COMMUNISM AND UTOPIA

Is Marx's communist society utopian in nature? To Marx himself or any current Marxist ideologist, the term *utopian* was and is derogatory. When discussing what Marx's communist society might be, one would likely contrast the "scientific inevitability" aspect (as the inevitable outcome of socioeconomic forces) with the "idle dreams" of more conventional utopian thinkers. But is communism really that different? Are the qualities that make up Marx's unrealized society different than previous speculations of “an ideally perfect place, especially in its social, political, and moral aspects” (American Heritage Dictionary 1993)?

According to Herbert Marcuse, utopia remains an impossible dream to those theorists who use "the concept of 'utopia' to denounce certain socio-historical possibilities" (Marcuse [trans. Shapiro and Weber 1970] ). Now, the current production of goods and knowledge, with the skills to back them up, has transformed the utopias of the past into practical alternatives to our lives. The realization of these currents and their import has lead to a revived interest in Marx's ideal of the communist society (Ollman 1977).

Although there are some authors who have chosen to take on the task of collecting Marx's statements on communism, and still others who attempt to bridge the gap between an ideal society in general and Marx's in particular, most have remained either on one side of communism/socialism or the other, i.e. scientific or utopian. I believe this is where confusion lies in making a determination about Marx's ideas. It is not the society itself which is scientific or utopian, but the premise on which it is based and the means to achieving it, which deserves these labels. Such utopian images of the future communist society, however dispersed and fragmented in the writings of Marx, are a fundamental part of his theory, one that is paramount to understanding the appeal of Marxism (Meisner 1982).
Although both Marx and Engels dismissed certain forms of utopian thought, such as in Engels' *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, it was on the basis of form and not content. Marx's content was more rational and scientific as to its approach and foundation, as well as its logically thought out steps. This does not make it less utopian than other utopian socialist's visions of the time, just more thought out and empirically plausible. To many, the idea of utopia has a negative or superfluous connotation, to equate Marx's ideas with a utopian vision may somehow belittle him by accusing him of something he appeared to argue so strongly against.

I argue that this widely held view of utopian visions or ideology is unwarranted. There are many distinct kinds of utopia, and they all must be looked at within their proper perspective. This is especially true when distinguishing between literary and non-literary utopias; a point that I will take up later (Gilison 1975). An abundance of utopian literature that varies with Plato's *Republic* to Moore's *Utopia* and Bacon's *New Atlantis*, makes it remarkably difficult to develop a proper and all-encompassing definition. Yet, there are certain characteristics that all utopias share in common.

To do a competent comparison, we must look at that stage of utopian thought that developed with the simultaneous impact of modern capitalism, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution. It is here that the idea of utopia was connected with historical evolution, thus giving secular utopianism its powerful historical force. This is where socialist utopias emerge as a major challenge to conventional capitalist thought. And it is here that both Marx and Engels become most ardent critics to the authors and their ideas. Once again I will state that it is not their ultimate ends that bother them, but the means to achieving them.

For Marx, we can use the volumes of his published work to somehow determine what elements went into the makeup of his communist society. We can assume with some accuracy that Engels carried on Marx's visions regarding communism even when writing
alone. But even Marx himself gave clues, brief but descriptive, about communist society.

One of the main problems in trying to make a judgment comes from Marx himself. He did not necessarily prove that his vision was different than other utopias; in fact, he said very little when it came down to actually describing his future communist world. By looking at various areas of his writing, it is possible to piece together a fairly complete picture. "Marx's communist utopia is in the anomalous position of being, at one and the same time, the most famous of utopias and among the least known" (Ollman 1977).

Besides Marx never giving a systematic account of the communist society, he repeatedly denounced those socialists writers who did present one as silly and unproductive. Other remarks of his suggest that it is impossible to describe communism because it is eternally and continually in the process of growing: "Communism is for us not a stable state which is to be established, an ideal to which reality will have to adjust itself. We call communism the real movement which abolishes the present state of things. The conditions of this movement result from the premises now in existence" (Marx and Engels [ed. Feuer 1959]).

