CAUSA Worldview
Section 1

Development of Communist Theory

(Draft Edition)

CAUSA Institute
401 Fifth Avenue
New York, NY 10016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNIST THEORY

> We are living in the era of premeditation and the perfect crime. Our criminals are no longer children that can claim passion as their excuse. On the contrary, they are adults, and they have a perfect alibi: philosophy, which can be used for any purpose--even for transforming murderers into judges.
>
> -- Albert Camus

PREFACE

When at the conclusion of World War II the Allied forces confirmed the rumors about Dachau and Auschwitz, the world was appalled. Six million men, women and children had been herded like animals to their deaths. Their only crime was that they were not members of Hitler's elite "chosen race."

Adolf Hitler had advocated the building of a new society. He had called on the Aryan race to build the Third Reich. The Reich's leadership was to have been the guiding light for all civilization. The promise of a new society became the justification to murder millions and plunge the world into war.

Today the world is outraged by Hitler's barbarism, yet apparently we have not learned our lesson.

The error of the Free World forty years ago was apathy and indifference. When Hitler said, "Germany wants nothing but peace...and therefore knows no imperialistic policy of conquest toward the outside...," we believed him. When the rumors about the extermination of the Jewish people were officially denied, we believed him again.

Today again we risk making that same error.

A new, self-proclaimed elite has emerged. It speaks of establishing a civilization devoid of war, racism, and hunger. It promises utopia, worker's paradise, the long awaited ideal society on earth. This is international Communism. Its proponents cite the writings of Karl Marx as the basis of their beliefs.

One hundred and thirty-five years have passed since Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. Sixty-six years have gone by since the first communist government was established in Russia.

Communists believed that their philosophy would surely eradicate all the contradictions and evils of society. They proposed to bring about an ideal state where each would contribute according to his ability and receive according to his needs.

By persistence and grim struggle, Communism has rooted itself in Eastern Europe, China, North Korea, Afghanistan, Vietnam, Cuba, Angola, and many other far-flung regions of the world.

Communist revolutionary fires are burning in all six continents, and in a short 66 years international Communism has brought over 1.5 billion people under its absolute control.

Are these people living in utopia? The ideal society? Absolutely not.

Promises broken

Communism promised a workers paradise, but no workers on earth are more unfortunate than those under communist rule. Today Eastern Europe is 80 billion dollars in debt to the West. In terms of the buying power of wages, working conditions, opportunities for creative expression and advancement, and virtually all of the tangible and intangible factors which provide for human happiness, this "paradise" could more aptly be called a living hell.

Communism promised the total liberation of man, but no society on earth is more devoid of freedom than those ruled by communism. They are not only deprived of those freedoms which they may have lacked under previous governmental systems, they are now subjected to severe regimentation, and even deprived of the freedom of thought itself.

Communism promised the attainment of the true and ultimate human dignity, but the record of the past 66 years of communism is a history of brutal and demeaning acts of man against man. Nowhere are human beings more degraded than under communist rule. In fact, there is no foundation in the communist philosophy for an understanding of human rights and dignity. Communist slogans boast of a concern for these but once power has been seized, the slogans are abandoned and the state rules absolutely. When people come to realize that they have walked into a trap, it is already too late.

Communism promised a society of material satisfaction for all. Impoverished people have been particularly drawn by guarantees of food, land, ownership of the means of production (industries), and control of resources. Many

thought that even a high degree of sacrifice would be justified for the sake of the following generations. Contrary to the promises, however, communism has starved millions to death and deprived unknown multitudes of every shred of personal possession, often driving them far away from their homelands.

Indicative, perhaps symbolic, of the poverty of the Soviet state is the fact that every Soviet housewife spends an average of 20% of her leisure time queuing up for basic commodities, primarily food and clothing.[1]

Since 1960, the life expectancy of the Soviet male has decreased from 67 to 62, while during the same period in Japan it increased from 70 to 77. In the past 10 years, the infant mortality rate of the USSR has nearly doubled (from 23 per 1000 births to 40 per 1000 births,[2] nearly four times the U.S. rate).

Communism promised a classless society where the equality of men would be perfected, and the exploitation of one class by another would cease. Sadly, it is in the communist societies where an entirely new type of super-elite has entrenched itself in a position of absolute supremacy over all facets of life. Those who flee Soviet Russia describe it as the world's largest prison camp. For the overwhelming majority of the camp's detainees, escape is impossible. Hundreds of millions are serving an indefinite term with no hope of a pardon.

