

KARL MARX'S "EDUCATION OF THE FUTURE"

One of Marx's Favorite Ideas – Disappeared

————— “ —————
The only method of producing fully developed human beings.

—KARL MARX

————— ” —————



redflagspress.org

KARL MARX'S "EDUCATION OF THE FUTURE"

One of Marx's Favorite Ideas – Disappeared

Socialists unethically hide Marx's anti-liberal beliefs and goals as part of their effort to rebrand socialism.

Karl Marx is the most important socialist philosopher of all time. His thinking has defined socialism for the past 150 years.

And today's democratic socialism is no exception. Michael Harrington, the founder of the Democratic Socialists of America, declares Marx a

champion of human freedom and democratic socialist.¹

Today's socialism remains Marxism, but today's socialists want to distance Marx from the oppressive history of the nations and parties that have carried his banner in the past. They assert with Harrington that Marx was for freedom and democracy.

For example, in *Marx's Concept of Man*, celebrated socialist Erich Fromm writes:

Marx's philosophy was ... aimed at the full realization of individualism.²

And Terry Eagleton, in his recent book *Why Marx Was Right*, writes that the "whole aim" of Marx's philosophy is

the free flourishing of individuals.³

Such claims simply aren't true. They only succeed by hiding Marx's many anti-liberal goals and beliefs.⁴

A prime example of this anti-liberal thinking is found in Marx's plan for "the education of the future," an idea he considers so good that he describes it as

the *only* method of producing fully developed human beings.⁵

What is Marx's strategy for "producing fully developed human beings"?

It's *compulsory child labor*. Compulsory child *factory* labor.

"EVERY CHILD WHATEVER, FROM THE AGE OF NINE YEARS"

Marx advocates for child labor as a core component of education multiple times, including in three of his most important works. He characterizes this idea not only as "the only method of producing fully developed human beings" but also as

a progressive, sound and legitimate tendency.⁶

Consider this example from his most famous individually authored work, *Capital*:

The germ of the education of the future is present in the factory system; this education will, in the case of every child over a given age, combine productive labour with instruction and gymnastics, not only as one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production, but as the only method of producing fully developed human beings.⁷

The only difference between traditional education and the "education of the future" is the addition of a requirement for "every child over a given age" to perform "productive labor."

Marx further identifies factory labor in education as a socialist goal in *The Communist Manifesto*, his best-known work, coauthored with Friedrich Engels. They called for

Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production.⁸

In other words, Marx was against banning child labor outright (as actually happened under the liberal/capitalist system he loathed). Instead, he wanted a new type of child labor under the label of education.

Some thirty years after first writing to advocate child labor as supposed education, Marx pitched his Education of the Future idea in another of his most noted works, *The Critique of the Gotha Program*.⁹ He writes:

A general prohibition of child labour is incompatible with the existence of large-scale industry and hence an empty, pious aspiration. Its realisation—if it were possible—would be reactionary, since, with a strict regulation of the working time according to the different age groups and other safety measures for the protection of children, an early combination of productive labour with education is one of the most potent means for the transformation of present-day society.¹⁰

Despite having three decades to reevaluate his thinking, Marx still refused to call for the elimination of child factory labor. Instead, Marx explicitly dismissed the idea of banning child labor. He called a world without it “reactionary”—that is, a step backward.

Friedrich Engels, too, remained in favor of child labor as “education” some thirty years after he and Marx first wrote of the idea. In *The Anti-Dühring*, Engels refers to “the education of the future” and explains his and Marx’s desire for

the combination of work and instruction in socialist society.¹¹

Another instance of Marx promoting child labor, with additional details on his recipe for the Education of the Future, is found in papers he drafted for the International Workingmen’s Association (IWA). As part of this material, he writes:

We consider the tendency of modern industry to make children and juvenile persons of both sexes co-operate in the great work of social production, as a progressive, sound and legitimate tendency, although under capital it was distorted into an abomination. In a rational state of society every child whatever, from the age of nine years, ought to become a productive laborer.¹²

Again, Marx doesn’t seek to end child labor but rather to make it an everlasting element of socialist society. Child labor is “an abomination” under capitalism, he says, but it’s going to be peachy keen come socialism.

