Journal of Social Sciences, Naresuan University, Volume 18 Number 1 (January–June, 2022): 1–31

Received: 16 Sep. 2021; Revised: 18 Oct. 2021; Accepted: 27 Oct. 2021

Marx Unmasked? The "Siamese Intellectual" and a (Mis) Reading of Karl Marx in Thailand

Puangchon Unchanam[1]

ABSTRACT

In recent years, new biographies of Karl Marx have emerged in the English-speaking world, and they give a fresh reading of Marx's ideas and personal life by putting them back into the historical context of his time. In Thailand, unfortunately, local readers do not have the same privilege as there have not been original and full biographies of Marx written by Thai authors. What appears to be a silver lining for Thai readers is that Sulak Sivaraksa, one of the most renowned and well-respected intellectuals in Thai academia who has widely been known as the "Siamese Intellectual," wants to break new paths. He writes a substantial account of Marx's personal background, the impact of the historical contexts of his time on his intellectual development, and the tension between how he acted privately and what he discussed in public. However, this article argues that Sulak's take on Marx is wide of the mark. Rather than demythologising Marx, Sulak ends up reproducing myths and misunderstandings surrounding the man. Instead of a critical assessment, Sulak's take on Marx is conservative to the core. It does not just conflate Marx with Marxism, Stalinism, and Maoism; it also casts doubt on Marx's ideas by condemning his personal flaws. On top of that, Sulak makes several comments about Marx that lack of evidence.

Keywords: Karl Marx, Sulak Sivaraksa, Political Thought, Misinterpretation, Biography

[1] Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences, Naresuan University <Email: puangchon@gmail.com>

Introduction

Karl Marx was supposed to be dead and buried. Especially after the fall of the Berlin Wall, the dissolution the Soviet Union, and the end of the Cold War in the late twentieth century, Marx's reputation apparently reached its nadir. Marxism, an ideology that was named after him but did not necessarily follow his lead, has been criticised and blamed as the major doctrine that did not merely inspire despotic rulers such as Joseph Stalin, Mao Zedong, and Pol Pot; it also led to famine, poverty, the suppression of individual rights, genocides, and state terrorism in communist countries around the world. However, despite a bad reputation from the past, Marx remains a monumental figure in the twenty–first century. These days, he seems to be more relevant than ever. On May 5, 2018, *The New York Times* marked the 200th anniversary of Marx's birthday with an article, "Happy Birthday, Karl Marx. You Were Right!" (Baker, 2018). Similarly, *The Guardian* observed, "Two Centuries On, Karl Marx Feels More Revolutionary Than Ever" (Jeffries, 2018), and the *Financial Times* remarked, "Why Karl Marx Is More Relevant Than Ever" (Tooze, 2018). From Berlin to Beijing, from Trier to London, and from New York to Havana, Marx was widely celebrated in state–organised ceremonies, city events, academic conferences, and campus festivals (Colpaert, 2019; Palmer, 2018; Shepherd, 2018). On top of that, the resurgence of Marx makes its presence felt in the printing industry. Since the beginning of the new century, publications about Marx's ideas have proliferated. They not only examine what Marx wrote but also tackle how his writings are still relevant to today's socioeconomic conditions. (Anderson, 2016; Eagleton, 2011; Harvey, 2010, 2019; Hobsbawm, 2011). Biographies of Marx have also been popular, and this has become an emerging literary genre in itself. While classic biographies of Marx have been revised and reprinted (Berlin, 2013; Blumenberg, 2000; McLellan, 2006), new accounts of Marx's life story keep hitting bookstores (Gabriel, 2011; Heinrich, 2019; Jones, 2017; Liedman, 2018; Sperber, 2013; Thomas, 2012; Wheen, 2001). Based on the renaissance of his reputation and the increasing interest among readers in his life and thought, it looks as Marx's legacy is far from dead. It is alive and kicking.

What draws a new generation of readers to Marx is his critique of capitalism. In *The Communist Manifesto,* Marx and Friedrich Engels (1977a), his lifelong intellectual and political ally, discuss the impact of capitalism. On the bright side, capitalism creates unprecedented wealth for mankind, emancipates peasants from their exploitative feudal lords, and connects people and countries around the globe. Capitalism is also accompanied by the creation of nation–states; the establishment of a modern legal system; the equalisation between genders; and the rise of advanced technology, science, and knowledge, which are all the features of so–called progress, modernity, and civilisation. Marx and Engels, however, recognised the negative consequences of capitalism. These include the concentration of wealth among the richest capitalists, the proletarianisation of the multitudes of poor people, social inequality between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the estrangement between workers and the products of their own labour, the domination of the government by capitalist interests, and the recurrence of economic crises that widely affect the majority of the population.

Although it was written in the mid–nineteenth century, this critical analysis of capitalism still resonates with today's readers. We live in the world of social and economic inequality. That is, the richest 1% owns 44% of the global wealth; that same 1% reaps twice as much of a share of global income as the bottom half; and the world's ten richest billionaires possess a massive scale of wealth, a sum greater than the total goods and services of most nations ("Global inequality," n.d.). Almost half of humanity is living on less than US$5.50 a day, and around 735 million people are still living in extreme poverty ("5 shocking facts," n.d.). Furthermore, a multinational corporation nowadays tends to hire a subcontractor, who in turn employs the multitudes of workers to produce a part of or a complete product, which will be later sold as a corporate commodity. As a result, the estrangement between subcontracted workers and the product of their labour has never been wider, and corporate responsibility becomes merely a nominal term that is rarely applied to the exploitative condition in the subcontracting labour system (Balakrishnan, 2001; Cowie, 2002). In 2008, the world saw one of the worst economic crises in history, and it had a global economic and social impact.

While several corporations, especially financial institutions, were rescued from going bust by vast government bailouts, the mass of workers were left mostly on their own in deep trouble, lacking support from the government and dealing with increased unemployment and the loss of income (Harman, 2010; Roberts, 2016). These problems of twenty–first–century capitalism should not be interpreted as proof that Marx was a prophet who could see a future of the world after his death. Instead, similarities between what he wrote about capitalism and what has unfolded in our time show the power of his theory that, remarkably, captures how capitalism functions and how it creates critical problems in the long run.

