforced, through the legislations, lengthening the working-day. But

physical power and strength. "The capitalistic mode of production (essentially the production of surplus value the absorption of surplus labour) produces thus with the extension of the working-day, not only the deterioration of human labour-power by robbing it of its normal moral and physical, conditions of development and function. It produces also the premature exhaustion and death of this labour-power itself". (Ibid., 265)

1. Ibid., p. 235.  
2. Ibid., p. 235.  
3. Ibid., P. 235.
But the middle of the 19th century has transferred the power in the hands of the labourers. The fixation of 10 hours working-day in England in the year 1848 is the grand achievement for the labourers. The February revolution was necessary to bring into the world the 12 hours' law. Karl Marx, however, awakens the workers if they want to win the race and to escape themselves from the vampire who will not lose its hold on him so long as there is a muscle, a nerve, a drop of blood, to be exploited, "the labourers must put their heads together, and, as a class compel the passing of a law, an all-powerful social barrier that shall prevent the very workers from selling, by voluntary contract with capital, themselves and their families into slavery and death".¹

The prologgation of the working-day has its own limitations. Labourers resist and continue in trade unions and force the state authorities to check the tendency and keep a compulsory limit to the working-day. The extent of the working-day is shortened by the act of the Parliament. "The hungry wolf," the capitalist now changes his tactics and finds a way for the increase of surplus-value in the introduction of machinery "so soon consequently as an increased production of surplus-value by the prolongation of the working-day was once for all put a stop to, from that moment capital

¹. Ibid., p. 302.
throw itself with all its might into the production of relative surplus-value, by hastening on the further improvement of machinery"¹ The other reason for the adoption of machinery lies in the growing competition among the bourgeoisie who try to undersell the others and capture new field for their production. By revolutionizing the instrument of production, the inventor capitalist appropriates extra surplus-value, but "so soon as the new method of production has become general and has consequently caused the difference between the individual value of the cheapened commodity and its social value to vanish. The law of the determination of value by labour time, a law which brings under its sway the individual capitalist who applies the new methods of production, by compelling him to sell his goods under their social value this same law, acting as a coercive law of competition forces his competitors to adopt the new method".² Therefore, the law of competition and the greed of relative surplus-value compels the bourgeoisie to adopt new machines and thus revolutionise the mode of production. "While, therefore, competition continually pursues him with its law of the cost as production and every weapon that he forges against his rivals recoils against himself, the capital/continually tries to get the better of competition by incessantly

1. Ibid., p. 409
2. Ibid., p. 319.
introducing new machines, more expensive, it is true, but producing more cheaply, and new division of labour in place of the old, and by not waiting until competition has rendered the new ones obsolete. Thus, "The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society." Machine vanishes the difference between the skilled and unskilled labour, mitigates the difference of age and sex, and hence every human being—men, women and children, become its slaves. "Machinery, by throwing every member of that family on the labour market spreads the value of the man's labour-power over his whole family. It thus depreciates his labour-power. To purchase the labour-power of a family of four workers may perhaps cost more than it formerly did to purchase the labour-power of the head of the family, but, in return, four days' labour takes the place of one, and their price falls in proportion to the excess of the surplus-labour of four over the surplus-labour of one. In order that the family may live, four people must now, not only labour, but expend surplus-labour for the capitalist."

The introduction of machinery is injurious to the interests of the working-class. This has now changed the relation of the capitalist and the labour-class. Formerly, he was a free labour selling his labour-power to the capitalist. Now he sells the labour of his wife and children. "He has become a slave-dealer" He now allows the capitalist to exploit not only himself but also his family. Thus "Differences of age and sex have no longer any distinctive social validity for the working-class. All are instruments of labour.\(^1\)

The introduction of machinery has also converted the labourer into a cog in the machine without any individuality and charm in the work.

