

CONCERNING A MATERIALIST READING OF THE GOSPELS

J. Ellul

(Translated from the original French by José María Blanche
condensed by W. Dayton Roberts)

It is better not to talk in the abstract about a materialist reading of the Gospels. The only way to do it, really, is to take as our point of departure the work of those who think they have done it. I shall try here to evaluate one such work, without going into any general controversies on methodology. I have chosen to use primarily a book by Fernando Belo, inasmuch as the one by Michel Clevenot is only a summary--a simplification that adds practically nothing. (1)

Belo undoubtedly has his valid reasons for calling himself a communist --maybe a marxist, and a revolutionary (in that sense). But in his book his purpose is not essentially a political one, nor even a socio-economic-political one: It purports to be a study of a biblical text, of which he attempts to produce a political analysis. This seems to me to be perfectly legitimate--it has been done frequently. Furthermore, it is a leftist political analysis. And even this seems to me to be altogether normal, since everybody has his own "grid", which is the result of his ideology and the milieu to which he belongs--the pattern of stereotypes which each of us necessarily carries about.

But it is here where we start to feel uncomfortable! Belo does not mean to obey an ideology: everyone has an ideological reading of the Gospel except him! He, and he alone, has a scientific reading--the first and only one. And this I find to be totally unacceptable. Everywhere we find this "triumphalist" overtone: everybody in the last 2000 years has hidden the true meaning of the text, has falsified Jesus. But a materialist reading--the only scientific approach--gives us back the true meaning!

At my age, I feel somehow sad when I am faced with such statements. In the forty years I have been reading biblical interpretations, I have come across at least twenty such affirmations: "At last, and for the first time, the Gospel has been given back its latent truth." But before going into a detailed criticism of his project and of his method, I would like to underline the points in which I agree with him, or in which I think Belo makes a positive contribution.

First of all--and this is a great virtue--he looks at the text with a new eye and insists that the reading be done with the closest attention. This is the most conspicuous merit of the structural approach. Again, in

making the classical distinction between the Story and the Narrative, he rightly shows that the emphasis has generally been given to the Narrative, and it is important that we again focus on the Story, which is the story of a "praxis." Belo is right in pointing out that the Gospel for many readers has been reduced to a teaching, whereas it is evident that Jesus did indeed take actions, and that these actions must be again put into right perspective--the words of Jesus generally being encompassed by the actions--what Belo calls "praxis."

Belo's interpretation of the Old Testament "Code of Defilement" and "Code of Debts" as related to the ministry of Jesus is interesting, and even may be partially right. But because of over simplification, it faces serious exegetical problems. It may be remarked in general that Belo, who is so thorough in his analysis of Mark's Gospel, is incredibly frivolous when he examines other texts, to the point quite often of ignoring them altogether.

His idea concerning the Church is also very interesting and worthy of further exploration. He sees the Church not as the community gathering in assembly; rather "it means the specific praxis of this community as it expresses itself at three levels: economic, political and ideological, as charity, hope and faith." With some clarifications, I would almost agree with this.

In another sphere, we clearly agree in drawing attention to the political conflict underlying the whole Bible. But this has already been done quite often. His effort to read the Bible at three levels--economic, political and ideological--is also intriguing. But Belo exaggerates a bit when he presents this as something original. It is quite commonplace. (2) True, it has not been done in a systematic way and as a complete commentary, but many studies have used this kind of reading for some portions. He underlines also the strict and radical polarity between the concepts of God and money, God and the State, God and Caesar, God of the living and God of the Dead--these ideas are significant, but the least that can be said of them is that they are not extremely original!

At this point we need to comment that Belo frequently repeats well known ideas which he thinks are new. Ninety-five percent of what he writes has been said here and there for many years. Some examples: his theory of religion (page 37); that the year of the Jubilee was probably not applied; the polarity of Heaven and Earth as a tool to interpret the two symbolic orders; the conflict between the political and economic system of Israel and the prophets, etc. I could add examples ad infinitum. Not that I blame him for repeating what others have said--we all do that. What I object to is dressing these banalities with new words of a pseudo-scientific jargon and trying to give them the appearance of novelty, implying that

"nobody has ever said this..."