As mentioned above, an increasing interest in Marx's thought goes together with another popular trend among a new generation of readers—they want to know more about his private life. Since his death, there have been distortions, misunderstandings, and falsehoods surrounding Marx. To be precise, according to Andy Blunden and Rob Lucas (2005), there are two types of myths about Marx. First, his ideas have been conflated with Marxism and the communist regimes of Lenin, Stalin, and Mao. Therefore, it is commonly believed that Marx was responsible for the orthodox and rigid concepts of Marxism such as historical materialism, scientific socialism, and economic determinism. Worse than that, it has been maintained that he was to blame for the major policies of the communist regimes such as centralised planning, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the state ownership of the means of production, all of which, tragically, led to terrorism, poverty, hunger, and the suppression of individual freedom among the people in those regimes. Second, opponents of Marxism usually call into question Marx's ideas by attacking his character. As a result, there emerge several myths about his notorious personality. According to these myths, "Marx was a megalomaniac, a bully, an anti–Semite and a racist, a snob, a womaniser and a sexist, a boring writer and a plagiarist" (Blunden & Lucas, 2005). Thanks to new biographies of Marx since the new millennium, however, those myths about Marx's life and thought now come under serious challenge (Gabriel, 2011; Jones, 2017; Sperber, 2013; Wheen, 2001). Rather than conflating Marx's writings with his intellectual followers, new biographers examine the

meaning of those writings in the political and historical context of the nineteenth century. Likewise, instead of anachronistically judging his character by the moral standard of our time, they contextualise Marx's life and put it back into the historical surroundings and social prejudices of his era. Although this approach of depicting Marx as a man of his time may not ultimately separate him from the ideology that he played an important role in creating or excuse all of his personal flaws, it shreds a new light on Marx, a larger–than–life figure who has long been treated as a cult symbol of the Communist International and a bogeyman of the Free World. Based on the warm reception of those new biographies, it looks as if today's bookworms are eager to learn more about Marx's life and thought with a fresh reading, free from all the myths that surrounded him during the Cold War.

The renaissance of Marx's reputation, nonetheless, should not be seen as a worldwide phenomenon. In Thailand, at least, a new generation of readers do not have the same privilege that those in the English–speaking world possess. Even though there are several publications about Marx's ideas in Thailand's libraries and bookshops, they are simply in essence books for beginners, and they tend to pay more attention to the orthodox concepts of Marxism than to the ideas of the man himself (Bawon, 2004; Chiangkul, 2015; Jayanama, 2010; Sirimanon, 1975). A story of Marx's life, if it is mentioned at all, is briefly stated in the first chapter or the first few paragraphs of these introductory books. Moreover, even though there are some short biographies of Marx, they are merely translations from foreign languages, and they are difficult for local readers to understand (Lenin, 1980; Rius, n.d.; Singer, 2015; Stepanova, 1975). Notably absent in the Thai–speaking world is a full and updated biography of Marx that is written by a Thai author. Against this background, Marx as a man, therefore, has been introduced to Thai readers only in passing. How did his upbringing play a role in his intellectual development? How did he transform himself from a liberal student to a communist revolutionary? What were political and social conditions of his time that influenced his life and thought? How did he attempt to change those conditions? How are those conditions different from the contexts of our time?

These questions have rarely been examined and discussed in Thai literature on Marx. As a result, for Thai readers, Marx remains as mysterious a figure just as he has been for a century. His ideas are indistinguishable from those of his followers, and his words are frequently taken out of context, regardless of the historical circumstances in which they were written in the first place.

What appears to be a silver lining for Thai readers is the publication of *Unmasking Western Intellectuals [lokkhrap panyachon farang]* (Sivaraksa, 2020). Although it is not a full biography of Marx per se, this book introduces three famous writers from the West—Marx, Jean–Jacques Rousseau, and Leo Tolstoy—to the Thai audience by providing substantial accounts of their personal backgrounds, the impact of their historical contexts on their intellectual development, and the tension between how they acted in a private domain and what they discussed in public. First released in 1992, *Unmasking Western Intellectuals* has sold well. It has been reprinted in 1993, 2000, 2011, and 2020. Most importantly, this book is written by Sulak Sivaraksa, a renowned and outspoken Thai intellectual and social critic. Sulak is also a scholar, a writer, a publisher, a social activist, and a founder of *Social Science Review [sangkhomsat parithat],* one of Thailand's most critical journals during the age of military despotism in the 1960s and the early 1970s. Notably, Sulak is a prolific writer. Since his first publication in the late 1950s, he has authored more than a hundred books and monographs in both Thai and English. His writings are related to various topics: a study of Western philosophies and religions; a critique of capitalism, materialism, and consumerism; a reformation of Thailand's military and monarchy; the problems of Buddhist monks; and the development of indigenous, sustainable, and spiritual models for social change ("Sulak," n.d.). Thanks to this massive body of work and the longevity of his career as a writer, Sulak has been one of the most famous and well–respected figures in Thai academia. He has been dubbed the "Siamese Intellectual" *[panyachon sayam],* an honourable and rare title which is given to a handful of writers who have made a great impact on Thai society (Sattayanurak, 2014). With all these prestigious

credentials, Sulak looked like the right person to shed new light not only on Marx's ideas, which had been censored in the Thai kingdom during the Cold War, but also on Marx's life, which remains an unfamiliar topic among local readers. Unfortunately for Thai booklovers, Sulak's take on Marx is wide of the mark.

This article is a critical examination of "Karl Marx," the last chapter of *Unmasking Western Intellectuals.* Despite his promise to unmask Marx, this article argues, Sulak ends up reproducing the myths that had been used during the Cold War to discredit the man. Instead of a critical assessment, Sulak's take on Marx is conservative to the core. It does not just conflate Marx with Marxism, Stalinism, and Maoism; it also casts doubt on Marx's ideas by condemning his personal flaws. Marx is accused by Sulak of being a disgraceful son, a disloyal and abusive husband, a tyrannical father, a racist father–in–law, and a selfish friend. With the emergence of new biographies of Marx since the beginning of the new century, Sulak could have revised his original take on Marx by incorporating new evidence and new interpretations from those biographies, which effectively demythologise many misconceptions about Marx. Instead, he kept his first version intact and merely reprinted it in all the later editions. Worst of all, Sulak makes several comments about Marx that lack of evidence.

Question Marx

Unmasking Western Intellectuals, as its introduction asserts, is set up as a critical examination of prominent thinkers and writers from Europe. Rather than accepting their ideas without question, Sulak asks his readers to be careful, critical, and sceptical when they read the writings of Western intellectuals because the latter are hypocritical—they did not practice what they preached. In addition to Marx, Rousseau, and Tolstoy who are the major targets of the book, Sulak mentions Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud, Max Weber, Jean–Paul Sartre, and Bertrand Russell as the European intellectuals about whom Thai readers should have reservations. Sulak's scepticism of them, however, is not based on critical thinking. Instead, it is driven by religionism, nationalism, and xenophobia. Those Westerners, according to Sulak, "were full of arrogance and egotism"; they

"did not believe in religion"; they "attacked religious sects [and] religious doctrines that are related to God" (Sivaraksa, 2020, pp. 41–43). Worse than that, they "proclaimed themselves to be like Popes or cardinals by using their pens or words to convince people to follow them....They claimed that they did it for the sake of humanity and social justice." Without his intervention, Sulak worries, Thai readers would end up being brainwashed by those Westerners. "Many Thais," Sulak asserts, "superficially read the works of Western intellectuals, forget themselves, and imitate the iconoclastic manners [of Westerners]" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 43). In contrast, "only a handful of Thais deeply understand the ideas of those intellectuals and know the foreground and background of their lives: how they kept friendship, how they betrayed other people, [and] how they spoke with magic words." Seeing himself as a latter type of Thai, Sulak raises his concern further: "[Thais] usually claim that we love [our] nation, religion, and monarchy, but we are being brainwashed by Western intellectuals. Have we ever been aware of how they do their tricks?" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 59). With this concern, Sulak makes it clear why he wrote *Unmasking Western Intellectuals*: this book "will bring some Western intellectuals to light and unmask them before our eyes, in terms of their lives and their minds...[so that] some of us will no longer admire Westerners." After this aggressive introduction, the book turns to Rousseau and Tolstoy in its first two chapters. Last but not least, Marx, a man whom Sulak deems a "false prophet," is put to the test in the final chapter.