The most deteriorating effect of the introduction of machine is felt by the labourer when he becomes superfluous. "But machinery not only acts as a competitor who gets the better of the workman, and is constantly on the point of making him superfluous. It is also a power ñá enimical to him.\(^2\) When a new machine is introduced it requires lesser and lesser labourers to handle it, for the production of a certain quantity of a commodity. Thus, the formerly employed workers become redundant and are thrown out of employment. "So soon as the handling of this tool becomes the work of a machine, then, with the use-value, the exchange-value too of the workman's labour-power vanishes; the workman becomes

---

1. Manifesto, p. 61.  
unsaleable, like paper money thrown out of currency by legal enactment. The instruments of labour strikes down the labourer. This direct antagonism between the two comes out most strongly whenever new machines are introduced. "The object of improved machinery is to diminish manual labour, to provide for the performance of a process of the competition of a link in a manufacture by the aid of an iron instead of the human apparatus."

1. Ibid., p. 431.

2. Report Inspector of factory for 31st October, 1858, p.43. (quoted in Capital I, p. 432) Marx quotes many examples (refer Capital, Vol. I, Ch. XV "Machinery and Modern Industry" section 5, "The strife between workman and Machine, from p. 427 to p. 437.) but a few will suffice our purpose. A Manchester manufacturer states, "We formerly had 75 carding engines, now we have 12 doing the same quantity of work ... we are doing with fewer hands by 14 at a saving in wages of £10 a week, our estimated saving in waste is about 10% in the quantity of cotton consumed". In another fine spinning mill in Manchester, "I was informed that through increased speed and the adoption of some self acting processes, a reduction had been made, in number of a fourth in one department, and of about half in another, and that the introduction of the combining machine in place of the second carding had considerably reduced the number of hands formerly employed in the carding room". Another spinning mill is estimated to effect a saving of labour of 10%. Nasmyth, the inspector of the steam hammer gives the following evidence "The characteristic feature of our modern mechanical improvements is the introduction of self-acting tool machinery. The whole clans of workmen that depend exclusively on their skill is now done away with ... Thanks to the new mechanised combinations, I have reduced the number of grown-up men from 1,500 to 750. The result was a considerable increase in my profits." (Capital Vol. I, p. 436).
Thus, the labourer is replaced by machines becomes superfluous because the demand not only shrinks in the old industries but also in the new ones. The new industries avail the services of machines and require lesser and lesser hands of handle them. "On the one hand, therefore, the additional capital formed in the course of accumulation attracts fewer and fewer labourers in proportion to its magnitude. On the other hand, the old capital periodically reproduced with change of composition, repels more and more of the labourers formerly employed by it." The organic composition of capital the proportion of constant and variable capital, changes. For example if it was 1:1 it now becomes successively 2:1 3:1 4:1 5:1 &c. so that, instead of 1/2 of the total value of the capital only 1/3, 1/4, 1/5 and c. is transformed into labour-power 2/3, 3/4, 5/5 & c. into means of production. As we know, that the demand of labour-power is correlated with the variable and not with the total capital, the demand for labour-power decreases much faster.

The next injurious effect of the introduction of the machine on labourer is caused in the reduction of his bargaining-power with the capitalists. Active labourer is turned into what Marx called the reserve army; women and children are recruited and replaced for adult workers. This certainly

1. Ibid., p. 628.
also have been set free or accumulated. We see, however, that the accumulated capital is constantly engaged in costly instruments of production. Thus, they cannot employ all the discharged workers and the newly added army of workers. Even if full-employment of the workers is achieved, which is quite impossible, Marx remarks "What a poor look-out is theirs! Crippled as they are by division of labour, these poor devils are worth so little outside their old trade, that they cannot find admission into any industries, except a few of inferior kind that are over-supplied with unpaid workmen".¹ Thus, Karl Marx was sure that the mass of workers cannot be absorbed in new industries or in other industries.