Regarding his methodology, Belo is, first of all, incredibly sensitive to what is fashionable. He uses a large number of acronyms that make him look scientific. STRZ stands for "zealots' strategy," and AA for "adversaries." This accounts for marvelous sentences like: "...in the FS, characterized by the MPE, the STRZ cannot answer to STRAA..." This is simply ridiculous--irrelevant! He is under the influence of R. Barthes. He enjoys playing with words.

Sometimes he sounds utterly ridiculous, as when he talks earnestly about the practice or praxis of the hands (which means charity), the practice of the feet (which is equivalent to hope), and the practice of the eyes (which stands for faith). He insists on referring to Jesus' body, rather than his person, just to de-spiritualize him. And he does not seem to remember the difference--universally understood since the 7th century B.C.--between seeing and believing. The eyes cannot be the organ of faith. This would be an absolute contradiction. To overlook this fact indicates a basic ignorance of the specificity of Israel's religion.

I could go on and note other ridiculous instances. When he refers to Jesus' statement concerning the poor widow's mite, for example, he writes in all seriousness that this portrays the contemporary level of economics in Judaea. He says that Jesus "gives a lesson on the subversiveness of the economic praxis within the framework of the Church!" And still concerning his use of words, two things trouble me. On the one hand, he arbitrarily ascribes to words the meanings that suit him and his purpose. And on the other hand, he tries to give the text a particular connotation by using modern words, with a strong emotional charge.

The first of these faults is illustrated in the opening part of the book where he includes a whole series of definitions of marxist concepts (productive forces, praxis, production relationships, mode of production, mode of circulation, etc.) to which he ascribes meanings which would make a marxist jump. I see this as being neither serious nor honest. And as an example of the use of his emotionally charged words, he translates the Greek word "pais" as "youth" rather than as "children," because the latter would not suit his purpose of showing them to be a force. In the same way, to Belo the Greek verb describing Jesus' death means "murder," implying the idea of "killing." It is important to him that Jesus did not die of his own volition, but was the victim of murder. "Death" might be considered a capitalist, ideological concept which would spiritualize the event and disguise the conflict of the classes. In the same way, he chooses to refer to "guerrillas" rather than "robbers," etc. The vocabulary thus aims at having the reader swallow a series of images, which is clearly a manipulative form of propaganda. (That capitalist writers often do the same thing

is no excuse for unscientific communication.)

Belo's whole demonstration rests on a number of ideological assumptions which he firmly believes but never proves. For him, faith is an ideology. Everything related to "heaven" or the the "Spirit" is mythology. Only materialism is scientific, and the only historical science is historical materialism. The key to all reality is labor, because production explains everything. And so on. We are faced with an implicit credo, based on absolute adherence by faith to a certain interpretation, and one which I would not even dare to describe as marxist. Belo holds as scientific truths what I am forced to call myths, because they are neither founded on reason nor are they critically examined.

The clearest example of this is seen in the concept of 'classes and class struggle. For Belo, classes have existed from all eternity, in all societies, under all circumstances. This fact is "self evident"--no proof is required. Whenever there are two different groups, and one prevails over the other, these are classes!

Belo's "referentials" (if one may use the pretentious language now in vogue!) are an incredible array of opposing inspirations. The four main sources of his inspiration are Althusser, Structuralism, Bataille and Nietzsche. It is, of course, acceptable for an essayist to refer to various sources--to borrow one idea from one author, and others from another. But this is not the case here. Belo espouses Marx's concepts, which he sees as an integral unit, rigorous and meticulous method. It does not seem to have crossed his mind that there may be incompatibilities in Marx, or that an essential contradiction may exist between Structuralism and Marx's method and thought. H. Lefebvre has clearly proved this insoluble contradiction. (3) He also uses some concepts from Nietzsche. I do not claim that Nietzsche developed a system, but I fail to see how one can accommodate Nietzsche into Marx! (4)

Another flaw in Belo's method is his laxity of analysis. He writes with a high level of confusion. For example, the Jewish Kingdom is presumed to be the same as other kingdoms in the Near East. Slavery, wherever it exists, is the same slavery. Every law is seen within the systems of Defilement and Debt, etc. In other words, he takes as identical what is not always the same, erasing the differences and making hasty assimilations. We find the same laxity and confusion when he talks about "communism" and the communist revolution. Jesus' messianic action is a "radically communist strategy." The least he could do would be to make clear that this communism has nothing to do with that of Marx, since it does not proceed in any way from an evolution of the forces of production. Thus he draws conclusions which may be acceptable emotionally, but which are altogether impossible from a marxist perspective. (5)

