

**THE PROBLEMATICS IN KARL MARX'S NON-VIOLENT HUMANISM,
IN HIS THEORY OF ALIENATION.**

BY

JOSEPH EHINOR VICTOR

ART2101110

DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**FACULTY OF ART,
UNIVERSITY OF BENIN,
BENIN CITY.**

SEPTEMBER, 2025

**THE PROBLEMATICS IN KARL MARX'S NON-VIOLENT HUMANISM,
IN HIS THEORY OF ALIENATION.**

BY

JOSEPH EHINOR VICTOR

ART2101110

**AN ORIGINAL ESSAY SUBMITTED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF
PHILOSOPHY, FACULTY OF ARTS, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN
CITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
REWARD FOR THE AWARD OF THE BACHELOR OF ART (B.A.)
HONORS DEGREE IN PHILOSOPHY, UNIVERSITY OF BENIN, BENIN
CITY.**

SEPTEMBER, 2025

CERTIFICATION

This is to certify that this research was carried out by **JOSEPH EHINOR VICTOR**, with the matriculation number **ART2101110** and it's meet the requirements for an award of Bachelor of Art in philosophy.

Prof. Valentine Ehichioya Obiyan

Project Supervisor

Date

Dr. Wesley T. Osewengie

Ag.Head of the Department

Date

External Examiner

Date

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to God almighty who has given me the strength to finish well and also to my dedicated and faithful parents, Mr and Mrs Joseph for the unshaken support towards my education, care and love, to my mentors and spiritual leaders and siblings, I'm indeed grateful to you all, thank you and God bless you all.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My utmost gratitude goes to almighty God for making this project research possible

I also acknowledge my considerate supervisor, Prof. Valentine E. Obiyan for his consistency towards the progress of this project research from the beginning when it started, to its end, I really appreciate. And also I want to acknowledge my HOD (Head of Department of Philosophy) Dr. Wesley T. Osewengie and others lecturers in the department which includes Prof. Perter Omozejele, Prof. Uzoma Okagba, Prof. Tony Asekhauno, Prof. Sylvester Odia, Prof. Felix Airoboman, Prof. Valentine Obiyan, Christopher Osawaru, Dr. Emmanuel Asia, Dr. Joseph Odige, Dr. Paul Michael, Dr. Victor Jeko, Dr. Sylvester Apologun who have directly contributed to my education and into what I'm today.

However, my sincerest gratitude goes to my father and mother Mr and Mrs Joseph for their immense contribution to my studies and also Mr and Mrs Eremah-Joseph (Joe spaco) Mrs Flora, Bro P. Aikore Nicholas Ogbes and my siblings for the advice and consistent encouragement God reward you all.

Finally, a special thanks and gratitude to my Circle; Morgan, Whitney, Loveth and admirable friends in philosophy department and also well wishers, thanks you all, I'm really grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE -	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
CERTIFICATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
DEDICATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
TABLE OF CONTENT	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi
ABSTRACT-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ix

CHAPTER ONE: THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study	-	-	-	-	-	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	-	-	-	-	-	
1.3 Purpose of the study	-	-	-	-	-	
1.4 Significance of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	
1.5 Scope of the study	-	-	-	-	-	
1.6 Methodology	-	-	-	-	-	
1.7 Conceptual analysis	-	-	-	-	-	
1.8 Literature review	-	-	-	-	-	

CHAPTER TWO: THE CONCEPT OF ALIENATION IN MARX'S THOUGHT

2.1 Definition and Historical Context: Alienation-	-	-	-
2.2 Alienation in Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts (1844)		-	-
2.3 The Four Aspects of Alienation -	-	-	-
2.4 Other Aspects of Alienation	-	-	-

CHAPTER THREE: NON-VIOLENT HUMANISM IN MARX'S PHILOSOPHY

3.1 Definition of Humanism in Marx's Work	-	-	-
---	---	---	---

3.2 The Structural Violence of Capitalism - - - -

3.3 Marx's View on Non-Violence and Revolution - - -

3.3.1 The Role of Class Struggle and Praxis of Revolution - - -

3.4 Alienation and Human Non-violent : Conceptual Complexity - -

CHAPTER FOUR: EVALUATION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

4.1 Evaluation - - - - -

4.2 Recommendation - - - - -

4.3 Conclusion - - - - -

BIBLIOGRAPHY - - - - -

ABSTRACT

One thing we people tend to forget is that Karl Marx's theory of alienation is a central theme in his critique of capitalism, where he tries to point out how labor under capitalist production estranges or alienate individuals, humans, laborers, workers, or what he clearly identifies as species-being from their work, their essence, production and society. However, the paradox founded in his non-violent humanism visualize his ideal of human emancipation seemingly contrasts with the revolutionary implications of his thought.

This project research explores the inconsistencies within Marx's humanist as well as his non-violence framework, particularly in relation to alienation. It examines how Marx's commitment to non-violent humanism struggles to reconcile with the structural violence of capitalism, his advocacy for proletarian revolution, and the potential coercion in his vision of a classless society.

By analyzing key texts and interpretations, with the critical analysis method, this research questions whether Marx's theory of alienation can truly align with a peaceful transformation of society, we shall find out. The work concludes that while Marx's humanism emphasizes human flourishing, his solutions inevitably involve tensions that challenge the feasibility of non-violent admiration.

CHAPTER ONE

THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Karl Marx, a German political philosopher, theorist, economic and revolutionary, is born May 5, 1818, at Trier, province of Rhine, Prussia and died March 14, 1883, London. At the University of Bonn in 1835 he is believed to have studied humanities and later law and philosophy at the "University of Berlin 1836–41, where he became acquainted with the philosophy of G.W.F. Hegel.¹

Worked as a writer in Cologne and Paris 1842 to 45, became active in politics. In Paris he is said to have met Friedrich Engels, who would become his lifelong collaborator. Expelled from France in 1845, he moved to Brussels, where his political orientation got nurtured and matured then he and Engels made names for themselves through their writings. Later on Marx was invited to join a secret left-wing group in London, for which "he and Engels wrote the *Communist Manifesto (1848)*."² In that same year, .He worked part-time as a European correspondent for the New York Tribune (1851–62) while writing his major critique of capitalism, *Das Kapital (3 vol., 1867–94)*.

The concept of Alienation is a paramount experience in our global society today, it serves the purpose of disconnecting one from the fundamentals of life and existence. This project

¹ Wikipedia contributors: *Karl Marx*, Retrieved Online from https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Marx on September 18, 2025

² The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. *The Communist Manifesto*. In *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Communist-Manifesto> on September 18, 2025

research seeks to analyze and identify the problems associated with non- violence humanism in the theory of Marx's concept of Alienation. In order to understand Karl Marx non-violent humanism, there is a need to breakdown the concept ie; Non-violence, Humanism, Alienation etc. For Mahatma Gandhi he note: "Non-violence is the greatest force at the disposal of mankind. It is mightier than the mightiest weapon of destruction devised by the ingenuity of man."³ Here, Gandhi concept of Non-violence Humanism capture the power of peaceful resistance and the belief in the strength of human dignity, value and worth over violence in a particular society, county or nation. "Humanism" from time pass in reference to history and also from human experience, Specifically refers to a cultural and intellectual movement in 14th-16th century Europe characterized by attention to classical culture and a promotion of vernacular texts, notably during the Renaissance.

Humanism, from the ethical perspective refers to a system centred on humans and their values, needs, interests, abilities, dignity and freedom; especially used for a secular one which rejects theistic religion and superstition. But using and understandable definition of Humanism, “Humanism is defined as a philosophy that usually reject super-naturalism and stresses an individual’s dignity and worth and capacity for self realization through reason”⁴ (Merriam-Webster, 2025). So back to one of the main theory of this project research "Alienation" from the word Alienate means, to Feel Isolated or Disconnected. Alienate refers to the act of causing someone to feel isolated, disconnected, or separated from others, themselves, for Marx, the meaning of Alienation can be understood from the concept “all round separation” and these all round separation leads us to the four major aspect of alienation.

³ Gandhi M.K. (1975), *Meaning Of Non-violence. In the collected works of Mahatma Gandhi* Vol. 61, pp. 265-266

⁴ Merriam W. Dictionary (2025), English Ver.9.0.1, : *Definition of Humanism*, app, Google Play, 2025.

