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(T)he notion of human equality has (to) acquire . . . the fixity of a popular conviction.

—Marx, Das Kapital, I

He saw further, deeper, and faster than the rest of us . . .

—Engels on Marx

The beginning and end of all philosophy is — Freedom.

—Schelling

No man is great because he preaches a particular doctrine.

—Viscount Haldane
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I. INTRODUCTION

The term "social justice" is one not readily associated with Karl Marx — and with good reason. Marx himself was inclined to deprecate justice whenever he spoke of it. To him it was nothing but a bourgeois prejudice. In the one explicit reference to justice that appears in his works, he mentions only how it has failed in the bourgeois world: "Look at what the bourgeois calls justice," he
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proclaims; but this receives no real explanation. So, Marx did not base his arguments on the concept of justice.¹

As a matter of fact, Marx attacked those Utopian Socialists who came before him as simple-minded seekers after social justice—blind to the scientific laws of history in his Communist Manifesto.² Marx, indeed, considered all socialists before him to be "Utopians."³ To distinguish himself from them, he called his political philosophy "scientific socialism," in that it dealt with the study of historical causes and events and with the analysis of inevitable trends.⁴ He sought to supplant these so-called utopian doctrines with those of his own, which he thought were more practical and realistic—like the concept of power with which he was dealing.⁵ Nevertheless, many of the socialistic ideas Marx often used he had absorbed from those he contemptuously called Utopians without giving them any credit⁶—and he had embedded deep within him moral impulses as humanistic as any possessed by the Utopians. This humanism may be seen in his analysis of the wretched working conditions and poverty that existed in mid-19th century England.⁷ Even before that, some scholars had claimed to detect a humanistic phase of thought in the earlier writings of Marx.⁸

Thus, perhaps in spite of himself, the great philosopher of socialism could be considered a humanist, with an almost passionate concern for social justice.⁹ For many, in fact, who are treated as social inferiors or are subjected to intolerance and persecution Marxism seems to have a natural appeal,¹⁰ not to mention its incisive appeal for others.¹¹ But, Marx rejected the theo-centric humanism. For him, man was the creator, not the creature; he was free to make his world according to his will, so that he could shape his existence whatever way he chose to. Marx's humanism was a messianic humanism, claiming to possess the key that would infallibly lead to man's destiny.¹² In this way Marx was like a

¹ C. Friedrich, An Introduction to Political Theory 30 (1969) [hereinafter cited as Political Theory].
² Id. at 32.
⁵ C. Friedrich, Political Theory, supra note 1, at 45.
⁷ M. Curtis, supra note 4, at 154-55.
⁸ D. Germino, Beyond Ideology 57 (1967).
⁹ C. Friedrich, Political Theory, supra note 1, at 30, 43.
¹¹ M. Curtis, supra note 4, at 154.
¹² D. Germino, supra note 8, at 58-59, 43-44.
prophet in the old Hebraic tradition. He was a revolutionist who wanted to change the world. His ideal was social change.

The ideas of Marx, with his belief in social justice, were to play a great role in the development of what the notion of social justice was to be for the heritage of political thought in Western society and for mankind as well. The effect would be as catastrophic as profound — more so than even Marx could have realized, for it challenged not only the entire Western heritage but also the entire tradition of rationalism since the days of the Greeks.

As a social scientist, socialist theoretician and political writer, Marx certainly made his influence felt on the contemporary world, perhaps as no other single political thinker has, and, while the brilliant mind of Marx disappointingly produced a legacy of anti-theory rather than any real great work of political theory, his widespread appeal and influence still demand an examination of what Marx himself had to say about the whole area of human rights, including justice, democracy, freedom and equality. That is the purpose of this paper.

II. TOWARD A CLASSLESS SOCIETY

A social theorist as provocative as he was influential, Marx made people realize the importance of class, for it was his fundamental conviction that class was the basic determination of modes of human thought. Indeed, Marx began his theories with the influence of class status and politics, attributing to the socio-economic status operating within politics a monolithic force under this class consciousness.

For Marx, a class (that is, a social class) consisted solely of a group of persons holding a particular position in the production process. Despite the fact that there was no empirical basis for it, Marx’s idea was that there were only two such classes toward which everyone and everything was being pushed. These two existing classes were, of course, the bourgeoisie, who owned the means of production, and the proletariat, who operated those means of

15. C. Friedrich, Political Theory, supra note 1, at 43, 52.
17. D. Germino, supra note 8, at 57.
18. L. McDonald, supra note 14, at 363. Marx had always been much concerned with disclosng the hidden recesses of human motivation. C. Friedrich, Political Theory, supra note 1, at 155.
21. L. McDonald, supra note 14 at 363.
production. Marx defined the proletariat, in comparison to the bourgeoisie in his *Communist Manifesto*, as "that class of society which derives its subsistence solely from selling its labour and not from any profit on capital. . . . The proletarian has no property; its relationship to wife and children is utterly different from the family relations of bourgeoisie life. . . . " Between the two classes Marx proclaimed that there was a sharp distinction and an irreconcilable hostility.  