"Karl Marx" begins with the assessment of Marx's legacy. According to Sulak, Marx left a horrific legacy to the world. He was responsible for the suffering of millions of people under the communist regimes, which were ruled by the admirers of his ideas. The root of this catastrophe, Sulak contends, is Marx's prophetic concept of "the authoritarian regime of one-man rule" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 177). Once this idea had been applied by his followers such as Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Ho Chi Minh, Pol Pot, and Deng Xiaoping, it led to social catastrophe and human suffering under their oppressive leadership. There is nothing new about Sulak's condemnation of Marx's legacy. As mentioned above, this is one among many myths that have been used to delegitimise Marx by

conflating his ideas with all the violence, crime, and tragedy that has happened under the misappropriated banner of his name. What is unique about Sulak's take on Marx, however, is his claim that Marx envisioned "the authoritarian regime of one-man rule." Yet, there is no evidence that Marx ever conceptualised or promoted that kind of idea. Actually, Sulak's case would have been stronger if he had attributed those social disasters under the communist regime to Marx's idea of the "dictatorship of the proletariat," a notorious concept that had been interpreted and used by communist leaders to legitimise their anti-democratic and oppressive rules. But even if Sulak had decided to take this approach, his argument would have still been on shaky ground.

In contrast to common perception, Marx's concept of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is not an endorsement of an authoritarian rule of a few leaders, let alone that of one man. According to Hal Draper (1987), when Marx (1977b) used this term for the first time in his 1850 article, *The Class Struggle in France 1848-1850,* the meaning of the word "dictatorship," as it had meant for centuries, was the accession of a popular sovereign or the rule of the people. As a result, what Marx meant when he promoted this particular idea, Draper pointed out, is nothing more than "the rule of the proletariat; but that does not mean the rule of a man or a clique or a band of a party; it means the rule of a class. Class rule means class dictatorship." Only after the rise of authoritarian rulers such Stalin and Mao in the mid-twentieth century did the term not only become a synonym for despotism, tyranny, and autocracy; it was also counterpoised with democracy. Likewise, Terry Eagleton (2011, p. 204) argued that "what [Marx] means by this sinister-sounding term was nothing more than popular democracy. The dictatorship of the proletariat meant simply rule by the majority." In this sense, Sulak's accusation of Marx as the architect of "the authoritarian regime of one-man rule" is groundless.

After his take on Marx's legacy, Sulak turns to Marx's writings and reveals some problems that he finds. Three of them will be reviewed here. First, Marx was wrong to believe that his theory is based on science instead of abstract ideas, that his theory is better than his opponents' theories because it is scientific,

and that he is more like a scientist than a scholar. According to Sulak, "Marx believed that his theory is scientific, in the same way that Darwin's theory has been accepted in natural science" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 178). Yet, Sulak contends, Marx "was neither a scholar nor a scientist" because "he was not interested in finding the truth but in proclaiming what he believed to be the truth" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 185). As a result, Sulak declares that there was nothing scientific about Marx's theory; indeed, it was anti–scientific because the theorist tended to select and use only some facts that he liked to support his theory while neglecting other data that contradict it. For example, Sulak criticises *Capital* (Marx, 1992), Marx's magnum opus, by writing that it is not a scientific work but "the proclamation of his belief." It is mostly composed of "the fortune teller's prophetic words." It selectively uses only some information that Marx saw as fit for his theory, while "hiding other facts and even generating fake data" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 204). Even worse, many sources in *Capital* come from a book that Sulak considers propaganda rather than academic writing. This work is *The Condition of the Working Class in England,* written by Engels (2009). According to Sulak, Engels misrepresented facts about English workers by showing only the deteriorating condition of their homes and their work environment, while remaining silent about the improvements in working–class conditions that had been made by the bourgeoisie. Since Marx borrowed some sources from Engels without questioning them, both authors, Sulak condemns, "mutually lie to their readers by distorting and hiding facts that are contradictory to their theories" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 211).

This accusation is based on Sulak's misunderstandings about Marx's concept of science, the historical context of this word, Marx's relationship with Engels, and the significance of Engels's classic work. When Marx used the word "science," or *Wissenschaft* in German, Paul Thomas (1976, p. 18) pointed out, he did not mean natural science as today's readers tend to understand. Instead, science, for Marx, means "the study of the actual life process and activity of the individuals of each epoch" (Thomas, 1976, p. 7). Also, when Marx used the word "scientific," or *wissenschaftlich* in German, its meanings go beyond scientific, as

it is normally rendered. In fact, it can also be translated as "factual," "logical," "non-random," "rigorous," and "systematic." For Thomas (1976, pp. 15–16), Marx's method of inquiry was not "one of the straightforward observation of a detached observer, of data-gathering and collation, and the subsequent construction of an explanatory and predictive system," and thus "Marx never claimed to be scientist in this sense." Instead, Marx's method is scientific in a sense that it is "to appropriate the material in detail, analyse in different forms of development, and trace their inner link." Putting Marx's concept of science into its nineteenth-century context, James Farr (1991, p. 110) noted that on the rise at that time was a concept of science, which was promoted by prominent philosophers such as August Comte and John Stuart Mill, as "an empirical, factual, and observational form of human inquiry." In contrast, Marx rejected this idea. He did not believe that science could be based on sense data or sense observation. Instead, "Marx believed that science progressed by propagating theories, not merely by accumulating facts. He also believed that the most important terms in theories could not be reduced to observational terms." Moreover, John Holloway (2002) argued that we should consider Marx's concept of science as negative, critical, and revolutionary. Unlike the "bourgeois science" that assumes the reality of capitalist society and simply tries to understand that reality, science for Marx is the negation of what appears to be real in capitalism, the exposé of contradictions within it, and the knowledge inquiry that is crucial to the struggle to change the world.

Depicting Marx as a wannabe scientist who aspired to be put in the same league with Darwin, Sulak apparently confuses Marx with Engels. As Thomas (1976, p. 3) commented, "there is, after all, very little argument about natural science as such, or its methods, in Marx, but a good deal of this in Engels." Instead of Marx, it is Engels who was obsessed with natural science, Darwin's theory, scientific laws, and positivist research. It is also Engels, not Marx, who promoted the ideas of scientific socialism, dialectic materialism, and historical materialism, all of which can be understood through a universal law of motion in the same way that physical science promotes understanding (Carver, 1981, 1983). Clearly

articulated in Engels's most popular work, *Anti–Dühring* (Engels, 1878), and its shorter version, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (Engels, 1880), these ideas became instrumental in the founding of Marxism and even had more impact on the communist leaders than that which Marx actually stated in his writings (Holloway, 2002; Jordan, 1967; Rubel, 1972). Above all, it is Engels who introduced Darwin's *On the Origin of Species* (Darwin, 2001) to Marx and furthermore saw the latter as a counterpart of Darwin in human and social sciences (Sperber, 2013, p. 393). In his speech that was given at Marx's funeral on March 1883, 17, Engels (1883) remarked: "Just as Darwin discovered the law of development [of] organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of development of human history." In addition to this remark, there is a myth that Marx tried to dedicate *Capital* to Darwin, a myth that leads to a common misunderstanding that Marx is an admirer of Darwin. In fact, unlike Engels, Marx had reservations about the great biologist and was sceptical about the idea that Darwin's theory could be applied to economy, society, and history (Sperber, 2013, p. 396).

