



# International Journal of Sanskrit Research

अनन्ता

ISSN: 2394-7519

IJSR 2017; 3(2): 129-131

© 2017 IJSR

www.anantaajournal.com

Received: 27-01-2017

Accepted: 28-02-2017

**Dr. Dinesh Kumar Singh**

Lecturer, Seth Motilal Teachers  
Education College Jhunjhunu,  
Rajasthan, India

## Indian education thought and Karl Marx values

**Dr. Dinesh Kumar Singh**

### Introduction

The process of industrialization and the expansion of cities greatly influenced the development of the education system. Until the first few decades of the 19th Century, most of the populations had no schooling whatsoever. But the industrial economy rapidly expanded, there was a great demand for specialized schooling that could produce educated capable work force. As educational system become universal, more and more people were exposed to abstract learning, rather than to the practical transmission of specific skills. In a modern society people have to be basically skilled, i.e. reading writing and calculating and a general knowledge of their physical social or economic environment, but it is also important that they know how to learn, so that they can master to new technical forms of information. Swami Vivekananda discussed on all main issues of Education like building character, need for concentration, brahmacharya, meditation, and other spiritual aspects(Forster J- 1964).

Swami also felt the need of Physical education, Moral and Religious education, like the other modern educational thinkers of India. He also felt the need of synthesis of Religion and Science and stressed the importance of Technology. The Educational philosophy of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of Independent India. His educational thought is influenced on the one side by socialist thinkers like Karl Marx and on the other side by the ideas of Mahatma Gandhi.

The Significance role of education issues

1. The society role in education
2. Social groups tend to enjoy more educational success

### Mass communication

More recently, difficulties about definition of the field have stemmed from developments of technology that have blurred the line between public & private communication & between mass & interpersonal communication. It is unlikely that we can find a single definition of the field that can adequately cover the diversity of the relevant phenomena & perspectives.

### Levels of communication

The term 'mass communication', which was coined at the end of the 1930s, has too many connotations to allow of a simple agreed definition. The word 'mass' itself value viaden & controversial, & the term 'communication' still has to agreed definition although Gerbner's (1967) 'social interaction through messages' is hard to beat for succinctness.

At each descending level of the pyramid indicated there is an increasing number of cases to be found, & each level present its own particular set of problems for research & theorizing. In an integrated modern society there will often by one large public communication network, usually depending on the mass media, which can reach & involve all citizens to varying degree. Although the media system is also usually fragmented according to regional & other social or demographic factors. At a level below that of the whole society there are several different kinds of communication network (Hiller H 1976).

### Functionalist

Mass media is one sub-system of the society. Social practices and institutions satisfy the needs of the individual and the society.

**Correspondence**

**Dr. Dinesh Kumar Singh**

Lecturer, Seth Motilal Teachers  
Education College Jhunjhunu,  
Rajasthan, India

Media as an institution is supposed to satisfy the needs of continuity, order, integration, motivation, guidance, socialization, adaptation etc. Organized society life requires the continued maintenance of an accurate, consistent, supportive and consistent picture of the social environment.

Versatile Karl Marx only knew the press before it was effectively a mass medium it is still possible to analyse modern media according to his ideas, even when Marxism is widely thought to have failed as a guide to social change. The media as an industry conform to a general capitalist type, with factors of production (raw materials, technology & labour) & relations of production. They are likely to be in monopolistic ownerships of a capital-owning class, & to be nationally or internationally organized to serve the interests of that class. They do so by materially exploiting workers & consumers (Nagla, Madhu 1997) [3]. Media work ideologically by disseminating the ideas & world-views of the ruling class, denying access to alternative ideas that might lead to change or to a growing consciousness on the part of the working class of its interests. They also hinder the mobilizations of such consciousness into active & organized political opposition.

The question of power is central to Marxist interpretations of mass media. While varied there have always emphasized the fact that ultimately they are instruments of control for a ruling class. The founding text is Marx's German ideology, whereas states. The class that has the means of materials production has control at the same time over the means of mental production so that, thereby; generally, speaking the ideas of those who lack the mean of mental production are subject to it. Insofar therefore, as they rule as a class & determine the extent & compass of an epoch, it is self evident that they among other things regulate the production & distributions of the ideas of their age: thus their ideas are the ruling ideas of the approach. (Cited in Murdock & Golding 1977) Marxist theory posits a direct link between economic ownership & the dissemination of messages that affirm the legitimacy & the value of a class society. There views are supposed in modern times by evidence of tendencies to great concentration of media ownership by capitalist entrepreneurs (for eg. Bagdikian, 1988) & by much correlative evidence of conservative tendencies in contact of media so organized (for example Herman & Chomsky).

### **Karl Marx**

Marx was a world-renowned social philosopher, sociologist and economic historian. He made remarkable contributions to the development of various social sciences including sociology.