1.2 STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

According to Karl Marx wrote; “The worker therefore only feels himself outside his work, and in his work feels outside himself. He is at home when he is not working, and when he is working he is not at home”⁵(Marx, 2007,p.72). Which explains his theory of alienation in which workers, labor get separated from their work just because they are being deprived. This claim raise some fundamentals questions regarding this theory, questions like; Is alienation an inherent part of modern society, regardless of the economic system? While Marx attributes alienation to capitalism, do socialist or mixed economies also produce similar feelings of estrangement?

If violence is deeply rooted in systemic oppression, can non-violence alone dismantle injustices, or does transformation sometimes require force? Moreover, how well do one understand the the concept “violence does” is it only from the idea of direct physical harm, or should structural violence, such as poverty and discrimination, also be considered forms of violence that non-violent humanism must address? Another major question is whether non-violence is has an ethical implications, in cases of self-defense or protecting the vulnerable, is using force justified, or does it compromise the principles of humanism?

If non-violence only talk about respecting human essence, identity and dignity, how do we reconcile that with situations where political and economical structures allows suffering to remain? Historical movements led by figures like Gandhi and Martin Luther King Jr. suggest that non-violent resistance will always be powerful and violent, but sometimes their successes often came alongside violent struggles. Now the question is does this mean non-violence is effective only in certain contexts, or is it an ideal that can work generally? Let leave it for this work to decide

⁵ Marx, K. (2007). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (M. Milligan, Trans.). Dover Publications. p.72

Lastly, on a personal level, how do individuals practice non-violent humanism in daily life while living in a competent and often exploitative societies? Can non-violence coexist with ambition, economic survival, and self-interest, or does it demand a radical transformation of human priorities? These unresolved questions show that while non-violent humanism is a powerful ideal, its practical approach is far from simple.

1.3 PURPOSE OF STUDY

One of the purpose of this project research is to promote a world where human dignity, compassion, and justice prevail. Ultimately, Marx's aim was not just to describe alienation but to argue that it could be overcome. He believed that by abolishing capitalism and replacing it with a communist society, where workers collectively own and control the means of production, alienation would disappear. In such a system, labor would become meaningful, people would engage in work that reflects their creative potential, and social relationships would be based on cooperation rather than exploitation.

His theory of alienation was therefore, a foundational part of his broader revolutionary project to inspire the working class to recognize their oppression and seek liberation through the overthrow of capitalist structures. It seeks to establish societies based on mutual respect, equality, and cooperation, ensuring that conflicts are resolved through dialogue and peaceful means rather than aggression or coercion. Its objectives include fostering social and political structures that eliminate oppression, advocating for human rights, and addressing systemic injustices such as poverty, discrimination, and war. It also encourages personal transformation, urging individuals to embrace empathy, ethical responsibility, and a commitment to peace in their daily lives. Non-violent humanism ultimately envisions a world where humanity is united through shared values of kindness, non-aggression, and respect for life.

1.5 SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

The significance of this research richly includes and also not limited to the following;

1.5.1. A deep and proper understanding and clarification of what alienation entails in a society, country or nation.

1.5.2. Offering significant academic contribution to universities, college, institution and more or less secondary school.

1.5.3. Identifying the defects surrounding the whole idea of a non-violence society and also validating the possibility of a existence without violence.

1.5.4. Probably to eliminate and eradicate a world or existence with just theories and speculation, a philosophical worldview hell bent on mere utopianism and ideologies with no sense of pragmatism.

1.5.5 However, it would also be used as a medium to point out measurable faults involved in most of Marx's Ideologies and more importantly his humanist misconception of the potentials embedded in religion, capitalism and others. Karl Marx seemed to have had a one-sided view of capitalism and well as religion.

1.5 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The scope of this research revolves around Marx's concept of alienation as connected to his broader vision of humanism, which isn't strictly non-violent, his understanding of alienation as a condition imposed by capitalism, where workers are estranged from their labor, the products they create, their fellow human beings, and even their own human essence, and his humanist theory which is rooted in the belief that humans, by nature, are creative and social beings. However the briefings of capitalism and their terms associated with it as well as the connection

between capitalism and alienation, it also examine Marx's humanism based on the true human freedom and dignity, and the conceptual complexities in non-violent humanism, the common principles surrounding non-violent humanism pertaining to Marx's view and the possibility of a non-violent humanism in a contemporary era.

This study explores Karl Marx's concept of alienation through the lens of non-violent humanism. Focusing on Marx's early works, particularly the Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844, however, this research examines how alienation is presented as a critique of capitalist society. The study aims to analyze the relationship between alienation and humanism in Marx's thought, highlighting the ways in which his ideas can be seen as a call for human emancipation and social transformation. By examining the intersections between alienation, humanism, and non-violence, this research seeks to contribute to a deeper understanding of Marx's philosophical project and its relevance to contemporary social and political issues. The challenges as well as the impediment and problematics facing Marx's theory and what make these problems challenging will be thoroughly looked into.

1.6 METHODOLOGY

The methodology for examining non-violent humanism through an analytic and evaluative approach involves critically assessing its philosophical foundations, historical applications, and practical implications in contemporary society. This research work adopts an analytic method to break down the core principles of non-violent humanism, examining its problems both political and social dimensions. By dissecting key philosophical texts, speeches, and movements associated with figures like Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King Jr., and contemporary non-violent activists. In addition, the evaluative method assesses the effectiveness of non-violent humanism in addressing real-world conflicts, social injustices, and systemic oppression. By comparing historical case studies. This research includes textual analysis of

secondary sources that provide critical interpretations. Comparative analysis is applied to assess the outcomes of non-violent resistance movements versus those that have incorporated elements of force or armed struggle. The methodological approach ensures that non-violent humanism is not only understood in its idealistic form but also studied in terms of its practical applicability and limitations.

1.7 CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS

Another important aspect of this research, here we're looking into important keywords associated with Marx's Non-violent Humanism in his theory of alienation, these keywords include;

1.7.1 Alienation: A concept in Marxist theory that describes the estrangement of workers from their labor, the products they create, their fellow humans, and their own essence due to capitalism. It highlights how individuals feel disconnected from meaningful work and society.

1.7.2. Non-Violent Humanism: A philosophical approach that promotes human dignity, equality, and justice without the use of violence. It emphasizes peaceful solutions to social and economic oppression. However, in Marx's case, his humanism is debated because his revolutionary ideas allow for potential conflict.

1.7.3. Capitalism: An economic system where private individuals or corporations own the means of production and operate for profit. Marx viewed capitalism as exploitative because it alienates workers and concentrates wealth among a few.

1.7.4. Labor: The productive work done by individuals, which Marx saw as central to human nature. Under capitalism, labor becomes a forced activity, leading to alienation because workers have no control over their work or its outcomes.

1.7.5. Proletariat: The working class in a capitalist society, who sell their labor to survive but do not own the means of production. Marx believed they were the most alienated and would eventually lead a revolution against capitalism.

1.7.6. Bourgeoisie: A class of citizens who are richer members of the third estate. The capitalist class⁶. This class for Marx is often referred to as "the capitalist" known to have a private investment and ownership of properties.

1.7.7. Class Struggle: The ongoing conflict between different social classes, particularly between the proletariat and bourgeoisie, over economic power and resources or sometimes it might be political. Marx saw this struggle as the driving force of historical change.

1.7.8. Revolution: A fundamental change in political and economic systems. Marx viewed revolution as necessary to overthrow capitalism and end alienation, though this raises questions about the role of violence in his humanism.

1.7.9. Structure: "The overall form or organization of something"⁷. In the later part of this work will reflect on Structure of capitalism, which means the form and organization of a capitalist society ruled by class struggle, exploitation and social conflict.

1.8 LITERATURE REVIEW

Marx's thought on humanism and non-violence captures a world with the peaceful methods in which one can resolve conflicts, here humans are put first before anything. He tries to eliminate societal tyranny and oppression from the higher institution like the governmental bodies and mere human alike in high places (bourgeois) in a capitalist society, he also envision a world

⁶ English Dictionary. (2025), English Ver.9.0.1, : *Definition of bourgeoisie*, app, Google Play Store. 2025.