In the material he drafted for the IWA, Marx also defines how many hours of the school day should be devoted to performing labor instead of attending class. He calls for nine- to twelve-year-olds to provide society with two hours of work a day, thirteen- to fifteen-year-olds to work four hours a day, and sixteen- and seventeen-year-olds to work six hours a day.¹³

That doesn’t leave much time for instruction and gymnastics, does it?

STRIPPING OFF THE FETTERS OF INDIVIDUALITY

What type of work does Marx want children to perform? The same kind he desires for adults: factory labor.

Marx’s preference for factory labor isn’t just about maximizing production. He also believes that working in large-scale industry produces humans well suited to be socialists. He writes that

the partially developed individual ... must be replaced by the totally developed individual, for whom the different social functions are different modes of activity he takes up in turn.¹⁴

How is the partially developed individual turned into a fully developed one? By working in large-scale industry. To Marx's thinking,

large-scale industry, by its very nature, necessitates variation of labour, fluidity of functions, and mobility of the worker in all directions.¹⁵

He believes that when someone works

systematically with others, he strips off the fetters of his individuality and develops the capabilities of his species.¹⁶

Working in the social setting of large industry yields what Marx sees as a one-two punch. One: it "strips off the fetters," or chains, of the worker's individuality. Two: it "develops the capabilities of his species." In other words, it strips away the personal autonomy and identity of each person with the goal of improving the productivity of the collective and creating people trained to pursue social objectives.

Marx doesn't simply *favor* work in large industry; he's also *against* people working independently. In contrast with factory labor, working individually doesn't "strip off the fetters" of individuality. It develops individuality. And we can't have that.

Craft "Idiocy"

Socialism's objections to craftwork aren't simply a reflection of Marx's anti-craft attitudes. Craft and small-scale production violate multiple tenets of socialist philosophy. That's why celebrated socialist Vladimir Lenin bemoaned the existence of small enterprises, saying: "Unfortunately, small production is still very, very widespread in this world."

To learn more about socialism's disdain for craft and small production, see the RFP paper "Why Socialism Says Craftwork Is 'Idiocy.'"

This animosity for working individually is illustrated by Marx's contempt for craftwork. In *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx notes with pleasure that

the automatic workshop [the factory] wipes out specialists and craft-idiocy.¹⁷

In the same passage, Marx makes the snarky assertion that craft-style production turns craftspeople into pinheads, idiots.¹⁸ As one socialist has written,

Marx completely rejects the craft ideal. ... It's a limited, individual activity.¹⁹

Marx's love of large industry and his disdain for craft production are reflected in his plans for the Education of the Future. He's explicit that children are to carry out their compulsory labor for socialist society in "the factory system,"²⁰ performing "industrial production."²¹

"WORK IN ORDER TO BE ABLE TO EAT"

Marx's child labor plan has nothing to do with developing our individuality—quite the contrary! But that's what makes it a winner for a socialist society.

First off, compulsory child labor would give socialist society the ultimate method of producing citizens drilled in the principle of "from each according to their ability," socialism's 170-year-old duty to work for society.²²

In the materials he authored for the IWA, Marx states that being compelled "to become a productive labourer" would teach children a key lesson: that one must "work in order to be able to eat."

In a rational state of society, every child whatever, from the age of nine years, ought to become a productive labourer in the same way that no able-bodied adult person ought to be exempted from the general law of nature, viz.: to work in order to be able to eat, and work not only with the brain but with the hands too.²³

In what Marx considers "a rational state of society," every child would be required to start working for society at age nine. Obviously, children of nine, ten, eleven, and so on would not be involved in workplace decision-making. They'd be taking orders. And when someone felt a child failed to execute orders properly? Then the child would have another educational opportunity: being schooled in workplace discipline.

By the time kids turned eighteen, they'd have spent a decade learning about socialism's compulsory duty to give our time and talents to society by being compelled to give their time and talents to society. The Education of the Future will have prepared them for the reality they will experience as adults in socialist society.

