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I.
In recent years Karl Marx has again become a major topic of scholarly analysis and public discourse. At least in Germany this discourse is moving in two different, even opposite directions. One side sees Marx as a man of the nineteenth century, strongly influenced by that century’s first half in particular, that is, by the age of the French Revolution and its aftermath, by Hegel’s philosophy and its critiques, by early industrialization particularly in England, and by the theories of political economy emerging from there (Adam Smith, David Ricardo, John Stuart Mill). This means understanding Marx’s thought, his life and his politics as time-specific. It means “historicizing” him without denying his outstanding importance for the following decades and perhaps for today. It also means sharply distinguishing between the historical Marx on the one hand and the Marxisms of later decades on the other, that is, between Marx as revealed by historical research and the doctrines and ideologies, distortions and myths which were later represented as his legacy, through which he became an influential historical force for different political purposes, and which defined his “historical greatness” in the long run more than his biography proper.

Major biographies have been published which successfully advance the project of historicizing Marx. The new edition of Marx-Engels Collected Works, the new MEGA — thus far 59 published volumes with 32 still to come — has had a similar effect. It has shown the tremendously heterogeneous, frequently contradictory nature of Marx’ writings, very fragmented and not yet published at the time of his death in 1883, which left scope for very different ways of editing, arranging and completing them later on. This job of editing, arranging and amending was effectively started by Friedrich Engels, Marx’ closest friend, but continued by others under very different political regimes throughout the twentieth century. The distinction between Marx and Marxism is old. But now it has gained a new meaning and a solid empirical foundation.

On the other hand, the new discourse about Marx consists of a much more present-related approach practiced by authors and speakers

1 Lecture delivered at the symposium “Marx at 200” held at the German Historical Institute Washington, April 12, 2018 and co-sponsored by the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung and the Goethe Institut Washington, DC. The lecture format has been preserved in this published version. Only a few adjustments have been made and some footnotes were added to selectively acknowledge my intellectual debt to other authors and to facilitate access to further reading.


who turn to Marx in order to either admire what they see as the eternal truths of his teaching or who try to learn from him in order to deal with present-day problems like the crisis of capitalism, increasing social inequality, the burdens of globalization or the problems of “neoliberalism” in different spheres of life. They ask: “What would Marx have said?,” and somehow imply that if we had followed him we would be better off now. Referring to Marx in this way often is more of a political gesture than a substantial argument, a gesture signaling dissatisfaction, criticism and intellectual protest, a sign of self-identification with the left.

The bicentennial of Karl Marx’ birth was an occasion for commemorating, celebrating and — to some extent — monumentalizing him again. His birthday was staged as an event, mainly in Trier, the West German town with Roman origins where Marx was born on May 5, 1818. There was no shortage of official speeches, talk shows, and mainstream media coverage as well as some pop culture elements, e.g. the portrait of the “bearded prophet from Trier” appearing on T-shirts and the like, but also an occasion for informative exhibitions, numerous scholarly conferences and substantial discussions in the national and international media. The dominant way of remembering Marx did not lead to his glorification or condemnation, but to sober information, historical contextualization and multidimensional evaluation.

In general, something like a mild Marx renaissance is occurring, not in politics proper, but in the cultural sphere, in the feuilleton, in intellectual discourses and in the different spaces in which social criticism takes place, at least in Germany. This new interest in Marx is partly driven by different concerns about growing inequality in our societies, world-wide crises of socioeconomic origins or dimensions, and a revived interest in social criticism. Marx no longer is a hotly disputed object of ideological battles, as was the case during large parts of the twentieth century. The direct exploitation of his theories, his name and his legacy in order to justify contemporary strategies, positions and parties has become rare nearly everywhere. The distance between him and the present has grown. But this has opened up the chance to read him in a new way and rediscover elements in his work which continue to be challenging, inspiring and fascinating.

