

Baqir Al Sadr on Marxist Economic Model: Marxism: The basic Components of the Doctrine

Prof. Manzoor Ahmad Bhat*

Marxism is the gamut of economic, social and political theories formulated by Karl Marx¹ and Friedrich Engels,² stressing the doctrine of dialectical materialism,³ class struggle, the labour theory of value and the inevitable decay of capitalism, leading to the goal of a class society.⁴

Karl Heirich Marx was born in Germany at Trier in 1918 C.E. He studied various subjects including; law, history, philosophy and economics. The study of economics and h history led him to conclude that society have always remained a composite of two antagonistic classes. One of which possessed the means of production and the other did not possess them. The continuous opposition between two contradictory but interconnecting force (thesis and antithesis) and their continual reconstruction takes place at a higher level (synthesis).⁵

Materialism is a theory, according to which physical matter is the only a fundamental reality and all beings, processes and phenomena can be explained as manifestations or results of matter. In this doctrine the higher values or objective lie in material and in the development of material progress.⁶

Dialectical materialism is a Marxism theory, which asserts and maintains the material basis of a reality constantly changing in dialectical process and the priority of matter over mind. According to Engles:

“The great basic thought is that the world is not to be comprehended as a complex of readymade things, but, as a complex of processes in which the things apparently stable, no less than their mind image in our heads, the concepts, go

* Professor, Shah-i-Hamadan Institute of Islamic Studies, University of Kashmir Srinagar

through an uninterrupted change of coming into being and passing away.”⁷

He continues:

“For it (dialectical philosophy) nothing is final, absolute, and sacred. It reveals the transitory character of everything and in everything; nothing can endure before it except the uninterrupted process of becoming and of passing away of endless ascendancy from the lower to the higher. And dialectical philosophy itself is nothing more than the mere reflections of this process in the thinking brain.”⁸

Thus, Marxism want to assert on the basis of the law of dialectics that, the society has been in a continuous state of change and the modern capitalistic society, based on the law of dialects will once collapse down because, it contains some contradictory elements inherent in it, will act as its antithesis and will finally replace it by socialism

Economic Interpretation of History:

Marx seeks to explain every event of history on economic ground. He provides an economic interpretation of history. According to Marx, man’s relations are determined by the means of production. All wars, riots, and political movements have their Origin in the economic factors, he writes:

“In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of the society- the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determine their beings, but on the contrary their social being that determines their consciousness.”⁹

About the classes and class struggle, Marx asserts in the Communist Manifesto that, history of mankind is the history of class struggle. He writes:

“The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, Lord and self, guild master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed, stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on an uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large or the common ruin of the contending classes.”¹⁰

Marx adds; that the modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonism. It has but established, new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. He further writes:

“Our epoch, the epoch of bourgeois possesses, however, this distinctive feature:
It has simplified the class antagonism. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly faces each other-bourgeoisie and proletariat.”¹¹

According to Marx, the hostility between the two classes will continue. He explains that, with the passage of time the capitalism will generate conditions which will replace it by socialism. The capitalists will grow in wealth as the time passes, but will become less in number. There will be a cut throat competition in which the lower capitalists will perish. This will result into monopolies and over production, which will necessitate markets abroad. This will lead to an imperialistic war, and one war will be followed by another, more terrible than the proceeding one, till capitalism perishes in the conflict and the dictatorship of proletariat is established.

The theory of Surplus value

The third component of the Marxian doctrine is the theory of surplus value, which has become the pivot round which the entire Marxian economic analysis revolves. In his Das capital Marx

begins with explaining the nature of the terms; use value and exchange value. The exchange value in a natural raw material comes into existence only as a result of the rectification of human labour therein. He writes:

“as the exchangeable values of commodities are only social functions of those things, and have nothing at all to do with their natural qualities, we must first ask; what is the common social substance of all commodities? It is labour. To produce a commodity certain amount of labour must, be bestowed upon it or worked upon it.”¹²

However, the resultant effect of labour may vary from one person to another, due to the difference in their intelligence and aptitude as well as their commitment to excel others. Therefore, to remove this controversy, Marx uses the term social labour, he defines, social labour as:

The labour time socially necessary is that, required to produce an article under the normal conditions of production and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at that time.”¹³

Marx propounded his theory of surplus value on the basis of his theory of value. He says, that, in order to enable labourer to carry on the work of production, he needs some instruments of production and other facilities but he lacks these facilities. Hence, he has to sell his labour to the capitalist. However, the capitalist does not pay the labourer the full value of the product produced by him. A worker continues working even after the time he has put in labour worth its price. Sometimes he works for twelve hours where as six hour labour was enough to compensate the capitalist. Thus, work of labour force is not merely to produce value equal to its price but much more than it. Marx calls this extra value as, ‘Surplus Value’.¹⁴ The surplus value is the difference between the market value of the commodity and the cost of the factors used in the production of the commodity. Marx says that the manufacture gets for his commodity more than what he has spent on labour and other costs. By using this surplus value, the capitalist can get still more surplus. This surplus is the creation of labour. It is created because; labour is paid much less than is due to it. He characterizes the appropriation of the surplus value by the capitalist as robbery

and exploitation. A commodity according to him is simply a 'crystallized labour' or 'congealed labour'. He writes:

"All commodities are only definite masses of congealed labour time."¹⁵

In this way the capitalist by the help of surplus value become richer and richer, and the exploitation of the working class is continuously increasing. Thus, Marx propounded his theory of exploitation on the basis of the theory of surplus value.