Marx also writes about a second benefit socialist society would receive from the Education of the Future. In *Capital*, the first justification he lists for child labor is that it's

one of the methods of adding to the efficiency of production.²⁴

Another translation of the same passage of *Capital* puts this first benefit socialist society receives from child labor even more bluntly. It's

a means for increasing social production.²⁵

How nice for socialism! Boosted production and improved efficiency via the compulsory labor of children as young as nine.

Socialists—with Marx leading the charge—have long attacked capitalism as meaning the “exploitation” of workers. But in Marx’s socialism, making children perform compulsory labor as “a means of increasing social production” doesn’t count as exploitation.

“Private Labor” Rights

In liberal society, our work choices are under our individual, private control. Marx calls for such “private labor” rights to be replaced by “directly social labor”—our work under society’s ultimate control.

Today’s socialists say our private labor rights are a “defect” of liberal society, an “infection” socialism must cure. They continue to seek the abolition of these rights.

To learn more about socialist calls for “private labor” to be eliminated, see the RFP paper “A ‘Defect’ of Liberalism.”

“MARX DID NOT WRITE DIRECTLY ON EDUCATION”

As socialist authors explain,²⁶ Marx expected the advent of socialism during his lifetime or soon thereafter. Had he been right, the odds are high his dream of compulsory child labor as education would also have come true.

Today’s socialism remains firmly founded on the duty of “from each according to their ability.”²⁷ But because our liberal society did away with child labor long ago, it’s not realistic for socialists to promote Marx’s call for this duty to commence at age nine.

And although it’s reasonable for socialists not to endorse Marx’s plan for the Education of the Future, that doesn’t give them the right to do what they have done: disappear this favorite idea of Marx’s so they can sell him as a “champion of human freedom.”

Marx’s plan for a large chunk of the school day to be spent performing factory labor affords critical insights into his overall thinking—the thinking that’s been the essence of socialism for well over a century.

And Marx’s repeated writings on this topic are exceptionally noteworthy because they are rare violations of his famous-in-socialist-circles pronouncement that he would not “write recipes” for the operation of socialist society.²⁸

Nevertheless, you can consume any number of socialist-authored works about Marx and his philosophy without reading anything whatsoever about his calls for child factory labor as education.

Is there any mention of the Education of the Future in Terry Eagleton's *Why Marx Was Right*, the work in which Eagleton claims that the aim of Marx's thinking is "the free flourishing of individuals"? No. There's not one word.

Is there any mention of the Education of the Future in Erich Fromm's *Marx's Concept of Man*, the work in which Fromm argues that "Marx's philosophy was ... aimed at the full realization of individualism"? No, there isn't. In fact, as part of his effort to make Marx out to be a humanist, Fromm writes that Marx

speaks of the importance of producing "fully developed human beings."²⁹

The phrase "fully developed human beings" has been plucked out of Marx's explanation of the Education of the Future in *Capital*, quoted earlier in this essay.³⁰ Fromm doesn't explain that the context of the phrase is Marx's argument for child labor as education. Instead, he uses Marx's words out of context for his own misleading purposes.

Marx's calls for child labor as a key component of socialist education are even missing from works *specifically about* Marx and education.

Consider a book with that exact title, *Marx and Education*,³¹ and one titled *Marxism and Education*.³² These books—authored by socialists Dr. Jean Anyon and Mandan Sarup, respectively—contain detailed overviews of Marx's philosophy,³³ many quotes from him, and even more commentary about his thinking. Yet nowhere in either of them is there a single quote—or even a single word—about "the education of the future."

Hiding what Marx says about child labor as education yields books full of dishonest material.³⁴ Sarup goes so far as to claim that

Marx did not write directly on education.³⁵

Similarly, in an online essay on Marx and education, author Barry Burke praises Marx and writes about the "profound" influence Marx has had on educators.³⁶ But Burke's opening sentence reads:

Karl Marx never wrote anything directly on education.³⁷

It's all but impossible to believe that these authors—who researched and then wrote about Marx and education—could have missed every one of Marx's repeated calls

for child labor as a critical aspect of socialist education.³⁸ These authors are either astonishingly ignorant of this favorite idea of their “champion of human freedom” or they want you to be.