Yet, inherent in his study of capitalism was the notion that it would eventually lead to a communistic society and scattered through his writings are elements of this place. According to Bertell Ollman, drawing from an 1851 outline of what was to become Capital, Marx intended to relate his ideas of communist society in a more complete manner in the final volume, but he never completed it. Marx seemed to walk a narrow line between discussing communist society and letting it unfold in the dialectic of history. One of the main ways he chose to differentiate himself with other socialist writers that had an idealistic vision of the future was to write about the actual conditions of the current oppressive society that would lead to a communist utopia, rather than to idly fantasize about what a perfect society may hold.
Therefore, I think it important to Marx that his vision of a non-exploitive society -- communism -- be explained and interpreted for what it really is. Marxism will in no way be diminished and yet still find a home amongst utopian thought and ideology. What may be understood by putting the communist society in the utopian tradition, is the not too far-fetched idea that communism is one model of ideal society, presented as an substitute to an existing evil (Gilison 1975). The intention of this paper is to place Marx's utopia -- or communist society -- in its rightful context of utopianism and to indicate how the important elements of communism compare with the outstanding characteristics of well known utopias from the past.

As stated earlier, because Marx did not give a systematic portrayal of communist society, many different sources must be consulted and pieced together. Here the work of Bertell Ollman and Maurice Meisner will suffice. They have done the arduous task of building a fairly complete model of what communist society would be like from Marx's own writings.

The paper will be organized into two sections. The first will consist of an overview of utopian thought as well as the elements that make up a ideal type utopia. Secondly, the same will be done for Marx's writings on communism. From these communist elements, I will attempt to synthesize the two concepts of utopianism and communism in order to clearly show the connection between them, and the better understanding that results.
THE UTOPIAN PLAN

From the day when the words mine and thine were brought into the world by the law, community was finished ... Private property, in establishing the distinction of thine and mine, has infiltrated the idea of justice into man’s head ... it is well established that man ignores jealousy ... to the degree that he lives in a communist milieu...

Epiphanes, *On Justice* 3rd century B.C.

All must hold their goods in common, all must have a part in them and live on the same basis; it is not good for one to be rich and the other miserable ... I establish one single way of life, common to all, the same for all.

Proxagora 5th century B.C.

By looking at the two quotes above, it must be clear that an idea of a communist utopia is nothing new. In fact before Plato's work, two others: Epiphanes, a Gnostic who died at the age of seventeen, and Proxagora, one of the earliest feminist thinkers, were able to imagine a world unlike theirs where all things were equal and free. Notice that the ideas are not too different from Karl Marx's on property and human's perversion under a private property system.

*The Basics of Utopia*

The appeal of the utopian idea in the imagination of Western thinkers over the centuries is one of the interesting aspects of both literary and political history. Typical literary utopian writings are the product of literary imagination. They attempt to describe fictional situations and people in an imaginary society. Some have either laid out or searched for a novel approach for a superior society, "one in which life is uncomplicated, more equitable, and where an ideal moral, social, and political climate ensues" (Sullivan 1983).

Utopian forms have a delicate distinction: those that were used as devices for Platonic speculation on an ideal, and those that were seriously suggested as programs for future
social action or predictions of things to come (Meisner 1982). The "classical" (pre-nineteenth century) utopias were Platonic while the "modern" utopias are more programmatic (Shklar [ed. Manuel 1966]). Modern utopian visions of the future not only function as a critique of an existing social order, they can also offer alternatives to it, not only making people aware of the deficiencies of the present but also prodding them to change it in line with an utopian vision.