End of Capitalism:

According to Marx, the forces that operate in the capitalist system lead to greater and greater exploitation of the laborers. The capitalists compete against one another in order to increase their profits. These are three ways of enhancing the exploitation, a) increasing the duration of the working day; when the period of working day is increased, total output increases, but the wages remain fixed. Thus, it leads to the enhanced exploitation. b) Surplus value is increased by the more intense use of labour. The working hours are not increased, but the workers are made to produce more. However, the surplus value cannot be substantially increased by these two methods. C) According to Marx, there is a third and more important method of increasing surplus value. It is to increase the physical productivity of labour by technological progress. Technical progress implies improvement in the techniques of production by technological progress. Technical progress implies improvement in the techniques of production by which a labourer is able to produce more, working the same number of hours as before. The result is that the total output of labour increase. Thus there is increase in surplus value, or the rate of exploitation. In his way, the working of capitalistic system results in the worsening condition of the working class. Marx calls it the law of increasing misery of the working class. According to this law, owing to technical progress, increase in capital accumulation and the consequent increase in national income under capitalism, the relative share of wages in national income is bound to fall and that of capital is bound to go up.

Surplus value is basis for profits and accumulation of capital. The aim of the capitalist is to increase surplus value to the maximum.

At first, when the supply of labour is large, wage rate remains constant at the subsistence level, but sooner or later, the demand for labour exceeds the available supply and wages rise, reducing thereby surplus value. With the loss of surplus value, there is a crisis,' as the capitalist has no incentive to invest. He also tries to create again a surplus value of labour using labour saving machinery but this also is temporary solution as a too frequent resort to this device will lower the rate of profit and thereby reduce the capitalist's incentive to accumulate.

Thus, capitalism is doomed to fail and give place to socialism. This is the picture which Marx himself predicts on the eve of the fall of capitalism. He comments, "Along with the constantly, diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolies all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of working class, a class always increasing in number, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself..... centralization of the means of production and socialization of labour at last reach a point where by become incompatible with their capitalist integument bursts asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds."¹⁶

Baqir al Sadr on Marxist Economic structure; Economic Science and Economic Doctrine:

According to Baqir al Sadr, there are two aspects of economy; economic science and economic doctrine. The economic science is the science which gives the explanation to the economic life, its economic events and its economic phenomena and the linking of those events and phenomena with the general causes and factors which rule therein.¹⁷

The economic doctrine is an expression of the way which the society prefers to follow in its economic life and in the solution of its practical problems.¹⁸

The line of demarcation between science and doctrine is the ideology of social justice, Sadr writes, "The economic doctrine consists of every basic rule of economic life concerned with the

ideology of social justice. And the science (of economics) consists of every theory, which explains the reality of economic life apart from a prefixed ideology or an ideal of Justice.”¹⁹

On account of this, Sadr classifies Marxist economy into historical materialism (the Marxist science) and the socialism and communism (the Marxist creed). Historical Materialism is the Science of Marxism which gives the economic explanation of the entire history in the light of Productive powers.²⁰

Marxist creed means the social system towards which Marxism calls and for the materialization of which it leads humanity.²¹

In spite of the vast difference between the two aspects, Sadr states that the link between them is very strong. He remarks that if the historical materialism fails to discharge its scientific function and in its analysis, it is proved that it does not explain the laws of human societies, when the whole edifice of Marxist creed will collapse down, as the foundation of the Marxist creed is laid on the historical materialism.²²

Historical Materialism as a single factor Theory:

Historical materialism is the interpretation of history in terms of single factor. According to this theory; it is the economic formation which determines social, political, religious, ideological and other manifestations of the social existence. As for the economic formation it too bears a cause that cause is the mode of Productive forces and the means of production. Thus, the theory regards economic factor as the chief factor and the first guide to the origin and development of society. Sadr however, regards this theory as one of the many theories, which interpret history in terms of the single factor. One such theory holds race as a basis of societies. Another theory regards geographical and physical factors as the basis of the history of nations. Another interpretation of history in terms of single factor is provided by psychologists who regard sex instinct as the main factor, which underlie all the human activities.²³ Sadr states that, for every social or historical occurrence many factors including social, political, economic, cultural and psychological are also operating. Therefore, the interpretation of

history in terms of single factor does not stand the test of reason and science.

Historical Materialism in the light of Philosophy:

After providing a detailed discussion on the philosophical materialism, Sadr analysis the theory in the light of philosophy, he find that, Marxism regards it necessary to interpret history in terms of means of production. According to it, as long as material interpretation is true in case of existence in general, it will be true in the case of history also; since history is only a part of general existence.²⁴ On account of this, it condemns the standpoint of the eighteenth century materialism in respect of its interpretation of history. According to Engels:

“And for us that in the realm of history old materialism becomes untrue to itself, because it takes the ideal driving forces which operate there as ultimate causes, instead of investigating what is behind them, what are the driving forces of these driving forces. The inconsistency does not lie in the fact that the ideal driving forces are recognized, but in the investigation not being carried further back these into their motive causes.”²⁵

Sadr disagrees with Marxism; he argues that, materialism in its philosophical conception means that matter with its manifold manifestation is the only reality which includes all the phenomenon of nature with it. Such a philosophical outlook makes no difference whether man is taken to be the product of material conditions and the production forces or the conditions of production and its forces are the product of man.²⁶ If other words historical materialism and philosophical materialism are two independent theories.

