Pursuit of an occupation for profit's sake combined with greed and avarice may be peculiar features of a money-and-commodity-economy; and they may therefore reach their climax in capitalism as the highest form of an "acquisitive society". Other aspects of selfishness such as ruthlessness and foul play, jealousy and lust for power, are perhaps traits of any consumption-oriented culture, particularly as long as it is divided into national or other societies. The existence of a small group of over-selfish people in a society will easily result in either subjecting this society to their rule, thus recreating new types of social dependence and exploitation, or in forcing the same attitudes upon others who do not want to succumb in the struggle for existence. One ought not to overlook this marginal power of these "wolves", or, to use Machiavelli's simile, the "lions and foxes". Even where man tries to maintain the interests of the whole, he may accumulate power for that purpose and succumb to the temptations of prestige, vanity, etc., especially where important judgments and decisions on fundamental values are at stake. Marx probably did not give enough emphasis to these aspects of human intercourse from the psychological angle; since Freud, they can no longer be ignored.

The increasing similarity among men will possibly solve some of these questions. However, that similarity which is attainable for mankind as a whole can only be the result of an extremely long process of evolution lasting not decades but centuries, assuming that conditioning is all-powerfull, so as to reduce to a minimum all hereditary factors. This is an assumption which is unwarrantably favorable for Marx. The time needed for such a process would be considerable, as one would have to overcome a "past" that has conditioned man so long and will continue to do so even in the future! Theoretically, under equal conditions the evolution to an equal being could indeed be brought about in the course of time. But Marx himself is far from condoning the sacrifice of variety for uniformity's sake.

In conclusion, we should recall that high productivity is for Marx only the "mother" of the emancipation of mankind; there also is a "father" i.e. the proletariat, as well. History shows, as a rule, that a suppressed class is able to bring about a revolutionary change in society only after having reached a high degree of self-reliance and independence, of skill and knowledge, of wealth and power. After the experiences of the last decades it is hard to foresee how or when the proletariat will muster as much revolutionary strength and power as the bourgoisie has shown in recent centuries. It is even doubtful whether in any foreseeable future the great bulk of unskilled and half-skilled labor will ever reach a status in society comparable with that of the bourgeoisie in the eighteenth or nineteenth century. Compared with the so-called new middle-classes, the role of the proletariat in the transformation of capitalist