Sulak is right to say that Marx cited *The Condition of the Working Class in England* several times in Capital. Mark deeply admired Engels's first–hand observation of the lives of the English workers, and it became a crucial reference when he illustrated in *Capital* some examples of how capitalism seriously degraded the working class (Carver, 1983, p. 46). Sulak's criticism that Engels's book misrepresented the facts about the English workers, however, is unfair. According to Eric Hobsbawm (2011, p. 99), an accusation that Engels portrayed the condition of workers in an unnecessarily dark tone and failed to recognise the benevolence of the bourgeoisie is unfounded. "He did not deny that improvements in working–class conditions had been made," Hobsbawm noted, "[and] he did not present the bourgeoisie as a single black–hearted mass." For Hobsbawm, the critics' objection to Engels is based on their unwillingness to accept his facts. "No man, communist or otherwise," Hobsbawm commented, "could have visited England from abroad in those years without a sense of shocked horror." Indeed, prominent nineteenth–century writers such as Charles Dickens and Alexis de Tocqueville similarly depicted the condition of workers in Manchester, the industrial

city that Engels studied, as poor, horrible, and unbearable. "What I have seen has disgusted and astonished me beyond all measure," said Dickens as he visited Manchester (Quoted in Boyer, 1998, p. 158). "Here civilisation works its miracle," de Tocqueville remarked of Manchester, "and civilised man is turned back almost into a savage" (Quoted in Boyer, 1998, p. 158). Although Terrell Carver (1981, p. 18) admitted that *The Condition of the Working Class in England* "was avowedly partial to what [Engels] took to be working–class interests," he warned that "critics today must think carefully before dismissing it for failing to be impartial, neutral, and non–engaged." In fact, Carver questioned critics of Engels's account of the working class: "What would an impartial account of misery be like? Should one be neutral about suffering? What is the point of research and theorising if it does not help to alter the structure of an imperfect world?" These questions can also be applied to ask critics of Marx's account of capitalism, including Sulak.

The second problem that Sulak finds in Marx's writings is related to Marx's theory of revolution. For Sulak, the latter is not even a theory; it is just a religious, poetic, and imaginative plot which was created by Marx, a false prophet and a moral preacher. Marx's writings, Sulak claims, are based on the dark themes such as intense pessimism, hopelessness, hatred, violence, corruption, global crises, and the destruction of the world. Sulak believes that these dramatic themes became the background to *The Communist Manifesto* and the climax *of Capital.* In other words, Marx's writings are similar to eschatology. "If you have a chance to read the original draft of *The German Ideology,"* Sulak comments on the 1845 manuscripts of Marx and Engels (1977b), "you will find that its themes are based on the Day of Judgment, the poetic scenes of burning cities, crying people, and many men hanged on the lamppost, and the plot of the heroic role played by the proletariat" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 187). This theme of a Doomsday that can be found in Marx's writings, Sulak contends, proves that they are not scientific but artistic, and Marx merely relied on intuition rather than reasoning, when he wrote. On top of that, Marx's idea of the proletariat as the only class that will play a

historic role of leading the revolution that emancipates all social classes from capitalism, for Sulak, is based on a Jewish and Christian concept. That is, Marx's proletariat plays the same role as the Messiah or redeemer. In this regard, Marx's theory of revolution, Sulak concludes, is not about facts or what really happens in the world, but it is simply based on Marx's own moral judgment and his "prophetic words that predict how society must be in that particular way" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 199).

Sulak's accusation of Marx is unwarranted, especially when it is compared with the way prominent biographers of Marx understand his writings. According to Isaiah Berlin (2013, pp. 5–6), when Marx wrote, he did not use intuition, illusion, emotion, or moral ideals but reason and truth to appeal his readers. For Marx, "true insight into the nature and laws of the historical process will of itself, without the aid of independently known moral standards, make clear to a rational being what step it is proper for him to adopt." In this regard, Berlin noted, "Marx had no new ethical or social ideal to press upon mankind; he did not plead for a change of heart; a mere change of heart was but the substitution of one set of illusions for another." David McLellan (2006, pp. 96–97) recognised that there are misinterpretations of Marx's writings: that Marx's underlying theme in his writings was "the Christian conception of salvation—the proletariat played the role of Isaiah's suffering servant" and that "Marx's views are not empirically based, ...[but] they have their origin in a moral indignation at the condition of the proletariat." For McLellan, "all these interpretations are mistaken." Putting Marx's theory of revolution back into the historical context of his time, McLellan argued that Marx's account of the role of the proletariat is not inspired by a biblical plot. Instead, it was drawn from his study of the French Revolution, the legacy of the 1789 revolution that still made a huge impact on nineteenth century thinkers.

The last issue that Sulak has with Marx's writings is related to *On the Jewish Question,* a controversial article written by Marx (1977c). For Sulak, this article reveals that Marx was anti–Semitic and propagated anti–Semitism. Actually, this article tackles several topics that are crucial not only to the Jewish emancipation in nineteenth–century Prussia but also to political and social issues in capitalist society. Those include intrinsic contradictions within the secular state, the inequity of political emancipation, legal rights, civil liberty, and religious freedom, and the human emancipation from capitalist exploitation through a social revolution. *On the Jewish Question,* however, tends to be simply remembered by Marx's critics as reproducing several anti–Semitic stereotypes, exposing Marx, who had Jewish ancestry, as a self–hating Jew. To be precise, in this article Marx identifies capitalism with the Jews, and he uses several parts of the article to negatively portray a close association between Judaism and commercial activities such as moneylending, peddling, haggling, and trade. For example, Marx wrote: "What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, selfishness"; "[w]hat is the secular cult of the Jew? Haggling"; "[m]oney is the jealous God of Israel before whom no other god may stand"; "[e]xchange is the actual god of the Jew"; and "[t]he imaginary nationality of the Jew is the nationality of the merchant, of the money man in general" (Marx, 1977c, pp. 58–60). According to Sulak, Marx was not alone in promoting this kind of anti–Semitism; his German fellows also shared and propagated the same negative views toward the Jews. Worst of all, Sulak contends, after Marx, Adolf Hitler "adopted this view to terribly and horribly exterminate the Jews in Europe. It is hard to believe that [these] men who claimed to be civilised would transform themselves into those creatures who were inferior to savage animals" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 196).