Most interesting is Belo's attitude regarding capitalistic exegesis. In general, such exegesis is declared to be ideological, thus false. Twenty times we are told that the capitalist historians and exegetes have no understanding of the Gospel nor of Jesus' practice. But sometimes, without any explanation, Belo uses conclusions drawn from those exegetes to his own purpose. Thus he decides that the genuine text of Mark's Gospel ends with verse 8 of chapter 16. Why? Because "everybody"--meaning the unacceptable capitalist exegetes--"agrees that Mark 16:9-20... does not belong in the text...!"

We have reached, step by step, the center of the debate. Belo tells us that he presents a materialist reading of the Gospel. I must confess that after looking for that materialist element in his book, I was not able to find it.

What could we understand as materialism? Obviously, many things. First the choice--the decision--that there is no Spirit, no Transcendence, no Somewhere Else, and above all, no God intervening in history. This is a philosophic, monistic decision. It also has methodological implications. The historian must always question what purports to be God's intervention. However, this is not really materialism; any middle-class, spiritualist historian would use the same method.

Secondly, we must understand that any historical process has an economic basis. However, for the last century this has been said by many who are not materialists. The economic "key" is a universal explanation (and a trite one, at that!)

A third aspect of materialism is the concept that any society is characterized primarily by its class relationships and class struggles. But this has nothing to do with materialism, regardless of what some people suggest. Marx was not the first to say this. Turgot had a similar explanation for the transformation of societies (using the same terms), and Thiers (in his Histoire du Consulat et de L'Empire) developed a complete theory out of it in 1840.

The fourth aspect, much more recent, is illustrated by those authors who try to be "materialist" when dealing with any text by searching for the condition of its "production" (i.e. which class? which relationships of force? and so on). But even this is a very old approach under a new guise. Taine offers the best explanation of the method. Many capitalist, middle-class historians who are far removed from the political left have used the same system. Belo simply confuses classical historical analysis with the method of historical materialism. (6)

To be truly materialist, the interpretation would have to be closed

and absolute--with the factor "God" excluded not only from the interpretation, but also from the event. The economic factor would not only have to explain everything that happens, it would have to exclude any independent spirituality. In other words, this exclusiveness is what materialism is all about.

In Belo's work, however, no radical option is ever found. Sometimes one has the impression that everything is being reduced to strategies, and sometimes, in a very ambiguous way, the Spirit's intervention is kept, without saying so in so many words. In the case of the resurrection, for example, the text is so fluid that it is impossible to determine exactly whether Belo takes the resurrection as the disciples continuing the life of Jesus, or as a political insurrection, or as a specific resurrection of Jesus' body.

In brief, it seems to me that Belo submits as "materialist" what in fact is simply a known historical method, and he leaves us uncertain as to his own adherence to a rigorous and consistent materialism. The main value of his work is that he refuses the easy way of a so-called spiritual reading, which would solve all the problems by appealing to the Holy Spirit's inspiration. But there are many of us, non-materialists, who agree on this!

Now we come to the painful part of this critical review. As a historian, albeit not a very specialized one, I cannot but be amazed at the many gaps, factual errors, simplicities and distortions found on almost every page. This is because instead of using secondary sources, he is using at least quaternary ones! (7) Belo knows Marx's thought only through Althusser's interpretation. And the historical and economic situation of Judæa he knows only from theoretical generalizations. These gaps are the more startling because in certain areas Belo proves to be a good scholar: he is thoroughly acquainted with Derrida, Althusser, Von Rad, de Vaux and others. This would seem to indicate that he knows well the recent books on the subject, but is not familiar with all that preceded them. Thus we are faced with a thin film of modern scholarship floating on an ocean of ignorance!

For example, Belo ascribes to Althusser the distinction between dialectical materialism and historical materialism--a distinction first pointed out by Stalin. Marx himself never made such a distinction. For him, history is dialectical, and materialism is at the same time dialectical and historical. (8)

Belo's definitions of the terms used in marxism are very often whimsical. He takes "praxis" to be "any process of transformation of raw material as found in a given product--transformation that is done by human

labor and by using given means." In Marx's writings, however, praxis is always correlated with theory. Marx kept on using the word precisely because it was distinct from practice. Belo does not make this distinction. His confusion of the two terms allows him to lift the concept out of the economic field and refer to "messianic practice" and "subversive practice," transposing the "transformation process" into an indefensible conceptual amalgam--a combination of words without specific meaning.