⁷ *Ibid*

without class struggle but a world with free-will because for him human essence is found where there's peace and unity amongst people.

For Howard Zinn, the concept of non-violence humanism can be derived from a practical approach. For him, in order to understand non-violence humanism, it must be derived from its meaning from the idea of socio-change, which is considered as a practical approach and also a tool to achieving revolution. For him, history shows that when ordinary people unite and resist oppression peacefully, they can force those in power to make change. He looks at the U.S. civil rights movement, labor struggles, and anti-war protests as proof that non-violent resistance can transform society more effectively than violence. In his work, *A People's History of the United States* (1980). Zinn explains Martin Luther King Jr.'s approach in his writing he said: "King's stress on love and non-violence was powerfully effective in building a sympathetic following throughout the nation, among whites as well as blacks."⁸ With reference to the above, it is concluded that this research only captures the idea of Socio-change and revolution, which means that in trying to conceive non-violent humanism in a modern contemporary time, the idea of "change" must first be achieved.

For J. Butler, the idea of non-violent humanism is understood from the concept of "Political Force." This active political force tends to challenge systems of domination and injustice.⁹ She writes: "Non-violence is not a passive position, but a sustained commitment to a form of life that affirms equality and inter-dependency, and that opposes the conditions that produce inequality and violence."¹⁰ In *The Force of Nonviolence* (2020), she argues that non-violence is deeply tied to human interdependence, the idea that our lives are bound up with one another in a united stance. For Butler, to practice non-violence is to recognize this shared vulnerability and to resist the

⁸ Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the United States*. Harper & Row. p.393

⁹ Butler, J. (2020). *The force of nonviolence: An ethico-political bind*. Verso Books. p.31

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p.31

structures such as racism, economic exploitation, and state violence that deny certain groups their humanity. She emphasizes that non-violence is not simply the absence of violence; instead, it is a deliberate and forceful stance that disrupts the logic of power. For example, when oppressed groups refuse to retaliate violently, they expose the moral bankruptcy of their oppressors and create new forms of solidarity. Butler also critiques the way governments and powerful groups justify violence as “necessary,” arguing that such reasoning maintains inequality and domination. In this note, one can say that Butlers agrees with Marx's to an extent that non-violent humanism and resistance tends to challenge political power, authority and domination.

Peter Gelderloos, an advocate of revolutionary change, also agrees and support the dissolution and transformation of the state, but made a concrete point which Marx later fell back to. In his work “*How Nonviolence Can Protect the State (2007)*” believes that leaders of the state will not acquiesce. Hence, he concludes, that physical force must be used.¹¹ By addressing this, he made emphasis on the following: Nonviolence is ineffective against oppressive systems backed by violence.¹² He also sees non-violent humanism as static and inferior, because it protects the state from the only challenge that can overthrow it, namely violence he said: "Put quite plainly, non-violence ensures a state monopoly on violence" and the fact that non-violence is strategically inferior he notes: "The struggle against authority will be violent, because authority itself is violent and the inevitable repression is an escalation of that violence. ... Lobbying for social change is a waste of scarce resources for radical movements."¹³ Gelderloos arguments goes against Marx's view as stated in the above is underlying built on his certainty that the idea of non-violence humanism cannot be possible when most government enforces

¹¹ Peter G. (2007), *How Nonviolence Protects the State*, Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2007, pp. 94-95

¹² *Ibid...*, p.7-22

¹³ *Ibid..* p. 45-94

violence as part of their strategy, which leads to his conclusion that violence is needed to overthrow oppressive systems.

Finally, Karl Popper presents a critical interpretation of Marx's humanism, including its non-violent theory, in his work on *"The Open Society and Its Enemies (1945)." Popper acknowledges that Marx aimed at human emancipation and the alleviation of social injustice, but he is deeply skeptical of Marx's reliance on historical determinism the idea that societal change follows inevitable laws of history.*¹⁴ Popper argues that non-violent humanism is centered on the concept of achieving "human liberation", and that this Marx's view on non-violent humanism and revolution is deterministic and can undermine individual moral responsibility and potentially justify coercion or violence in the name of "historical necessity." by saying: "The future depends on ourselves, and we do not depend on any historical necessity."¹⁵ In other words, even Marx's non-violent ideals could be compromised if they are subordinated to the perceived inevitability of revolutionary change.

However, Popper doesn't see quest for non-violence, humanism and revolution as possible if it's centered on determinism. In essence, Popper sees Marx's non-violent humanism as conceptually appealing but potentially dangerous if interpreted through deterministic frameworks. He insists that non-violence and humanist goals require conscious, accountable participation within open and democratic structures, rather than blind faith in historical inevitability. With these arguments one can say there are specific conditions and requirements necessary for advocating socio-change

¹⁴ Popper, K. (1945). *The open society and its enemies:Vol.II. The high tide of prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the aftermath.* London; Routledge P. 78-79.

¹⁵ *Ibid...*, p.106

CHAPTER TWO

THE CONCEPT OF ALIENATION IN MARX'S THOUGHT

2.1 DEFINITION AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT: KARL MARX ALIENATION

Karl Marx developed his theory of alienation during the 19th century, a period marked by rapid industrialization, development, and the rise of capitalist economies. His insights were influenced by earlier philosophical traditions, particularly the works of Hegel and Feuerbach. Hegel saw alienation as a spiritual and intellectual condition, where individuals feel estranged from their essence and the absolute truth. Marx, however, grounded alienation in material and economic realities, focusing on the conditions of labor under capitalism.

Feuerbach's critique of religion also shaped Marx's thinking. Feuerbach argued that religious belief alienates individuals by projecting their human essence onto an abstract deity. Marx extended this critique to capitalism, asserting that economic systems, like religion, create conditions where individuals become estranged from their true nature. Speaking of labor, for Marx, human beings are inherently social and creative. Labor is not merely a means of survival but an essential and important aspect of human self-expression and fulfillment, in which human beings connect to their essence. In a just society, labor would be a cooperative and meaningful activity that enhances individual and collective well-being. However, capitalism distorts this relationship by transforming labor into a commodity, stripping it of its intrinsic value and subjecting it to the requirements of profit and market exchange.

The theoretical basis of alienation is that a worker invariably loses the ability to determine life and destiny when deprived of the right to think (conceive) of themselves as the director of their own actions; to determine the character of these actions; to define relationships with other people; and to own those items of value from goods and services, produced by their

own labour. Although the worker is an autonomous, self-realised human being, as an economic entity this worker is directed to goals and diverted to activities that are dictated by the bourgeoisie who own the means of production in order to extract from the worker the maximum amount of surplus value in the course of business competition among industrialists.

2.2 ALIENATION IN KARL MARX'S ECONOMIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL MANUSCRIPT (1844).

Estrangement in the man's labor activities, Marx writes in the Economic and Philosophical Manuscript of 1844, Marx observed: "The relation of the worker to the product of labour as an alien object exercising power over him"¹⁶ (Marx & Engels, 1974, p.275). The product that the worker creates is not his, but is appropriated by the capitalist. This product stands opposed to him as capital. Second, " . . . labour is external to the worker, i.e., it does not belong to his intrinsic nature ; . . . in his work, therefore he does not affirm himself but denies himself. . . "¹⁷. Marx pointed out significantly that man differs from animals based on the fact that he has consciousness. objectifying this consciousness in his work, duplicating himself in the world of objects. Accord to Marx man's powers and "nature " are transformed into objects, into material creations, which includes his skill, ingenuity, values, etc., and all these become realized through this life activity.