First, I would like to turn to a different though related discussion. I mean the new interest in capitalism, especially among historians and social scientists, but also in the public debate. The concept, which had originated and flourished in the early decades of the twentieth century...
century, had virtually disappeared from serious research and non-polemical scholarly discussion outside Marxist and Marxist-Leninist circles during the cold war period. But since the 1990s this has changed. Presently the concept is “in,” particularly among historians, and especially in the English-speaking world. Some authors have started to speak of a “New History of Capitalism” they see emerging. The concept serves both analytical and polemical purposes. As Sven Beckert recently observed: “During the past few years, few topics have animated the chattering classes more than capitalism. In the wake of the global economic crisis of 2008, questions about the nature, past and viability of capitalism suddenly appeared on evening talk shows and in newspapers throughout the world.”

There are many who prefer not to use the concept, most economists and many economic historians among them. One should not exaggerate the depth nor the scope of this semantic revival of “capitalism.” But the concept is used again, not just in polemics but in scholarly texts, and many historians engage in serious talk about how best to conceptualize a history of capitalism.

Clearly the discourses on Marx and on capitalism are related to each other. Some would say present-day crises spurred both to a significant extent. Debates about Marx usually touch on capitalism, one of the main topics, perhaps the main topic, of Marx. On the other hand, critical discussions about capitalism frequently touch on Marx. Whoever writes a history of capitalism has to deal with Marx as an object of study: Marx as a thinker who excelled in formulating anti-capitalist criticism, as somebody who played a major role in the emerging European labor movement first in 1848/49 and then again in the 1860s, and Marx as a figure whose legacy became an important source of imagination and legitimation for different non-capitalist and anti-capitalist movements and regimes in the twentieth century and even today.

But what exactly can we take from Marx’ thought and writings when we want to describe and explain capitalism in the past and present? What can we take from him when it comes to writing a history of capitalism and to understanding what capitalism means today? This is the question which I propose to discuss in the rest of this lecture.

II.
Karl Marx rarely used the term “capitalism.” But Marx wrote so extensively and penetratingly about the capitalist mode of production
that his understanding of capitalism shaped future generations more strongly than the work of any other single person. The main components of his notion of capitalism may be summarized in four points:7

First, Marx saw the market, which presumed a division of labor and money economy, as a central component of capitalism. He emphasized how merciless competition spurs technological and organizational progress while simultaneously positioning market players against each other. He brought out the compulsive character of the “law” of the market, a law capitalists and workers, producers and consumers, sellers and buyers have to obey on penalty of failure, no matter what their individual motives might be.

Second, Marx discussed at length capitalism’s trend towards essentially unlimited accumulation as one of its distinguishing features, that is, the formation and continuous increase of capital more or less as an end in itself, initially as “original accumulation” owing to transfers from other sectors (not without expropriation and not without force), later as the reinvestment of profits, but ultimately derived from the value that labor created: capital as congealed labor.

Third, Marx saw a core of the capitalist mode of production in the tension between capitalists as owners of the means of production, along with the entrepreneurs and managers depending on them, on the one hand, and workers, contractually bound but otherwise freely employed in return for wages and salaries without ownership of the means of production, on the other. Both sides were bound to each other by an exchange relationship (labor in exchange for wages or salary, labor as a commodity) and by a relationship of dominance and dependency that enabled the “exploitation” of workers by capitalists: exploitation in the sense that a portion of value earned by workers, so-called surplus value, was not made available or paid out to them. This portion passed into the possession of the capitalist/entrepreneur, who used it partly to advance accumulation and investment, partly to provide for what he consumed. The capital-wage labor relationship understood this way not only advanced the dynamism of the system. It simultaneously provoked class struggles that would lead to a confrontation between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat facing each other as irreconcilable adversaries. This was, according to Marx, the precondition for revolution that, carried by the proletariat, would abolish the system of capitalism in favor of another, specifically socialist or communist, alternative, though Marx did not enter into any more detailed discussion of this alternative system. With

---

7 This summary closely follows Jürgen Kocka, Capitalism. A Short History (Princeton, NJ, 2016), 7-10.
this prediction, which could simultaneously be read as a call for the proletariat to attend to its historical mission, Marx transformed his theoretical conception into a practical political guideline, which is how many understood it ever since the late nineteenth century.

Fourth, Marx analyzed the enormous dynamism of the capitalist system that, sustained by the bourgeoisie, was dissolving everything traditional, was on its way to spreading all over the world and had not only the drive but also the capacity to extend its logic into non-economic areas of life. Marx was convinced that the capitalist mode of production had a tendency to shape society, culture, and politics decisively. What the economist Adam Smith had described as a “commercial society” and the philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel had called “bourgeois” or “civil society,” Marx portrayed as a social formation heavily influenced by the capitalist economy.8

How valid and indeed how useful is this view of capitalism for understanding and explaining the history of capitalism? Let me first address some weaknesses and then some strengths of the Marxian approach.

