

Communist manifesto essay



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Benjamin Franklin once said, “ It is easier to be critical than to be correct. ” Marx, in his Proletarian and Communist part of the Communist Manifesto takes in criticism towards the Bourgeois with sarcasm to convey that what the Bourgeois is claiming is to be right is wrong according to Marx. What Marx says in his Communist Manifesto might not be entirely true, but he uses certain techniques to convince the people that what he is asserting is right. That is the power of ethos.

Proletarian and Communist of the Manifesto Communist is claiming that the Bourgeois principle of a free trade and private ownership of property is destroying the society that we are currently living in. What is very interesting about the Communist Manifesto is that it is actually not criticizing the Bourgeois to persuade the Bourgeois to be part of their radically movement of Communism, but, his purpose was to win over the potential members of the Communists.

By using certain literary devices such as questioning the Bourgeois society, using logics and taking the censure made by the Communists with sarcasm, Marx is trying to evoke a sense of unity of the working class members also known as Proletarians to make them believe that they are part of a huge revolutionary movement. Marx uses logos to carry out his ethos. He uses information that has obviously been aware to many. When Marx disagrees with the private ownership of property, such technique is fairly visible. He believes that “ Property, in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage labour. For the Bourgeois society, “ the right of personally acquiring property as the fruit of a man’s own labour, which property is

alleged to be the groundwork of all personal freedom, activity and independence. ”

However, Marx claims that in this Bourgeois society, the workers do not work the sake of themselves but for the sake of the bourgeois and that “ All that we want to do away with is the miserable character of this appropriation, under which the labourer lives merely to increase capital, and is allowed to live only in so far as the interest of the ruling class requires it. According to Marx, it is logic that a labour should work for the purpose of working. Thus, he believes that labours working for the Bourgeois lost their sole purpose of existence-work. He claims that in the Bourgeois society, the Proletarians are used to increase capital and the Bourgeois property only, and become useless after they have done their job.

In the Communist society, “ accumulated labour is but a means to widen, to enrich, to promote the existence of the labourer. Through the use of reasoning concepts that were obvious to the readers even before it was ever reasoned in this document, Marx persuades the audience that the function of the Bourgeoisie society is misleading. As well as logos, Marx cleverly frequently asks questions to make the audience to intellect on whether or not the present Bourgeois society is destroying or benefiting them. When Marx questions the existence of the labours in the Bourgeois society he asks “ But does wage-labour create any property for the labourer? This makes the audience to deeply reason and think about a question that has not been brought in to thought frequently.

Not only does this literary device make the audience to reason, but even before the audience can get out an answer, Marx gives his answer as he criticizes the Bourgeois. He answers back, “ Not a bit. It creates capital, i. e. , that kind of property which exploits wage-labour, and which cannot increase except upon condition of begetting a new supply of wage-labour for fresh exploitation. The same pattern is seen when Marx is criticizing the Bourgeois form of family and education. He first asks the audience, “ On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? ” He immediately answers, “ On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form, this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. ” Such technique can easily persuade the audience that what Marx is saying is probably right, and they would effortlessly admit to what Marx has said about the Bourgeois.

Marx’s sarcastic response to the criticism made by the Bourgeois also shows that Marx is not intimidated by such condemnation and claim that he has the strength to resist such denigration made by the Bourgeois. “ The bourgeois clap-trap about the family and education, about the hallowed co-relation of parents and child, becomes all the more disgusting, the more, by the action of Modern Industry, all the family ties among the proletarians are torn asunder, and their children transformed into simple articles of commerce and instruments of labour.

But you Communists would introduce community of women, screams the bourgeoisie in chorus. The bourgeois sees his wife a mere instrument of production. He hears that the instruments of production are to be exploited in common, and, naturally, can come to no other conclusion that the lot of

being common to all will likewise fall to the women. ” This particular quote presents a clear sarcasm made to the Bourgeois by Marx. He claims that the Bourgeois flaunts about their superior idea of a higher education for children and a “ co-relation of parent and child. However, what they are only doing is destroying such “ co-relation. ” The exploitation of children by parents and the statement that children and spouses are “ a mere instrument of production” who works for the sake of the property of the Bourgeois, as stated by Marx are the core elements to destroy a family structure. Thus Marx believed that education should not be included within the society, and children and wife should not work for the goodness of the Bourgeois of its members.

The remarks made by Marx could somewhat be harsh towards the Bourgeois, however, the techniques he are using to evoke a sense of union for the potential individuals who can become Communists, especially Proletarians, he tries to convince them that he has the authority and capability to assert that Communism is a better kind of society. His harsh tone kind of gave advantage when stating his opinions on Communism and Bourgeois. His repetition of questioning the state of the Bourgeois encourages the audience to be easily sided with the Communists especially the working class members.

His sarcasm toward the criticism made by Bourgeois seems to be rhetorically effective for swaying the Proletarians that they are leaders of a radical revolutionary movement, and not just a useless part of the Bourgeois society they are currently living in. After all, “ In bourgeois society, therefore, the past dominates the present; in Communist society, the present dominates

the past. In bourgeois society capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality. ”