“FREE FLOURISHING” INDIVIDUALS OR “CONSCIOUS COGS”?

Today’s socialists sell Marx and Marxism as desiring “the full realization of individualism.”³⁹ But earlier socialists offered a fundamentally different—and far more accurate—vision of the goals of Marx and socialism generally.

Ernest Bax was a founder and leader of two prominent British socialist organizations: the Social Democratic Federation and (with Marx’s daughter Eleanor) the Socialist League.⁴⁰ He’s credited with introducing many of Marx’s ideas to the English-speaking world.⁴¹

Bax writes about the “new ethic of socialism.” He explains that it

exhibits for the first time in the world’s history the conscious sacrifice of the individual to the social whole.⁴²

Bax isn’t criticizing socialism because it means “the conscious sacrifice of the individual.” No, he’s praising this premise at the heart of socialism—one reflected in and enforced by socialism’s compulsory duty of “from each according to their ability.”

Socialist icon Che Guevara similarly explains that socialism would mean that

man once again regains the old sense of happiness in work, the happiness of fulfilling a duty, of feeling himself important within the social mechanism. He becomes happy to feel himself a cog in the wheel, a cog which has its own characteristics and is necessary although not indispensable to the production process, a conscious cog.⁴³

Socialism isn’t about “the free flourishing of individuals,” as Terry Eagleton claims. No, the happiness that socialism offers is “the happiness of fulfilling a duty.” Socialism will make us “happy to feel [like] ... a conscious cog.”

Marx considered his formula for the Education of the Future “the only method of producing fully developed human beings.” Under his plan, every socialist citizen would be the product of a school system that devoted as much time to “productive labour”

as it did to classroom instruction. Every socialist citizen would spend a decade of their childhood working in an industrial environment that Marx favored because it “strips off the fetters of [our] individuality.”

What type of humans would this system produce? Not free flourishing individuals but conscious cogs.

Socialism has long been based on the requirement of “fulfilling a duty,” the duty of “from each according to their ability.” It remains so today.⁴⁴ Socialism’s foundation on this compulsory duty makes it a system that inevitably leads to the development of “conscious cogs.”⁴⁵ The history of socialist experiments has demonstrated this reality time and again.

It’s dishonest for socialists to sell Marx as a “champion of human freedom” or his philosophy as seeking the “full realization of individualism.” And it’s all the more unethical for socialists to hide what they know about Marx’s Education of the Future and his many other⁴⁶ anti-liberal goals and beliefs in order to peddle this fiction.

NOTES

1. Michael Harrington, *The Twilight of Capitalism* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976), v.

2. Erich Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man* (New York: Frederick Ungar, 1971), 3.

3. Terry Eagleton, *Why Marx Was Right* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), 86, Kindle.

4. The goals that are the topic of this paper only scratch the surface of Marx's anti-liberal beliefs—dangerous beliefs that played a direct role in the horrors that befell the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the People's Republic of China, “Democratic” Kampuchea, and so on. First and foremost among the anti-liberal beliefs on which Marx's thinking is based is the compulsory duty of “from each according to their ability.” This duty turns the time in our lives into what socialism treats as “society's time,” society's property to control.

Socialist duty is based on denying the key premise of the liberal philosophy that underpins our current society: the idea that our time and talents are our own, and we should not be born owing them to others. As detailed in the RFP paper “The Ripple Effects of Socialist Duty,” socialism's foundation on this requirement of duty is behind such ugly aspects of socialism as its obsession with alleged “parasites.” Hundreds of thousands of those deemed to be “parasites” have perished at the hands of their socialist governments.

Another example of Marx's anti-liberal beliefs is found in the fact he dismisses human rights as “rubbish” and “trash” and states that he objects to the entire concept of rights. Yes, the most important figure in socialist philosophy dismisses our individual rights. The RFP paper “Our ‘So-Called’ Rights” provides an overview of socialism's view of rights relative to duty.

Marx didn't simply dismiss the general concept of rights; he called for the suppression of key rights we have in liberal society, including our “private labor” rights—the right to choose any career we wish. To learn more about socialism's plan to replace our private labor rights with what Marx called “directly social labor” (our work under society's direct control), see the RFP paper “A ‘Defect’ of Liberalism.”