Such "class antagonism" according to Marx, was officially expressed by "political authority." He concluded that political power had been exercised in the past by and for those who owned the means of production, and he under-scored the inter-connection he saw between the capitalist economic class and political officials. In historic reminiscence, Marx had studied types of rule based on economic class divisions where the governing class had controlled the means of production. He gave a good deal of attention to deficiencies of feudal, bourgeois, and imperialist regimes, but, in the given sets of relationship which his philosophy embraced, Marx was essentially uninterested in those early stages, including feudalism. Of the system of rules he described, he broke it down to a real dichotomy of the last two: capitalism and communism. Marx was pre-occupied in his analysis of the capitalist system, having obtained his research from British sources (in particular the famous Blue Books), so that his theory here was based on factual details of British industrialization. At any rate, class consciousness was a mark of the governing elite, as Marx defined government itself in these terse terms:  

"The state is the executive committee of the ruling class."  

Marx saw the state as the organ of class coercion. In this regard, he spoke of coercive centralism, for political power had, he

22. A. Ranney, supra note 20, at 222.  
24. A. Ranney, supra note 20, at 222.  
29. Id. at 167.  
30. C. Friedrich, supra note 6, at 155.  
31. Curtis, supra note 4, at 154.  
32. J. Barzun, supra note 6, at 155.  
34. Id. at 167.  
35. Cropsey, Karl Marx, in History of Political Philosophy 703 (J. Strauss & J. Cropsey ed. 1963) [hereinafter cited as *Karl Marx*].
was convinced, became an apparatus of coercion in time. All classes were to respect the power of government, thereby being compelled to contribute to and, thus, sustain it. It was dehumanizing to be under the bonds of government restraint like this. In the eyes of Marx, the existing structure of government was one based on domination by one small class that made laws to suit their own interests and, in so doing, limited the rights of other members of society.

Since Marx claimed laws were made for the advantage of the ruling minority, he thought that these laws were not beneficial to society. When Marx spoke of a civil society he meant, economically, the capitalist state. It was in the truly developed state that man, to Marx, lead a double life: first, the heavenly life, in which man was a member of the political community, and, second, the earthly life in the bourgeois society. In the latter life, man, as a private person, regarded other men as means. To be but a means was a degrading thing, for man was "a plaything of alien powers." Given this present state of man, Marx tended to look upon him in much the same pessimistic light that Hobbes had; this was, to be sure, a very negative image of man, one that was very deterministic—an environmental determinism that would almost seem to preclude ever changing human nature. Under this view, man was not free, but, rather, subject to the determination of social forces over which he really had no control. It was social being, Marx maintained, that determined consciousness, not the reverse, as the idealists had asserted.

Marx noted that throughout history man had been alienated from his fellowman, nature, and himself; he had become a slave to extraneous economic forces and illusionary ideas; like religion, philosophy, and politics. The socially inferior class had had their ideology molded by their superiors. This ideology of religion, philosophy, art, literature, ethics, law, et. al., was actually a part of the ideology of the dominant class, and, since man was conditioned by his environment, all this man-made philosophy,
politics, religion and morality were a result thereof. To Marx's mind, religion, the 'groan of the oppressed creatures,' was a societal product of an alienated, preverted social existence, while morality was but another bourgeois prejudice.

Law, too, had become as much a bourgeois prejudice as had morality and religion for the proletariat, whose 'national characteristics' had been despoiled; behind such prejudices, wrote Marx, 'bourgeois interests lurked in ambush.' Indeed, it was his stand, although he over-simplified a highly complex phenomenon, that a nation's religion, social customs, art and forms of government were merely reflections of its economic system, with the economic distribution of wealth comprising the foundation of political-legal substructures. Moreover, all this ideology was said to be just that—nothing more than ideology, mere superstructure (for Marx saw all ideas as a superstructure of man's economic condition). There was no relation here to reality, the crucial aspect of which was material, as far as Marx was concerned, and not spiritual. His own absolute valuation corresponded with basic facts. So, Marx had introduced a disturbing concept into the social sciences, to wit: that the scheme of ideas with which men defended an out-worn and obsolete value system that did not reflect realities.

