

1. 2. The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a *practical* question. Man must prove the truth, i.e., the reality and power, the this-worldliness [*Diesseitigkeit*] of his thinking in practice. The dispute over the reality or non-reality of thinking which is isolated from practice is a purely *scholastic* question.
- 5.
10. 3. The materialist doctrine concerning the changing of circumstances and upbringing forgets that circumstances are changed by men and that the educator must himself be educated. This doctrine must, therefore, divide society into two parts, one of which is superior to society.
- 15.
20. The coincidence [*Zusammenfallen*] of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-change can be conceived and rationally understood only as *revolutionary practice*.

(Note 2, line 3) Do you agree that the truth or otherwise of human thinking is a *purely* practical question - ie has no theoretical implications?

(Note 2, line 4) What do you think the word 'must' implies here?

(Note 2, line 5) What do you think Marx means by 'this-worldliness'? What would be another way of putting this?

Note 2, line 8) What does 'scholastic' imply?

(Note 3, lines 10-11) What do you think this 'materialist doctrine' claims?

(Note 3, lines 12-13) Is it true that all changes to circumstances result from human actions?

(Note 3, line 13) What do you think Marx had in mind here by 'the educator'?

Note 3 lines 14-15) Why must this 'materialist doctrine' 'divide society into two parts'?

Note 3, line 17) What do you think Marx meant by 'coincidence' here?

(Note 3, lines 18-19) Why do you think Marx used the phrase 'human activity or self-change (ie as if they were inseparable)'?