nizes equally with history. If the emancipation of the proletariat is identical with the liberation of all mankind - present, past, and future -, the proletariat expropriates the bourgeoisie not only in the proletariat's selfish interest, but also in the "well-understood" final interest of the bourgeoisie itself - at least in so far as this class remains an integral part of human history and is absorbed as such into the new "classless society". Thus in Marx's philosophy the bourgeoisie (and all the other decrepit classes and groups as well) suffer real tragedy, since, due solely to the necessary limits of their class-ideology, they do not and cannot understand the "cunning" of world-history.

V

Leibniz constructed his theodicy in a three-dimensional thought-world, for the world of his monads was static. Hegel's world, the world of the "Absolute Mind", although faintly suggesting historical evolution, still remained for the most part merely spatial - his conception of time was rather rudimentary. Marx, however, conceived a truly historical, four-dimensional world in which time is essential and all-pervading. "Pre-established harmony" belonged naturally enough to Leibniz's theodicean world; it did not fit too easily into the imperfect historical world of Hegel, who indeed, did not succeed in solving the dichotomy. For Marx, attempting to establish a pre-arranged harmony in a dynamic, historical world, the difficulties are multiplied a hundredfold. A thorough and open idealistic and theological system can stand a good deal of harmony and optimism much more easily than a system as strangely hybrid as Marx's attempt at a synthesis of historical materialism and idealistic dialectics. Yet Marx's efforts at a solution do not transcend, at least methodologically, Hegel's endeavours and must therefore prove to be even less successful. If Marx indeed intends the entire previous human evolution to culminate in the victory of the proletariat and has the riddle of socio-historical development come to a solution in the proletarian "Class-Consciousness" and its Marxian "Theory", what is this but Hegel's old ruse of the "World-Spirit" with his "Cunning of Reason"?

Marx no less than Hegel claims to be able to see through all the ruses of world-history for the first time and to reach an adequate understanding of history and society through his own social Theory as the highest expression of the "Class-Consciousness of the Proletariat". As little as Hegel does he appreciate his Theory as a partly subjective achievement. Just as the World-Spirit is the earthly representative of the "Absolute Mind" (God) for Hegel, Marx considers the proletariat as the potential and actual representative of all past and future Humanity. Since its class-consciousness and its social theory alone are correct, it is not only the object, but also the subject of history. The proletariat acting as the chargé d'affaires of history and humanity knows what