III.

Marx predicted the long-term decline of capitalism due to its own dynamics, which would finally bring it down and prepare the transition to a post-capitalist system, namely socialism. In his extensive writings there are at least three theoretical approaches to explaining the expected collapse of capitalism.

First, Marx understood well that capitalist growth comes in ups and downs, booms and busts, interrupted by crises. He has a lot of pertinent arguments to account for this fluctuating pattern, especially in terms of overproduction and under-consumption in an economy in which major decisions are taken in a decentralized and competitive way instead of being centrally planned. But Marx went further. His ill-conceived theory of the falling rate of profit anticipated the capitalist engine to slow down, profits to dry out and stagnation to follow. With this notion Marx built on older theories by Adam Smith, Thomas Malthus, David Ricardo and John Stuart Mill, who had expressed either the fear or the hope that the economy would stop growing because the rate of profit would eventually fall so low that new investments would no longer be profitable. Basically these authors of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries — including Karl Marx — could not imagine the tremendous multiplication of

8 Based on insights and comments by Marx (and Engels) spread out over their extensive oeuvre. Most important for Marx’ theory and description of capitalism: his “Grundrisse der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie” (1857-58, first published in 1939); “Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie. Erstes Heft” (1859); “Das Kapital,” vol. I (1867) and vols. II and III compiled from Marx’ unpublished manuscripts and published by Engels in 1884/85 and 1894; “Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei” (1848); “Lohnarbeit und Kapital” (1849). These sources should now be used in the new and still unfinished Marx/Engels Gesamtausgabe (MEGA). English translations: Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels Collected Works (MEWC), 50 vols. (Moscow, London and New York, 1975-2000). For an introduction to Marx’ work as an economist see Sperber, Karl Marx, 419-463; Stedman Jones, Karl Marx, 375-43; Jerry Z. Muller, The Mind and the Market: Capitalism in Western Thought (New York, 2002), 166-207; still very useful: Eduard Heimann, Geschichte der wolkswirtschaftlichen Lehrenungen (Frankfurt/Main 1949), ch. VI.
human needs and desires which would take place when the means of satisfying them would become real possibilities. They underestimated the dynamics of the future. They were contemporaries of early industrialization and conditioned by the experiences, observations and discourses of their time.9

Second, Marx developed the notion of a contradiction between the relations of production and the means of production. With this formula he referred to a growing tension or incompatibility between the social and political conditions including property rights and law on the one hand and the economic processes including technological and organizational innovation on the other — economic processes which take place in that framework of social, legal and cultural relations but after a while tend to push beyond this framework which increasingly impedes them and even prevents further innovations before it is finally changed, frequently in an abrupt, revolutionary way. I see this as a very helpful notion that historians can apply to the description and explanation of historical change in different fields again and again.10

Marx described the capitalist relations of production as the framework that had hosted and supported all the changes, innovations, and advances in an increasingly industrialized economy but was now just about to change its role from a supporting to an impeding factor. It needed to be replaced, he thought, by a post-capitalist set of relations if the economy was to stay dynamic. Thus he dramatically underestimated the flexibility and changeability of capitalist relations, and he underestimated capitalism and its ability to adjust to new challenges and opportunities.11 Marx’ main ideas were formulated in the 1840s and 1850s. He was and remains a contemporary of early industrial capitalism, which was already very visible in England and just emerging on the continent.

9 Similar points convincingly argued in Sperber, Karl Marx, 437-463; for a basic analysis see Keith Tribe, “Karl Marx’s ‘Critique of Political Economy’: A Critique”, in The Economy of the Word. Language, History, and Economics (Oxford, 2015): 171-254. In the first and the last phases of his political life Marx developed other theories why capitalism would end, stressing political action and the role of the working class. See further below. He also knew and described countervailing factors which would work against the tendency of the profit rate to decline. Engels, however, when editing Capital vol. III in 1894 made Marx’ argument less ambiguous and more straightforward, predicting the fall of the rate and the collapse of capitalism as more or less necessary — something the German Social Democrats, whom Engels advised, wanted to hear. Presently, some prominent non-Marxist economists do not exclude capitalist stagnation in the long run and find some merit in Marx’ notion of the falling rate of profit. See Hans-Werner Sinn, “Was uns Marx heute noch zu sagen hat,” Re. Das Kapital. Politische Ökonomie im 21. Jahrhundert, ed. Mathias Greffrath (Munich, 2017), 73-94, esp. 80-83.

