ever, reveals this to be a delusion. In the end, the bourgeoisie also is subject to the blind natural forces of capitalism; since it cannot penetrate intellectually its own self-alienation and hence feels itself at home in its own deprivation, it is even more dehumanized than the proletariat. Forfeiting socially the freedom that it has won from nature, it grows, in the course of its rule, more and more backward and impotent. In the end it is for the proletariat to overthrow this power which has become, in terms of world history, a "giant with feet of clay". The proletariat, which is already a potential force, has but to reveal itself as the new lord, as a master who is no longer master but only emancipator and redeemer. Thus the deepest dehumanization of the proletariat guarantees that it has to realize the dialectical change towards highest humanization.

As this conception shows, Marx, no less than Hegel, conceives of world history as a world-court and a world-stage. Schiller spoke of the theater as a stage setting embracing the entire world; with Marx, the socio-historical world shrinks to a grandiose theater play. It is no accident that Marx explains his reference to individuals "only in so far as they are personifications of economic categories, representatives of special class relations and class interests"[65], nor should it be overlooked that the expression "character-mask" is current in Marxian literature, "The capitalists and landowners" as personages, to quote Marx, as well as those of the peasant, the petty bourgeois, and the proletarian are actors on the world stage who have but to perform their parts. Regardless whether their acting is superb or terrible it will not affect the outcome of the play! This is determined as definitely from the very beginning as in the drama, where we find the course of several acts marking different stages in the development of the theme, the successive introduction of the characters and elements of the plot, the revelation of complications which lead to a climax, and finally the solution of the problem by the so-called catastrophe. For with Marx as with Hegel history recalls a modern play with a happy end rather than a Commedia dell'Arte, in which the players enjoy a certain freedom. Or, to change the analogy, world history is with Marx a world-court where at least the judges know how the trial will end. The proletariat is prosecutor, judge, and executioner at the same time, whereas the bourgeoisie has to play the part of defendant and culprit. Just as Hegel maintained that the culprit had to pronounce his own verdict the bourgeoisie too, in a way, passes sentence upon itself, which only has to be executed by the proletariat in the name of world history![66]

---

65) Karl Marx, Capital, Vol.I, p.864.

66) In his pithy speech at the anniversary of the "People's Paper" in April 1856 Marx himself closes his remarks with the following words: "There existed in the middle ages in Germany a