to increase, the sum total of happiness, it considers as wasted. The only self-
remuneration which it applauds, is devotion to the happiness, or to some of the
means of happiness, of others; either of mankind collectively, or of individuals
within the limits imposed by the collective interests of mankind.

I must again repeat, what the assailants of utilitarianism seldom have the
justice to acknowledge, that the happiness which forms the utilitarian standard
of what is right in conduct, is not the agent's own happiness, but that of all
concerned. As between his own happiness and that of others, utilitarianism
requires him to be as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent specta-
tor. In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the
ethics of utility. To do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbor as
yourself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality.

Whether There Is Enough Time to Calculate the Effects
of Our Conduct

Again, defenders of utility often find themselves called upon to reply to such
objections as this—that there is not time, previous to action, for calculating
and weighing the effects of any line of conduct on the general happiness. This is exactly
as if any one were to say that it is impossible to guide our conduct by Christianity,
because there is not time, on every occasion on which anything has to be done, to
read through the Old and New Testaments. The answer to the objection is, that
there has been ample time, namely, the whole past duration of the human species.
During all that time, mankind have been learning by experience the tendencies of
actions; on which experience all the prudence, as well as all the morality of life
are dependent. People talk as if the commencement of this course of experience
had hitherto been put off, and as if, at the moment when some man feels tempted
to meddle with the property or life of another, he had to begin considering for
the first time whether murder and theft are injurious to human happiness.

Whether We Are Born with the Feeling of Moral Duty

It is not necessary, for the present purpose, to decide whether the feeling of
duty is innate or implanted. Assuming it to be innate, it is an open question to
what objects it naturally attaches itself; for the philosophic supporters of this
theory are now agreed that the intuitive perception is of principles of morality
and not of the details. If there be anything innate in the matter, I see no reason
why the feeling which innate should not be that of regard to the pleasures
and pains of others. If there be any principle of morals which is intuitively
present, I should say it must be that. If so, the intuitive ethics would coincide
with the utilitarian, and there would be no further quarrel between them. For
it is, the intuitive moralists, though they believe that there are other
peculiar moral obligations, do already believe this to one; for they unanimously
hold, that a large portion of morality turns upon the consideration due to the
existence of our fellow-creatures. Therefore, if the belief in the transcendental
principle of moral obligation; gives any additional efficacy to the internal sensation
appears to me that the utilitarian principle has already the benefit of it.
that each time ended, either in a revolutionary re-constitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes. In the earlier epochs of history, we find almost everywhere a complicated arrangement of society into various orders, a manifold gradation of social rank. In ancient Rome we have patricians, knights, plebeians, slaves; in the Middle Ages, feudal lords, vassals, guild-masters, journeymen, apprentices, serfs; in almost all of these classes, again, subordinate gradations.

The modern bourgeois society that has sprouted from the ruins of feudal society has not done away with class antagonisms. It has but established new classes, new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle in place of the old ones. Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, possesses, however, this distinctive feature: it has simplified the class antagonisms. Society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes, directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat.

From the serfs of the Middle Ages sprang the chartered burghers of the earliest towns. From these burghers the first elements of the bourgeoisie were developed.

The discovery of America, the rounding of the Cape, opened up fresh ground for the rising bourgeoisie. The East-Indian and Chinese markets, the colonization of America, trade with the colonies, the increase in the means of exchange and in commodities generally, gave to commerce, to navigation, to industry, an impulse never before known, and thereby, to the revolutionary element in the tottering feudal society, a rapid development.

The feudal system of industry, under which industrial production was monopolized by closed guilds, now no longer sufficed for the growing wants of the new markets. The manufacturing system took its place. The guild-masters were pushed on one side by the manufacturing middle class; division of labor between the different corporate guilds vanished in the face of division of labor in each single workshop. Meanwhile the markets kept ever growing, the demand ever rising. Even manufacture no longer sufficed. Then arose, steam and machinery revolutionized industrial production. The place of manufacture was taken by the globe. Modern industry, the place of the industrial middle class, by industrial millionaires, the leaders of whole industrial armies, the modern bourgeoisie.