Private institutions of the kind mentioned above, insisted Marx, produced negative community interests that were actually anti-social because they created fragmentation and conflict within and between men. The self-assertiveness of man which pitted one against another in the name of one's own inalienable, irreducible rights, another source of dehumanization for man, characterized community life for Marx. This thinking was certainly in line with the class antagonism Marx wanted to emphasize, but Marx did not give adequate consideration to the obvious fact that there are compatible, as well as divergent, community interests. Nevertheless, Marx denied the existence of any general community of interests. He attacked any harmony of interest by asserting that
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it could not be achieved as long as private ownership was permitted to be the instrument of production.\textsuperscript{58}

Marx wrote of the forces and relations of production in the economic sub-structure, albeit changing their exact make-up from time to time.\textsuperscript{59} Generally, however, the conditions of production—conscious production being the singular sign of humanity—were said to control the distribution of income, as well as the consumption of output.\textsuperscript{60} It divided men among owners and workers, rich and poor, and the exploiter and exploited.\textsuperscript{61} While Marx had praise for capitalism because of the industrial advances it had made, he deduced that its periodic economic crisis indicated the growing part industry was playing in the economic system and, also, the accompanying trend toward industrial concentration; the dynamics of the industrial process which created these periodic crises led to the exploitation of labor, increasing in degree with each successive crisis.\textsuperscript{62} This is why Marx equated "modern industrial labor" with "modern enslavement by capital,"\textsuperscript{63} and spoke of the frustration and anxieties of the producer in terms of "alienation" of labor.\textsuperscript{64}

Marx felt a strong sense of injustice about such exploitation that treated men only as commodities.\textsuperscript{65} In the middle chapters of \textit{Das Kapital}, Marx wrote emotionally in behalf of the dignity and worth of the individual, while emotionally protesting against those who would class him as merely a commodity enmeshed in machine and market place.\textsuperscript{66} In this way, Marx showed the same interest in the quality of life in the market society which produced the working class as did a totally different moralist like Mill.\textsuperscript{67} But then, much of Marxism consists of assumptions that seek to explain the impoverishment of the working class.\textsuperscript{68} Full-machine production under private ownership required absolute pauperization of the wage earner due to the pressure of capitalistic competition.\textsuperscript{69} Far worse, the whole thing was most dehumanizing.\textsuperscript{70}
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Basically, Marx sought to control the means of production through Communism (broadly defined) in the socio-political realm. This seemed perfectly natural to him, and, hence, sound.\textsuperscript{71}

Marx maintained that each epoch in history inherited a mode of production with a complex set of relations among men that was fitted to that particular mode. In time, the mode was changed as need be.\textsuperscript{72} From this starting belief that the mode of production of material means of life conditioned the general socio-political and intellectual processes of life and relations among men, Marx formulated his rigid determinism of the dialectic method to serve as his fundamental analysis in understanding history\textsuperscript{73} and in explaining the nature of society.\textsuperscript{74} Like his economic theory, the dialectic materialism of Marx was concerned with fundamental historical laws as he saw them.\textsuperscript{75}

His economic theory, based in turn, on his labor theory of value and surplus value, advanced the argument that the inevitable fall in the rate of profit would increase the tendency to accumulate capital and increase, as well, the growth of industrial monopolization.\textsuperscript{76} This "restless struggle for profit" created a constant state of flux within the capitalist economy and society,\textsuperscript{77} and, it made work painful because it was directed solely at what would sell most profitably (though work in itself was not to be considered inherently painful by Marx).\textsuperscript{78} Moreover this struggle, propelled by history, involved each class in a different process of production.\textsuperscript{79} The expression of the mode of production was to further dictate the terms of the struggle that would mean all-out war, with everyone battling everyone else on the field of material interest.\textsuperscript{80} Material possessions themselves were so important, claimed Marx rather questionably, that those with large property income were sure to put up a fight against their dispossession.\textsuperscript{81} Having referred to the great "feudal estates" of the bourgeois in discussing class inequality,\textsuperscript{82} Marx had recognized, like Madison
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before him, that inequality of property would provide a lasting cause for conflict.  

Having noted the sequence of growth, development, and decline of human society, Marx concluded that the struggle of classes had been brought about by the diversity apparent in a modern, pluralistic society. Indeed, Marx glorified this struggle between the two hostile classes for ultimate total domination. He exhorted the workers, as the largest and most numerous class to acquire that domination so as to extend and generalize rights through a workers' state where all would have common rights. Marx knew that when the masses could no longer stand the wretchedness of their present existence, the class conflict would explode into decisive combat; that the contradictions inherent in capitalism between the forces of production, due to polarization of, and antagonism between the classes, would lead to the workers' growing misery and, therefore, produce revolution.