However he pinpointed that unlike animals, men tend to produce even in the absence of immediate physical and material need but in the contrary animals product is immediately used to fulfill a subsistence need; activity purely dictated by instinct. Going further, man produces

¹⁶ Karl M. and Frederick E. (1974) Collected Works, volumes 3 and 5. London: Lawrence and Wishart Ltd.; and in collaboration with New York: International Publishers Co., Inc.; and Moscow: Progress Publishers. p.275

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.274

willfully and confronts his product freely. This product has a use-value, i.e., having the capacity to satisfy a human want. Man as a species-being decides how and when this product is to be used but with the advent of capitalist society wage labor not only reduces his product, but also his labor into a commodity that is controlled by always administered by his superior. However it is pertinent to understand that the product is no longer significant for its use, but merely for its worth on the market, i.e., monetary worth or value. Labor on the other hand too, is converted into a commodity because now it has what is identified as "exchange-value" (wages) and becomes an abstraction measured by money. Human capacities are abstracted and quantified through the assignment of a monetary value. In an unalienated labor use-value is created for its own sake, to be used. But in wage labor, value is created only to be transformed or converted to exchange-value. Looking at a coat as an example, a coat has a certain use-value, it was produced by a man more importantly it's an objectification of his labor making reference to its design, pattern, color which tends to reflect the worker's consciousness, while its craftsmanship reflects his real, human essence and powers. In this case, looking at a capitalist production the coat is only valued for its exchange-value. Moreover the product is never controlled by the workers, but by the capitalists.

Products tend to subordinate them for its own purposes and these products control the workers, i.e., their labor always conforming to division of labor. Their motions are not self-determined but directed by the capitalist who has purchased their labor, thus controlling it and its product. Labor is not an end, but a means. It is what I call "A slave of wage." Continuing, Marx writes: "Estranged labour turns thus: (3) Man's species-being . . . into a being alien to him, into a means for his individual existence . . . (4) An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of his labour, his life activity, from his species being, is the estrangement of man from man"¹⁸.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 277

The Alienation theory while found throughout Marx's writings, is explored broadly in his early works, particularly central to his critique of capitalism. In his work *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, he describes alienation in the context of labor and how the capitalist system affects workers with this, As Marx argued: “The worker becomes all the poorer the more wealth he produces, the more goods he produces, the more his production increases in power and size. The worker becomes an ever cheaper commodity the more commodities he produces. ... The result is that the worker feels himself to be alienated from the product of his labor, from the activity of labor, from his species-being, and from other people”¹⁹ (Marx, 1975, p.272). It's important to note that previous version of Marx's theory of alienation is grounded in the philosophy of G. W. F. Hegel and Ludwig Feuerbach materialist critique of Hegel.

In Marx's definition of alienation, he describes a state where workers become detached from the products of their labor(hand work), the process of their work, their own human nature, and from other people. He explains the facts that under capitalism, workers do not own the goods they produce, nor do they control the means of production but have to work to survive. The fruits of their labor belong to the capitalist, and the worker is separated from the very product they create, which no longer holds personal significance or value to them. This separation makes the worker feel disconnected from the outcome of their efforts, and the product becomes something foreign and external. Moreover, Marx argues that the very process of labor itself becomes alienating, and alienating in this context means disconnecting on from his true essence. In capitalist society, work is often reduced to repetitive, tasks that require little creativity or skill, leaving the worker feeling like a cog in a machine rather than a person engaged in meaningful, self-expressive work. For him the worker's labor is not a reflection of their own desires or creativity but a means to survive, dictated by the needs of the capitalist. This creates a deep sense

¹⁹ Karl Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, in Marx-Engels Collected Works, Vol. 3, New York: International Publishers, 1975, sec 1. p.272

of alienation from the act of labor itself, as it no longer represents an expression of the worker's humanity or individuality.

Finally, Marx stated how this alienation extends beyond the worker's relationship with their work and products, affecting their relationships with other people. Capitalism fosters competition rather than collaboration, isolating individuals from each other. Workers are pitted against one another to secure jobs, wages, and resources, which breaks down social bonds and solidarity. The worker, in this system, becomes alienated not only from their own potential but also from others, as the capitalist system turns human beings into competitors rather than cooperative members of a community.

2.3 THE FOUR ASPECT OF ALIENATION

Marx identified four interrelated dimensions of alienation, each highlighting the ways capitalism estranges workers from essential aspects of their lives. These dimensions offer a comprehensive framework for understanding how economic systems impact human relationships and identity.

2.3.1 Alienation From The Product Of Labor

Under capitalism, workers are alienated from the products they create. The goods and services produced through their labor do not belong to them but are instead owned and sold by capitalists for profit. This separation means that the fruits of the worker's labor exist outside of their control and often serve interests that are entirely detached from their own. For example, a factory worker may spend countless hours assembling consumer goods but cannot afford to purchase the very items they produce. This disconnection fosters a sense of powerlessness and estrangement, as workers see their labor manifest in objects that do not enhance their own lives. The commodification of labor also devalues the creative and personal aspects of production. Workers

do not have the freedom to imbue their products with individuality or meaning, as the primary goal is efficiency and profit. The result is a profound disconnection between workers and the outcomes of their efforts.

2.3.2 Alienation From the Process Of Labor

The second aspect of alienation concerns the labor process itself. In capitalist systems, workers have little control over how they perform their tasks or the conditions under which they work. Labor becomes a means to an end a way to earn wages necessary for survival rather than a fulfilling activity. This lack of autonomy reduces work to a monotonous and mechanical activity dictated by the needs of capital rather than the aspirations of the worker. This alienation is particularly evident in industries where repetitive tasks dominate, such as assembly lines or call centers. Workers are required to adhere to strict procedures, minimizing their ability to exercise creativity or initiative. The labor process becomes dehumanizing, as workers are treated as interchangeable parts in a larger system designed to maximize productivity.

2.3.3 Alienation From Fellow Workers (Society & Others)

Capitalism fosters competition and individualism, creating social divisions among workers. Rather than encouraging collaboration and solidarity, the system pits workers against one another in a race for limited opportunities, promotions, or job security. This competitive ethos undermines the potential for collective action and mutual support, isolating workers from their peers. Moreover, hierarchical structures within workplaces often exacerbate this alienation. Managers and supervisors are positioned above workers, enforcing rules and quotas that

prioritize profits over well-being. This dynamic creates tension and mistrust, further eroding the social bonds that could otherwise form among colleagues. Alienation from fellow workers also extends beyond the workplace. In capitalist societies, relationships are often mediated by economic transactions, reducing social interactions to exchanges of goods and services. This commodification of relationships reinforces a sense of isolation and detachment, as individuals prioritize personal gain over communal well-being.

2.3.4 Alienation From Species-Being (From Self)

Marx argued that human beings have a natural inclination to engage in creative and productive activities that allow them to express their species-being the essence of their humanity. However, under capitalism, this innate creativity and fulfillment are hindered. The fragmentation of labour and the focus on profit-driven production alienates individuals from their true human potential, preventing them from fully realizing their creative capacities.

For Marx, these forms and types of alienation were private contradictions within the capitalist mode of production. He believed that overcoming alienation required a fundamental transformation of society (social change), including abolishing private ownership of the means of production and establishing a more egalitarian and collectively controlled economic and social system.

Looking at the concept "Estranged Labour"²⁰ One of the chapters in the (Paris manuscript) of Marx's. The term estranged labour does do justice to all the characteristics, philosophy and the ideology of alienation, breaking it down taking estranged first, in as much as it is past tense tends to explain a scenario of something that has happened and is still ongoing. Now estranged here means something made foreign, a stranger towards something, be-stranged. When we add

²⁰ Ibid.,p. 24

labour to it, it means foreign labour or strange labour particularly to the laborers. Terms like the above is what Marx's used to conceptualize the whole idea of alienation

However, alienation is believed to be a particularly popular concept used in Marx's discourse, it is at the heart of numbers of argument and ideas that it has been made relevant to philosophy. Alienation is also a concept that is mostly and commonly misunderstood and misinterpreted, that is why it is advisable to be acquainted with Marx's description of alienation as well as its significance to his theory.

Alienation can also be thought of as the notion of "species-being"²¹ or the human-essence, he makes use of the phrase "species-activity"²² that distinguishes it from others. Just as animals act to satisfy their immediately material need, human work beyond those needs and this is mostly what separates humans from animals. The human essence as mentioned above is referred to as "work", work is humanity's species-being, human essence, and also to identify other dimensions of alienation

2.4. OTHER ASPECTS OF ALIENATION

2.4.1 Ideological Alienation

When Marx talked about alienation, he did not only mean the way workers are cut off from the products of their labor, from each other, and from their creative potential. He also pointed to a deeper and more subtle form: ideological alienation. This occurs when people are separated from truth and reality because their beliefs, values, and worldview are shaped by the dominant ideology of the ruling class. In other words, capitalism does not only control material production

²¹ *Ibid.*....,p..24

²² *Ibid.*....,p.24

but also the production of ideas and consciousness. Marx captures this in his famous statement: “The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling idea.”²³ This means that those who control the means of material production (factories, land, technology, capital) also control the means of mental production (education, media, religion, culture). As a result, the worldview of the powerful is presented as “common sense,” “truth,” or “natural,” even though it mainly serves their own interests.