Modern industry has established the world-market, for which the discovery of America paved the way. This market has given an immense development to commerce, to navigation, to communication by land. This development has, in its time, reacted on the extension of industry; and in proportion as industry, commerce, navigation, railways extended, in the same proportion the bourgeoisie developed, increased its capital, and pushed into the background every class handed down from the Middle Ages.

**BOURGEOISIE EXPLOITATION OF LABORERS**

We see, therefore, how the modern bourgeoisie is itself the product of a long course of development, of a series of revolutions in the modes of production and of exchange.
swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses, his real conditions of life, and his relations with his kind.

The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the whole surface of the globe. It must nestle everywhere, settle everywhere, establish connections everywhere.

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world-market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of Reactionists, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old-established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, by industries that no longer work up indigenous raw material, but raw material drawn from the remotest zones; industries whose products are consumed, not only at home, but in every quarter of the globe. In place of old wants, satisfied by the productions of the country, we find new wants, requiring for their satisfaction the products of distant lands and climes. In place of internal division of labor, we find an intercontinental division of labor. Capitalist production drives all to sell and to buy in a general market; in place of small proprietorship, there is large industry; instead of the old feudal relation of feudal proprietorship, there is the new, frank, universal, interdependent intercourse of nations.

And as in material so also in intellectual production. The intellectual creations of individual nations become common property. National differences in taste, in physical organization, even in political institutions, have become more and more impossible, and from the numerous national and local literatures, there arises a world literature.

The bourgeoisie, by the rapid improvement of all instruments of production, by the immensely facilitated means of communication, draws all, even the most barbarian, nations into civilization. The cheap prices of its commodities are the heavy artillery with which it battereth down all Chinese walls, with which it forces the barbarians' intensely obstinate hatred of foreigners to capitulate. It compels all nations, on pain of extinction, to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; it compels them to introduce what it calls civilization into their midst, i.e., to become bourgeois themselves. In one word, it creates a world after its own image.

The bourgeoisie has subjected the country to the rule of the towns. It has created enormous cities, has greatly increased the urban population as compared with the rural, and has thus rescued a considerable part of the population from the idleness of rural life. Just as it has made the country dependent on the towns, so it has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered character of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralization. Independent, loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments, systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with a government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier and one market.

customs-tariff. The bourgeoisie, during its rule of scarce one hundred years, preceding generations together; Subjection of Nature's forces to man, machinery, electric telegraphs, clearing of whole continents for cultivation, earlier century had even a presentiment that such productive forces slumbered in the lap of social labor? We see the means of production and of exchange, on whose foundation the stage in the development of these means of production and of exchange, organization of agriculture and manufacturing industry, in one word, the fruited productive forces; they became so many fetters. They had to be burst asunder.

Into their place stepped competition, accompanied by a social and the bourgeoisie class.

A similar movement is going on before our own eyes. Modern bourgeoisie has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, that the market-habit of the revolts against modern conditions of production, against the property in rule. It is enough to mention the commercial crises that by their periodic bourgeoisie society. In these crises a great part not only of the existing industry, but also of the previously created productive forces, are periodically. would have seemed an absurdity—the epidemic of over-production.

appears as if a famine, a universal war of devastation had cut off the supply not why? Because there is too much civilization, too much means of subsistence; industry and commerce seem to be destroyed; too much industry, too much commerce. The productive forces at the disposal of society no longer tend to further the development of the conditions bourgeoisie property; on the contrary, they have become too powerful for these letters, they bring disorder into the whole of bourgeois society, endangers to narrow to comprise the wealth created by one nation, but extend them. And how does the share of productive forces on the other, by the conquest of new markets, and
by the more thorough exploitation of the old ones. That is to say, by paving the way for more extensive and more destructive crises, and by diminishing the means whereby crises are prevented.

**SELF-DESTRUCTION OF THE BOURGEOISIE**

The weapons with which the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.

But not only has the bourgeoisie forged the weapons that bring death to itself; it has also called into existence the men who are to wield those weapons—the modern working class—the proletarians.

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e., capital, is developed, in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed—a class of laborers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital. These laborers, who must sell themselves piece-meal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.