The concern of Marx for attaining economic liberty demanded effort, and he certainly would not stop short of violence. Marx himself surely thought of revolutionary force, which was to become the doctrine of Soviet Communism, as a necessity. In Marx's challenge to liberalism, "freedom flowers in necessity"—an inescapable fact that historical necessity had decreed. Further, world revolution was proclaimed as necessary for eventual world order, Marx having insisted that a world community did exist.

This transformation of society via revolution would, Marx predicted, come in the last stages of industrial capitalism as that vast mass of exploited workers confronted the technical and the powerful who had dominated them. Among these confronters were the class-conscious elite of Communism. The Communist Party, a decisive force in advancing the movement of the working class, according to the Communist Manifesto, was to be the vanguard for the proletariat who understood the historical process that meant the eventual destruction of capitalism and all its forms of exploitation.
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That is, those members of the proletariat who “clearly understand the line of march” (or, course of history) were Communists in an elitist position. They were to prepare for the transformation of the human condition from one of slavery to one of mastery. While the “head of emancipation was philosophy,” these proletarian’s provided the heart. Theory and practice were now united, for “as philosophy finds in the proletariat its material, so the proletariat finds in philosophy its spiritual weapon.” Thus, a revolutionary movement led by a class-conscious proletariat was, for Marx, the locus of political rationality. Taken together, revolution would support the philosophy of history Marx had devised. To a movement that previously had no adequate theory, Marx supplied the creed—“the whole-cloth,” as George Catlin put it.

Marx was calling for total action in a final victory for humanity. He was looking toward full humanity: complete emancipation from all kinds of bonds—a state of freedom, not of nature where nature would dominate over man. It lay beyond material production and really meant the elimination of the power of social and religious institutions, thereby emancipating man from their control. One of Marx’s deepest human concerns had been to free man from the “alienation” to which modern mass production had condemned him. The ultimate political freedom of man was somewhat related to the activity of the individual in social life in the mind of Marx. Marx believed, for example, that the individual must have the opportunity to develop facilities and versatility within society where the free development of each was dependent on the free development of all—a feeling that was expressed in his analysis on the division of labor, basic to the economic system to which man had had to submit.

III. COME THE REVOLUTION...

It was only in the post-industrial society where machines would liberate humanity from tedious labor that the libertarian
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socialistic society of Marx had any meaning. 105 At the base of Marxism was the anticipated end of political and religious life, replaced by such a society. 106 This true socialist state was established through the aforementioned violent revolution and the subsequent liquidation of the unrepentent capitalist. 107 Indeed, with the overthrow of all remaining elements of the existing capitalist socio-political order, the hard core enemy himself was also destroyed. The proletariat now had become the majority class, as all others were relegated to the minority. 108 Out of the revolution, the victorious proletariat, who neither had nor acquired wealth, nor sought to take over the oppression they had just ended, 109 were still to maintain the socialist state through dictatorship. 110 This dictatorship of the proletariat, directly following the culmination of the class struggle, was a transition period for the abolition of all classes for the "classless society."

It represented that stage between the conquest of the state by revolution and its final dying away. 112

At least until the time the state had completely "withered away," Marx felt the proletariat had the moral right to exercise the political power once held by the decaying bourgeoisie. Marx wanted a greater political role for the working classes, for he witnessed that even during the Industrial Revolution, with its high productivity, the working class was still excluded from political power in Europe. This represented an unequal distribution of power as capitalists in industrial nations ruled only to further their own general interests instead of those of the commonweal while the socialists' system would bring equality for all. 113 Even so, the interest Marx had shown in workers was not so much as human beings but more as instruments of world revolutionary action built on the class-war theory. 114 He would still spare nothing in serving the mass movement. 115

There is some speculation that Marx might have intended to have democratic institutions such as the civil liberties of free government carried over into his socialist government as a "necessary stage" to bring about Marxist socialism—with the

---

105. Lipset, Political Changes, supra note 29, at 43.
106. Cropsey, Karl Marx, supra note 35, at 721.
107. A. Ranney, supra note 20, at 150.
108. C. Friedrich, Political Theory, supra note 1, at 45-46, 52.
110. A. Ranney, supra note 20, at 150.
111. L. McDonald, supra note 14, at 361.
112. C. Friedrich, Political Theory, supra note 1, at 46.
113. C. Andrain, supra note 27, at 149.
114. G. Catlin, supra note 23, at 569.
115. D. Germino, supra note 8, at 65.
hope, perhaps, that democracy itself could be better realized here: a sort of proletarian "democracy." The point of all this seems to be that Marx did not totally dismiss democratic concepts out of hand, although he usually spoke of representative government with contempt. He would belittle democracy and glorify dictatorship; democracy was, to him, a sham—unworkable. At any rate, he was sure that it could not work in a society of classes. Yet, it is certainly difficult, especially for the modern Marxist mind, to fathom any acceptance by Marx of even the implications of democracy. Marx was too dogmatic in his conviction that he was right and would win in the end, and that everyone else needed to get in step with him and history; this inflexible all-or-nothing alternative was wholly alien to any democratic spirit.