This distinction can be made clearer by separating utopian conceptions into two forms: the active or non-literary and the passive or literary. Passive or literary utopianism often takes the form of solely literary description of a perfect or ideal society. Its Western form dates back to Plato's Republic, and invariably emerges throughout history. These literary descriptions of utopia may open people's eyes to the wrongs of their current society and point them in the direction of new possibilities, but they are mostly conjecture and often do not supply more than fictional fantasy.

The literary utopians noted in the modern Western tradition began with Sir Thomas More in the year 1516, whose treatise gave the movement its name. Lewis Mumford remarked that the term utopia, can mean either the ultimate in human hope or the ultimate in human folly (Meisner 1982). He also noted that Sir Thomas More knew of both meanings when he indicated its different Greek origins: eutopia, which means the good place; and outopia, which means no place (Mumford 1962). The utopian idea was then continued with Sir Francis Bacon's The New Atlantis in 1627, on through Edward Bellamy and William Morris in the late 1800's.

Although much utopian writing generally falls into the category of writing in which the social setting is consciously invented by the author, some did not feel content with this divorce of the genuine from the fictitious. They looked for some sort of connection to create a "plausible extension of reality" (Gilison 1975). This quest led to the activist or non-literary
forms of utopianism. This is where the utopian socialists of Marx's time fit in. They envisioned a future society and embodied that vision with the anticipation that its arrival is looming, or in the process of being borne.

This form of utopianism is confident that people can build a new and ideal social system by their concerted deeds in the present-day, thus demanding collective political action to change society to reflect the way it should be. This mentality is a distinctively modern product of the industrial age (Meisner 1982).

The authors claim that the apparatus for the building of a utopia already present in society. Utopia involves the extension of some attributes to new levels while purging others. The connection between what is and what will be involves the social process, a conversion of society progressing with the aid of the common acceptance and constant use principles that define social relationships and human behavior (Gilison 1975). Utopian writers believe that these are rational and intelligent ethics that sensible human beings would agree with and follow.

This consequent elaboration on reality is perfected by being completely optimistic about potentials of human beings, optimistic about the positive function of reason in establishing social change, and convinced that there are basic knowable laws which could restructure human existence and give it meaning (Gilison 1975). It is exactly on this issue of the nature of man that utopians stake their claim.

All utopias rely on the interdependence of societal relations outside of the human being with the psychological relations that make up their inner identity. Utopias are depicted as the "reification of reasonable, logical ideas, utopian man is also described as the epitome of reason and logic" (Meisner 1982) -- human characteristics become synonymous with and conform to the attributes of utopian society.

This may sometimes imply elimination of specific varieties of human experience,
reducing certain possibilities by eliminating the wrongs in society -- or at least dramatically reducing the possibility of their happening. All utopian authors have their lists of hideous human sins they would like to abolish. Any need for more varied experience is "reduced to an absurd longing for a touch of evil to add zest to human experience" (Kateb 1963).

Since utopias operate by removing present evils, they also become radical critiques of existing society (Gilison 1975). They all start from the assumption of society as destroyer of potential human virtues making a radically different alternative superior. As mentioned above, the focus becomes the utopian image of human’s inherent nature. The utopian believes that human nature is inherently virtuous, and that society "warped human behavior by creating external constraints on the practice of goodness" (Gilison 1975). As Edward Bellamy states in *Looking Backward*,

... human nature in its essential qualities is good, not bad; that men by their natural intuition and structure are generous, not selfish; pitiful, not cruel; sympathetic, not arrogant; godlike in aspiration, instinct with the devinist impulses of tenderness and self-sacrifice; images of God indeed, not the travesties upon Him they seemed.

Because utopian writers are critical of "perverse" elements in the society within which they live, two elements become prominent in most utopian works: the author's radical critique of their own society, and the their beliefs about the essence of human nature -- human beings freed from their artificial bonds.