2.4.2 Political Alienation

For Marx, alienation was not only economic (in the workplace) or ideological (in ideas and beliefs), but also political a condition where ordinary people are separated from real power over their lives because political structures serve the interests of the ruling class. On this note, Marx argues that liberal democracy treats people as abstract citizens, separating their political life from real social and economic life. People vote but have little real control. Making people feel that they are important due to the fact that Marx argued that under capitalism, the state and its institutions (laws, parliaments, courts, police, military) are not neutral. Instead, they function to protect the interests of the bourgeoisie (the capitalist class) while in reality people are just another tools used to sustain their regime. So in accordance to this he note: "Political emancipation is a reduction of man to the status of a citizen, a member of the state."²⁴ Political alienation here really alienation people from their status even as citizens in their own state.

²³ Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1970). *The German Ideology* (C. J. Arthur, Ed.). International Publishers. p.64

²⁴ Marx, K. (1975). *On the Jewish Question*. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* (pp. 212–241). Oxford University Press. p. 234

2.4.3 Religious Alienation

In his critique of religion, Marx, following the footsteps of Feuerbach, argued that religion is a projection of human essence onto a divine being, alienating people from their own potential. Marx, building on Feuerbach's ideas, argued that religion is a way people project their own human qualities like love, justice, or power onto an imaginary divine being. Instead of realizing these qualities in themselves and in their communities, they transfer them to "God" and then worship them as something outside of themselves. This makes people separated from their own potential. Instead of believing that human beings can create justice and hope, they wait for salvation from heaven. Religion, for Marx, provides comfort but also prevents people from changing their real conditions on earth. He described it famously: "Religion is the sigh of the oppressed creature... It is the opium of the people."²⁵ Religion here acts like a drug: it eases pain and suffering, but it also dulls awareness and keeps people passive. And For Marx people tends to focus their essence to the divine, supernatural or religion and this makes them totally separated from themselves.

2.4.4 Alienation In Commodity Fetishism

In Capitalism, Marx expands on alienation through the idea of commodity fetishism whereby people relate to each other and to objects through market values, not as human beings with needs. All that humans beings see in this context earlier stated is how they can trade or make more money or benefits from each in terms of commodity reference which means no genuine social relationship. So to really explain in simple statement he stated: "The definite social relation between men... assumes here, for them, the fantastic form of a relation between things."²⁶ When

²⁵ Marx, K. (1970). *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*. Cambridge University Press. p.131

²⁶ Marx, K. (1990), *De Capital: Volume I* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Classics, p.165

this happens, social relationships take on a distorted form. For example, instead of valuing a farmer for feeding people, society only values the price of the crops. Human labor and effort are hidden behind the exchange of commodities

2.4.5 Alienation of Nature

Marx also said capitalism alienates humans from nature. Humans depend on nature for food, shelter, and survival, and we are supposed to live in balance with it. But capitalism reduces nature to a mere resource to exploit for profit. He wrote:“Man lives from nature... and he must maintain a continuing dialogue with it.”²⁷ This means humans must see themselves as part of nature, not its master. However, capitalism pushes endless exploitation cutting down forests, polluting rivers, overusing land without regard for balance. This destroys both nature and humanity’s connection to it. ie: Deforestation for palm oil or mining for rare earth metals not only damages the earth but also displaces local communities, showing how capitalism breaks the natural relationship between humans and the environment. These kindly shows that Marx's alienation not just revolve around just the four identified types or dimensions but also has it specific relevance.

²⁷ Marx, K.(2007). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844* (M. Milligan, Trans.). Dover Publications. p.28

CHAPTER THREE

Non-Violent Humanism in Marx's philosophy

3.1 UNDERSTANDING OF HUMANISM IN MARX VIEW POINT

The word “humanism” is usually connected as well as related with the belief and ideology that all human tends to share timeless and unchanging essence. But for Richard Rorty he disagreed with this idea. He noted that “socialization, and thus historical circumstance, goes all the way down. There is nothing else apart from socialization or prior to history that defines man..... With history, experience and social culture, man get their real identity.²⁸ In other words, Rorty argued that there is no permanent human essence; people are shaped only by history and culture. Because of this, his position is tagged anti-humanist.

In contrast to this, Karl Marx is believe to be a humanist, not in the traditional sense of believing in a fixed human essence. But in the ground that his humanism is forward-looking and open-ended. He sees human nature as something that develops, grows and change through history, conflicts and struggle. In the Grundrisse, Marx pointed out that the people move pass or beyond capitalism, true wealth will not mean possessions anymore, but he then noted; the full development of human potential and skill over the forces of nature, of both the so-called nature and that of humanity's own nature (human's nature)... "the absolute working-out of his creative potentialities"... here his essence is completed so he cannot strive for what is has already become,

²⁸ Rorty, R. (1989). *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. P.xiii

but but there's a thousand and plus one work to be done because he is still in absolute potentiality.²⁹

Showing Marx's humanism he views “humanity’s own nature,” but not as something fixed. Instead, the goal is to keep developing and mastering both natural and human forces. For Marx, humanism is understood from the concept of human development. Here, the idea that human can evolve or develop their potentialities and abilities, essence and nature continuously without any influence. This same passage was used as the front page of Raya Dunayevskaya’s book *Philosophy and Revolution* (1973), since she founded the school of thought called Marxist-Humanism.

In *De Capital*, Marx also wrote that humans must always produce to survive, this is a necessity we cannot escape as the workers. But freedom means that people, as “associated producers,” could collectively control their relationship with nature instead of being ruled by it. He wrote that; “freedom... can only blossom forth mainly with necessity”.³⁰ What he meant is that while survival work will always exist, progress allows humans to work less, giving them more absolute creativity, growth, and freedom.

With this, one can know that Marx’s humanism is not abstract but revolutionary. It goes ahead to stress the importance of connecting the humanist goal which is the development of all human powers with the real struggle to change it society. However, Marxist humanism has sometimes been turned into words with meaning. Dunayevskaya in his work criticized this by mocking those who would repeat that Marxism came from German philosophy, English, economics, and French socialism, only till then “fight for 5¢ more in wages”.³¹ Her point was that without connection to practice, humanism becomes meaningless.

²⁹ Marx K. (1973) *Grundrisse*. New York :Vintage Books. (Original work published 1857). p.488

³⁰ Marx, K. (1976). *Capital: A critique of political economy*, Penguin edition (Original work published 1867). p.959

³¹ Dunayevskaya, R. (1956). Dear Friends [Unpublished letter]. Raya Dunayevskaya Archives. Marxists Internet Archive. p.1

3.2 THE STRUCTURAL VIOLENCE OF CAPITALISM

One of the things that affects Marx Humanism is the violence of capitalism which is structural violence meaning, the kind of harm that comes directly from the way society is organized. It is “violence without a visible attacker,” built into laws, institutions, and economic systems and religion. In capitalism, this violence is part of the system itself because the economy is designed around growing more profit other than human needs. People are not usually beaten into poverty; instead, the system silently introduce poverty, hunger, and inequality by the way it distributes resources and opportunities.

One of the clearest forms of structural violence in capitalism is economic inequality. A small group, the bourgeoisie (owners of factories, land, and capital), grows rich based on either merit or luck and over takes the labor of the majority, the proletariat (workers). Workers create value through their labor, but they are paid only a penny of that value in wages, while the rest becomes an immense profit for the owners. For example, a garment worker in Bangladesh may work twelve hours a day sewing clothes for big brands, yet earn wages too low to cover food and housing. The company, however, sells those clothes for huge profits in Europe or America. Here the worker is not directly beaten or forced, but the structure of capitalism leaves them trapped in poverty and this is structural violence.