This leads to the most serious criticism in this field. Belo uses Dhoquois's "classification" of the various modes of production: Asian, sub-Asian, para-Asian, Asian feudalism, and so on, and places the Jewish economy in the sub-Asian category. To this I must react with all severity. It is well known that for Engels and Marx there was a fairly rigorous succession of historical development from the primitive community to the slave mode of production, then to the feudal pattern and finally to the capitalist model. Two short texts have been picked out--mainly by Gordelier--where Engels and Marx stressed the possibility of another model: the mode of production called "Asian." Possibly this underwent a different evolution, and may have skipped one or more stages to reach capitalism.

On the basis of this scheme, some authors have given labels to societies which do not show the exact characteristics which Marx described. This is why they talk about "sub-Asian" economies, for example, where the State intervenes only on the level of relationships (but not of production) by taking part of the excess production and by controlling the exchanges. All this, however, has no meaning from a marxist perspective: the mode of production is determined by the forces of production, and not by the relationships of production. In point of fact, we are dealing in Belo's treatment with societies where production is only of the rural (i.e. village, community or family) type, with the political power imposing various kinds of laws and statutes. In this system, the state takes some of the economic wealth in exchange for certain services rendered--collective protection, for example--because it would be absurd to believe that the political power exists only to impose oppression and violence! But this does not constitute a mode of production of the "Asian" kind, since the political power has no integration at all with the production circuit. Inasmuch as Marx himself was extremely precise about these matters, one wonders at the frivolity and inconsistency of such labels as "sub-Asian", or "Asian feudalism."

A further lack of precision is seen in the manner with which Belo constantly refers to "classes" and "State" when he deals with Israel. Is it in fact permissible to speak of a "State" every time a political power is present? How can the charismatic power of a Romulus, for example, be classified with the huge bureaucratic organization of a modern nation? Or how is the Merovingians' patrimonial system to be compared with the legal system of Athenian aristocracy? Belo constantly uses the word "State" very

loosely to refer to the modern features of the Jewish organization. He does this, however, at the cost of flattening out historical dimensions and suppressing the specific character of political forms into arbitrary generalizations.

Strangely enough, although he seems to have definitions for almost everything else, Belo never attempts to define the concept of social class. It would seem from his writings that the dyad rich/poor, or even oppressor/oppressed, correspond to class divisions. He seems to be unaware, however, of the many texts where Marx blasts precisely this type of confusion. Social classes for Marx are not just the rich and the poor, but the class that holds the political power and the one which does not. But Belo's confusion is evident in his constant switching from class to caste, with no apparent awareness that these are opposing realities.

A class cannot develop in just any economic and social context. A very precise set of factors is required. But Belo does not seem to care about this. For him, a class is a kind of metaphysical entity which needs no definition and whose existence is taken for granted. Thus in Israel there are classes: priests; military chiefs, etc. Their role in economic production? Nil. But this does not matter! How is this class formed? "The king enlists some young men as soldiers; he expropriates some land; he endows their relatives..." And this is how a ruling class is manufactured! David introduces in this way a class system! It is priceless! To talk about "class struggle" is out of the question, because this social group does not own the productive forces. They possess only a small fraction of Israel's land, and they have no part in the organization of its production. All this is pseudo-marxist and pseudo-materialist discourse.

The remaining vast area of gaps in Belo's work is his history. It seems evident that he does not know what has been written on the economy of the New Testament period, for example, by Heichelheim, Tenney Frank, Rostovtzeff, Valarche, to mention only the classics. Each of them has presented an exact view of the Middle Eastern and Roman economies. To talk about forces of production, relationships of production, economic structure, etc., one must know the facts.

Like many other authors, when he talks about the "publicans", Belo places them among the poor. According to his reading, Jesus gathered around him only the poor and those opposed to the Romans. This, however, shows astonishing ignorance. The publicans, strictly speaking, were very rich--perhaps even the financial power within the Empire. Everything was based on the lease system. Rome had no civil servants, and taxes were paid on a fixed basis. In other words, someone would pay in advance to the Roman treasury the estimated amount of taxes due for the year, and then he would collect the taxes for himself. His profit consisted of the difference.

between what he had paid at the beginning of the year and what had been collected at the end. Since the second century B.C. the publicans handled huge amounts of taxes and established vast financial societies to manage their assets until the next payment to Rome.