Because of this inherent nature, the potentiality of human beings to live in surroundings that perpetuate internal and external unity, stability, and contentment logically follows. Where utopian thinkers may differ, is on what problems need to be fixed in society. To reach utopia, the human race must overcome many hurdles placed on the "road to salvation." Thus, while utopians may differ in their optimism about the workability of building utopias, they are all optimistic about the potential for human beings to live in an utopian society (Gilison 1975).
The utopian sees ongoing and systematic problems in the established order, requiring a methodical reforming of human social reality. Thus the utopian becomes a revolutionary of sorts, but an intellectual revolutionary. The author presumes that, in an atmosphere that advocates good and deters evil, people will act infinitely better, i.e. more human, than they do now.

**The Utility of Utopia**

"Civilizations are founded upon utopian and messianic promises which are never fulfilled, but without which there would have been no progress" (Meisner 1982). The utility of utopianism lies in the ability of people to imagine a better future. It is important there be meaningful efforts to change what is happening today. Before action, people imagine and hope. Their hopes are usually rooted in some vision of a better future, lest their actions be dim and purposeless.

The unique human capacity to imagine "another and radically different world and time" is clearly essential for historical progress (Meisner 1982). People make history, they are not idle implements in the hands of impersonal and immutable forces of history. If this is true, then the creation of history presumes the ability to envisage a another society in the future. Such "images of the future" bear upon one of the enduring features of human historical experience -- the tensions between the imperfections of the world as it is and a vision of the world as it should be (Meisner 1982).

**MARX'S THEORY OF COMMUNISM**

Marxist theory both communicates a strong utopian vision of the future as well as delivering a harsh critique of utopian mentality. Marx's theory predicts human's progression from "the realm of necessity" to "the realm of freedom," a move that signifies an important
transition from "pre-history" to a "truly human history" (Meisner 1982). His vision of a future society "where the free development of each is the free development of all" (Marx and Engels, *Manifesto* [ed. Feuer 1959]), was a society in which the principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" (Marx, *Gotha* [ed. Feuer 1959]), would reign. It was in effect, the "good place":

*... communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing to-day and another to-morrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic.*

(Marx and Engels *German Ideology* [ed. Feuer 1959])

**Marx's Condemnation of Utopia**

When one looks at the writings of Marx, a very clear picture of an utopia emerges. Yet, if you were to present this notion to an avowed Marxist, or perhaps Marx himself, they would undoubtedly disagree. Both Marx and Engels outwardly attacked the utopian socialists of the time, but this attack was based more on the utopians perception of current elements in society as well as what means it would take to achieve such an ideal society. The problem was that the utopians failed to look at historical forces as well as the element of class struggle: "That which is utopian in the Marxist vocabulary refers at best to the idle and empty fantasizing about the future, and more often than not, to reactionary ideologies opposed to the progressive demands of history and the necessity of class struggle" (Meisner 1982).

Both Maurice Meisner and Jerome Gilison argue that Marx wasn't opposed to the social ideals and visions of these socialists, but that modern capitalism had changed the conditions, and these utopians were unable to keep up with its demands. In the *Communist Manifesto*, Marx gives credit to them by saying, "they attack every principle of existing society
... they [utopias] are full of the most valuable materials for the enlightenment of the working
class" (ed. Feuer 1959). But this obviously wasn't enough, later in the *Manifesto* he says, "... although the originators of these systems were ... revolutionary, their disciples have, in every
case, formed reactionary sects" (ed. Feuer 1959).