He also disagrees with Marxism on applying dialectical method in the investigation of history. He observes that the results it arrives are contrary to the law of dialectics. On one hand Marxism hold the view, on the basis of the law of dialectics, that the class contradictions is the only one main cause of the internal conflicts in the society and all the other contradictions merely arise from it, yet at the same time, it lays down that the caravan of humanity is travelling inevitably towards a single class. Sadr urges that how

could Marxism explain dialectical movement in a class society, as dialectical movement cannot arise except on the basis of contradiction.²⁷

Arguments in Favour of the Historical Materialism

After the making a close examination of many source books on the historical materialism, Sadr remarks that there are three types of arguments put forth by Marxism in favour of the historical materialism. These include philosophical argument, psychological argument and scientific argument.²⁸

a) Philosophical Argument

The Philosophical argument is based upon the principles of cause and effect. According to this Principle, nothing occurs by chance and that for every occurrence there is a cause. Marxism holds the view that ideas and opinions cannot be regarded as the basic behind the historical and social occurrences. Because these ideas are also subject to particular causes and to their coming into existence. Therefore, it is necessary to interpret history in terms of means of production.²⁹ On account of this, Marxism criticizes idealistic philosophy. According to Plekhanov:³⁰

“Hegel found himself having fallen in the very same vicious circle, in which the (French) sociologists and French historians had fallen for they had explained social forms by the existing state of ideas and the existing state of ideas by the social forms.”³¹

According to Sadr, Marxism explains the history of production forces and their evolution in term of means of production themselves. It says that production forces are the forces which change and subsequently entire society changes accordingly. It can be explained in this way that the production forces, in the course of mans interaction with nature give birth in the mind of mans the reflective ideas and knowledge. By the help of these ideas and knowledge man makes inventions of new means of production. In this way the development and renovation of production forces take place. Thus, development of productive forces is accomplished in correspondence with the reflective and scientific development and the reflective and scientific development are fashioned by these productive forces during the course of their experimentation.³²

Marxism in this way follows a circular course in its explanation of production forces and scientific development. Sadr argues that if such a circular course is possible from a philosophical side, then it is also possible to say that social formation results from the social experiments which man conducted during the course of his interaction with other individuals. This occurred in the same way as man conducted experiments with nature with productive forces, during the course of his productive operations. The society's practical ideas developed under the shelter of these social experiments. Just as man's mind develops during the course of his experimentation with nature. These ideas which are the result of social experiments give rise to new experiments, consequently leading to the development of the entire society.³³ In this way, Sadr provides the possibility of an alternative explanation of history. He regards the justification of this possibility from law cause and effect in which the Marxism believes.³⁴

b) Physiological Argument

According to Sadr on the basis of this argument propounded by Marxism the rise of thought in the life of mankind results from the phenomena and forms of a specific society. Thoughts appear in the history as an outcome of social phenomena in the life of mankind. This means social phenomena are prior to thought. Consequently, it is not possible to explain any social phenomena in their first formation by ideal factors.³⁵ In support of this argument Marxism takes the help of language.

According to Stalin,³⁶ one of the prominent Marxist writers, "whatever the thoughts be that come to the mind, it is not possible for them to be begotten and to come into existence except on the basis of the media of language."³⁷

In other words thoughts cannot emerge without language and language is nothing but a social phenomena.

Sadr contests this argument and holds that thought bears its existence independent of language. Language arose in the life of a man as a result of man's need of communicating the ideas to others. Man is a thinking being without language. It is not language which by coming into his life made him a thinking being.

He further remarks that language appear in the life of man and not in other begins, only because man alone is able to think and reflect. It is alone possible for him to perceive and change the existing reality. If language is assumed to be the outcome of productive forces, then it should undergo a change with the change in the productive forces,³⁸ but it is not the fact. Language maintains its own pace of development and change which lies in the thoughts and needs of human being rather than in productive forces.³⁹ In this way Sadr refutes the psychological argument of Marxism, according to which, thought cannot be the cause of any social phenomena.

C) Scientific Argument

Marxism provides explanation of historical and social phenomena in terms of dialectical materialism and regards this as a scientific explanation of history. According to Lenin:⁴⁰

“Dialectical materialism is no more in need of a philosophy higher than the other sciences. The only thing that remains of ancient philosophy is the theory and laws of the mind i.e. formal and dialectical logic.”⁴¹

Sadr argues that, any hypothetical explanation attains the scientific degree only when the scientific evidence is able to establish it as the only possible explanation of the phenomena and deny the possibilities of other explanations. Such an explanation is possible in the field of physical sciences and not in the social sciences.⁴²

Sadr states:

“The first and the serious obstacle which confronts Marxism in its path is the nature of the subject matter of history. ... the subject matter of inquiry in the field of history differ in nature from the subject matters of scientific inquiry in the field of physical science. The historical investigator who proposes to explain human society, its origin, development and its stages, he is not able to investigate these phenomena directly, in a way a physicist is able to explain physical phenomena which he can test by special experiments.”⁴³

On account of this, Sadr concludes that it is not possible to accept the economic factor as an inevitable cause behind all the historical and social events as long as other factors like social, religious,

political, ideological, Psychological, aesthetic etc. also have the ability to become the causes of these events.⁴⁴

Sadr on Marxist conception of ideology

According to Marxism, the real cause of every ideological process whether it is based upon religion, philosophy or science is latent in the material and economic conditions. According to it, ideology; whether it is based on religion, philosophy or science has no independent history of its own. It changes according to the change in productive forces.⁴⁵

a) Marxism & Religion:

Marxism shows a negative approach towards religion; it believes that religion is the product and outcome of the class conflict of society.⁴⁶

Marx writes:

“Religious suffering, indeed, is the expression of the real suffering, as also the protest against this suffering at the same time. Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature, the sentiment of the heartless world, as it is the spirit of the spiritless. It is the opium of the people, so the criticism of religion, then, is the first step towards the criticism of this valley sunk in tears.”⁴⁷

Marxism believes that, Religion as opium is given by the ruling exploiter to the exploited class to drink in order to make it forget its demands and its political role and submit to the existing evil reality.⁴⁸