Belo might well have compared the publicans to those who collaborated with the Germans in the early 1940's and who became rich as a consequence of their transactions with the conquerors and their exploitations of the poor. But then, the clear pattern of class struggle would have been missing! Belo could not see the disparate nature of Jesus' circle, where there were poor and rich, nationalist zealots and foreign collaborators. His own ideological bias blinded him to this fact.

Similarly, it should be remarked that the prostitutes mentioned in the Gospels were more the equivalent of modern "call girls", rather than destitute streetwalkers, enslaved by their gigolos. They consorted with the wealthy. Concerning the peasants, Belo describes them as feudal pawns--far from the case. And he goes along with the popular notion that the Roman Empire was based on a large and powerful army. Quite the contrary. It is not on the army that the Empire was built, but rather on the administrative skill of the Romans and on the voluntary adhesion of the great majority of the Empire's peoples.

Alone among the satisfied local populations, Judaea was rebellious, and thus constituted for Rome a constant and perplexing problem. Elsewhere, when opposition arose, the tactic was to push the rebel populations out of the Empire. This was effective with the Picts, the Bataves and the Daces. But only Judaea remained indomitable. In order to prosecute the war of AD 67-70, Rome was forced to assemble half of its entire army, thus leaving unprotected the great majority of its provinces and borders! The whole army consisted of more or less 25 legions. The military presence thus was something less than overwhelming.

The minor mistakes are countless. For example, on page 303 it is said that Jesus was dressed as a soldier when the purple mantle was placed on him, whereas this is in reality the symbol of the commander-in-chief or emperor. In general, Belo is not really interested in history, and he flattens it out with platitudes and generalizations. These, in turn, lead to over-simplified statements.

He presents as innovations such ideas as this: that the identification of the miracle of the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes as a sign of the Kingdom or a symbol of the Eucharist is a capitalist exegesis: that the theological changes which took place between the years 50 and 100 AD are due to the delay of Christ's Second Coming. Belo ascribes this latter idea to Conzelmann, but it can be found in all the standard biblical introductions.

Again he shows as something new that the conflict built around Jesus was political in nature. Jesus confronted the rich, the Romans, the powerful, the Temple. All this, according to Belo, the capitalist exegetes have never understood--they have never asked what were the political forces behind Jesus' death! It is unbelievable! Likewise, the temptation for Jesus to defend himself by force was apparently discovered by Belo. He states that "the capitalist exegesis does not come to read that Jesus could be tempted at that level..."

Sometimes Belo seems totally unaware of what he is proposing. He is right in reacting against the spiritualization of the Gospels--but none of us are there any more! He says the miracle of the Multiplication of the Loaves and Fishes must be understood in the physical sense. Agreed. But he goes further. Jesus is recognized as the Messiah because he has physically fed the multitudes. Giving to the poor is the essence of his ministry. Physical hunger and satisfaction are not only essential parts of this event--they are the only meaning thereof. The orientation is towards "a political strategy, towards the world table of feeding."

Now I am really sorry to say that this perspective has already been described in detail by someone else. It is Dostoevski's Grand Inquisitor. When he writes in the way he does, Belo seems not to understand the historical consequences, nor that this corresponds to the second temptation!

Finally, Belo offers an ideological discourse on the Gospel. With remarkable intransigence, he considers as capitalist ideology all that does not fit into his interpretations. So, with only a word, and without any further "scientific" discussion, he discards all the writings that do not fit into his ideology. In brief, he goes back to what has always been done from the beginning of Christianity: that is, he uses Jesus and the biblical texts to justify his own ideas, choices, and interests, with the end result of falsifying the Gospel. I have no quarrel with Belo's choice of political postures, of the revolution to serve the poor. What I question is whether these choices can find their roots in the Gospel, and whether the Gospel may be used to justify his choices. Whether he likes it or not, the Gospel has another dimension, without which the basic confrontation (including the political one), in which I profoundly believe, cannot take place.