To Marx, the problem was the utopians inadequate understanding of the forces
working throughout history, i.e. its limitations and potential for change. This argument stems
from the utopians lack of knowledge combined with an idealism that placed *reason* as the
agent of social, historical, and economic change. Once humans tuned into this ultimate
reason, the utopian ideal could and would be realized (Meisner 1982). Truth, reason, and
human will, would all be brought forth by those who had become enlightened, thus bringing
about social change. "Socialism, for the utopian socialist, was not the product of history, but
rather the more or less fortuitous expression of absolute truth ..." (Meisner 1982)

Utopian's view of utopia was a product of their time. Marx differed because he was
writing from an historical epoch that was immersed in the capitalist mode of production. It is
then understandable how the ignorance of the utopians, i.e. of the capitalist system, would
cause both Marx and Engels to react the way they did. To reiterate, it was not their vision, but
the means to achieving it in the modern historical age, that they could not agree with. Thus, it
lacked and investigation of the social movements created by the people themselves (Moore
1975). Marx made it clear in *The German Ideology* that,

> Communism is not for us a state of affairs which ought to be established,
an ideal in accordance with which reality should be transformed. For us
communism is the real movement abolishing the present state of affairs, a
movement whose necessary conditions exist as part of that same state
of affairs

(ed. Feuer 1959)

There are those who believe, such as Stanley Moore, that this conflict between the
utopian and scientific aspects of Marxism, represent an internal conflict within Marxist
ideology itself. If this is the case, then perhaps it was not Marxian interpretations and casual readers that were first to discover this conflict, it may have been a problem of identity for Marx as well.

Yet others argue that Marx continued to clarify himself on this subject. Because utopian socialists did not take into account capitalism as the preconditionary base for socialism, and the proletariat as the revolutionary agent that would realize a communist society, it was not true socialism, just fiction. They were divorced from modern historical reality, and were at best "a futile search for 'no place' " (Meisner 1982).

Gilison makes an argument that draws Marx into the utopian debate while also saying it was impossible for Marx to write (or produce) a utopia. This paradoxical stance comes from the idea that because Marx felt that he had identified certain underlying historical forces. His findings were more scientific, not in the sense of precise, but empirically verifiable. Because ideology was a product of the material world and could be quantified,

His style was tough minded, contemptuous of wishful thinking, and embarrassed by sentimentality ... Thus, Marx never wrote a utopia, and in fact, could not have written one.

(Gilison 1975)

But he goes on to say that, "Although Marx disqualified himself as a utopian writer, we must still drag him -- against his will, no doubt -- into the camp of utopian thinkers" (Gilison 1975). This is what I will attempt to do, and explain why it should be done, in the next section of the paper.

The Reluctant Utopian

To understand Marx’s relationship to utopianism, it is necessary to discuss both the general (comprised of general elements), and his specific components of communist society that solidify his position, and my argument. Meisner argues that the tension between the
moral idea of "what should be" and the historical imperative of "what is," caused Marx to come to the moral need for communism before he stated its inevitable nature in historical facts (Meisner 1982). Thus, this may make Marx slightly guilty of what he argues so vehemently against.

Gilison argues that Marx was a utopian without a utopia: he may not fit well within the literary area, but it is in the philosophical tradition where he finds a home. Marx reinforced the idea of a utopian society by making it an historical inevitability. There was no question that man would eventually live in a utopian community, because the factors leading up to it were already in motion and could be observed. Marxism projects a notion of a communist future that is seen as brewing in the present.

Rather than numbering in some sort of systematic way, the elements Marxism has in common to utopianism, I will group certain characteristics in a general way. The first one deals with the fact that utopian authors are often alienated from their own society. Besides that, utopias are a kind of extension of the author's society, the author removes existing features of society that are perceived as harmful to the development of a positive society. They also attempt to enlarge on other features which further the development of a utopia, or they may reverse some existing social relationships to achieve their ends.

Marx was indeed alienated from his own society -- a simple look at his biography will reveal this. And he is known for his radical critique of capitalist institutions. Just like the other utopians, he recognizes basic flaws in the social system that can only be fixed with a total reorganization of society. Marx concentrated his energies on an ongoing critique of the capitalist system to lay a foundation for his utopian aspirations (Gilison 1975).

Secondly, in common with the utopians, Marx shares an optimism about the potentiality of human beings and their ongoing perfectibility as well as an optimistic view of the future. Humans, according to Marx, have a propensity for goodness and a potentiality for
far greater and more diverse accomplishment than previously realized (Gilison 1975).