According to Sadr religion is not the ideological phenomena of the multiclass societies only, even the primitive societies which Marxism thinks were communistic in nature, practiced the ideology of religion.⁴⁹ He further states that it is an undisputed truth that, religions always grow in the lap of the miserable and poverty stricken people. It illuminates their souls with its brightness, before it enlightens the entire society.⁵⁰ He further argues that if religion could be treated as the creation of the ruling class then it should not have passed decree against the practices like Usury.⁵¹ Similarly, if religion could be regarded as the ideology of down trodden and oppressed only then it should not have accepted by the class not down trodden and not oppressed.⁵²

b) Marxism and Philosophy

Philosophy according to Marxism is another intellectual manifestation of the material life and economic conditions in which the society lives. It establishes an inevitable relation between philosophy and productive forces. Knostantinov, one of the prominent Marxist say:

“..... In fact the sociological, juridical aesthetic and philosophical ideas are the reflections of material conditions of social life.”⁵³

Evolution in philosophical thinking takes place along with the evolution in productive forces. According to British communist philosopher Maurice Cornforth:⁵⁴

“The advancement of science towards evolutionary conception, and which expresses the discovery of the actual evolution of nature and society, corresponded with the development of the industrial capitalism in the later part of the eighteenth century, obviously, this correspondence was not a merely a pure correspondence but expressed a casual nexus..... bourgeois would not have lived had not the continuous revolutionary changes in the modes of production brought in....it was these conditions which lead to the general appearance of the conception of the evolution of nature and society. Because of this the importance of philosophy in the generalization of laws of hange and evolution, did not result merely from the scientific discoveries but was rather tied with every movement of the new society in is entity.”⁵⁵

Thus it appears that the above mentioned philosopher opines that means of production were changing and taking new forms and inculcating in minds of philosophers the conception of evolution which transferred the static philosophical theory of nature towards the revolutionary view which corresponds with the continuous evolution in the means of production. In other words there is a necessary causality between philosophy and means of production. Philosophy of a particular stage of history depends on the mean of production of that time. Philosophical ideas and views change along with the change in the means of production.

Sadr acknowledges the relationship between philosophy and productive forces. However, his difference with Marxism is an accepting economic cause as the sole cause behind the philosophy. He mentions various early philosophers in this respect these include, Anaximander⁵⁶ Heraclitus⁵⁷ and Sadr al-din Shirazi,⁵⁸ whose philosophical ideas were the same as found in the 18th century materialistic philosophy. Sadr argues that if Marxism is true is its conception, that philosophy and productive forces should maintain the same pace, the philosophical ideas of these philosophers would not have been the same to the philosophy of eighteenth century.⁵⁹

c) **Marxism and Science**

About science Marxism expresses the similar view as about philosophy, that is all the natural sciences progressively advance and grow in correspondence with the material needs opened up to them by the economic formation.⁶⁰

Sadr acknowledges the relationship, between scientific progress and economic forces, however he disregards economic cause as the soul cause behind the scientific progress. According to him except in the modern times, all the societies which existed before were to a great extent alike as to their means and modes of production. Simple agriculture and handicrafts were the two forms of production in these societies. He argues that if the forms of production were same, then why was there difference in the scientific progress.⁶¹ He further says that although socio-material needs result in new inventions and discoveries, however, this cannot be the legitimate interpretation of history and its progress. For the simple fact that many needs remained thousands of years waiting until science opened ways to fulfill them.⁶²

Sadr on Marxist Law of Value

Marxism holds the opinion that raw materials by their nature possess no exchange value. The exchange value in a natural raw material comes into existence only as a result of the rectification of human labor there in. Marx writes:

“Take two commodities, e.g., corn and iron. The proportions in which they are exchangeable whatever those proportions may be can always be represented by an equation in which a given quantity of corn is equated to some quantity of iron. E.g., 1 quarter corn = x cwt, iron what does this equation tell us? It tells us that in two different things in 1 quarter of corn and x cwt. Of Iron, there exists in equal quantities something common to both. The two things must therefore be equal to a third, which in itself is neither the one nor the other.....if we leave out of consideration the use value of commodity, they have only one property left that is being products of labour.”⁶³

Thus work is the basis of exchange value. However, this law in Marxism does not apply in case of hoarding, similarly, this law is not applicable in case of some technical and monumental productions like a plate produced by an outstanding skilled artist or a handwritten letter which dates back to hundreds of years.

According to Sadr, work is not the basis of exchange value. He argues that two persons can create two different exchange values of the same commodity, at equal intervals of time due to the difference in their mental aptitude, desire to excel others and the kinds of feeling they harbor in their minds about that particular work.⁶⁴ Two painters, for instance, each of whom has one hour to paint a picture, but natural ability of one of them makes the picture painted by him more charming than that painted by the other. Thus Sadr considers work as a heterogeneous factor which includes units efforts, which differ in importance and vary in degree and value. He regards it a folly to measure work quantitatively and numerically alone.⁶⁵

He further says that it is also possible to exchange a technical or monumental production at a rate higher than what has been spent on it in the form of work. A letter of historical importance for instance can be exchanged for a book of al-Kalim’s history, if such an exchange is possible then what is the common thing between them besides labour?⁶⁶ This means there is some other things between them besides labour. Similarly, Sadr argues that Marxism

fails to explain the falling of exchange value of a commodity with the decline in the collective desire or demand for it. The value of the commodity falls despite the fact amount of collective work involved there in remains unchanged. Sadr agree that, the degree of the utility of a commodity and how far it satisfies the need of a person both have a bearing on the constitution of the exchange value.⁶⁷ He concludes that it is not the work but the collective human desire which is common fact between two things. If the desire for a particular commodity increases, one can pay every price to obtain it. Thus, it is not work, but the human desire on the basis of which exchange of commodities takes place. He writes:

“Thus there is a collective desire for the cot as also for the cloth. This desire is attributable to the use and benefit they have in them. In this way, although the benefits they render are different from each other, yet the result produced is common between them, which is the human desire.”⁶⁸

Sadr on Primitive Communism:

After investigating many contemporary societies, Marxism propounds the view that humanity has passed through a stage of primitive Communism at the dawn of its social life. The primitive conditions according to it prevail in these societies even to this day. These societies include most of the tribes in Africa, Polynesia, Malenesa, Australia, America Indians, Eskimos, and Lagoons.⁶⁹

On this, Sadr remarks that if these societies are accepted as primitive, then it goes against the law of inevitability of history in which Marxism believes, according to which, societies have continuously moved from one stage to another. He argues that how primitive societies can remain thousands of years at one stage without any development.⁷⁰

Marxism explains the nature and characteristics of property relations in these societies in the following words:

“Human beings were obliged to pursue production a jointly social form and unblock (in group) to face the nature, due to man’s weakness and Paucity of means. Cooperation in production necessitates the establishment of Communal Property and forbids the thought of Private ownership.....For the several low level

of the forces of production rendered meager food and simple commodities in equal Portion obligatory.”⁷¹

Thus, Marxism has regarded scarcity of production as the main cause behind the communal social life. However, at same time it contradicts, while talking about the moral dispositions of the communist society and while glorifying its virtues.

About the American Indians Anderz a Marxist writer cites on the authority of Catalin,

“Every individual of an Indian village has the right to enter any dwelling and eat if he is hungry; nay, those who were disable fo work or whom sheer laziness from hunting were able, in spite of that to enter any hose they want and share food with its intimates.”⁷²

This shows that the production level in these societies was quite high. Taking into consideration the above passages Sadr concludes that, if the production level in the Primitive societies was high then what is the logical explanation of these societies being communistic.⁷³ He further argues that why did not occur to anyone the idea of exploitation and fraudulence in terms of distribution of produced commodities, when there was enough possibility of it due to abundance of production. According to Sadr, the answer of all these things lay in the consciousness of these people, which was preventing them from doing so.⁷⁴ Thus, it was not the economic factor, which was responsible for the equal distribution of food in these societies, but the human nature which was not allowing them to make suffer others.

Sadr continues that, however, if the equal distribution was the result of scarcity of production, then what is the reasonable explanation of feeding those idle fellows by whose loss they would have lost nothing.

Sadr on slave Society

The communist society emerged into the slave society, as a result of the development in production forces. According to Marxism; due to increase in productive forces, an individual was able to meet his requirements by labour of a limited portion of time, but the

productive forces were demanding more work. Thus, slavery system began to emerge to meet the new requirements of the new times. About the way it emerged it explains:

“The individuals who were pursuing function of the leaders, senior was officers and the priests in a primitive communist society took to exploiting their position in order to obtain wealth and to acquire a public property and began to secede gradually from the members of their own societies to be formed into aristocracy.”⁷⁵

It further says:

“The society converted the prisoners or war into slaves and began to gain an account of it, surplus product, till it became rich and was able, as a result of its wealth, enslave those members of the tribe, who had become debtors.”⁷⁶

In view of the above passages Sadr argues that, the explanation Marxism provides about the emergence of the slave society contradicts with the historical materialism. The explanation regards political factor as the major and economic factor as the minor factor responsible for its emergence. It further fails to explain that why those masters were provided the opportunity of enslaving the others as communist society claims equality of it people.⁷⁷

Accordng to Sadr, it was not the economic factor, but the human natures which gives rise to the slave order.⁷⁸ Man by nature loves comfort and leisure and when faces two ways to achieve one aim, surely chooses the less difficult. It was this nature of man which inspired him to think of enslaving others. Such a method provided him a better guarantee of comfort and leisure. He argues that if the development was demanding more labour. It was more fruitful to make a free mutual agreement with the people, who were made slaves. Such a trend would have multiplied the labour, consequently, the production because; a slave works disinterestedly in contrast to a free man. However, such a trend was not followed as it contradicts with the human nature.⁷⁹

Sadr on Feudal Society:

According to Marxism the slave society emerged into the feudal society as a result of the brutal exploitation of the slaves by their masters. In this way, thousands of slaves lost their lives. Besides, the conversion of majority of independent farmers and craftsmen decreased the number of armed forces and soldiers, which consequently, decreased the flow of slaves supplied through them. Because of all this a violent conflict arose between the scarcity of labour supply and the increasing demand of productive forces. Therefore, the slave society collapsed and the feudal order succeeded.⁸⁰

Such a change, according to Marxism, was revolutionary in nature as it was the result of class conflicts. Further, the change was the result of the development in productive forces because; it is the means of production which is the supreme force behind the history. Lastly, the change resulted into progress and development because, history always moves in forward direction according to the law moves in forward direction according to the law of historical materialism⁸¹

Sadr mentions the transformation of Roman society from slave order to feudal order. He argues that the transformation was a voluntary action on the part of the master class and there was no revolution.⁸² Sadr further says that transformation is not the necessary result of development in productive forces. It was the same agriculture and some handicrafts found in the slave order that continued in the feudal system. Contrary to this, the primitive society underwent a drastic change in the form of productive forces. The primitive man first used to take help of stones in their natural form to carry out his productive activities, and then he designed them into stone implements. Thereafter, he was able to discover fire. Later on, the forces of production developed and the mining implements and bows and arrows made their appearance. In spite of all these great transformations the society is regarded as primitive communistic.⁸³ He argues, if the modes of production change while the social forms remain unchanged as in primitive society and if the society changes while as the modes of production

remain constant as in feudal society, then how can Marxism explain the historical materialism in such a situation.⁸⁴