5. Karl Marx, *Capital*, trans. Ben Fowkes and David Fernbach, 3 vols. (London: Penguin Classics, 1978–1981), 1:614. Emphasis added. The first volume of *Capital* was originally published in German in 1867.

6. Karl Marx, “Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council,” in *Karl Marx: On the First International*, ed. and trans. Saul K. Padover (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), 26.

7. Marx, *Capital*, 1:614.

8. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Chicago: Charles H. Kerr and Co., 1910), 42. *The Communist Manifesto* was originally published in German in 1848.

9. One of the reasons this work, written in 1875 but first published in 1891, qualifies as one of Marx's most important is that it contains his famous-in-socialist circles statement that there would be two phases of socialist society, including a “higher phase” that would be based on the principle “From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs.” It was Marx's adoption of this phrase (originated by Louis Blanc in the 1840s) that made it the most famous saying of socialism and its defining promise. Karl Marx, “Critique of the Gotha Program,” in *The Marx-Engels Reader*, ed. Robert Tucker (New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1972), 388.

10. Marx, “Critique of the Gotha Program,” 398.

NOTES

11. Friedrich Engels, *Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's Revolution in Science*, trans. Emile Burns (New York: International Publishers, 1966), 360. In this work, originally published in German in 1878, Engels quotes in full Marx's discussion of the Education of the Future in *Capital* (360–61). Engels praises Marx's ideas on the subject and criticizes competing socialist theorist Eugene Dühring for having “backboneless” ideas about combining education and work as compared to those of Marx.

12. Marx, “Instructions for the Delegates,” 26.

13. Marx, “Instructions for the Delegates,” 26: “Children and young persons of both sexes divided into three classes, to be treated differently; the first class to range from 9 to 12; the second, from 13 to 15 years; and the third, to comprise the ages of 16 and 17 years. We propose that the employment of the first class in any workshop or housework be legally restricted to two; that of the second, to four; and that of the third, to six hours. For the third class, there must be a break of at least one hour for meals or relaxation.”

14. Marx, *Capital*, 1:618.

15. Marx, *Capital*, 1:617.

16. Marx, *Capital*, 1:447.

17. Karl Marx, *The Poverty of Philosophy* (Moscow: Foreign Languages Publishing House, 1956; orig. 1847), 144. Noted socialist thinker G. A. Cohen asserts that, as Marx uses the term, “idiocy” refers to “narrow parochialism” and “not feeble intelligence” (G. A. Cohen, “Marx's Dialectic of Labor,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 3, no. 3, [Spring 1974], 248). But this argument is undercut by the fact that Marx effectively labels craftspeople pinheads (individuals with “the knowledge and the consciousness of the pin”) in the same paragraph in which he writes that “the automatic workshop wipes out specialists and craft-idiocy.” Moreover, whatever meaning we ascribe to Marx's use of “idiocy,” he's certainly not promoting craftwork as an option in socialist society, much less as part of socialist child labor as education. In Cohen's article, he states that Marx's socialism would “banish” craft until socialism produced an ultra-automated fantasy future in which literally all work had ceased to exist (256–57).

18. As explored more fully in the RFP paper “Why Socialism Says Craftwork Is ‘Idiocy,’” Marx attacks the specific nature of craft production: the fact that the craft artisan performs all steps in the production of an item. He writes that this style of labor creates workers who have “the knowledge and the consciousness of the pin” (Marx, *Poverty of Philosophy*, 144). Working as the craftsperson does results in having the smarts of a pin; in other words, it makes you a pinhead—an idiot.

19. Sean Sayers, “The Concept of Labor: Marx and His Critics,” *Science and Society* 71, no. 4 (October 2007): 449.

20. Marx, *Capital*, 1:614.

21. Marx and Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, 42.

22. Louis Blanc is typically credited with, in the 1840s, defining the specific wording of socialism's requirement of duty to society: “from each according to his abilities.” Writing in 1880, he explains: “The more one can, the more one must. ... Hence the axiom: From each, according to his abilities. That is the DUTY” (“Plus un homme peut, plus il doit ... D'où l'axiome : De chacun, selon ses facultés. Là est le DEVOIR”). Louis Blanc, *La Histoire de la Révolution de 1848* (Paris: C. Marpon, 1880), 1:148.