10 E.g., to the analysis of the downfall of the Soviet Union in the 1980s and 90s. The centralized, state-administered and protectionist relations of production had been conducive to economic advancement in earlier phases of Soviet industrialization from the 1920s to the 1970s, but became a restraining and impeding framework once the means of production reached a more advanced stage at which new forms of communication needed more flexibility, decentralization and cross-border networking than allowed in the rather rigid and hierarchical Soviet system. See Manuel Castells, The Rise of the Network Society: The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture (Cambridge, MA, 1996).

11 For more on this, see L. Boltanski and E. Chiapello, Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme (Paris, 1999); and Jens Beckert, Fictional Expectations and Capitalist Dynamics (Cambridge, MA, 2016).
Third, Marx referred to the role of the working class in order to argue that and why capitalism will go down and be replaced by a post-capitalist order. Marx observed and analyzed the rise of Lohnarbeit — work for wages or salaries on a contractual basis, workers without owning the means of production, but free of non-economic (e.g. feudal) bonds — as a decisive feature of capitalism. He vividly described workers’ exploitation by capitalists, their poor and miserable working and living conditions which he thought would grow even worse in an unavoidable process of further pauperization. He partly observed, partly anticipated, and certainly worked for processes of class formation, bringing these workers together opposite the bourgeoisie, consolidating them into a large social grouping with common interests, a shared consciousness and the ability to act collectively, a class which would become steadily more anti-capitalist, oppose the increasingly united capitalists and finally topple the system that had brought forward this proletariat and had thus produced its own grave digger.

This argumentation contains productive analytical tools that have been used by historians of class formation ever since. To the extent that it contains empirical truth it reflects the conditions of the Industrial Revolution and of industrial capitalism in its initial phase. But even with respect to this period Marx’ view was highly selective and exaggerated. His view was biased by his problematic labor theory of value, which overstressed the role of work as the value-creating factor and underestimated other sources of increasing productivity like trade, organization and particularly knowledge. For Marx the difference between qualified and unqualified work was unimportant, he expected that the rise of machinery would obliterate this difference altogether. In that he was dramatically wrong. The working class has not become more homogeneous, neither within individual societies nor worldwide, on the contrary. Marx also severely underestimated the possibility of distributing the gains of increasing productivity in a way which would remain unequal, but lead to rising welfare of most workers as well.

It took a long while before it really became clear that workers would never form a class as Marx had expected them to do. Most recently research on plantation capitalism in the colonial period and on labor relations in the Global South have effectively started to question the central role of Lohnarbeit as a criterion of capitalism since it seems that economic performance fulfilling most capitalist criteria

---

12 I have repeatedly used a refined Marxist concept of class evolution (and class devolution) for analyzing social historical phenomena of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Most recently in: Jürgen Kocka, *Arbeiterleben und Arbeiterkultur. Die Entstehung einer sozialen Klasse* (Bonn, 2015), 21-28, 413-421.

13 Of course, different people accepted this at different points in time, some never believed it, and there are still some who continue to expect it to happen, on a global scale. Very important: Eric Hobsbawm, “The Forward March of Labour Halted?”, Marxism Today (September 1978): 279-286.
can function with unfree labor for a very long time while new forms of self-employment, whether precarious or not, turn out to be fully compatible with advanced forms of post-industrial capitalism. All this clearly transcends the conceptual world of Marx.