Thus, machine replaces skilled workers by unskilled, men by women, adult by children. It throws the hand workers onto the streets in masses. It also sharpens the competition amongst the capitalists. This competition itself has its peculiarities. Marx remarks, "this war has the peculiarity that its battles are won less by recruiting than by discharging the army of labour. The generals, the capitalists, compete with one another as to who can discharge most soldiers of industry".²

The antagonistic character of the introduction of machine can be explained in the accumulation and centralisation of capital in the hands of the bourgeois class, who converts the unpaid portion - the surplus-value into capital where it

¹. Ibid., p. 440
is expended in new circle. Thus money begets money. On the other hand, the labour sinks so deep that he cannot think of his salvation in the capitalistic mode of production. "Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality, mental degradation, at the opposite pole, i.e., on the side of the class that produces its own product in the form of capital".¹

The introduction of machinery has sharpened the class-conflict between the labourers and the capitalist class. The labourers now fight not only with the bourgeois class, but also with the instruments of production. "The contest between the capitalist and the wage labourer dates back to the very origin of capital. It raged through-out the whole manufacturing period. But only since the introduction of machinery has the workman fought against the instrument of labour itself, the material embodiment of capital. He revolts against this particular form of the means of production, as being the material basis of the capitalist mode or production."²

2. Marx quotes various examples in support of the argument. In the 17th century nearly whole Europe experienced revolts of the work people against the ribbon-loom. In Hamburg it was burnt in Public by order of Senate. No sooner had Everett in 1758 erected the first wool-shearing machine that was driven by water-power than it was set on fire by 100,000 people who had been thrown out of work (Refer Capital Vol. I, p. 428) The enormous destruction of machinery that occurred in the English manufacturing districts during the... conti..
The question of the appropriation of the surplus-value has been dismissed by Karl Marx in a very interesting manner. He presents the two classes of labourers and the capitalists with claims and counter claims. The surplus-value is created by the labourer thus he must be its owner. The labourer says to the capitalist, "of these 4 lbs of twist, say three-fifth represent 'constant capital. They belong to you. Therefore, you have to pay me the 2 lbs. so pay me the value of 2 lbs".  

The capitalist questions his claim and says "Have I not advanced the constant capital?" The labourer admits his claim and allows the capitalist the full-value of the constant capital appropriated during the process of production worth for 3 lbs. The capitalist however, is not satisfied and argues "But you couldn't materialise your labour, you couldn't spin without my cotton and my spindles; you must pay extra for that". The labourer tries to satisfy the capitalist that he also an important instrument in production. He says, "Well, the cotton would have rotted and the spindles rusted if I hadn't used them for spinning". It is only the labourer who preserves

---

first 15 years of this century chiefly caused by the employment of the power-loom is known as the Luddite movements (Ibid., pl 429).

1. *Theories of Surplus-value* (Vol. IV of *Capital*), art I, Foreign Language Publishing House, Moscow, p. 307 (hereafter referred to as *Theories*).

2. Ibid., p. 307

3. Ibid., p. 307
the value of the instrument of production and the raw material in the process of production. Their value that is equivalent to 3 lbs. is therefore preserved to 5 lbs of Yarn. "I'm not charging you anything for this value - maintaining power of my labour because it didn't cost me any extra labour-time beyond the spinning itself, for which I get the 2 lbs."\(^1\) Therefore,"you can't charge me for not being able to spin without spindles and cotton. For without spinning your spindles and cotton wouldn't be worth a brass farthing".\(^2\)

We must also know that in the capitalistic mode of production labour advances his labour-power to the capitalist. The capitalist pays the wages only after he consumes the use-value of the labour-power. "the use-value of the labour-power is advanced to the capitalist: the labourer allows the buyer to consume it before he receives payment of the price he everywhere gives credit to the capitalist".\(^3\) Thus, the claim of the capitalist is nullified because both advance their belongings to each other.

The second claim of the capitalist comes under the risk theory of profit. The capitalist here argues that he pays the labourer his wage before he disposes-off his product. It involves greater risk. The capitalist argues

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 307  
\(^2\) Ibid., p. 307  
"perhaps I may not sell them at all. That is risk No. 1,
secondly, perhaps I may sell them at less than their price.
That is risk No. 2. And thirdly, in any case it takes time to
sell them. And I to take on both risks on your behalf without
recompense and lose my time into the bargain? You can't expect
something for nothing". The labourer also takes risk in the
capitalistic mode of production. He advances his labour-power
and gives credit to the capitalists. "That this credit is no mere
fiction, is shown not only by the occasional loss of wages on the
bankruptcy of the capitalist, but also by a series of more enduring
consequences". The worker receives his wages after the expiry of
a certain period, say a week, fortnight and month, he has to report
on credit for the maintenance of self and the family. The
shopkeeper supply with adulterated commodities and also
charge higher prices. For example in London there are two
sorts of bakers - full priced and the under sellers. The under
sellers, almost without exception, sell bread adulterated with
alum, soap, pearl ashes, chalk, Derbyshire stone dust etc.
Sir John Gordon stated before the committee of 1855 that "in
consequences of these adulterations, the poor man, who lives
on two pounds of bread a day, does not now get one fourth
part of nourishing matter let alone the deleterious effects on
his health". The workers have to accept it because he has