Another way non-violence humanism is introduced is through capitalism, it produces violence through unemployment and job insecurity. Because the system values profit making over people, companies can just decide to lay-off workers whenever it benefits shareholders, regardless of the human cost. For example, during global financial crises, millions of people usually lose their jobs overnight, because the economic structure prioritizes saving capital instead of protecting human livelihoods. This loss of income can lead to many causalities such as; homelessness, hunger, and depression, all of which are forms of indirect violence.

A notable and important form of structural violence is alienation, a concept Marx explained. Workers are separated from the products they make mainly because they are poor and basically what they create belongs to the capitalist. They are also separated from their own creativity likewise humanity, since work becomes a repetitive activity done only to survive, not

to fulfill human potential. For example, a factory worker who spends all day tightening the same bolt may feel disconnected from their labor, as if they are just a machine part, not a human being. This kind of alienation causes mental and emotional harm, even though it is not visible as physical violence.

Finally, capitalism creates global structural violence. Rich countries often exploit poorer countries mostly by taking raw materials from them cheaply, now this cheap labor basically when turn into finished product is sold back at high prices. This keeps poor nations more dependent and underdeveloped. With instance like a cocoa farmers in West Africa earn very little for the beans they grow, while global chocolate companies make billions in profit. The farmers often remain in poverty, sometimes forcing children to work in unsafe conditions, while consumers in wealthy countries enjoy cheap chocolate. Again, the violence is structural: no single person is directly attacking these farmers, but the capitalist system ensures their suffering.

It is impertinent to note that the key facts about the structural violence of capitalism is mostly isolated, hidden or not physical but powerful. It works through inequality, poverty, unemployment, alienation, and global exploitation. This is why Marx argued that capitalism cannot be “reformed” into fairness: its very structure creates violence, and only changing that structure through collective action can remove these harms.

3.3 MARX'S VIEW ON NON-VIOLENCE AND REVOLUTION

People tend to forget that Karl Marx didn't teach “non-violence” as a rule, but he also did not see violence as a goal in itself. His position was always conditional, depending on history and context. In places with strong democratic institutions, such as England or the United States in his time, Marx pointed out that in some countries, workers win power peacefully. But in countries where the ruling class blocked free elections, censored speech, or used the army against the people, force could become necessary. For him, glorifying violence wasn't the issue then, but about how freedom could be realistically won by the working class.³² At the same time, Marx

³² Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *The Communist Manifesto*. International Publishers. (Original work published 1848) p.30—34

was clear about something and that which he was certain about was that the old state could not simply won or taken over and used by workers. From his study of the *Paris Commune*, he concluded that the state was built to protect the interests of the ruling class, so it had to be changed at its roots. This meant a new form of politics based on mass democracy, popular control, and institutions that served working people rather than capital. He believed that even if this change could be carried out with little bloodshed, he see the transformation of the state (change in leadership) a must do.

Violence also to Marx is a social fact, and not a moral principle. In *Capital* he famously said: “Force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one.” What he meant was that, throughout history, major changes mainly come from a struggle a later get resolved. He did not praise violence but recognized that old ruling classes usually resist change with force, making violence and conflicts inevitable.³³

The idea of a “transition period” also helps explain Marx's view. He argued that between capitalism and communism there would be a stage where workers ruled politically as the majority class. He called this the “dictatorship of the proletariat,” but by this he meant democratic rule from below, not tyranny by a few. Whether this stage was peaceful or violent would depend on how much the old ruling class resisted as people tends to act obediently when form is usually applied. Now later writers have emphasized that Marx rejected both extremes: he was against illegal violent uprisings without mass support, and against absolute pacifism that refused to resist even when attacked. He favored democratic mass action, using elections, unions, speech and organization whenever possible, but he also advocated for workers self defense when need may arise at least having the capacity to protect and defend themselves if peaceful roads were blocked. Engels later added that by the late 19th century, ruling classes actually feared workers, legal and parliamentary power more than street fighting which showed that building mass, organized, democratic strength was the key.

Human non-violence was Marx's ideal revolution. Revolution was not as a sudden heroic act of violence but as a long-band gradual historical process shaped by class struggle and finally

³³ Marx, K. (1990). *Capital: A critique of political economy*, Volume I (B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1867) p.916

ends at societal revolution. In *The Communist Manifesto*, he summed this up with the famous line: “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.” For Marx, revolution meant raising the serving class to political power and “winning the battle of democracy,” and not the rule of the minority.³⁴ From his study of the *1871 Paris Commune*, Marx also stressed that the working class could not continue from where the former state leader stopped by using the same machinery and structures, no instead, the state itself had to be transformed, since its structure served to protect them.³⁵

Violence, in Marx’s thought, was never a principle or a goal in itself. In *Capital*, he described force as “the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one” meaning that violence often accompanied great social change, but not because revolutionaries glorified it.³⁶ Marx also left open the possibility of peaceful, parliamentary paths. In a speech in Amsterdam in 1872, he said that in countries like the United States, England, and “perhaps Holland,” workers might be able to achieve their aims peacefully. But in most of continental Europe, where repression was too strong, “force” would likely be necessary and unquestionable.³⁷ Similarly, the 1872 German preface to the *Manifesto* stated, that the specific revolutionary measures listed in 1848 were no longer fixed or central, since tactics depended on its historical structure.³⁸ This clearly shows that Marx rejected both absolute pacifism and blind insurrection. He opposed “putschism” violent uprisings without mass support but also warned that ruling classes would rarely give up power without resistance. For him, the revolution was not about conspiratorial coups but about democratic self-rule by the working class itself. Engels later added to this view

³⁴ Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *The Communist Manifesto*. International Publishers. (Original work published 1848) p. 29—31

³⁵ Marx, K. (1971). *The Civil War in France*. In D. Fernbach (Ed.), *The First International and After: Political Writings, Volume 3* (pp. 1871–1881). Penguin. Original work published 1871

³⁶ Marx, K. (1990). *Capital: A critique of political economy, Volume I* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). Penguin Classics. Original work published 1867 p. 916

³⁷ Marx, K. (1974). Speech at Amsterdam, September 8, 1872. *La Liberté*, September 9, 1872. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23 (pp. 255–256). International Publishers.

³⁸ Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1974). Preface to the German edition of 1872. In K. Marx & F. Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23 (pp. 175–176). International Publishers.

in the 1890s, observing that the ruling class had grown to fear the workers' legal and parliamentary action even more than uprisings, since elections gave workers a powerful voice.³⁹

Scholars have clarified this balanced position. *Hal Draper (1987)* shows that Marx's phrase "dictatorship of the proletariat" referred to a highly democratic form of rule from below, modeled on the *Paris Commune*, not a dictatorship by a few leaders. August Nimtz (2000) explains how Marx and Engels combined support for elections with readiness for mass action, arguing that workers might have to use "the ballot, the streets, or both," now it depends on the condition. Together, these readings confirm that Marx saw revolution as democratic self-emancipation, where the methods peaceful or violent would depend on the balance of forces.

3.3.1 THE ROLE OF CLASS STRUGGLE AND PRAXIS OF REVOLUTION

Marxist theory explains that class struggle in this system is imminent and it is a driven force of history. It is the process that makes societies move from one stage of development to another. In *The Communist Manifesto*, Marx and Engels wrote that "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." This means that progress does not happen easily or naturally, there must be a conflict and this conflict must be between groups of people whose interests are opposed. Back then in old times this conflict was between slaves and masters; in the feudal period, it was between feudal lords and serfs; in capitalism, it is between the proletariat (the working majority) and the bourgeoisie (the small group in charge of the means of production). Marx also showed that this struggle is not only about money or work but also about ideas, cultures and laws. However, Marx made it clear that conflict by itself can never bring human emancipation.

People may only fight against oppression in different ways, but if their actions are not organized and guided by a clear vision, they are often defeated or absorbed by the ruling system. This is why Marx stressed the importance of revolutionary praxis, which means joining theory with practice. Praxis is simply pragmatic; it is acting with vision, drive, and direction. In his

³⁹ Engels, F. (1978). Introduction to Marx's Class Struggles in France. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed., pp. 618–624. W. W. Norton. Original work published 1895.