23. Marx, “Instructions for the Delegates,” 26.

24. Marx, *Capital*, 1:614.

25. Karl Marx, *Capital*, trans. E. Paul and C. Paul (London: J. M. Dent, 1930), 522.

26. In one example, socialist Istvan Meszaros writes: “As is well known, Marx had great expectations of ‘the social revolution of the nineteenth century.’” Meszaros continues explaining that Marx “hoped, and explicitly

NOTES

said” that socialist revolutions in the 1800s would “take the capitalist order into its grave.” Istvan Meszaros, *Beyond Capital* (New York: Monthly Review, 2010), 917, Kindle.

27. That today’s “democratic” socialism remains founded on the duty of “from each according to their ability” is demonstrated by the fact that countless socialist writers who present themselves as democratic socialists continue to refer to this standard in their works. Three examples:

Michael Harrington, the founder of the Democratic Socialists of America, writes that “the goal of socialism, clearly, is to ... act on the basis of ‘to each according to his/her need, from each according to his/her ability.’” Michael Harrington, “What Socialists Would Do in America—If They Could,” *Dissent*, Fall 1978, 445.

In his recent book *The Morality of Radical Economics*, Ron Baiman defines democratic socialism by this very standard: “The only way that the current capitalist ... as opposed to democratic socialist (‘from each according to their ability, to each according to their need’), economics can be justified...” Ron P. Baiman, *The Morality of Radical Economics* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2016), 276.

Robert Sewell writes in a recent article that socialism is to mean that “society will be based on the principle ‘from each according to their ability, to each according to their need.’” Robert Sewell, “Why You Should Be a Socialist,” *Socialist Appeal*, September 4, 2015, <https://www.socialist.net/why-you-should-be-a-socialist.htm>.

28. The idea of Marx’s Education of the Future represents an important exception to his vow that he would not “write recipes” for the socialist future. Marx laid out a specific vision—a fixed-course menu, if you will—of what would constitute a socialist society. For example, he said that a socialist society would be one in which there is no buying or selling, no money, and not a single private business. But while he provided a high-level picture of what qualifies as a socialist society, Marx famously (at least among knowledgeable socialists) said that he was going to “confine myself to the mere critical analysis of actual facts, instead of writing recipes for the cook-shops of the future” (Marx, *Capital*, 1:99).

Given Marx’s outsized importance to socialism, his “no recipes” pledge has become a socialist standard—one reprised by dozens of socialist thinkers. Marx by and large abided by his own rule. He provided relatively scant details about how socialist society would operate day to day. But then there’s his Education of the Future idea. Here Marx writes a recipe for a specific operational aspect of socialist society. He gets into such details as the age when child labor would begin, how many hours kids would be made to work, and so on.

The fact Marx broke his own rarely broken “no recipes” rule, and did so repeatedly, reinforces the importance Marx placed on the Education of the Future. Yet when socialists write about Marx and his socialism, almost all of them fail to remark about this remarkable aspect of his thought.

29. Fromm, *Marx’s Concept of Man*, 76.

30. Fromm uses the 1906 Charles H. Kerr edition of Marx’s *Capital*, vol. 1, as his source in *Marx’s Concept of Man*. The footnote for “fully developed human beings” on page 76 of *Marx’s Concept of Man* points to pages 529–30 in this edition of Marx’s *Capital*. These are the pages on which Marx outlines “the education of the future.”

31. Jean Anyon, *Marx and Education* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2011). In addition to being a devout socialist, Dr. Jean Anyon was a professor at the City University of New York.

32. Mandan Sarup, *Marxism and Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1978).

33. See Sarup, *Marxism and Education*, 108–28; Anyon, *Marx and Education*, 6–14.

34. Two examples from Mandan Sarup’s *Marxism and Education*:

Sarup writes that the goal of his book is to present a theory of education that stems from a “libertarian Marxism” (8). The preposterous notion of a libertarian Marxism would fail instantly if Sarup had included details about Marx’s Education of the Future in his book. Compulsory child labor as education is as far removed from libertarianism as it’s possible to imagine.