For Marx capitalism was not only a system of production and distribution, that is an economic phenomenon, but also a socio-political and a socio-cultural system, that is a *societal formation* in which the dominance of capital conditions the social, political, legal and cultural relations as a whole. Until today those who see themselves in the intellectual and political tradition of Marx conceive of capitalism not only as a form or type of economy, but also as a social, political and cultural system. This can be a burden and lead astray. Marx, like other socialists of the nineteenth century, developed theories (or theoretical views) that did not reflect basic processes of modernization which were underway at least since the eighteenth century and led to a differentiation of separate spheres of life — politics distinguished from economy and culture, the public distinguished from the private —, spheres of life which certainly interacted and influenced one another (with economic factors playing a strong role), but followed different logics and enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy vis-à-vis one another. While liberal theories of society and state began to reflect this process of differentiation already in the nineteenth century, most socialist theories did not.

As a consequence, Marx and his followers did not develop concepts which could have led them to make not only the interrelations between, but also the relative autonomy of economic, political, social and cultural dimensions a central theme. They did not and do not pay much attention to the fact that capitalism as an economic system or practice can and does exist and flourish not under all, but under very different political, social and cultural conditions, as historians and comparatists know, but some social theorists easily neglect. Therefore they frequently fail to acknowledge that capitalist economies can be deeply shaped by their social contexts and by political influences (which they influence but do not determine) and consequently differ significantly over time and space and with changing social, political and cultural conditions. They tend to overstate capitalism’s causal responsibility for all the world’s evils. This indicates a clear limit to the usefulness of Marxian analysis of capitalism for any history of capitalism to be written today since factors such as the changing relations between market and state, regulation and deregulation, the
rise of the welfare state as well as changing forms of social and cultural "embeddedness" are absolutely essential dimensions of every history of capitalism. It is the changing relation between capitalism and other spheres of life which has shaped and changed the nature of the capitalist economy since the time of Marx.\textsuperscript{18}

These changes have been tremendous. Of course, it would be completely wrong to blame Marx for not foreseeing them. Still, it cannot but be deplored that the analytical tool kit Marx used and left to his followers did neither invite nor facilitate empirical analysis of the changing relationship between different, partly autonomous though interrelated spheres of historical reality. This is what historians have to do.

The picture of capitalism which Marx — or rather Marx and Engels — painted was decisively influenced by the dynamic conditions they were able to observe in the first two thirds of the nineteenth century in western Europe. Marx and Engels perceived the Industrial Revolution as a secular upheaval, with very good reason. They correctly recognized the social dynamite inherent in the burgeoning labor question. Consequently, they conceptualized capitalism in a way that made it appear fully developed only as \textit{industrial capitalism}, with factory, machinery and massive wage labor at its core. Marx did not deny the existence of older varieties of capitalism prior to industrialization, especially agrarian capitalism, yet this was not relevant for his analysis. He was interested in capitalism in its then modern, industrial form and its emergence. His major empirical evidence came from the English case. He did not develop a set of concepts which would easily serve to analyze the history of earlier types of capitalism nor the forms of capitalism which have emerged in the one and a half centuries since Marx died.

\textbf{IV.}

But there is another side. In order to recognize and utilize the fruitfulness of the Marxian analysis of capitalism some intellectual steps of abstraction are required. Some of Marx’ insights have become either indispensable or at least highly recommendable elements for any historical analysis of capitalism.

This holds true for the basic notion of \textit{ambivalence} characterizing many elements of Marx’s view. For example, he develops the connection between efficiency and conflict intrinsic to capitalism. Marx also

\textsuperscript{18} See Kocka, \textit{Capitalism}, 145-161.
argues that in the capitalist type of economy, division of labor and exchange (stressed so strongly by Adam Smith) go hand in hand with dominance and subordination, with inequality and hierarchy (not much emphasized by Adam Smith). Marx does not question that the capitalist mode of production has led and is leading to important innovations and advances, and he sees the bourgeoisie as a progressive force in many ways. At the same time he emphasizes the downside of advancement, the costs of progress, the sacrifices it demands, and he knows that benefits and costs are very unequally distributed among individuals, social strata and classes. He understood and emphasized that there are winners and losers in the history of capitalism. As a consequence, Marx has an eye for the intrinsic relation between capitalism and protest, between capitalism and anti-capitalism, between capitalism and its enemies. One does not have to accept every detail of Marx’ theories and analyses, his partly gloomy, partly utopian predictions, in order to appreciate this basically ambivalent, sobering mood which, in my reading, informs much of his writing. Present-day historians of capitalism can only win by adopting this mood — and this mode — of ambivalence. It is appropriate.