This accusation against Marx is questionable if we consider the article's main idea and historical context. In *On the Jewish Question*, Marx did not oppose an idea of the political emancipation of the Jews, and his position was actually contrary to many anti–Semitic intellectuals of his time. What Marx wanted, however, was something more radical and revolutionary than the granting of political and legal rights to a minority group in a Christian state. That is, he asked

for human emancipation that will liberate all men from exploitation and suffering in capitalist society. Only with this radical liberation from capitalism, Marx believed, would all humans, regardless of their religious affiliation, Jewish or not, finally be free. In this sense, far from hating and persecuting the Jews, Marx wanted them to be truly free. Moreover, unlike the twentieth-century propaganda that still survives nowadays, the term "Jew" in this article has nothing to do with race. According to Berlin (2013, p. 91), Marx did not use this term as a racial or religious entity, "but a purely economic one, forced into usury and other unattractive professions by the treatment they received from their neighbours." Likewise, Gareth Stedman Jones (2017, p. 165) argued that, despite its reference to "the real Jew," the "Jew" in *On the Jewish Question* was "purely abstract, little more than a metaphor for the values and practices of civil society." For Draper (1977), the allegation that Marx was an anti-Semite since he equated Jewry with the spirit of money-making, merchant-huckstering, and commerce can be supported "only if the whole course of German and European anti-Jewish sentiment is whitewashed, so as to make Marx's essay stand out as a black spot." "Virtually the entire population of Germany (and the rest of Europe, too)," Draper remarked of the intellectual context that applied when the article was composed, "habitually used and accepted the words Jew and Jewry in the manner of Marx's essay whether they were favorable to the Jews' cause or not, whether they were anti-Semitic or not, whether they were Jews or not." Jonathan Sperber (2013, p. 127) warned today's readers who tend to read the article in "the light of twentieth-century German history and the Nazis' Final Solution to the Jewish Question." For Sperber, to really understand Marx, we have to remove Marx's essay "from the twentieth century's totalitarian regimes, mass murders, and racial anti-Semitism," and put it back into the historical context of the mid-nineteenth century. At that time, an understanding of being Jewish was not associated with a racial or biological entity; instead, it was related to one's religious, social, and cultural affiliation. In this respect, Sulak is barking a wrong tree if he believes that Marx was an ideological forefather of Hitler.

Marx, A Man

As "Karl Marx" moves from an overview of Marx's thought to a story about the man's life, Sulak's distortions and misunderstandings about Marx are even more exposed. Sulak does not mince his words about Marx's personal traits, harshly criticising the man for failing to fulfil several roles in his private life and also shamelessly exploiting many people around him. To begin, Sulak considers Marx a prodigal and disgraceful son. "All the letters that Marx wrote to his parents," Sulak claims, "were all related to [his] financial issues." When his father died, Sulak adds, "Marx did not [even] care to attend the funeral, but he wrote a letter to his mother asking her to send him money" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 222). Even though his family supported his education until he earned a doctoral degree, Marx was still unemployed after his graduation, and he kept asking for more money from his mother. The reason why Marx was a jobless man with a diploma, for Sulak, is that rather than from the University of Berlin, the institution where Marx studied and took courses, "he received a doctoral degree from the University of Jena, which had a lower [academic] standard than that of Berlin, [and] thus, his knowledge was not good enough to be qualified as a university professor" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 181).

The story about Marx's financial mismanagement and deficiency has been well known, and Marx's relationship with his parents was undoubtedly rocky. Notably, from an early age, Marx and his mother had a strained relationship. However, Sulak's depiction of Marx's relationship with his parents as if it was all about money is overstated. Besides his financial situation, Marx's letters to his father were also related to his career prospects, life on a campus, poetry, philosophy, and love interests (McLellan, 2016, pp. 16–25). While Marx and his mother rarely communicated, surviving letters that his mother sent to him reveal that she was concerned about her son's physical well–being and arrangements for daily life (Jones, 2017, p. 32). Although Sulak is right that Marx did not attend his father's funeral, his absence did not mean that he did not care about his father. As his father was seriously ill, Marx took a costly journey by mail coach

from Berlin to his home in Trier, and he stayed there for several days. Unfortunately, three days after Marx left Trier, his father died and was buried three days later. According to Mary Gabriel, an accusation that Marx was callous toward his father and so he did not attend the funeral is a misinterpretation of events. "Having just left Trier," Gabriel (2011, p. 31) commented, Marx did not return for the funeral because "it would have been impossible to make it there on time, and in any case, he had said his goodbyes." In spite of their disagreements, McLellan (2016, p. 33) noted, "Marx always retained a strong affection for his father." Marx always carried an old photograph of his father in his pocket, and upon Marx's death it was laid in his coffin by Engels.

Regarding Marx's education, Sulak is right to praise the academic standard of the University of Berlin, one of the best in the world during Marx's time. Unlike Berlin, the University of Jena required neither a residence period nor a formal defence at which the degree candidate appeared in person, and this was one of the main reasons why Marx submitted his dissertation to the institution. Jena, nevertheless, did not hold a low academic status as Sulak portrays. "Hostile commentators have sometimes described Marx's doctorate as a mail-order diploma," Sperber (2013, p. 69) observed. "[However] this seems rather unfair. Jena was a reputable university, not a diploma mill, to use modern parlance, and the doctoral dissertation that its faculty approved was a work of considerable erudition and scholarship, written by someone with serious aspirations to an academic career." Above all, shaming Marx's failure to finish his degree at the prestigious university and to secure a tenured position, Sulak takes Marx out of the intellectual and political context of his time. By the time Marx finished writing his dissertation, the University of Berlin had become more conservative and hostile to atheists, anti-monarchists, democrats, republicans, and especially Young Hegelians, a group of German intellectuals who radicalised the philosophical ideas of Hegel. When Marx was young, he belonged to all of those radical groups, and it was unlikely that he would have been granted a degree at Berlin. Moreover, the increasingly conservative government in Prussia made far less

likely the possibility that radicals who aspired to a professorship at German universities would succeed. As Sperber (2013, p. 64) pointed out, "there was no place in mid–nineteenth century German universities for atheists and democrats. Not a single Young Hegelian would obtain a university position; they would be forced into careers as freelance writers, journalists, and other financially uncertain occupations." In light of this historical background, it was the political and intellectual condition of his time instead of his academic qualifications that limited Marx's prospects for finding a professorship.

In his private life, Marx is also criticised by Sulak as an abusive and disloyal husband, a tyrannical father, a racist father–in–law, and an immoral master. Marx's wife, Jenny von Westphalen, according to Sulak, "was the most pitiful woman in the history of socialism" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 226). Born in a German noble family, she married Marx, a man Sulak decries as physically unattractive, dirty, unhealthy, spendthrift, financially unreliable, and frequently unemployed. Living in exile and in poor conditions for most of her life, Jenny had seven children with Marx but only three of them survived to adulthood. As Marx's wife, Sulak contends, she had to "serve him as if she were a slave" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 231). Worse than that, after she was stricken with smallpox, Sulak claims, "she lost her beauty, and, since then she was no longer important to Marx in any way…she became dispirited [and] hopeless" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 230). Worst of all, Marx betrayed her. He took his housekeeper, Helene Demuth, as his mistress, and their extramarital affair led to the birth of Frederick Demuth, who was then placed with a working class foster family. According to Sulak, Marx never publicly accepted that he was the father of his illegitimate son, yet he confessed this fact to Engels and asked him to keep this secret. Sulak also claims that Marx tried to hide this secret from his wife, "but she knew it eventually, and that is why she became sorry, cold, [and] no longer loved Marx from then on" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 232). For Sulak, Marx not only abused his wife and his housekeeper; he did the same with his daughters. Although Marx preferred male heirs, his surviving children—Jenny, Laura, and Eleanor—were

all female. His three daughters, Sulak accuses, "were useful [to Marx] only when they sometimes helped him as his secretaries" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 230). Even worse, "Marx did not allow his daughters to go to school and find jobs; all of them were kept in his house." When Laura married Paul Lafargue, a French revolutionary who was born in Cuba and multiracial, Marx despised him, and thought he was stupid, because "Marx was very racist." Meanwhile, Eleanor, Sulak asserts, "grew up with an idea of hating men, but worshipping only her father" because she had been "brainwashed by Marx" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 231).