It was confidently predicted by Marx that once the state died away, man would live socially under the rule of absolute benevolence—from each according to his ability, to each according to his need. Man would then be radically different than pre-revolutionary man: more cooperative, neighborly, and willing to share his goods. This would usher in a new age for man, a universal brotherhood to replace both coercion and civil society itself. Under this generation of the new man, the human condition now became one where good men sought after good via good means, and man responded, in turn, with only good motives. Man, by his own self-creation and determinism—for a one-dimensional man was the goal—could establish this new world through the realities of human social life. This actually transcended reality. When this third realm of history came about, it changed time into eternity, essence into existence, and alienation into identity; moreover, man was no longer a mystery to himself.

In his ideology Marx had promised man a "leap . . . to freedom," and in that leap man would become a giant as the state, that force of society repression, withered away. There would then, of course, be no need for such institutions as the church, family or
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private property which had burdened man in his pre-history.\textsuperscript{127} Neither would there be a necessity, Marx confidently expected, for bureaucratic administration in any future socialist society (although, in reality, it seems that socialistic states have more bureaucracy than ever);\textsuperscript{128} still, Marx thought all this would be replaced by an economic administration of things.\textsuperscript{129}

Though this Utopia of Marx differed from the Utopia of George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's "World Soul" and the absolute of the world process that the state was the guiding force of Humankind, he (Marx) was an Enlightened humanist in the tradition of Buddha, the Hebrew Prophets, Jesus Christ, Socrates, the Renaissance philosophers and Goethe.

Though this utopia of Marx differed from the utopia of More, for example, both looked toward a better future, as each conceived it to be.\textsuperscript{130} The perfect society would finally be achieved, for Marx, when philosophy, as one rule of life, and justice, as the other rule of life, became indistinguishable from one another.\textsuperscript{131}

Marx, who sought to prove that future liberty was a certainty on the basis of historical "laws" of gross change which he asserted revealed this necessity, saw the oppressed collectives coming into their own as a fulfillment of his aims—\textsuperscript{132} the same aims that were shared by Lasswell, upon whom the influence of Marx was felt; these ultimate objectives, some of which have been stated earlier in this paper, being the elimination of conflict, anxiety, violence, war, and, of course, "illusion, alienation, and exploitation."\textsuperscript{133} Though Marx also had an ultimate belief in natural social harmony,\textsuperscript{134} which was but one characteristic of his ideal—the classless society, he held fast to that overall positive and explicit ideal itself as more powerful than any one of the parts (such as social harmony) that made-up the whole of this classless society or even more powerful than justice.\textsuperscript{135} So, the ultimate end of the Communist society would bring an end not only to oppression but to justice, as well.\textsuperscript{136}

IV. THE MAN BEHIND THE THEORIES

Like a number of revolutionaries, Marx came from a bourgeois background. The son of a prominent lawyer, Marx
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would later marry the daughter of an equally prominent local aristocrat.\textsuperscript{137} Marx’s father, Hershel, was a Jew,\textsuperscript{138} and, although the Marx family had come from a long line of rabbis, the young Karl was baptized as a Protestant at the age of six.\textsuperscript{139} The elder Marx, a man of duty and humility, had a good deal of influence on his son. Marx did not hold his mother in the same esteem, however. He considered her to be a hard, bigoted woman. Unlike her son, who was born in the Rhineland, Mrs. Marx was a native of Holland.\textsuperscript{140}

At school, Marx’s teachers became aware of his abilities and expected much of him.\textsuperscript{141} Marx himself once declared in a school essay: “When we have chosen the position in life in which we can best work for humanity, then burdens cannot crush us, for they are sacrifices for all . . .”\textsuperscript{142}