There is an innate or latent goodness that can be developed by appropriate social conditions. This potential would be an expression of rationality, a logical human response to a redefined self-interest (Gilison 1975). Because current social bonds would be eliminated, human beings could develop fully, in accordance with their potential.

The absence of artificial property relations allows the necessary link of self-interest and societies interest in any conscious act (Ollman 1977). The end of alienation is at hand and humans are allowed the free expression of their innate abilities. The primary purpose then becomes a satisfying of aspirations for complete self-realization. Subjective happiness would be the end result because it would lead to societal contentment.

Because self-interests are fully realized in communism, humans achieve a consciousness, i.e. a knowing of the true contentment and meaning of consequential acts (Gilison 1975). This then becomes the highest stage of human development -- class antagonisms are abolished and forgotten. A new human emerges, a "real" human that develops a new morality:

> Freedom ... can only exist in socialized man, the associated producers, rationally regulating their interchange with Nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of Nature, and achieving this with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favorable to, and worthy of, their human nature.
> (Marx Capital [ed. Feuer 1959])

This human nature is allowed to develop by such means as the shortening of the work day. Increased time can then be given to, "that development of human energy which is an end in itself" (Marx Capital [ed. Feuer 1959]). The primacy of a human being's social identity is made aware and everyone becomes "poly-functional ... of many skills and talents ... and moves easily from one job to another" (Gilison 1975).
[Humans are] brought into practical connection with the material and intellectual production of the whole world ... these relations lead each individual to become conscious of humanity as part of himself, which is to say of himself as a social being.

(Marx *German Ideology* [ed. Feuer 1959])

Robert Tuckers, *Philosophy and Myth in Karl Marx*, plainly states that Marx's 1844 *Manuscripts* are full of statements linking human nature as the true community of man.

A third aspect that both Marx's communism and utopianism have in common is their propensity for communal living arrangements. This includes the integration of the individual into the community. The aspect of sharing resources as well as cooperative rather than competitive labor is basic to both Marx and utopian ideology. Humans seek purposeful achievement for societal ends rather than self-indulgence or private hedonism (Gilison 1975). There is no struggle for survival in this ideal society, all feel as members who are equally responsible for each other's welfare -- which is indeed their welfare.

Gilison states that in communism, property relationships among people are aligned with the way goods are produced in society -- meaning all is free and all is equal. This then restores a balance to society where no further revolution is needed. Human society has become stable and peaceful. The widest possible blending of personal and social interests occurs because no one stands against society, they are one with it (Gilison 1975). Inequalities become obsolete which leads to "fraternity, altruism, and the maximum cooperation between men" (Marx *Manifesto* [ed. Feuer 1959]).

Communal activity and communal consumption -- that is, activity and consumption which are manifested and directly confirmed in real association with other men -- will occur wherever such a direct expression of sociality stems from the true character of the activity's content and is adequate to the nature of consumption.

(Marx *1844 Manuscripts* [ed. Feuer 1959])
From this follows the material rewards that are assumed under communism and other utopian societies. Human being's productivity and social wealth multiplies to a point where need and want is eliminated (Ollman 1977), thus Marx's often quoted phrase, "to each according to his need ..." (ed. Feuer 1959).

Consumption for all citizens is that which the fully development of the individual requires.

(Marx Capital [ed. Feuer 1959])

The one element that Marx adds to utopianism is his commitment to action: he saw no contradiction between human action to achieve this end and historical determinism (Gilison 1975). In fact, his utopia was the only utopian plan ever consciously followed as a political agenda. Because it was embedded in both political and economic reality, it was "easier" to act in bringing about this vision. The people (proletariat) were already present to begin the revolution. Marx saw the need to act in favor of his plan as did others after him.