As Marx's wife, Jenny certainly had a tough life. She had to deal with illness, the early deaths of her children, depression, financial insecurity, social humiliation, and political suppression. However, her relationship with Marx was far from what Sulak bleakly portrays. Jenny did not serve Marx "as if she were a slave"; instead, she worked as Marx's secretary copying his manuscripts before they were sent to publishers. "The memory of the days I spent in his little study copying his scrawly articles," Jenny recalled, "is among the happiest of my life" (Quoted in Jones, 2017, p. 326). Furthermore, Jenny was not simply Marx's lover, Gabriel (2011, p. 255) noted, "but [she] had been his most trusted intellectual sounding board... Neither his heart nor his head functioned without her." Gabriel (2011, p. 190) also added, "Jenny was fully committed to Marx's work and truly did recognize and understand the needs of the rare genius she had chosen as a husband. For all his faults, Jenny loved Marx deeply...[and] she saw his life's work as her own." Their marital relationship might not have been a bed of roses, but it survived until the end of their lives. Eleanor recalled one of her father's last encounters with her mother before she died of cancer: "Together they were young again—she a loving girl and he a loving lad, entering into life together—and not an old man broken by illness and a dying old woman, saying farewell for what was left of their lives" (Quoted in Sperber, 2013, p. 541). This depiction is contrary to Sulak's claim that they no longer loved each other after Jenny contracted smallpox or once she knew about his adultery.

The story about Marx's extramarital affair with Helene and his paternity of Frederick has long been whispered and used by his opponents to question his morality, his fidelity to his wife, and his responsibility to his illegitimate son. Although most scholars today tend to believe that Frederick was Marx's son, the paternity of Frederick remains a matter of debate and it is not as conclusive as Sulak presents. According to Carver (2005), the controversy of Marx's illegitimate son has mostly been based on one source. It is a typewritten document that appears to be a letter written by Engels's housekeeper three years after her master died. In this letter, she recalled that Engels, on his deathbed, "confessed" to her that Marx was Frederick's father. Carver questioned not only the credibility of the document but also the uncharacteristic act of Engels, a loyal protector of Marx's reputation and legacy, in this alleged story. Regardless of whether Frederick was Marx's illegitimate son, it should be noted that, after Frederick was born, the Marx family did not break up. Marx and Jenny were still together; they had two more children, and Helene served them dutifully until they passed away.

Sulak is right to state that Marx had a bias when it came to the gender of his offspring. However, as Jones (2000, p. x) pointed out, "Marx's private utterances on sexuality, the family, child–rearing, the nature and place of women, etc. were undoubtedly in many respects in accord with the prevalent ideology of the time." Marx's own manifestations of manhood, Sperber (2013, p. 476) commented, "may appear sexist or inappropriate by today's standards...However, compared to many of his contemporaries, Marx comes across as having chosen some of the best possibilities available to a husband and father of the mid–nineteenth–century Anglo–German middle class." Actually, according to his lifelong associate Wilhelm Liebknecht, Marx was "the most tender father." As he recalled, "one must have seen Marx with his children to obtain a complete notion of the depths of sentiment and the childlike nature of this hero of *Wissenschaft.*" When Marx was free, "he brought them along, played the wildest and most lively games with them—in short he was a child among children" (Quoted in Sperber, 2013, p. 469). In contrast to Sulak's account, Marx did send

his daughters to school. In the mid–nineteenth century, as the public schools did not exist, Marx's daughters attended the private school for young ladies in London. They thrived intellectually and became among the top students at their school. In addition to taking classes in school, Marx's daughters were prepared to be proper ladies by studying French and Italian, practicing piano, taking painting lessons, and attending theatres (Sperber, 2013, p. 470). In this respect, Gabriel (2011, p. 278) commented, "they had the upbringing any middle–class girls might be expected to have at that period in England." Further, it is undeniable that Marx sometimes used racial slurs toward his son–in–law as well as toward some of his associates whom he disliked. It is also true that Marx was concerned when the romantic relationship between his daughter and Lafargue began. That concern, nevertheless, was not based on the colour of Lafargue's skin. As Sperber (2013, p. 410) remarked, Marx had "no problem with his daughter marrying a man of mixed race—at least, the problem he had was with Lafargue's lack of a steady income, not his origins." The allegation against Marx that he was racist becomes even less credible if we consider Marx's anti–slavery stance in the American Civil War (Gabriel, 2011, p. 298; McLellan, 2006, p. 361; Sperber, 2013, p. 411).

In addition to those members in the Marx's household, Sulak depicts Marx as a selfish person who took advantage of his friends. On top of that, he maintains, Marx was a snob who pretended to fight for proletarian comrades but despised them in reality. According to Sulak, Marx had constantly exploited Engels, his closest and most loyal friend. From the time they started their friendship until the end of Marx's life, Sulak asserts, Engels was the "most important financial source that maintained the Marx family." For all of his income, "Engels gave more than a half of it to Marx...because when Marx asked for money, he usually claimed that without [Engels's] money, he would be ruined." Seeing Marx's exploitative behaviour, Sulak admits that "it is puzzling that Engels always yielded to Marx's request" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 224). Furthermore, although Marx played a crucial role in the founding of the International Workingmen's Association, often called the International, Sulak claims that Marx "tried to find a way to prohibit any socialist from the working–class background to have an influential position in the

association." Marx did that "partly because he was egocentric and he disdained the working class, and partly because he feared that workers usually did not want to fight through a violent means, but they wanted to find a way to negotiate with their employers through a peaceful approach" (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 202). Even worse, "if any worker became a leader in a socialist movement, secured a mass of followers, [and] succeeded in demanding the increase of wage or the improvement of the working condition," Sulak adds, "Marx would be furious and tried to find a way to defeat them" because they did not follow a revolutionary strategy that he preached (Sivaraksa, 2020, p. 204).