George Catlin maintained that Marx began his career as he ended it: a materialist revolutionary, albeit anti-empirical. But Marx did change from a Hegelian revolutionary to an economic champion of the workers.\textsuperscript{143} As a student of philosophy, Marx had been early influenced by Hegelian idealism to a very strong degree; however, he came to grow critical of it and to end up by turning Hegel “right-side up.”\textsuperscript{144} He did this by adding to the dialectic of his old teacher, the evolutionary historian by whom he had been completely captured as an adolescent who was also writing tragic verse at the time, the material contents that seemed so positive to any movement of history; hence, Dialectic Materialism. Still, Marx owed his sociological bent to his study of Hegel and he continued to use Hegelian terms—which he did not bother to define—even after he had inverted Hegel’s philosophy.\textsuperscript{145} But that inversion had not yet been made by Marx in the early 1840’s, during which time he was remembered as “the life and soul of . . . radical Hegelians” in Germany, “a very remarkable circle . . . whose consistent cynicism left far behind even the most rabid Russian nihilists.”\textsuperscript{146}

Marx had served as a political journalist and editor in Germany before being banished near the end of the 1840s from his
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father land, first temporarily and then permanently.\textsuperscript{147} Marx had become a "German Democrat Communist" by then. In 1846 he had written that the middle and working classes were "the only classes betwixt whom there can be a possible struggle."\textsuperscript{148} So, having turned 30 in 1848 as revolutions were sweeping Europe, Marx, his doctrines now well-established in his mind, left Germany prepared to advance his own socialist movement around his theory of the class struggle.\textsuperscript{149} He spent short stays in Paris and in Brussels, where he was involved with the Communist League for whom he and Friedrich Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto of 1848,\textsuperscript{150} a call to action against the prevailing policies which were existent in current society.\textsuperscript{151} While at Brussels, Marx was described thusly by one contemporary:

\ldots a thick, black-mop of hair \ldots and crookedly-buttoned frock-coat, he gave the impression of one who has the right and power to command respect, whatever his appearance. \ldots His manners defined the accepted forms. \ldots, and were haughty and almost contemptuous. His sharp metallic voice suited remarkably well the radical verdicts which he was in the habit of pronouncing on men and things.\textsuperscript{152}

Already Marx was exhibiting the demeanor of speaking in the form of judgements \textit{sana} any appeals. Carl Schurz saw him in a similar light, too,\textsuperscript{153} when he concluded in his \textit{Reminiscences}:

I have never seen a man whose bearing was so provoking and intolerable. To no opinion which differed from his own did he accord the honor of even condescending consideration; every argument that he did not like he answered either with biting scorn at the unfathomable ignorance that prompted it, or opprobrious aspersions upon the motives of him who had advanced it \ldots (H)e denounced everyone who dared to oppose his opinions.\textsuperscript{154}

Marx, the amoral, could be almost self-righteous in showing his cold fury toward those who rejected the "manifest validity" of
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his brand of scientific socialism.\textsuperscript{155} Nor did Marx ever change or relent in his outward attitude and many were the accounts of the vain, quarrelsome, abusive and malicious, almost childish, nature of Marx, who summarily dismissed all his opponents as fools and knaves.\textsuperscript{156}

After leaving Belgium, Marx went to London in 1849 with the expectation of staying no more than a couple of months.\textsuperscript{157} After all, England was a backward country as far as revolutions were concerned.\textsuperscript{158} Marx was to remain here, however, until his death 24 years later. With Engels, his only real friend, making a living for them both on cotton in Manchester, Marx felt alone at first. He kept company with only a few German exiles like himself as he used the new solitude to collect his thoughts. Readjustment came painfully slow for him in his present state of depression, ill-health and poverty.\textsuperscript{159} Occasionally, Engels provided his colleague with a generous contribution,\textsuperscript{160} but most of the time Marx had to go to the pawnshop.\textsuperscript{161} Marx continually spent his time reading and writing in the British Museum, worked as a correspondent for the New York\textit{Tribune} and a Viennese newspaper, and also helped to found the First International, which he also helped to destroy later.\textsuperscript{162} Above all, he wondered when revolution would come, and he plunged deeper into the studies of history and economics.\textsuperscript{163} He said he was scientifically studying the economic and social order and its historic development, whose laws pointed inevitably, for him, to revolution on the basis of his research.\textsuperscript{164} Due to the vast network of correspondence he had established, Marx was also able to keep informed on conditions and developments in England, Germany, France and other countries.\textsuperscript{165}

Ten years after he arrived in London, Marx finally published, in 1859, a major work,\textit{Critique of Political Economy}, which was to provide a starting point for\textit{Das Kapital}.\textsuperscript{166} The first volume of\textit{Kapital} followed in 1867, with other volumes subsequently appearing after Marx's death.\textsuperscript{167} His last important effort before
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his death was a declaration against unification of German workers under the Gotha Programme. In this Critique of 1875, he wrote,

"The right of the producers is proportional to the amount of labour they contribute, the equality consists in the fact that everything is measured by an equal standard, labour... This equal right is an unequal right for unequal labour..."  