Similarly, the assertion that the change leads to the progress and development of the society is also not true. Sadr argues that instead of laying a positive effect, feudalism laid down a negative effect on progress and development. Feudalists remained contented with the agriculture revenues and its simple products, as a result of it, commercial capitalism got discourages. This resulted into wide spread poverty among the people.⁸⁵

Sadr on the Emergence of Capitalist Society

According to Marxism, The Capitalistic economic system emerged as a result of the disintegration of the feudalist economic system.⁸⁶

Marxism, while analyzing capitalism historically, lays much importance to the Primary accumulation of capital. It denies the conventional view point about political economy⁸⁷ which states that the capital production and the necessary wealth for the same, was the result of intelligence, frugality and good management by one class of the society. According to Marx:

“This historical movement was completed by means of enslavement, armed robbery, there being no hand in its realization of planning economy intelligence, as believed by authorities of the conventional Political economy.”⁸⁸

According to Sadr the Marxist description about the emergence of capitalism does not apply to the societies like Germany where a large number of feudalists built factories, carried on their administration and financed them with Feudal income they received. There was no violence, nor any movement of usurpation.⁸⁹ Similarly, it is not applicable to the commercial capitalism of Italy, which got huge profit to the Italian commercial Democracies like; Venice, Genoa and Florence because a class of traders came into being in these cities before the emergence of industrial capitalism. These traders earned huge profits by means of trade with eastern countries during the crusades.⁹⁰ Their profit was boosted as a result of their friendly ties with the rulers of Egypt & Syria. Consequently, on the basis of this profit, they set

up large factories. In this way the capitalism flourished without any violence.⁹¹

Sadr further says that, if the explanation provided by Marxism regarding the emergence of capitalism is regarded as absolute. It then contradicts with the emergence of capitalism is regarded as absolute. It then contradicts with the historical materialism. He argues, that, how could Marxists say that the reason behind the Primary capital accumulation and the existence of the capitalist class historically was the power of usurpation and subjection, where as it is itself a reason not economic by nature? As a matter of fact, Marx according to Sadr demolishes his historical logic himself and admits implicitly by that the class formation does not exist on economic basis.⁹²

Marxist Creed: Socialism and Communism

Socialism

Marxist creed means the social system to which Marxism calls and for the materialization of which it leads humanity.⁹³ It has two stages; Socialism and Communism.⁹⁴ From the point of view of the historical materialism, humanity will reach the highest stage of development on the basis of the law of dialectics. That highest stage is known as communism.⁹⁵ However, before reaching that stage it will pass through a transitory stage known as socialism. During this stage a government will be established which will nationalize the resources of wealth and the capitalistic means of production. In this way a classless society will emerge in which the arrangement of distribution will be based upon the principle, "From everyone according to his capacity and for everyone according to his work." Marxist believes that the class composition is the result of private property.⁹⁶ When the private property is abolished the society will turn into a single class.

Sadr argues that the class composition is not the necessary result of economic factor and the position of private property only. As many a class compositions have existed in history on military, political and religious basis. Therefore, historically it is not necessary that the division of society into classes disappears with the end of

private property, but it is also possible that a class composition may take place in the socialistic society on some other basis.⁹⁷

Further the economic and political nature of the socialistic stage according to Sadr, can lead to the creation of a new form of class inconsistency.⁹⁸ So far as the economic distribution in the socialistic state is concerned, it is based upon the principle, “For everyone according to his work,” Sadr argues that it contradicts with the classless nature of the socialist society, because, the individuals naturally differ from one another in their work efficiency, due to the difference in their capabilities, nature of the work and the degree of its complication. Thus, a talented worker gifted with genius and intelligence cannot be equalized with an ordinary worker.⁹⁹

Therefore, according to Sadr, Marxism finds only two solutions to solve the issue one; to adhere to the principle of distribution which state, “For everyone according to his work,” and therefore, distribute the production among the individual with different degrees, and create class inconsistency a new or it may take away the surplus value from the talented worker like capitalism, in order to equalize the wages.¹⁰⁰

The political nature of the socialist society also creates class inconsistency, based upon the possession and deprivation of the political power. Under socialism too much power is concentrated in the state. The state is not only a political authority but it also exercises unlimited authority in the economic sphere. According to Sadr, the ownership in its real substance is nothing but authority over the wealth and power. This authority is enjoyed by the political powers in the sociologist stage.¹⁰¹

Communism

Communism: according to Marxism, is the highest stage of human development. This is the final stage of history, in which the society will turn into a single class. All the class struggle will come to an end and the natural resources will be equally distributed. There are two pillars of communism according to Marxism; First, wiping out of Private ownership not only in the field of capitalist production,

but in the field of consumption also.¹⁰² Thus, it nationalizes all the means of production and all the consumer goods. Second pillar is the elimination of political authority and finally liberation of the society from the clutches of the government.¹⁰³

As for the wiping out of private ownership in all the fields, Sadr states that it does not drive its existence in the doctrine from the scientific law of value, as the nationalization of the means of Capitalist production is based on the theory of surplus value. Instead; the idea is based on the assumption that, the society will attain a high degree of richness, as the production powers will grow enormously; consequently, no room is left for private ownership.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, the distribution will be based upon the Principle, “from everyone according to his capacity, for everyone according to his need.”¹⁰⁵

Sadr argues that history has never witnessed such a miracle so far. It was the result that thousands of innocent people lost their lives while materializing this experiment by the Marxists. Therefore, the experiment remained preponderating between socialism and communism till it expressed its inability to materialize communism.¹⁰⁶