Sulak rightly states that Marx and members of his family heavily depended on Engels's financial support, especially at the moments of desperate poverty. It is also true that Engels mostly accepted Marx's request for money without any complaint. However, there is nothing puzzling about their relationship if we do not look at it as a zero–sum game as Sulak does. Instead, we should see it as an intellectual and political partnership that mutually benefited these two revolutionaries. For Marx, Engels was more than a financial sponsor. In fact, as Berlin (2013, p. 95) noted, "Marx, who, like many dedicated intellectuals, was himself haunted by a perpetual feeling of insecurity...required at least one person who understood his outlook, in whom he could confide completely, on whom he could lean heavily and as often as he wished." Fortunately for Marx, he found a loyal comrade and intellectual ally in Engels. For Engels, although he was a more prolific and well–known writer than Marx before they met, the meeting and later a decision to establish a partnership between them significantly changed Engels's life. Sensing Marx's "superior powers and analysis and unrelenting thoroughness," Carver (1981, p. 25) remarked, Engels "settled down to a junior role in the partnership." According to Carver (1983, p. 157), when Engels was young, he seemed to lack a coherent focus and sense of vocation, but, after meeting Marx and collaborating with him, Engels finally found his vocation as a Marxist theoretician. Moreover, as Sperber (2013, p. 479) noted, "in comparison to Marx, Engels was a difficult person, who got along poorly with his fellow leftists." So, it was Marx who "would guarantee Engels a place in the

labour movement, where he might otherwise have been shunned." Most importantly, after Marx passed away, Engels's political and intellectual reputation was enhanced even furthered as he became a guardian and editor of and an influential commentator on Marx's writings. Engels even claimed the intellectual unity, philosophical continuity, and political agreement between Marx and himself, though some scholars doubt that that was the case (Carver, 1981, 1983; Holloway, 2002; Jordan, 1967; Rubel, 1972). In this regard, it looks as if Marx was not the only one who benefitted from his partnership with Engels. The bottom line, however, is that their relationship had never been instrumentalist as Sulak indicates. Instead, Berlin (2013, p. 97) said it best: it was "a unique friendship, free from all trace of possessiveness, patronage or jealousy."

Marx was certainly not a labourer; he was a radical intellectual who came from a bourgeois background. However, Sulak's accusation that Marx was a snob who disdained workers is unfair. "According to the legend tirelessly peddled by his critics," Francis Wheen (1999) observed, "Marx was an incorrigible snob who despised working–class socialists, regarding them as dolts and asses who had acquired ideas above their station." However, questioning "where have these views and remarks been documented?" Wheen provided a clear answer: "You will search the works of Marx...in vain." Though he was very busy writing and preparing his manuscripts for *Capital,* Marx decided to join the International and worked exceptionally hard for this fledgling association because its membership was composed of so many genuine workers. "Without his efforts," Wheen commented, "the International would probably have disintegrated within a year." When he was assigned a task for drawing the general rules of the International, Marx (1864) opened the document with the declaration: "Considering, that the emancipation of the working classes must be conquered by the working classes themselves...that the economical emancipation of the working classes is therefore the great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as a means." In this regard, we can see that Marx devoted his life to the struggle and revolution of the working class. As Jones (2000, p. xi) remarked, Marx was

"a man with an often tragic private life...Yet the nature of that life, haunted by poverty, disease and death was a direct consequence of Marx's unswerving loyalty to the struggle of the working class."

Marx was no stranger to the accusation that he promoted violence, terror, and bloody revolution. After having lived in obscurity for the most part of his life, Marx became widely and notoriously known to the public after the publication of *The Civil War in France* in 1871 (Marx, 1977a). Marx wrote this political pamphlet as an official statement of the International regarding the Paris Commune. Instead of condemning, Marx saluted the struggle of the Communards, a radical socialist and revolutionary government that ruled Paris for two months before it was suppressed by the French Army. Thanks to this pamphlet, Berlin (2013, p. 242) noted, Marx "became overnight the object of public odium" and was popularly known as "The Red Terror Doctor," as public opinion in Europe was horrified by the violent actions of the insurgents. This mythical image of Marx as a violent thinker would even be exaggerated further in the twentieth century as his name was associated with communist dictators. Compared with some radical socialists of his time such as Mikhail Bakunin and Wilhelm Weitling, however, Marx looked more like a political reformer and an organiser of working-class associations than a violent revolutionary or a militant terrorist (Draper, 1987). While Marx did not reject the idea that the force of arms is necessary for a socialist revolution to be achieved in some countries, he also believed that in countries like England, Holland, and the United States, where capitalism has advanced and parliamentary democracy has been well established, socialist movements might achieve their goals by nonviolent means. According to Eagleton (2011, p. 192), Marx "did not dismiss parliament or social reform. He also thought that a socialist party could assume power only with the support of a majority of the working class." Above all, "he was an enthusiastic champion of reformist organs such as working-class political parties, trade unions, cultural associations, and political newspapers. He also spoke out for specific reformist measures such as the extension of the franchise and the shortening of the working day." From this perspective,

Sulak's charge that Marx disdained any worker leader who used a peaceful approach in their political struggle is unfounded.

Conclusion

In the English-speaking world, Marx has risen from the ashes. Reaching its nadir at the end of the Cold War, Marx's reputation has been restored in the new century by a wave of publications that not only distinguish Marx from all ideologies and regimes which claim authority by referring to his name but also give a fresh reading of Marx's ideas and personal life by putting them back into the historical context of his time. In Thailand, unfortunately, Marx remains as mysterious to local readers as before. If Sulak's take on Marx can be indicative of how the revolutionary thinker has been treated in Thailand, his legacy in this kingdom has not yet been repaired. It is as tarnished as it had been during the Cold War era, and it has not yet been freed from all the myths, misunderstandings, and falsehoods that surrounded him. Yet, as this article reveals, thanks to a new wave of literature that re-examines Marx both as a thinker and as a man, all myths about Marx that Sulak reproduces in his work can be demythologised. Sulak's accusation that Marx was a wannabe natural scientist, a prophet in disguise, and an anti-Semitic writer is baseless. Likewise, Sulak's allegation that Marx was a disgraceful son, a disloyal husband, an abusive father, a racist father-in-law, and a selfish friend is unsupported. In a perfect world, Sulak's take on Marx would have easily been criticized as a substandard piece of writing. In Thailand, however, it has been welcomed as another masterwork from the "Siamese Intellectual." Against this background, the restoration of Marx's legacy in the kingdom is undoubtedly an uphill task.

Acknowledgement

This research was supported by the Thailand Research Fund and the Office of the Higher Education Commission [grant number MRG6280056].

References

"5 shocking facts about extreme global inequality and how to even it up." (n.d.). *Oxfam.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.oxfam.org/en/5-shocking-facts-about-extreme-global-inequality-and-how-even-it

Anderson, K. (2016). *Marx at the margins: On nationalism, ethnicity, and non-western societies.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, J. (2018, April 30). Happy birthday, Karl Marx. You were right!. *New York Times.* Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/30/opinion/karl-marx-at-200-influence.html

Balakrishnan, R. (Ed). (2001). *The hidden assembly line: Gender dynamics of subcontracted work in a global economy.* Bloomfield, CT: Kumarian Press.

Bawon, S. (2004). *Marx's philosophy for beginners.* Bangkok: Samit. [in Thai].

Berlin, I. (2013). *Karl Marx.* Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1939).