In 1882, the poor health of Marx began to fail fast, hastened by lung trouble. In order to recuperate, Marx traveled to Algiers and came back via Monte Carlo. But the death of his daughter the following year only made him worse. Indeed, for all of Marx’s disagreeable, self-centered character and his insensitivity almost to the point of cruelty, he was, nevertheless, devoted to his family and his home. There are accounts of him as a warmhearted husband and father, with a life-long, tender regard for his wife and daughter. At the prior death of his 8-year-old child, Marx lamented that it “profoundly shattered my heart and brain” and he continued to “feel the loss just as fresh as on the first day.” Marx himself was to follow his grown daughter in death the same year; he was buried at Highgate in London.

V. PROGRESSION OF MARX’S THOUGHTS ON RIGHTS

Marx has been accused of having more respect for the rights of a whole class than for the rights of individuals. Defenders of Marx, however, have argued that this tends toward an extension of rights to all, and that this influence helped to abolish the old assumption of a graduated society with graded enjoyment of rights.

Perhaps one of the best of Marx’s early writings on the subject of the rights of man was his 1843-44 essay on “The Jewish Question,” Die Jedenfrage. In that essay Marx asked if the Jew could acquire civil rights, and with them also acquire the universal rights of man, which included “the right to be religious in one’s own fashion”—a privilege of faith. To that end, he set about to examine the rights of man “in their most authentic form, that which they have among those who discovered them, the North Americans and the French.” These rights were said to be, in part, political because they could only be exercised by members of a community, that is,
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through participation in the political life of the community (or state). This was in the civil rights category of political liberty.\textsuperscript{174}

Marx then distinguished between the rights of citizens and the rights of man, the later being the rights of a member of the aforementioned society, apart from others in the community—though not in the sense of some isolated nomad, drawn into himself. This was the liberty of man. Therein was to be found freedom of conscience; for example, the right to practice a chosen religion: this privilege of faith that was expressly recognized as a right of man—a guaranteed right as a consequence of his liberty.\textsuperscript{175}

While Marx had defined political emancipation as the dissolution of the old society, the freedom of man (liberty) meant “the right to do everything which does not harm others.” Such limits of action were defended by law, “just as the boundary between two fields is marked by a stake.” Since liberty, however, was a right of man based on his separation as an individual from other men rather than in relations with them, Marx next tried to show that this independence from society could be a right of self-interest. As a practical application of this right, he used the example of private property, at the base of all civilized society. It entailed the right to enjoyment of one’s own fortune and its disposal at will—without even the slightest regard for any other man. From all this, Marx noted that man began to see in others how his own liberty was limited.\textsuperscript{176}

Marx spoke of other rights, as well, in his essay. On equality, he said that under this equal right to liberty every one was equally regarded as self-sufficient; but there was no political significance here. As for the right to security, Marx classed it as the one supreme social concept of civil society: the concept of police. “The whole society exists,” he wrote, “only in order to guarantee for each of its members the preservation of his person, his rights and his property.” It was what Hegel called “the state of need and of reason,” Marx recalled, adding his own observation that it was an “assurance” of the egoism of society.\textsuperscript{177}

Marx, further in his essay, thought it degrading that man in society (species-life) was not considered a species-being; thus, man as bourgeois was not considered the true, authentic man.\textsuperscript{178} While
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Marx observed that man was a needy being, as each was condemned to depend on the external things (like nature) and on other men to help supply his needs, man was also viewed by Marx as a species-being (or, social being) in addition to his neediness, which had been exploited. Therefore, man should not only live and act in common with other men, but he could not realize his human possibilities without inter-action by fellow human beings. In short, man’s fellow-men were the whole of which he was but a part. Only when every man merged himself in the whole of humanity would man be perfectly free and the perfect society—that “final articulation of man”—be achieved.179

Having discussed human rights in his essay, Marx drew the following conclusion: actually, these so-called rights, separated from man’s fellows and his community, went no further than that of the egoist: “an individual separate from community, withdrawn into himself, wholly preoccupied with his private interest and acting in accordance with his private caprice. . . .”180

“The only bond between man,” Marx went on to write in his summation, “is natural necessity, need and private interest, the preservation of their property and their egoistic persons.”181

Marx wanted such egoism punished as a crime, for, as a result of it, citizenship in the political community had been reduced to a mere means for preserving what was called the rights of man. In essence, a citizen became a servant of egoistic man. Marx had written that “political life declares itself to be only a means, whose end is the life of civil society,” but he averred that when rights of liberty came into conflict with political rights, these freedoms ceased to be rights. Therefore, where political life merely guaranteed the rights of individuals, it should be forthwith suspended as soon as it came into flagrant contradiction with the end of his theory—the rights of man. And so, Marx closed his essay on the note of theory being the rule and practice the exception by neatly inverting the relation so that the end became the means and vice-versa.182

