its function and role is in the realization of the classless society of the future. All the other classes from the remote past to the recent present were never cognizant of this riddle in history. Hence they remain tools in the hands of "cunning" history which has gained complete self-knowledge only now with the class-conscious proletariat and the omniscient theorist Marx. These alone anticipate future humanity in its game with poor defenceless mankind of the days of class society[68].

Marx developed his philosophy of history and society primarily to quicken the pace of history. As the result of a previously unattained degree of division of labor in the nineteenth century, the adage "Art for Art's sake" was not without success and, similarly, many scholars labored for the sake of pure knowledge. Marx, on the other hand, developing further the practical aspects of the philosophies of Hegel, Fichte, and Kant, explained as early as 1845 in opposition to Feuerbach: "The philosophers have interpreted the world in various ways; the point however, is to change it"[69]. Looking back, we see even more clearly how strongly his pragmatical interpretation of the history of human development was primarily intended to demonstrate the inevitability of a rapid transition from capitalism to socialism and communism. Because of the impact of his expectation concerning the future upon the whole of

---

68) This problem has been perceived clearly by the philosophical communist Georg Lukacs and, still more critically, Joseph Révai who has formulated it in terms of German Transcendental Idealism as follows: "The concrete discovery of the proletariat as at the same time actor(subject) and object has existed in past history... History occurs but it has not occurred... But what else is this idea than that of Hegel's World-Spirit? The past, which is understandable only in contemplation is (in this conception) always opposed to the final elimination of the problem of the thing-in-itself. This problem of the thing-in-itself reappears in history (as over against past or prehistory) as the contrast between the "true", original character of past epochs and the way this character "appears" to the subject of historical contemplation... The proletariat is only the personification of the subject (actor) of history as a whole, but it is not directly identical with this subject. The Proletariat as the subject and object of capitalist society, as the actor of history is not identical with the subject of the universal history which is posited only as a correlate but cannot be concretely ascertained. The proletariat as an identical subject-object of a determined historical epoch has from its specific standpoint to project into the past a uniform subject of universal history which finally has become identical with itself... In the centre of history stands the "not being man"... The proletariat which embodies in its own inhumanity the deprived existence of men of all class societies, must assume, nevertheless, some merely "existing" man, who is only negatively determined. A human being, whose realization through the accomplishment of the proletariat is the aim of the historical process, is, therefore transcendentally inherent in this process, in which it is, however, a merely subjective and transcendent imputation. This "man"... who is to be realized through the proletariat is nothing but mythology. The relationship between Hegel and Marx is even closer than appears from Lukács's own position." Josef Révai, Archiv für die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, Leipzig 1923, Vol.XI, p.229 ff., esp. pp.233-236.

69) Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach" XI, Selected Works, Vol.I, p.473.