Blumenberg, W. (2000). *Karl Marx: An illustrated history* (D. Scott, Trans.). New York: Verso. (Original work published 1962).

Blunden, A., & Lucas, R. (2005). *Introduction to "Marx myths & legends.".* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/index.htm

Boyer, G. (1998). The historical background of the communist manifesto. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 12*(4),151-174.

Carver, T. (1981). *Engels.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Carver, T. (1983). *Marx and Engels: The intellectual relationship.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Carver, T. (2005). *Marx's "illegitimate son" or Gresham's law in the world of scholarship.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/terrell-carver/article.htm

Chiangkul, W. (2015). *Why read Karl Marx?.* Bangkok: Saeng Dao. [in Thai].

Colpaert, P. (2019, January 11). We went to Karl Marx's 200th birthday party in New York City. *Vice.* Retrieved from https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/gy7anm/we-went-to-karl-marxs-200th-birthday-party-in-new-york-city

Cowie, J. (2002). A century of sweat: Subcontracting, flexibility, and consumption. *International Labor and Working-Class History, 61,* 128-140.

Darwin, C. (2001). *On the origin of species: A facsimile of the first edition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1859).

Draper, H. (1977). *Marx and the economic-Jew stereotype.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/hal-draper/article.htm

Draper, H. (1987). *The "dictatorship of the proletariat" in Marx and Engels.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/hal-draper/article2.htm

Engels, F. (1878). *Anti-Dühring: Herr Eugen Dühring's revolution in science.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1877/anti-duhring/

Engels, F. (1880). *Socialism: Utopian and scientific* (E. Aveling, Trans.). Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/index.htm

Engels, F. (1883). *Frederick Engels' speech at the grave of Karl Marx.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1883/death/burial.htm

Engels, F. (2009). *The condition of the working class in England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1845).

Eagleton, T. (2011). *Why Marx was right.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Farr, J. (1991). Science: Realism, criticism, history. In T. Carver (Ed.), *The Cambridge companion to Marx* (pp. 106-123). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Gabriel, M. (2011). *Love and capital: Karl and Jenny Marx and the birth of a revolution.* New York: Little, Brown and Company.

"Global inequality." (n.d.). *Inequality.org.* Retrieved April 26, 2020, from https://inequality.org/facts/global-inequality/

Harman, C. (2010). *Zombie capitalism: Global crisis and the relevance of Marx.* Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Harvey, D. (2010). *A companion to Marx's capital.* New York: Verso.

Harvey, D. (2019). *Marx, capital, and the madness of economic reason.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heinrich, M. (2019). *Karl Marx and the birth of modern society: The life of Marx and the development of his work* (A. Locascio Trans.). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Hobsbawm, E. (2011). *How to change the world: Reflections on Marx and Marxism.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Holloway, J. (2002). *The tradition of scientific Marxism.* Retrieved April 28, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/john-holloway/article.htm

Jayanama, S. (2010). *Marx and socialism.* Bangkok: Kled Thai. (Original work published 1974). [in Thai].

Jeffries, S. (2018, May 5). Two centuries on, Karl Marx feels more revolutionary than ever. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/may/05/karl-marx-200th-birthday-communist-manifesto-revolutionary

Jones, G. (2000). *Forward to Karl Marx: An illustrated history.* New York: Verso.

Jones, G. (2017). *Karl Marx: Greatness and illusion.* London: Penguin.

Jordan, Z. A. (1967). *The origins of dialectical materialism.* Retrieved April 28, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/jordan/article.htm

Lenin, V. (1980). *Karl Marx: A brief biographical sketch with an exposition of Marxism.* Bangkok: Klum Saman. (Original work published 1914). [in Thai].

Liedman, S. (2018). *A world to win: The life and works of Karl Marx* (J. Skinner, Trans.). New York: Verso.

Marx, K. (1864). *The International workingmen's association: General rules, October 1864.* Retrieved April 15, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/history/international/iwma/documents/1864/rules.htm

Marx, K. (1977a). The civil war in France. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (pp. 539–558). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1871).

Marx, K. (1977b). The class struggle in France, 1848–1850. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (pp. 286–297). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1850).

Marx, K. (1977c). On the Jewish question. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (pp. 39–62). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1845).

Marx, K. (1992). *Capital, volume I* (B. Fowkes, Trans.). London: Penguin. (Original work published 1867).

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1977a). The communist manifesto. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (pp. 245–272). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1848).

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1997b). The German ideology. In D. McLellan (Ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected writings* (pp. 159–191). Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1932).

McLellan, D. (2006). *Karl Marx: A biography.* London: Palgrave Macmillan. (Original work published 1973).

Palmer, E. (2018, April 19). Karl Marx's hometown is selling commemorative 0 Euro notes for 3 Euros–and they've already sold out. *Newsweek.* Retrieved from https://www.newsweek.com/karl–marxs–hometown–trier–offering–eu0–bills–200th–birthday–cost–eu3–892602

Rius. (n.d.). *Marx for beginners.* Bangkok: Learner Press. (Original work published 1976). [in Thai].

Roberts, M. (2016). *The long depression: Marxism and the global crisis of capitalism.* Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Rubel, M. (1972). *The legend of Marx, or "Engels the founder".* Retrieved April 15, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/maximilien-rubel/article.htm

Sattayanurak, S. (2014). *10 Siamese intellectuals.* Bangkok: Openbooks. [in Thai].

Shepherd, C. (2018, May 4). No regrets: Xi says Marxism still "totally correct" for China. *Reuter.* Retrieved from https://www.reuters.com/article/us-germany-marx-china/no-regrets-xi-says-marxism-still-totally-correct-for-china-idUSKBN1I50ET

Singer, P. (2015). *Marx: A very short introduction* (K. Tejapira, Trans.). Bangkok: Openworlds Publishing House. (Original work published 2001). [in Thai].

Sperber, J. (2013). *Karl Marx: A nineteenth-century life.* New York: Liveright Publishing Corporation.

Stepanova, E. (1975). *Karl Marx* (C. Phumisak, Trans.). Bangkok: Maharat Kanphim. (Original work published 1968). [in Thai].

Sivaraksa, S. (2020). *Unmasking western intellectuals* (5th ed.). Bangkok: Sayam. (Original work published 1992). [in Thai].

Sirimanon, S. (1975). *What did Marx want to prove? How?.* Bangkok: Klum Settham Mahawitthayalai Thammasat. [in Thai].

"Sulak Sivaraksa." (n.d.). *Right Livelihood Foundation.* Retrieved April 28, 2020, from https://www.rightlivelihoodaward.org/laureates/sulak-sivaraksa/

Thomas, P. (1976). Marx and science. *Political Studies, 24*(1), 1–23.

Thomas, P. (2012). *Karl Marx.* London: Reaktion Books.

Tooze, A. (2018, May 4). Why Karl Marx is more relevant than ever. *Financial Times.* Retrieved from https://www.ft.com/content/cf6532dc-4c67-11e8-97e4-13afc22d86d4

Wheen, F. (1999). *Marx and the working class.* Retrieved April 22, 2020, from https://www.marxists.org/subject/marxmyths/francis-wheen/article.htm

Wheen, F. (2001). *Karl Marx: A life.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.