no money in his pocket to purchase in cash. Again, "at Horningham in Wilts, for example, where the wages are monthly, the same flour that he could buy elsewhere at 1s 10d per stone, costs him 2s 4d per stone". The risk of the capitalist does not spare the workers because he is placed in an acute portion. "Just as the capitalist takes the risk of selling the commodity below its value, he equally takes the chance of selling it above its value. The workman will be thrown out into the street if the product is unsaleable; and if it falls for long below the market-price, his wages will be brought down below the average and short time will be worked. It is he therefore, that runs the greater risk". Thus according to Karl Marx the risk theory of profit does not justify appropriation of profit by the capitalist.

The last claim of the capitalist is that he had himself worked. He asks, "Have I not performed the labour a superintendence and of over looking the spinner? And does not this labour, too, create value?". We must know that this relationship between the capitalist and the labourer has been created by the capitalistic mode of production. But this function at the same time, "a function of the exploitation of a social labour-process, and is consequently rooted in the

1. Ibid., p. 175.  
2. Theories, p. 311.  
unavoidable antagonism between the exploiter and the living and labouring raw material he exploits". Moreover, the capitalistic mode has brought matters to the point where the work of supervision, entirely divorced from the ownership of capital, is always readily obtainable. Therefore, it has come to be useless for the capitalist to perform it himself. "An Orchestra conductor need not own the instruments of his Orchestra, nor is it within the scope of his duties as conductor to have anything to do with the "wage" of the other musicians. The manager performs the duty of supervision. Hence, the capitalist's justification for the appropriation of the surplus-value is futile and is baseless.

The only claim that can be advanced is the supreme position of the capitalist in the capitalistic mode of production. He has no other claim, therefore, the appropriation of the surplus-value is clear exploitation of the labourer. "the capitalist," therefore, "gets rich, not like the miser in proportion to this personal labour and restricted consumption but at the same rate as he squeezes out of the labour-power of others, and enforces on the labourer abstinence from all life's enjoyment".

1. Ibid., p. 331. 
Karl Marx was also aware of the theory of so-called class harmony of the classical writers. He tests the question with his own thesis of class-conflict. For example, it may be assumed that the interest of the capitalist and that of the labour is one and the same i.e., increase of capital. The labourer cannot be employed by any other factor of production than capital. In the same way capital cannot be utilised by other than any factor than labourer.

"Capital can only increase by exchanging itself for labour-power, by calling wage-labour to life. The labour-power of the wage-worker can only be exchanged for capital by increasing capital, by strengthening the power whose slave it is. Hence, increase of capital is increase of the proletariat, that is, of the working class". And thus, "The interest of the capitalist and those of the worker are, therefore, one and the same, assert the bourgeois and their economists. Indeed! The worker perishes if capital does not employ him. Capital perishes if it does not exploit labour-power...".

We must take guard against the argument. Both are indispensable for each other, but the question here arise is that had they equal rights and claims. It is not a picture

2. Ibid., p. 86.
of the facts because if we consider the question of accumulation of capital, Marx writes, "Growth of the power of accumulated labour over living labour. Growth of the domination of the bourgeoisie over the working-class". Moreover we must recollect that accumulation of capital brings itself the enmical force in the shape of machinery which turns out the labourers onto the street.