Here lies another strength of Marx’ analysis. He stringently exposes capitalism’s overwhelmingly dynamic force. He shows how essential, unavoidable, even compulsory continuous investment, profit orientation, accumulation and expansion are in this economic system which we call capitalistic. He argues that business leaders have to move forward if they do not want to fall back (or drop out). He convincingly shows how impossible it is within capitalism to be satisfied with the status quo and how little it matters what capitalists and entrepreneurs subjectively think and prefer, since they have to follow the rules of the game or quit altogether. He has overdone this point, I believe. But he grasps an essential characteristic of capitalism showing its often aggressive dynamics, its essential dependence on growth, its structural dissatisfaction with what has been reached, its permanent quest for more, and that also means: its basic instability — if left alone. As a consequence, Marx exposes capitalism’s expansive and expansionist energies. He observes its tendency to move across borders, and he predicts its global expansion already in 1848. This was early — and correct. He also states — either as an observation or as a prediction — capitalism’s powerful inclination to export its principles — such as competition, marketization, continuous quest for more, and permanent checks — beyond the economic sphere into other spheres of life (if not checked). Rosa Luxemburg spoke of...
capitalism’s permanent drive towards “Landnahme,” that is towards the capture of new territory.\textsuperscript{21} I believe that these different dimensions of dynamic expansion of capitalism are nowhere better analyzed than in Marx’ writing or in writing embedded in Marxist traditions.

A third example of Marxian strengths: He draws our attention to the connection between capitalism and violence in the early phases of capitalist developments. This is not the place to reconstruct his much discussed notion of “original accumulation.” It must suffice to recall that according to Marx, it takes extra-economic forces to set the process of accumulation in motion, extra-economic forces which often include expropriation, theft, repression and sometimes violence. Marx analyzes this with respect to the rise of English agrarian capitalism in the early modern period — remember his famous treatment of “enclosures.”\textsuperscript{22} In the same context, Marx had an eye for the repressive effects of colonialism. We could add many other examples which show that it usually takes force, coercion, and often violence to create a capitalist market economy, the proponents of which like to stress its nonviolent character and tend to forget its violent origins. This is an important topic for research today for which Marx’ writings continue to be relevant.\textsuperscript{23}

Finally, a word on the notion of capitalism as a social, political and cultural system determined by the capitalist economy and the dominance of capital in particular. I have previously criticized this Marxian view as holistic, insufficiently differentiated and counter-productive. I stand by this opinion, but I would like to add that this approach can be fruitful if reformulated as a set of questions rather than a statement about the existence of a determined interrelationship. In other words: Asking the question whether or proposing the hypothesis that the asymmetric power relations within the capitalist economy heavily influence the distribution of status and power in society and politics at large will lead to the empirical discovery of such influences where they existed or exist: in many cases they did, in many cases they did not. No doubt the expansionist character of capitalism tends to have its principles intrude into spheres outside the economy, especially today. Starting from a Marxian analysis of capitalism may help draw attention to this dynamic spillover of capitalist principles into non-economic spheres of life, including politics, education and culture. It may help us to consider strategies for stopping or at least mitigating this spillover since the intrusion of capitalism into the world of politics, education, religion, or into private life may contradict our

\textsuperscript{21} Rosa Luxemburg, \textit{Akkumulation des Kapitals. Ein Beitrag zur ökonomischen Erklärung des Imperialismus} (Berlin, 1912).

\textsuperscript{22} Capital, vol. I, ch. 24.

values and the principles on which our liberal-democratic systems are built. Non-capitalist spheres of life may also be indispensable for the existence of capitalism itself. Anyway: exploring non-economic conditions and consequences of economic structures, processes and inequalities is something the concept of “capitalism” allows for and indeed demands, particularly if informed by a flexible, non-deterministic, non-holistic Marxian framework.

This, I think, is what “historicizing” Marx should mean: exposing the time-specificity of his approaches, revealing their limits, and at the same time preserving and adjusting them for purposes we may pursue in the present time. When writing a history of capitalism nowadays, one has to move far beyond Marx, but one can learn from him nevertheless. Historical contextualization and a high appreciation of Marx are certainly compatible.
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