As for the second pillar of communism (disappearance of government) is concerned, Sadr questions that how this change will take place? Marxists have been saying that the revolution against government always sprouts from the class which is not represented by that government; Sadr argues that if a change from socialism to communism is revolutionary, then which class is going to bring it, as in communism, the society is a single class.¹⁰⁷ However, if the change is a gradual one, then it contradicts with the law of dialectics. Sadr further argues that the change also contradicts the nature of reality because, how can government give a death blow to itself, while every other government on the face of earth adheres to its centre and defends its political existence till the last moment of its life.¹⁰⁸

Lastly, Sadr argues that if the miracle of communism is given the practical shape, will then the society not need an authority to

regulate the proper distribution of work and the problems related to it?¹⁰⁹

References and Notes

¹ Karl Heinrich Marx was born in Germany at Trier in 1818. He studied law, history and Philosophy at Bonn and Berlin Universities and received his Ph.D at Jena in 1842. In the same year he married Jenny von Westphalen, Stepsister of Ferdinand Von Westphalen, a reactionary statesman; and was about to become an assistant professor in philosophy, when politics attracted him. He became a newspaper editor in Cologne. The paper was banned in 1843 due to harsh criticism against Government policies and Marx moved to Paris, where he met Friedrich Engels. Working here as a Journalist and a bitter critic, he was expelled from France in 1845. He went to Belgium and taught Economics there for three years; and also wrote his first book, *The Poverty of Philosophy* 1847. He also founded a German worker's society and joined the Communist League. He moved to London. A German worker's society and joined the Communist League. He moved to London in 1849, and lived there till death in 1883.

² Fredric Engels (1820-1895) was born in Bremen. In 1844 he met Marx in France. The two became close friends and collaborated on a number of works, the best known of which is *Communist Manifesto*. Ed., David-L-Skills; *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences* (Macmillan Company and the Free Press 1968) Vol.5, p.64.

³ Dialectical materialism is a socio-economic theory introduced by Karl Marx and Frederic Engels, according to which; history and the forms of society are interpreted as the result of conflicts between social classes arising from the relations of the means of production. *The new International Webster's Comprehensive Dictionary of English Language* (Deluxe Encyclopedia edition) Trident Press International, 2003 edition.

⁴ **The New International Webster's Comprehensive Dictionary of English Language** (Deluxe Encyclopedia edition) Press International, 2003 edition.p. 584.

⁵ Ibid., p. 276

⁶ Syed Muhammad Ismail, *A Critical Analysis of Capitalism, Socialism and Islamic-Economic order* Adam publishers and Distributers, 2008, p. 176.

⁷ Karl Marx selected works, Foreign Languages publishing House, Moscow, 1946, Vol.1,p.359.

⁸ Ibid.,p.360

⁹ Ibid.,p.300

¹⁰ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engles, selected works, Foreign Languages publishing House, Moscow, 1950, Vol.1,p.33.

¹¹ Ibid.,p.34

¹² Karl Marx, selected works, op.cit.,p.247

¹³ Karl Marx, *A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production*, vol1 p.39

¹⁴ Ibid.,p.77

-
- ¹⁵ Ibid.,p.40
- ¹⁶ K.K. Dewett, *Modern Economic Theories*, S.Chand and Company, 2003,p. 599.
- ¹⁷ Baqir al-Sadr, *Iqtisaduna* Tr. English Our Economics, (WOFIS) World Organization for Islamic Services Tehran-Iran, 1982, Vol. 2, part, 1,p.6.
- ¹⁸ Ibid.,
- ¹⁹ Ibid.,p.10
- ²⁰ Ibid.,vol.1,Part.1 p.202
- ²¹ Ibid.,
- ²² Ibid.,p.4
- ²³ Ibid.,p.6
- ²⁴ Ibid.,p.18
- ²⁵ Fredrich Engles, *Tarikh ki Ishtiraqi Tafsir* (The socialist Interpretation of History), p. 57, Cf, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit., p. 19.
- ²⁶ Baqir al-Sadr, *Iqtisaduna* ,op.cit.p.19
- ²⁷ Ibid.,p.28
- ²⁸ Ibid.,p.35
- ²⁹ Ibid.,p.38
- ³⁰ Plekhanov Georgi Valentivovich Plekhanov (1859-1918) was a Russian Revolutionary and Marxist Theoretician. He was the founder of social Democratic movement in Russia Wikipedia. Org/Wiki/Plekhanov.
- ³¹ Karl Marx, *Falsafi Tarikh (The Philosophy of History)* P. 44,Cf, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit,p.38.
- ³² Baqir al-Sadr, *Iqtisaduna* ,op.cit.p.40
- ³³ Ibid.,p.42
- ³⁴ Ibid.,p.43
- ³⁵ Ibid.,vol.,2, Part.1 p.44
- ³⁶ Joseph Stalin (1879-1953) was born in Soviet. In 1917 he became the editor in chief of 'Pravad' and in 1922 and he was appointed Secretary Government of the Communist Party and Lenin's Successor. Ed. David L-Skill, op.cit.Vol.1, p.440.
- ³⁷ Polizer. Georges, *Madiyah wa Mithaliyat Falsafa* (Materialism and Idealism in Philosophy) p.77, Cf, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit.,Vol.1, Part, 1, P.44
- ³⁸ Baqir al-Sadr, *Iqtisaduna* ,vol.1,part,1,op.cit.p.78
- ³⁹ Ibid.,
- ⁴⁰ Vladmi Ilyich Ulyanov, Lenin (1870-1924) was the founder of the Soviet Union. He was exiled From Russia 1905-17 as a result of the leading role he played in the revolution of 1905. From 1918 to 1924, he was the head of the state and leading Marxist theoretician. His best known Works are "*Materialism and Empiro-Criticism and Imperialism, Final Stage of Capitalism*. Ed.David-L-Skills, op.cit.,Vol.9,p.254.