There may be another argument for class-harmony. The capitalist never violates the law of exchange when he purchases the labour-power. "Equivalent has been exchanged for equivalent. For capitalist as buyer paid for each commodity, for the cotton, the spindle and the labour-power, its full value. He then did what is done by every purchaser of commodities; he consumed their use-value". Moreover, the circumstances that on the one hand, the daily subsistence of labour-power costs only half a day's labour, while on the other hand the very same labour-power can work during the whole day, that consequently the value which its use during one day creates, is double what he pays for that use, "this circumstance is, without doubt, a piece of good luck for the buyer, but, by no means an injury to the seller".

Marx however, does not admit the argument and writes, "Though the latter with a portion of that tribute purchases the additional labour-power even at its full price, so that equivalent is exchanged for equivalent, yet the transaction is for all that only the old dodge of every conqueror who buys commodities from the conquered with the money he has robbed them of." ¹ If equivalent is exchanged for equivalent the possessor of the commodity can enrich himself by his own labour. In the capitalistic mode "when social wealth becomes to an ever-increasing degree the property of those who are in a position to appropriate continually and ever afresh the unpaid labour of others".² Moreover, when surplus-value arises during the process of production, in which variable capital - the labourer produces more than his remuneration, it certainly means that full value has not been paid to the labour-power.

Marx traces the antagonistic character of capitalist and the labourer in their relative status in the capitalistic mode of production. We must know that the increase in capital brings forth an increased demand for labour. It raises the wages and hence the enjoyments and satisfaction of the workers also increases. His status is raised. But

2. Ibid., p. 587.
we must not forget the relative advantage which he enjoys to the capitalist class. The social satisfaction that they receive must have fallen in comparison with the increased enjoyments of the capitalist class which are in accessible to the working-class people. Thus, "A house may be large or small, as long as the surrounding houses are equally small it satisfies all social demands for a dwelling. But let a palace arise beside the little house, and it shrinks from a little house to a hut... and however, high it may shoot up in the course of civilization, if the neighbouring palace grows to an equal or even greater extent, the occupant of the relatively small house will feel more and more uncomfortable, dissatisfied and cramped within its four walls".¹

Again, their interests are antagonistic because one class gains at the expenses of the other. Wages and profit are inversely related. Marx writes "capitalist's share, profit, rises in the same proportion as labourers' share wages falls and vice versa. Profit rises to the extent that wages fall; it falls to the extent that wages rise".²

Thus, Marx summarizes, "We see, therefore, that even if we remain within the relations of capital and wage labour, the

² Ibid., p. 89.
interests of capital and the interests of the wage labour are diametrically opposed".\(^1\)

When we come to the agriculture sector in Karl Marx system, we find that there are three classes "wage-labourers, industrial capitalists, and landlords constituting together and in their mutual opposition, the frame work of modern society"\(^2\). Here too the capitalistic mode of production predominates. This mode presupposes the separation of the direct producers from their position as mere accessories to the land, and on the other hand the expropriation of the mass of the people from the land. This mode transforms agriculture from a mere empirical and mechanical self-perpetuating process employed by the least developed part of the society into conscious scientific application of agronomy, that it divorces landed property from the relations of domination and servitude on the one hand, and, on the other, totally separates land as an instrument of production from landed property and landlord - for whom the land merely represents a certain money assessment which he collects by virtue of his monopoly from the industrial capitalist, the capitalist farmer. The capitalist farmer acquires land on lease and pays to the landlord rent for a particular period. He employs wage labourer for the cultivation and production purposes.

\(^1\) Ibid., p. 90
Karl Marx clarifies that surplus-value created by the labour-power is the only source appropriated by the capitalist and the landlord class in the shape of profit and rent respectively.

Marx follows Ricardo when he defines rent as "always the difference between the produce obtained by the employment of two equal quantities of capital and labour." He however adds "on equal areas of land". Thus natural fertility is the basis for the origin of rent. We must recollect that this natural fertility itself cannot produce rent. It helps in the increase of the efficiency of labour who is the only source to create surplus-value in excess to the less fertile land. Thus fertility of the soil can be compared to the machine which enhances the efficiency of labour-power but itself is barren to produce any surplus-value. Thus, labour aided by natural fertility is the cause of the differential rent. The condition here is, "the direct producers, must work beyond the time necessary for reproducing their own labour-power, for their own reproduction. They must perform surplus-labour in general. This is the subjective conditions. The objective condition is that they must be able to perform surplus-labour. The natural conditions must be such that a part of their available labour-time suffices for their reproduction and self-maintenance as producers, that the production of their
necessary means of subsistence shall not consume their whole labour-power". 1

Thus, the clash of interest between the capitalist farmer and labourer starts on the very same lines as that of the industrial sector. Here too, the labourers is reduced to the position of a pauper, replaced by machine into reserved army or punished to the towns, women and child labour is also introduced.