The materialist reading can sometimes be applied to certain documents, but never to those attempting to describe such an extraordinary phenomenon as that of Jesus. It is a phenomenon whose irrationality must be recognized. How can we explain the fact that this unsuccessful and insignificant Jewish rebel would become the motor of a civilization for thousands of years? How does it happen that among the thousands of equivalents to Jesus--Jewish rebels, insurgent slaves, idealogues with a spiritual message,

etc.--only one should have broken through this way? This, in the last analysis, is what the materialist and historical method should be able to explain.

Thus we come to one of the most critical points. This reading, which identifies certain aspects, leaves untouched one unchallengeable dimension of the text itself. As Ricoeur has said, the text contains "a surplus of meaning," and what a surplus! The materialist method, however, by its nature can be only total--it claims to explain everything--otherwise it is not materialist. Since the exhaustive and coherent knowledge of the Gospel age (comparable to Marx and Engel's knowledge of the English working class and of the economy of the 19th century) is not now available, any attempt to make a materialist reading of the first century becomes a contrived imposition--and the reading at this point becomes ideological. At best, it can be called a reading with a materialist intention and orientation, but nothing more.

Certainly, a "materialist" reading (within these limitations) looks to me to be possible as one among many readings. It is the expression of the author's commitment--it is one point of view, no more scientific than any other reading (obvious, symbolic, allegoric, christocentric, critical, structuralist, or what have you) and not a bit freer from ideology. But this pseudo-materialist reading becomes exclusively ideological (even idéalist) and anti-scientific when it claims to be the only possible reading--exclusive, exhaustive and complete.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) Fernando Belo, Lecture Matérialiste de l'Évangile de Marc, 1975. Michel Clevenot, Approches Matérialistes de la Bible, 1976. Belo's book has the following sections. A first part is an attempt of a formal theory on the concept of mode of production; he offers his own interpretation of the mode of production, of its forms and applications. A second part deals with Israel from two perspectives: a study of the symbolic order of the Old Israel (the main concepts and their relation with the social order) and then a descriptive picture of the first-century Palestine, the cultural milieu of Jesus and of Mark's Gospel. A third part is the (materialistic) reading and explanation of that Gospel subdivided in sequences. A last part attempts to develop a materialistic ecclesiology, including a practice, a critical analysis of theology, and exposé on powerlessness and on the ideology of the classes in power.
- (2) Without trying to be original, I could refer him to the Introduction of my Histoire des Institutions (1954) where I analyze in detail the correlations between what is economic, political and ideological.

- (3) H. Lefebvre: Le Nouvel Eleatisme, 1971. J. M. Benoist's effort of conciliation has not solved the problem Lefebvre poses!
- (4) No doubt that Belo has seen the outrageousness of introducing Nietzsche in Marx (363 f.) but he solves nothing in the five foot-notes, mainly the assimilation of the marxist concept of Work Force to the will to have power by switching illegitimately from Work Force to forces and then to relation between forces. It is incredible! The same can be said of his attempt to see Nietzsche's subjectivity as a play of tactics that take into account the specificity of the agents.
- (5) For example, Belo says that one of the areas of a communist strategy today will consist in transferring the utopia of the proletariat from the economic level, from fetiche of money, to the "body" of products. This is, however, totally unacceptable in any interpretation of Marx. There can be no transfer of a utopia (that does not exist!) and above all the transfer he talks about can only occur through the maturation of a preceding economic system.
- (6) His method regarding Mark's text is much closer to structuralism and linguistics, with Barthes' and Derrida's orientation, but in this field I dare no criticisms as I do not have special competence.
- (7) A clarification is needed. In history, a book is a primary source when it derives from the personal reading of witnesses, papyri, ostraka, etc. This kind of books are very specialized. In a secondary source the work is more general and uses the primary sources in order to elaborate updated synthesis of knowledge on a specific subject. A tertiary source is a book that uses the secondary ones to prepare a more general and wider view (for example, a Treatise of Economic History, or of a whole era, etc...). A quaternary source is the vast picture (like in Toynbee or Jacques Pirenne) or the ideological, theoretical interpretations that attempt to offer the sense, the explanation of an historical whole (for ex., Engels working on such a tertiary source like Gibbon's history).
- (8) It is basically inexact in Marx's thought to consider herby that dialectical materialism is the scientific method of philosophy and historical materialism that of history, and that the separation of the two implies on the one hand a mistaken idea of the three factors.