-
- ⁴¹ Baqr al Sadr *Falafatuna, Our Philosophy*, Tr. English, Shams C. Inti, Muhammad Trust of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Part.1,Chap.1,p.104.
- ⁴² Baqir al-Sadr, *Iqtisaduna* ,op.cit.p.51
- ⁴³ Ibid.,p.55
- ⁴⁴ Ibid.,p.58
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.,p.87
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.,p.81
- ⁴⁷ Karl, Marx, Selected Essays of Marxism(Arabic Tansl.)pp.16-17, Cf,*Iqtisaduna*, op.cit.,p.81
- ⁴⁸ Baqir al-Sadr, *Iqtisaduna* ,op.cit.p.81
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.,p.83
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.,p.82
- ⁵¹ Ibid.,
- ⁵² Ibid.,p.83
- ⁵³ Knostantinove, *Dur al Afkar al Tadmiya fi Tatwir al Mujtama* (The Role of Progressive idea In Evolution of society),p. 8.Cf, *Iqtisaduna*,op.cit.,p.87.
- ⁵⁴ Maurice Campbell corn forth (1909-1980) was a British Marxist Philosopher. He was the Official ideologists of the communist party of Great British. Wikipedia.Org/Wiki/Maurice Cornforth.
- ⁵⁵ Maurice Consforth, *Al Madiyat a IDialectia* (Dialectal Materialism) p. 40, Cf, *iqtisadun*, op.cit,p.88
- ⁵⁶ Anaximander who lived in the Sixth century B.C. 611-547B.C. gave to philosophy a c Conception of evolution which was not different in essence from the conceptions of Evolution which was not different in essence from the conceptions of evolution prevalent In the age of the capitalist production. He held that creatures in their first state were lowly things, then impelled by the power of their native motive force moved on by evolutionary process to higher and higher steps to concordance between itself and the external environment. Man, for instance was an aquatic animal but when water was swept off,this aquatic animal was obliged to seek congenial environment. So he acquired by the passage of time organs suitable for locomotory movement which enabled him to move upon dry land, and thus, became man.
- ⁵⁷ Heraclitus born 535 B.C. Died 475 B.C. gave philosophy the conception of evolution based On the opposite and the dialectics. He affirmed that nature does not remain in a fixed state But is in continuous flux. This change from one form into another form and the motion are The reality of nature; and explains this motion by the law of opposite which means that a Thing in motion 'is' and is changing that is existence and non-existence at the same instance, And this union of two instances of existence and non-existence is the meaning of motion Which is the essence of nature and is reality.

-
- ⁵⁸ Sadr ad Din al Shirazi, better known as Mulla Sadra (1572-1641). He believes that ancient philosophy combined with revealed truth gives the highest form of truth. He wrote a number of original works. The best of which is *Kitab-al-Hikma al-Muta'aliya*.
- ⁵⁹ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit.,p.91
- ⁶⁰ Ibid.,p.103
- ⁶¹ Ibid.,p.104
- ⁶² Ibid.,p.105
- ⁶³ Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production*, vol.1,p.38
- ⁶⁴ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit.,p.91
- ⁶⁵ Ibid.,
- ⁶⁶ Ibid.,pp.165-166
- ⁶⁷ Ibid.,pp.166-170
- ⁶⁸ Ibid.,p.177
- ⁶⁹ Ibid.,p.127
- ⁷⁰ Ibid
- ⁷¹ Fredrich Engles, *Tatwir al Milkiyat al Fardiya* p. 14., Cf, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit,p.128
- ⁷² Ibid
- ⁷³ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit.,p.129
- ⁷⁴ Ibid.
- ⁷⁵ Fredrich Engles, *Tatwir al Milkiyat al Fardiya* p. 134., Cf, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit,p.134
- ⁷⁶ Ibid.,p.135
- ⁷⁷ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*, op.cit.,p.175.
- ⁷⁸ Ibid.,p.131
- ⁷⁹ Ibid.
- ⁸⁰ Ibid.,p.136
- ⁸¹ Ibid.,p.136-137
- ⁸² Ibid.,p.137
- ⁸³ Ibid.p.140
- ⁸⁴ Ibid
- ⁸⁵ Ibid.,p.143
- ⁸⁶ Ibid.,p.144
- ⁸⁷ Political Economy is a common name for economics until the late nineteenth century, when government policies concerning finance and commerce (political) could at least be gradually separated from the realities of production, finance and trade (economic). Thus David Ricardo and John Start Mill's books (1817-1848) still dealt with "political Economy" where as Alfred Marshall's book (1890) is entitled *Principles of Economics*. Until recent times this term is the common name for the study of economic processes The term connotations of the inter relationship between the practical aspects of political action and pure theory of economics. Sometimes, it is argued that classical

political economy was concerned with this aspect of the economy and the modern economists have tended to be more restricted in the range of their studies.

⁸⁸Karl Marx. *Das Capital*. Vol.iii, Sec.3. pp.1050-55, Cf, *Iqtisaduna*,op.cit.,p.146.

⁸⁹ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*,op.cit.,p.14

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Ibid.

⁹² Ibid.,149

⁹³ Ibid.,p.202

⁹⁴ Ibid.,p.203

⁹⁵ Ibid.

⁹⁶ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engles, *Op.cit*,p.33

⁹⁷ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*,op.cit.,p.209

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.,p.219

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.,p.220

¹⁰¹ Ibid.,p.216

¹⁰² Baqir al Sadr, *Falafatuna*,op.cit.,p.28

¹⁰³ Ibid.,p.81

¹⁰⁴ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*,op.cit.,p.28

¹⁰⁵ Baqir al Sadr, *Falafatuna*,op.cit.,p.224

¹⁰⁶ Baqir al Sadr, *Iqtisaduna*,op.cit.,p.225

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.,p.227

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.,p.228