Owing to the extensive use of machinery and to division of labor, the work of the proletarians has lost all individual character, and consequently, all charm for the workman. He becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance, and for the propagation of his race. But the price of a commodity, and therefore also of labor, is equal to its cost of production. In proportion therefore, as the repulsiveness of the work increases, the wage decreases. Nay more, in proportion as the use of machinery and division of labor increases, in the same proportion the burden of toil also increases, whether by prolongation of the working hours, by increase of the work exacted in a given time or by increased speed of the machinery, etc.

Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of laborers, driven into the factory, are organized like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and overseers. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class, and of the bourgeois State; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overseer, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more poverty, more heartache and the more contemptible it is.

The less the skill and exertion of strength implied in manual labor, the more modern industry becomes developed, the more is the labor of men superseded by that of women. Differences of age and sex become more and more obvious in the factory, and the distinctions between individual workmen disappear. The collisions between the character of collisions between two classes. Thereupon the workers begin to
form combinations (Trades Unions) against the bourgeoisie; they club together in order to keep up the rate of wages; they found permanent associations in order to make provision beforehand for these occasional revolts. Here and there the contest breaks out into riots.

Now and then the workers are victorious, but only for a time. The real fruit of their battles lies, not in the immediate result, but in the ever-expanding union of the workers. This union is helped on by the improved means of communication that are created by modern industry and that place the workers of different localities in contact with one another. It was just this contact that was needed to centralize the numerous local struggles, all of the same character, into one national struggle between classes. But every class struggle is a political struggle. And that union, to attain which the burghers of the Middle Ages, with their miserable highways, required centuries, the modern proletarians, thanks to railways, achieve in a few years.

This organization of the proletarians into a class, and consequently into a political party, is continually being upset again by the competition between the workers themselves. But it ever rises up again, stronger, firmer, mightier. It compels legislative recognition of particular interests of the workers, by taking advantage of the divisions among the bourgeoisie itself. Thus the ten-hours' bill in England was carried.

Altogether collisions between the classes of the old society further, in many ways, the course of development of the proletariat. The bourgeoisie finds itself involved in a constant battle. At first with the aristocracy; later on, with those portions of the bourgeoisie itself, whose interests have become antagonistic to the progress of industry; at all times, with the bourgeoisie of foreign countries. In all these battles it sees itself compelled to appeal to the proletariat, to ask for its help, and thus, to drag it into the political arena. The bourgeoisie itself, therefore, supplies the proletariat with its own instruments of political and general education, in other words, it furnishes the proletariat with weapons for fighting the bourgeoisie.

Further, as we have already seen, entire sections of the ruling classes are by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress.

Finally, in times when the class struggle bears the decisive hour, the process of dissolution going on within the ruling class, in fact within the whole social body, assumes such a violent, glaring character, that a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift, and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as, therefore, at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie, more and more, over to the proletariat, and in particular, a portion of the bourgeoisie ideologists who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole.

Friedrich Nietzsche: Turning Values Upside Down

From Beyond Good and Evil, The Twilight of the Idols, and The Will to Power.

Born in a small village in what is now central Germany, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) was a professor of philology at the University of Basel. Chronic health problems forced him to resign while in his mid-30s, and he lived out his remaining years with his mother and sister. Reacting against the entire tradition of Western moral theory, Nietzsche expresses the view that there are no prescriptive rules of good and evil. His philosophy calls for a person's fullest expression of all intrinsic vital powers, although he argues a balance between the Dionysian (passionate) element in human nature and the Apollonian (rational) element. He is especially critical of the Christian value system for destroying the natural drive of morality and replacing it with weak notions of God, last judgment, truth, love, wisdom, and the Holy Spirit.

BEYOND GOOD AND EVIL

I hope to be forgiven for discovering that all moral philosophy hitherto has been tedious and has belonged to the superfluous appliances—and that "virtue," by anything else. at the same time, however, I would not wish to overlook perfect upon morals, and consequently it is very desirable that morals should today as they have always been: I see no one in Europe who has (or discloses) a dangerous, captious, and exasperating manner—what calamity might be utilitarian: how ponderously and respectably they walk on, stalk along (a bad already stalked in the footsteps of Bentham, just as he was a dangerous man, Helvetius, or senator Poccianti, to use an expression) a notion of an old thought, not even a proper history of what has been written one knows how to leave it with some mischief. In effect, the old English.