Marx regarded rent as the monopoly price. He writes," landed property is based on the monopoly by certain persons over definite portions of the globe, as exclusive spheres of their private will to the exclusion of all others." 2 The landlords therefore, enjoys every privilege that a monopolist can enjoy and Marx has no hesitation to remark that "capital as an independent source of surplus-value is joined by landed property, which acts as a barrier to average profit and transfers a portion of surplus-value to a class that neither works itself, nor directly exploits labour, nor can find morally edifying rationalisations, as in the case of interest-bearing capital e.g., risk and sacrifice of lending capital to others". 3

Marx also agrees with Ricardo that rent does not create value. It is merely a transfer from one class to the other.

1. Ibid., p. 620. 
2. Ibid., p. 601
3. Ibid., p. 809.
The extra profit is transferred to the landlord from the pockets of the capitalist farmer. Marx regards both the classes in the category of bourgeois class. Both share in the common loot from the surplus-value. There is therefore, no clear conflict between the two except that both exploit their supreme positions in the bourgeois mode of production.

We see that the whole system of capitalistic mode of production described by Karl Marx, is full of class antagonism and class-conflict. Marx regarded the capitalistic mode of production as the prime and also the last stage for class-conflict, because its internal contradictions give rise to socialist society with no class-antagonism and conflict. Marx proposes for a classless society with supremacy of the proletariat class. In the last stage the state will also wither away.

The capitalistic mode soon brings internal contradictions and the mode becomes out-of-date with the advance of the conditions. Briefly, we may summarise these contradictions as follows: There are periodical economic crisis and "In these crisis there breaks-out an epidemic that, in all earlier epochs, would have seemed an absurdity - the epidemic of over-production." The concentration and centralisation of capital switches the capitalistic production

on a very large scale. There the extent of commerce, industry and productive forces enlarged. The production forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions of bourgeois property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these conditions, by which they are fettered, and so soon as they overcome these fetters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endanger the existence of bourgeois property. Thus "The weapons with which the bourgeoisie felled feudalism to the ground are now turned against the bourgeoisie itself." The capitalistic mode has therefore, gave birth to its grave diggers. Moreover, the preliminary seeds for socialist society have been sown in the form of joint stock companies and in the birth of cooperative societies. Production on very large scale required huge capital accumulation. The industrial capitalist became unable to invest the demanded capital, therefore, joint stock companies are originated and private enterprise, thus became public, "It is the abolition of capital as private property within the frame work of capitalist production itself." It has been transformed the actually functioning capitalist into a mere manager, administrator of other people's capital, and of the owner of capital into mere

1. Ibid., pp. 57-58  2. Ibid., p. 58.
owner, a mere-money capitalist. Thus in stock companies the function is divorced from capital ownership, hence also labour is entirely divorced from ownership of means of production and surplus-labour. "This result of the ultimate development of capitalist production is a necessary transitional phase towards the recoverslon of capital into the property of producers, although no longer as the private property of the individual producers, but rather as the property of associated producers as outright social property."¹ The co-operative factories of the labourers themselves is another seed sown for socialist society. Marx, thus, refers that these new development "show how a new mode of production naturally grows out of an old one, when the development of the material forces of production and of the corresponding forms of social production have reached a particular stage."²

In the end Marx declares that the initiative lies with the proletariat class who has sunk deep, already trained to create revolutions. Their salvation lies in the overthrow of capitalism, and in establishment of socialism. Thus the communist party declares, "that their (proletariats) ends can be attained only by the forcible over-throw of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at the communistic revolution. The proletarians having nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win."³

¹. Ibid., p. 428  
². Ibid., p. 431  
³. Manifesto, p. 112.
We see that Marx traces the history of class-conflict through his concept of dialectical materialism. Professor Frank H. Knight remarks "underlying the historical theory of class-war, the intellectual basis or content of Marxism in the first place "dialectical materialism". He finds that with the mode of production the entire superstructure of the society is changed. The antagonism between the classes also sharpens with more force and combination. Thus, Henryk Grossman comments, "Of course class-struggle is not to be understood in the primitive sense that the workers must blindly attack the entrepreneur class wherever the two come into contact. Both the content and the form of the class-conflicts are themselves determined by the attained level of historical development and by the concrete historical situation."