NOTES

Sarup references Marx's attack on writing recipes about the socialist future (125), while suppressing all details about Marx's thinking on education—thinking that represents a flagrant violation of this “no recipes” rule.

35. Sarup, *Marxism and Education*, 135.

A third example of a socialist work specifically on Marxism and education that buries what Marx had to say about the Education of the Future is Mike Cole, *Marxism and Education Theory* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2008). The word “future” appears seventy-five times in this book, but not one these instances is Cole quoting Marx's discussions of the Education of the Future.

At one point in this book of over two hundred pages, Cole makes a brief reference to the fact Marx believed in “combining education with labour” (30). But he then provides a misleading explanation of Marx's goal in desiring this combination: that it was to “increase general awareness of the (exploitative) nature of capitalism.” The “exploitative” in parentheses appears as part of Cole's original text. Cole's explanation of Marx's intent is a complete distortion. As the quotes from Marx in the body of this present paper demonstrate, Marx wanted child labor because he believed it was “the only method of producing fully developed human beings.” He wanted factory labor by children to be the gold standard for education in socialist society—a world in which kids would perform years of forced labor for society, but magically, it would not be “exploitative.”

Cole must have struggled with his fib about Marx's goals for child labor as education, because he also includes a brief footnote that explains that Marx and Engels believed that adding work to traditional schooling would aid “in the construction of a socialist future.” The sole purpose of Cole's footnote is to hide this statement that at least addresses Marx's actual intent and contradicts the notion that Marx wanted child labor as a means to give kids and their families firsthand experience with exploitation. Surely this more accurate statement, along with quotes from Marx and additional meaningful details, should have appeared in the body of the text in lieu of the misleading sentence that actually appears.

36. Burke, “Karl Marx and Informal Education,” in *The Encyclopedia of Pedagogy and Informal Education*, www.infed.org/thinkers/et-marx.htm.

37. Barry Burke, “Karl Marx and Informal Education.”

38. The content of Anyon's and Sarup's books makes it clear they're intimately familiar with Marx's writings. It would be astonishing for them (both long-time socialist academics in the education field) to be unaware of what Marx had to say about education and “the only method of producing fully developed human beings.” And the possibility that Burke was unaware of Marx's calls for child labor as education seems equally remote. Burke's article includes a lengthy discussion of points Marx made in *The Communist Manifesto* and also quotes from it. Burke could not have missed what *The Communist Manifesto* says about the “combination of education with industrial production.”

39. Fromm, *Marx's Concept of Man*, 3.

40. Not only was Bax a founder and leader in the Social Democratic Federation (SDF), but he was editor of its paper *Justice*. Details about Bax's involvement with the SDF and the Socialist League are available at the socialist-run website Marxists.org biography of Bax, preserved at Archive.org: <https://web.archive.org/web/20211104141436/https://www.marxists.org/glossary/people/b/a.htm>.

41. A biography of Bax hosted on the socialist-run website Marxists.org (see n. 40) states that Bax was “important as the first source through which many of the Marxist and materialist ideas of history were disseminated through the English speaking world. Marx noted his efforts with approval.”

42. Ernest Belfort Bax, *The Ethics of Socialism: Being Further Essays in Modern Socialist Criticism* (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1893), 21.

43. Ernest “Che” Guevara, “On Creating a New Attitude,” in *Venceremos! The Speeches and Writings of Che Guevara*, ed. John Gerassi (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1968), 337.

NOTES

44. See n. 27 for three examples of present-day democratic socialists indicating that today's socialism remains based on socialism's 170-year-old duty of "from each according to their ability."

45. See the RFP paper "The Ripple Effects of Socialist Duty" for an overview of the ways in which socialism's foundation on the duty of "from each according to their ability" has contaminated numerous aspects of socialist philosophy.

46. See n. 4 for examples of Marx's many other dangerous anti-liberal beliefs and goals.