Theses on Feuerbach, Marx criticized philosophers mostly the ancient Greek for only interpreting the world instead of trying to change it. He believed that real change happens when people move from passively accepting oppression to actively working to change their social reality. Revolutionary praxis is the process through which workers move from being a “class in itself” (a group that exists only because they share the same exploitation) into a “class for itself” (a conscious and united group that understands its shared interests and acts together to change the system).

When combined, class struggle and revolutionary praxis makes social change more attainable and possible. Class struggle gives the objective basis by showing the contradictions of capitalism, the injustices of exploitation, and by creating unrest among the working class. Revolutionary praxis provides the subjective side: the conscious, collective, and organized effort that can turn this unrest into revolution. For Marx, this unity is necessary because exploitation is part of the very structure of capitalism and cannot be solved by reforms alone. Only through organized revolutionary activity can the system be broken and replaced with a new form of society. In the end, the role of class struggle and praxis is to open the way to human liberation, where oppression is replaced by unity and cooperation and where history is no longer shaped by exploitation, but by free and equal relationships between people.

3.4 ALIENATION AND NON-VIOLENT HUMANISM: CONCEPTUAL COMPLEXITIES

Marx’s idea of alienation gives a strong explanation of the type of life capitalism introduces. He believed that the working class are separated in many ways: from the things they make, from the process of making them, from their own true human nature as creative and social beings, and from other people. This problem is not just about feelings but it's in-built in the society especially when it comes to private property and the selling of labor as a commodity. For Marx, the only way to end alienation is through big social change, which means either ending or completely reorganizing the capitalist system that supports exploitation which is simply transforming the

source.⁴⁰ Non-violent humanism, on the other hand, puts the focus on human dignity, empathy, and respect first before any other thing. Thinkers like Tolstoy, Gandhi, and Martin Luther King Jr. taught that the way we fight for justice must match the world we want to create. For them, civil resistance, peaceful protest, and moral persuasion are the right tools because it tends to weaken unjust and unfair systems without copying their violence and cruelty.⁴¹ One thing we should note is that this view talks less about structures and more about moral choice and while it does, it still shares with Marx the goal of building a society where people can live free and fully human.

The first big problem is about means and ends. Marx said that because social change comes from class struggle, workers must be ready to use force if the ruling class uses violence to stay in power. Non-violent humanists argue instead that violence cannot create a truly human society, because violent means ruin the goal. This raises the hard question: is peaceful protest enough to defeat systems protected by state violence, or is force sometimes just imminent?⁴²

Another challenge is structure versus agency. Marx paid more attention to the big systems of production and history that shape society, while non-violent thinkers focus on personal moral choices, conscience, and community action. This creates a key question: can moral effort alone change deep economic structures, or do those structures require forceful action to be transformed?⁴³ The two also differ in what it means to be human. Marx saw our essence in work and community life our ability to create together and to function. Non-violent humanists speak

⁴⁰ Marx, K. (1978). *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 66–125). W. W. Norton. (Original work published 1844)

⁴¹ Gandhi, M. K. (1993). *An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. Beacon Press. pp. 453 —454. (Original work published 1927), King, M. L. Jr. (2010). *Where do we go from here: Chaos or community?* Beacon Press. Original work published 1967, pp.67—70, 161—163.

⁴² Fromm, E. (1961). *Marx's Concept of Man*. Frederick Ungar, pp. 36—39. Gandhi, M. K. 1993. *An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. Beacon Press. pp. 453—454

⁴³ Marx, K., & Engels, F. (2012). *The Communist Manifesto*. International Publishers. Original work published 1848, pp. 29—31.

more about inner dignity, spiritual growth, or conscience. Both want human flourishing, but one stresses social production, while the other stresses moral and inner life.⁴⁴

Practical politics gives more insight. Studies, such as those by Chenoweth and Stephan (2011), show that non-violent movements have often been more successful and more likely to lead to democracy than violent ones. This evidence challenges Marxists who doubt that peaceful struggle can really remove corrupt systems. Even if Marx is correct about deep structures causing alienation, peaceful methods might still be a safer and more effective way to change them.⁴⁵

Finally, there is the question of revolutionary ethics. History shows that violent revolutions often end up creating new forms of oppression and alienation, however these form of oppression is mostly controlled by what was then known as once working class that is now ruling. Non-violent thinkers warn that only peaceful methods can avoid this danger. Some Marxists answer that strict organization and democracy inside a revolution can prevent abuse, while others say that violence may sadly be necessary in some contexts. The issue remains unresolved: can revolutions succeed without losing their moral integrity?⁴⁶ In the end, the difficulties between Marx's theory of alienation and non-violent humanism come from their different starting points. Marx begins from historical and structural analysis, while non-violent thinkers begin from ethical and moral action. Yet they are not completely opposed. Both agree that alienation harms humanity and both hope for a society where people can live fully and freely. The real challenge is to decide whether liberation can be achieved without violence, whether moral action can bring deep change, and how to prevent revolutions from creating new alienation to an extent. Dealing

⁴⁴ Tolstoy, L. (1987). *The Kingdom of God is Within You*. University of Nebraska Press. Original work published 1894, pp. 9—25, 242—246. Marx, K. 1978. *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader*. pp. 70—81, 96—105.

⁴⁵ Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. (2011). *Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict*. Columbia University Press. (pp. 6—9, 40—43, 207—210).

⁴⁶ Arendt, H. 1965. *On Revolution*. Viking Press. pp. 54—78. Lenin, V. I. (1975). *Left-Wing Communism: An Infantile Disorder*. Progress Publishers. Original work published 1920 pp. 23—25

with these questions is key for anyone who wants to bring together Marx's critique of capitalism with the moral power of non-violence.

CHAPTER FOUR

EVALUATION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

4.1 EVALUATION

Marx's "non-violent humanism" is best understood as the goal he was aiming for, not as a strict rule about tactics but because he believed humans are naturally social and creative, and that a good society lets people develop their abilities together without domination, exploitation, or fear. However, Karl Marx non-violent Humanism only just states a theory that is impossible to realize. From the analysis of the previous chapters were Karl Marx advocates for non-violence but fails to account for the possibility of a society without violence, now we are left with the question "can a society without violence of any form, be pictured? Marx's fails to address this.

Another likewise in this research explains that despite the foundation of violence as rooted in capitalism and also the socio-conflict which still incorporate some level of violence, Marx emphasis on non-violence in relevance to analytic consideration, is self contradictory on the grounds that he did advocate and encouraged peaceful and non-violent protest in aspiring for societal revolution but created room for violent retaliation identified as "public defense". This act of retaliation actually eliminate the vision for non-violence simply because it was practiced by the those advocating for revolution. This contradiction put Marx in the position of the possibility of an anterior motive.

Looking at the issue of protestant trying to implement the principle of non-violence, raises the question weather or not Marx was able to identify when a protest for revolution isn't a protest but riot. Another fault in Marx's non-violent humanism doesn't account for the nuisance in the society, when they cause violence in the society, what happens to them and how does he tends to tame or coordinate their character of violence? He didn't address this. Marx only identified violent Humanism in a capitalist setting, raising the question of it possibility in both a socialist and a communist environment what happens to a communist and a socialist state?, is it only in a capitalist state that Violent Humanism is practices? Leading us to only understand what he's trying to say. Because he only stated that revolution comes when the structure of the society experience change firstly in it's structure and after this societal structure has been transformed, the society begins to experience transformation too. So if a society transforms and change to socialism, what the probability that Non-violence Humanism ends totally with the reign of capitalism and not continue with socialism.

Finally, another defect is that Marx's non-violent humanism struggles to address contemporary problems that may haven't have existed in his time. Communism, unity and peace has been achievable through some certain means, violence through the recent years have been proven useful as human being including those that act with instinct have proven to respond well to violence either directly or indirectly, and it's this violence that has brought the society, and it's people under control and authority. And with this violent means people tends to be responsible. With this analysis, one can deduce that Marx is just talk and no act as his theories has indeed failed to address simple and pressing problems.

4.2 RECOMMODATION

4.2.1. A reformation of Marx's thought on humanism and non-violence

4.2.2. Students should try and adapt Marxist ideas to contemporary issues. Extend his humanist vision to modern problems like climate change, digital capitalism, gender inequality, and global poverty.