In Marxian concept, class-struggle is not regarded as an evil but as a dynamic force, the lever of history. By fighting for its right against the ruling class, the exploited and oppressed class creates a new historical situation. New rights are wrested from the ruling class, and the whole of society is thereby raised to a new and higher level. In this conception, class struggle does not end with the abolition of feudalism by the bourgeoisie but is also typical of the relations between the bourgeoisie and the working class. According to Marx, the process of history on the road of progress, far from becoming increasingly peaceful, increases.

in violence with the development of capitalism, and class conflicts become the decisive instrument in the transition from capitalism to collectivism. Thus Marx "explains genetically the necessary emergence of class conflicts in various historical epochs and explains their original form and intensity by the development of productive forces in each period and by the position individuals and classes occupy in the productive process. This endows the doctrine of class struggle with a concrete and profound meaning".  

Marx read the system of capitalism as a passing phase "in the transition from the feudal economy of the past to the socialist economy of the future". His main efforts, however, were not directed to the precapitalist forms but to a systematic analysis of the genesis and development of the specific historical phases of capitalism and to the transition from capitalism to socialism. Marx views, "the evolution of the economic formation of society .. as a process of natural history" and his aim "lies in the disclosing of the special laws that regulate the original existence, development death of a given social organism and its replacement by another and higher one". Whereby society, "can neither clear

by bold leaps, nor remove by legal inactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth pangs. Briefly stated, it is that within the existing economy a new economic form arises and grows, that the two enter into ever sharper conflict with each other, and that through the violent resolution of the conflict the new economy finally takes over. Every new stage becomes a higher stage. Socialism will be last stage. There will be no classes, property rights will be done away.

Another important point is to be noted in Marxian analysis is that he proves capital to be sterile to produce any surplus-value and hence appropriation of profits by the capitalist class is a clear exploitation. Maurice Dobb comments "For Marx it was evident (as an empirical fact, not as a proposition relying on some a priori argument for its validity) that the capitalist class, drawing an income by virtue of property rights lived off the surplus labour of wage-workers in the same sense as the medival lord lived off the surplus labour of his serfs or the slave-owner off his slaves; and that this was the real crux of the matter." He has refuted all the arguments - that capitalist advances his capital for which he must get a reward or

capitalist undertakes a risk or that he has himself worked, and held that appropriation of profit as clear exploitation of the labour. Moreover, Marx has read the question in the classical view point. Again Maurice Dobb writes, "Marx was to show how the fact that one class in society drew an income without contributing any productive activity could be consistent with the prevalence of competition and the rule of economic law." Again, "He had to explain, as my theory of profit or surplus has to do, why it was that competition did not force down the value of the net product to the money, expenses of production, consisting of 'wage advances' to labourers or alternatively force up the reward of labour until it absorbed the whole net product." Marx writes "To explain the general nature of profits, you must start from the theorem that on an average, commodities are sold at their real values, and that profits are derived from selling them at their values ... If you cannot explain profit upon this supposition, you cannot explain it at all."  

Thus Marx's whole thesis is based on the evolutionary process of dialectical materialism and a revolution to be brought about by the phenomena of class conflict. Henryk

1. Ibid., p. 188  
2. Ibid., p. 188  
3. Value, Price and Profit, ed Eleaner Marx Areling (London, 1899), p. 53-54 (Quoted by Maurice Dobb, Ibid., p. 188)
Grossman comments "For the first time in the history of ideas we encounter a theory which combines the evolutionary and revolutionary elements in an original manner to form a meaningful unit".