He contributed greatly to sociological ideas. He introduced key concepts in sociology like social class, social class conflict, social oppression, alienation, etc. Marx, like Comte, argued that people should make active efforts to bring about societal reforms. According to Marx, economic forces are the keys to underestimating society and social change. He believed that the history of human society has been that of class conflict. He dreamed of, and worked hard towards realizing, a classless society, one in which there will be no exploitation and oppression of one class by another, and wherein all individuals will work according to their abilities and receive according to their needs. Marx introduced one of the major perspectives in sociology, called social conflict theory.

### **The principal features of the Marxist dialectical method are as follows**

- ✓ Nature Connected and Determined

- ✓ Nature is a State of Continuous Motion and Change
- ✓ Natural Quantitative Change Leads to Qualitative Change
- ✓ Contradictions Inherent in Nature

### **Concept of Social Change**

In their struggle against nature, and to gain their livelihood through associated labor, men create specific forms of social organization in tune with specific modes of production. All these modes of social organization, with the exception of those prevailing in the original stage of primitive communism, are characterized by social inequality. Marx, insisted on the principle of historical specificity, that is, he thought it essential to note that each particular class antagonism, rooted in particular productive conditions, must be analyzed in its own right. Each stage in history is conceived as a functional whole, with its own peculiar modes of production, which give rise to distinctive types of antagonisms between exploiting and exploited classes. Class antagonisms specific to each particular mode of production led to the emergence of classes whose interests could no longer be asserted within the framework of the old order; at the same time, the growth of the productive forces reached the limits imposed by previous productive relations. When this happened, the new classes, which represented a novel productive principle, broke down the old order, and the new productive forces, which were developed in the matrix of the old order, created the material conditions for further advance (R. Rama devi, 2013) [4].

### **Class and Class Conflict**

For Marx, the analysis of social class, class structures and changes in those structures are key to understanding capitalism and other social systems or modes of production. In the Communist Manifesto Marx and Engels comment that the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Analysis of class divisions and struggles is especially important in developing an understanding of the nature of capitalism. For Marx, classes are defined and structured by the relations concerning (i) work and labour and (ii) ownership or possession of property and the means of production. These economic factors more fully govern social relationships in capitalism than they did in earlier societies. The main classes in capitalism are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. However, other classes such as landlords, petty bourgeoisie, peasants, and lumpenproletariat also exist, but are not primary in terms of the dynamics of capitalism.

**a. Bourgeoisie:** The bourgeoisie or capitalists are the owners of capital, purchasing and exploiting labour power, using the surplus value from employment of this labour power to accumulate or expand their capital. It is the ownership of capital and their uses to exploit labour and expand capital are important here. By employing workers, industrial capital created the surplus value that could take on the various forms such as profit, interest and rent.

**b. Proletariat:** The proletariat are owners of labour power and mere owners of labour power, with no other resources than the ability to work with their hands, bodies, and minds. Since these workers have no property, in order to survive and obtain an income for themselves and their families, they must find employment work for an employer. This means working for a capitalist-employer in an exploitative social relationship.

### **Conclusion**

The social structures that regulate the relation between humans in the production of goods. Marx used the term mode of production to refer to the specific organization of economic production in a given society. A mode of production includes the means of production used by a given society, such as factories and other facilities, machines, and raw materials. It also includes labor and the organization of the labor force. The term relations of production refers to the relationship between those who own the means of production (the capitalists or bourgeoisie) and those who do not (the workers or the proletariat). According to Marx, history evolves through the interaction between the mode of production and the relations of production. The mode of production constantly evolves toward a realization of its fullest productive capacity, but this evolution creates antagonisms between the classes of people defined by the relations of production.

According to Marx, the combination of forces and relations of production means that the way people relate to the physical world and the way people relate to each other socially are bound up together in specific and necessary ways. People must consume to survive, but to consume they must produce, and in producing they necessarily enter into relations which exist independently of their will. For Marx, the the analysis of social order and the causes of social change must be discovered in the specific mode of production that a society has. He further argued that the mode of production substantively shaped the nature of the mode of distribution, the mode of circulation and the mode of consumption, all of which together constitute the economic sphere. To understand the way wealth was distributed and consumed, it was necessary to understand the conditions under which it was produced.

### **Reference**

1. Forster J. the sociological consequences of Tourism, International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 1964.
2. Hiller H. Escapism, Penetration and Response; Industrial Tourism in the Caribbean Studies, 1976.
3. Nagla Madhu. Sociology of Medical Profession, Rawat Publishers, Jaipur, 1997.
4. Rama devi R. Education And Values In Modern Indian Thought, Department Of Philosophy And Religious Studies Andhra University, Visakhapatnam - 530 003 Andhra Pradesh, India, 2013.