4.2.3. In reference to Alienation people experience separation not only because of the people around them but mainly because of their leaders so more emphasis on democratic participation. Ensure that workers and citizens have real, ongoing control over decisions to prevent concentration of power.

4.2.4. Integrate ethical education with economic reform. Promote awareness of human dignity and cooperation alongside structural changes in workplaces and communities.

4.2.5. Balance theory with practical implementation. Translate Marx's principles into step-by-step policies and programs that reduce alienation and exploitation without triggering unnecessary conflict.

4.3 CONCLUSION

Our contemporary society is well defined by its structure. The structure of a society explains how that society operates, and also the pattern that shapes the interaction of individuals, social group, institution and other groups in the society or country. Thus, the structure of the society entails how the society is. Now, on the discourse on contemporary social structure, there are elements involved, and these elements include; economical, political, social, religious and academical.

The economic structure of our society today emphasizes that of "crisis and hardship". However, it's proven that our economy is structured naturally to inflict hardship and cause crisis as reflected in chapter three of this research which made emphasis on "the structural violence of capitalism" which states the fact that some of the violence people experience are caused by the society. One of those structures is the economy. The economy plays a very pivotal role in either improving or diminishing the society. Now, a society that inflicts "hardship, pain and causes crisis", its people advocate for societal and economical change and one of the ways to get engaged is through protest. Looking at the issue of the "End Sars Protest" questions the possibility of a non-violent authority. Now the second question on that which made the people to protest, takes us back to contemporary societal structures.

Another major structure it's that of politics. Politics is another aspect of societal structures that tends to affect the society one way or the other. The structure of politics today, implies that political rule in our society is based on the "Powerful and Mighty", this infers that in this contemporary times, only the mighty rules and this struggle for political power will eventually lead us to violence.

Now looking at the religious sector, it's important to note that religion has to do with the churches nowadays. Religion of today is often characterized by the existence of two set of people, the "rich and poor". A society where those that are wealthy are mostly attended and recognized by the pastor in charge while the others are left behind and neglected. A society where the ontological essence of spirituality has no relevance but the essential quality of the humans pocket. The instance of a yahoo boy getting special treatment in church and due to his generosity, he's actions are exemplified as that life of a Christian using the concept of "*giving*". A society where the doctrines of the churches doesn't apply to them like; dreaded hair, indecent dressing, or ta-too drawing and late-comings is overlooked. So with all this issues, people naturally tends to be react.

Now on the social aspect, the societies of today captures the whole idea of a "wokist" society. The term wokist is identified as an African Expression, gotten from the word "*Woke*" which means to be socially active and aware of some certain level of injustice in which operates within the society, which includes, inequality and racism. Now we are confronted by a society that is filled with people who are ready to confront injustice of any kind. However, looking at the aspect of homo-sexualism, i.e "gay" in this African society actually push for a need for violence why, because even the homosexuals themselves also fight for the right to express themselves but are afraid that the African system wouldn't allow these kinds of people advocating for equal right just as normal to exist for long. And also the idea to a gay harassment, if not intervened by the local authorities immediately, will defiantly lead to serious casualties.

Finally, the structure of the academic system in our society has alot to contribute on how humans tends to react to certain circumstance. Using the instance of the "*increase in school fees*" that is originally meant to be free, or the recent issue with light and water in school hostel that happened sometimes back raised the tendency for student to become violent in the society or the issue of student buying a "First class result" brings lot of discouragement that make others not to

consider school from the start and venture into cultism while others drop-outs. Instead of being useful to the society, they become a tool a violent and menace to the society.

Humans naturally, should have the tendencies to remain violent given the following structure as stated in the above, in this our contemporary times, they have every right to. So given the brief analysis of this issue, the question that now comes to mind now is, is Marx right to assume that non-violent humanism can be achieved? No.

In conclusion, Marx's theory, especially his vision of non-violent humanism, remains a powerful tool use for understanding human freedom, dignity, and social justice, but it is not without challenges. While his early writings emphasize overcoming alienation and creating a society where people can develop their full potential, critics point out that revolutionary strategies can unintentionally lead to authoritarian rule, later regimes often misused his ideas, and due to the fact that Marx wasn't able to address or clarify some certain contemporary issues regarding non-violence also make the theory problematic on its own. With clear analysis, one can implies that Marx theory on is only utopian and it will always remains an idea.

BOOKS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arendt, H. *On revolution*, Viking Press, 1965.
- Butler, J. *The force of nonviolence: An ethico-political bind*: Verso Books, 2020.
- Chenoweth, E., & Stephan, M. J. *Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict*: Columbia University Press, 2011.
- Dunayevskaya, R. *Dear friends*, Unpublished letter, Raya Dunayevskaya Archives, Marxists Internet Archive, 1956.
- Engels, F. *Introduction to Marx's Class struggles in France*. In R. C. Tucker Ed, *The Marx-Engels reader* 2nd ed, W. W. Norton, Original work published 1895, 1978.
- Fromm, E. *Marx's concept of man*. Frederick Ungar, 1961.

- Gandhi, M. K. *Meaning of non-violence*. In The collected works of Mahatma Gandhi Vol. 61, 1975.
- Gandhi, M. K. An autobiography: *The story of my experiments with truth*: Beacon Press, Original work published 1927, 1993.
- King, M. L., Jr. Where do we go from here: *Chaos or community?* : Beacon Press, Original work published 1967, 2010.
- Lenin, V. I. Left-wing communism: *An infantile disorder*: Progress Publishers Original work published 1920, 1975.
- Marx, K. *Critique of Hegel's philosophy of right*. Cambridge: University Press, 1970.
- Marx, K. *The civil war in France*. In D. Fernbach, Ed., The first international and after: Political writings, Volume 3 Penguin. Original work published 1871, 1971.
- Marx, K. *Grundrisse*. Vintage Books. Original work published 1857, 1973.
- Marx, K. Speech at Amsterdam, September 8, 1872. La Liberté, September 9, 1872. In K. Marx & F. Engels, Collected works Vol. 23, International Publishers, 1974.
- Marx, K. *On the Jewish question*. In D. McLellan Ed, Karl Marx: Selected writings, Oxford University Press, 1975.

- Marx, K. *Capital: A critique of political economy*, Penguin. Original work published 1867, 1976.
- Marx, K. *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844*, In R. C. Tucker Ed, *The Marx-Engels reader* 2nd ed, W. W. Norton, Original work published 1844, 1978.
- Marx, K. *Capital: A critique of political economy*, Volume I B. Fowkes, Trans, Penguin Classics. Original work published 186, 1990.
- Marx, K. *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844* M. Milligan, Trans. Dover Publications, 2007.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. *The German ideology*, C. J. Arthur, Ed: International Publishers, 1970.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. *Collected works*, Vols. 3 & 5,. Lawrence and Wishart; International Publishers; Progress Publishers, 1974.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. *Preface to the German edition of 1872*. In *Collected works*, Vol. 23; International Publishers, 1974.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. *The Communist manifesto*: International Publishers. New York, Original work published 1848, 2012.
- Peter, G. *How non-violence protects the state*: South End Press, 2007.
- Popper, K. *The open society and its enemies*: Vol. II. *The high tide of prophecy: Hegel, Marx, and the aftermath*, Routledge, 1945.

- Rorty, R. *Contingency, irony, and solidarity*: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Tolstoy, L. *The kingdom of God is within you*: University of Nebraska Press, Original work published 1894, 1987.
- Zinn, H. *A people's history of the United States*. Harper & Row, 1980.

DICTIONARY

- English Dictionary *English Dictionary App: Definition of "bourgeoisie."*
Retrieved on 15, September, 2025.
- Merriam W. Dictionary *Merriam W. Dictionary App: Definition of "humanism."*
Retrieved on 19, September, 2025.

ENCYCLOPEDIA

- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. *The Communist manifesto*. In Encyclopaedia Britannica.spent <https://www.britannica.com/topic/The-Communist-Manifesto>, Retrieved on 18, September, 2025.

INTERNET SOURES

- Wikipedia COntributions *Karl Marx. In Wikipedia contributions,*
https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Marx, Retrieved on 18, September, 2025.