This analysis of communist society may seem striking and very straightforward, but there are those who believe that such an interpretation is a "misreading of Marx's works, especially certain key earlier works" (Nordahl 1987). Richard Nordahl argues that the extent the individual is completely integrated into society may be overstated. He focuses in on the fact that people may still have private lives within a personal sphere. He points out that conflict may still arise in this perfect society.

Nordahl believes communist society is in fact highly differentiated, involving numerous freely chosen activities generating many different interests and desires (Nordahl 1987). This ultimately separates individuals from one another. While he does admit that Marx wishes to eliminate the traditional forms of social stratification, e.g. class, race, gender, etc., he points out that new stratification systems will emerge as well as blatant individuality, making it a less than perfect utopian society. He says that "individuals who are not possessive individualists but instead cooperators will nevertheless have their conflicts" (Nordahl 1987), i.e., over
social priorities, love relationships, etc.

Marx's communist society is radically different from the old "bourgeois" society. And it may be utopian (that is, impractical) in many ways. But it is not the utopia which is ascribed to him in the "orthodox" literature. (Nordahl 1987)

Even if we were to take this argument as truth, one must simply look at Marx's words previously quoted, to see that a utopian communist society would exist even with individual tendencies. Nordahl argues that a number of Marx's statements are too abstract or are taken too literally, but the simple fact remains that Marx makes explicit that everyone is aware of everyone else's consciousness. This consciousness binds and connects all humans, leaving any other divisions or conflict that could possibly form, minor and easily resolved.

Marx's own logic on this matter could be used: Since communist society has not occurred yet, it is impossible to know fully how people will deal with these situations. In any case, from the abundance of Marx's description, he foresees a world in which any conflict or division that we could conceive of now, as completely transcended.
CONCLUSION

In this analysis of Marx's communist society, I have attempted to show that his ideas were not that far off from utopian visions of his time and those written earlier. His views on the communal orientation of human beings, and the greatest potential they have for creating a society where want is eliminated and freedom of expression and self-interest is the norm., are but a few of the commonalities that communism holds with a utopian future.

"Marx creates a future society ... [that] depicts human beings transformed morally through the philosophic intervention ... where conflict seems to be absent: non-alienated, psychically liberated human communities, free from the ambivalence posed by historical struggle" (Glass 1974). And Daniel Bell aptly points out that communism has freed men from the economic scarcity they have continually had to deal with throughout history (Bell 1973).

Marx differed with the utopians because his utopianism was more than wishful thinking or daydreaming about the future. He had a severe complaint against the capitalist system, and an equally harsh remedy for it: revolution by the proletariat. This revolution was inevitable and empirically linked to his present economic conditions. It was only a matter of time before the wheels would be set in motion and his communist vision would become a reality.

There have been a few who argue that Marx's vision was not as grandiose as some may speculate. They point to the abstractness of his statements and the ambiguous imagery he offered to support his points. In either case, there is no mistaking the general framework of Marx's concept of communism. This concept is glaringly utopian in nature and practice.

As I stated earlier, Marx will not suffer by being included in this category, in fact it may help to better understand where his images originated and where he saw the human race heading in the coming centuries. Hence the shortest, and at the same time most essential, definition of Marxian communism: communism = *humanism in practice* (Schaff 1970).
As Marx said it:

Communism is the positive abolition of private property, of human self-alienation, and thus the real appropriation of human nature through and for man. It is, therefore, the return of man himself as a social, i.e., really human, being, a complete and conscious return which assimilates all the wealth of previous development. Communism as a fully developed naturalism is humanism and as a fully developed humanism is naturalism. It is the definitive resolution of the antagonism between man and nature, and between man and man. It is the true solution of the conflict between existence and essence, between objectification and self-affirmation, between freedom and necessity, between individual and species. It is the solution of the riddle of history and knows itself to be this solution.

(Marx *Philosophical Manuscripts* [ed. Mendel 1977])
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