Near the end of his life, Marx was again to make another such pronouncement on rights, especially as they applied to equality. On that occasion he began by pointing out that one man would excel another physically or intellectually, thereby contributing within the same time more labor, or laboring for a longer time. In
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using labor as a measure here, Marx cautioned that it "must be defined by its duration or integrity, otherwise it ceases to be a standard measure"; and from there he went on to assert, "This equal right is an unequal right for unequal work." While it recognized no class differences because every worker ranked as worker like his fellow man, it did recognize, Marx maintained, "unequal individual endowment, and thus capacities for production as natural privileges." Marx deduced, therefore, that it was, by its very content, "a right in inequality," like every general right.

VI. CONCLUSION

In his funeral oration over the grave of his close comrade, Engels likened Marx to Darwin, since the departed had discovered "the law of evolution in human history." Marx would certainly have approved of that comparison, for it was one he had stressed himself. Indeed, Marx saw his own work as paralleling that of Darwin, and he wanted to dedicate a portion of his Kapital to him. To be sure, both Marx and Darwin had observed, according to Catlin, "the deadly battle of survival." Marx found it among the classes. Jacques Barzun delves deeper into this Marx-Darwin coupling; referring to them as "prophets of our destiny," he writes of this "great pair" whose thoughts and concepts were responsible for revolutionizing the history of Western civilization and moving millions in the modern world: each led his own revolution of human life over pre-history, and together they spoke of human brotherhood. Barzun further notes that Darwin's idea on the struggle of life and Marx's economic interpretation of history both involve many current-day problems of democratic freedom and autarky.

But whether one looks upon Marx as a realist or an idealist, he may also be compared with Machiavelli and, hence, classed as a
Machiavellian himself.194 By returning to politics as the science of power, it may be said, as Catlin has, that Marx did for the socialist movement what Machiavelli did for the state.195 This Machiavellian heritage in Marxism spread to Russia in 1917 with the Bolshevik revolution, characterized by terrorism, as an example of how men could be carried away by the alien extremes of Marxism.196

Oddly enough, with its appeal to persecuted people, Marxism had been successful in establishing a European regime only in Russia, where not only do Jews not dominate, but where they are still subject to persecution and intolerance, as well.197 The shocking waves of anti-Semitism which continually take place in Soviet Russia and its satellites are nothing new, unfortunately, and now this religious persecution even includes national captivity. Jews have been put on trial, without benefit of legal counsel, on charges that are not released. Such a spectacular misuse of allegedly judicial procedures is merely aimed at perpetuating the anti-migration policy, along with fanning the flames of anti-Semitism. To be sure, the Russian idea of the purpose of a trial has been one based on government policy instead of justice. This is, indeed, a great blow to the concept of the rule of law and the principle of religious toleration. Many throughout the free world—including this writer—who seek humane treatment for all peoples have protested such treatment accorded Soviet Jews by the Marxist government in Russia, with the hope that by exerting whatever pressure possible that government will be forced to reverse these actions.

In addition to the unmanifested promise above, what social revolutions had occurred in Europe did not come in industrial countries there, as Marx had also predicted, but, rather, in those less or under-developed countries. Neither did the power of the state die away under communism; on the contrary, it has increased. And there are still other Marxist predictions which have gone unfulfilled. The middle-class between the proletariat and capitalist has not been eliminated; nor has the class struggle been intensified—if anything, it is reduced. Further, the conditions of the working class have grown better, not worse.198 As a result, the theories of Marx seem a good deal "iffy," at best.199
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The gospel of Marx, even so, may be open to many interpretations. On human freedom, Barzun recognizes that man has the freedom to choose purposes, with, perhaps, no need for complete freedom as long as he has the freedom to change channels between his feelings and his ideals by which he can generate all other freedoms. Recognizing further that equality is "a concept for dealing out justice among imcommensurable human beings," Barzun looks to Marx's means of achieving political equality in terms of an international brotherhood of men. But, while man can bind himself or others through his beliefs, the main message Marx had for the masses, toward such an end, was to band together and wage combat against their hereditary enemy who had exploited them; and, once they had overthrown their masters, they would, in some way, build a new order where there would be no future class wars. Of course, these ends were to be accomplished through violence, for Marx was wont to say that "Force is the midwife of Progress." That was all too basic to Marx's popular movement: only bloody revolution would bring about reform. However, what Marx and his later-day disciples failed to accept is that reforms, including those concerned with human rights and its expansion, can be—and, indeed, have been—made within the existing structure of society.
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