The human cost of Communism--150,000,000 deaths

Visitors to Berlin's wall are often struck by the irony of a society which professes to be moving towards utopia and yet constructs massive fortifications to imprison its "citizens." If the promise of communism were true, the free world would now be emptying as people competed to enter Communist lands.

The Communist utopia that Karl Marx preached has never been realized. The worker's paradise was not lost, it never existed! Human history has never seen greater misery and exploitation of man by man than that found under communism. It is the masterful perfection of totalitarian imperial rule.

---

[1] Cullen Murphy, "Watching the Russians," The Atlantic, February, 1983, p.50.

[2] Lawrence Minard and James Michaels, "Why workers won't work in the Soviet Union," Forbes, December 6, 1982, p.142.

According to the French magazine, "Le Figaro," Communism in its 66 years has taken a human toll of 150 million lives. (Nazism murdered 6 million.) In Southeast Asia alone, almost 4 million Cambodians and Vietnamese people were destroyed.

In spite of these horrors, many people in Western society refuse to face the truth. Some contend that the world has not seen true communism, and the teachings of Marx have thus far been misapplied. Others insist that these death tolls must be an exaggeration. Indeed, the same was said in Hitler's days.

In the West, there is a great indifference toward the ideology of communism. Just as few bothered to read "Mein Kampf," today few take the time to read Marx or Engels. It is often remarked that "communism is not so bad, it may even be good for some people." Tragically, the same was said for Nazism 45 years ago.

Communism--a false ideology

What exactly is the fearsome current which we have called communism? Communism is more than a political system, more than a social system, and more than an economic system. It is also far more than the application and expansion of Soviet power.

Communism makes use of a system of arguments designed to deceive. It was these arguments which Vladimir Lenin used to convince fatigued Russian soldiers and peasants that they would have a brighter future with the Bolsheviks. It was these same arguments which allowed Fidel Castro to convince disatisfied elements of Cuban (and North American) society to cast their lot with him. It was the same series of arguments which allowed the battered forces of North Vietnam to prevail over the United States on the battlefield, at the negotiating tables, and in the United States Congress. The same arguments are being taught and advocated throughout the world today.

The purpose of the arguments is to pursuade people to walk into the trap of communism. They are encouraged to trade their present problems for the solutions which communism offers. These arguments derive from a core of doctrine which claims to explain the world--its origin, its behavior, man and his history, and progress. The arguents may be invoked in any situation, though they need

---

3 "N oublions jamais mais n'oublions rien," Figaro, 1978.

not be identified as being "Communist" or Marxist" by the person who employs them. In fact, a adept Communist will frequently deny even the tenets of Communism in a debate. Nevertheless, the arguments come from the core doctrine of beliefs. This is the meaning of ideology, and Communism is fundamentally an ideology.

People today do not understand the power of communism as an ideology. Ideology provides a philosophical foundation, new hope (in this case, false hope), and a plan of action. It is the guide to power and the means of transforming an ordinary man into the "new Communist man."

We hear many times of the missionary zeal and self denial of the early Christians. The tremendous dedication often displayed by the adherents of Communism is a perversion of that same zeal. Communism is a Godless religion. It takes a person in total control. It takes a man's soul, and engenders in him a near-religious fervor. This is the source of Communism's power. It transforms the spiritually destitute individual into a destructive revolutionary.

The Communist ideology inspires a *false* mysticism

Those who have studied Communism cannot fail to be amazed by its ability to inspire men to sacrifice. Communists, according to Lenin,

> are marching in a compact group along a precipitous and difficult path, firmly holding each other by the hand. We are surrounded on all sides by enemies, and are under their almost constant fire. We have combined voluntarily, precisely for the purpose of fighting the enemy, and not to retreat into the adjacent marsh, the inhabitants of which, from the very outset, have reproached us with having separated ourselves into an exclusive group and with having chosen the path of struggle... [4]

In the revolutionary Che Guevara's final letter to his parents, he wrote:

> My Marxism has taken root and become purified. I believe in armed struggle as the only solution for those peoples who fight to free themselves, and I am consistent with my

[4] V.I.Lenin, "What is to be Done?" (1901-2), Selected Works, (New York: International Publishers, 1943), vol.II, p.33.

beliefs.[5]

For the French writer, Andre Gide, the experience of Marxism was strikingly religious in character. Prior to his first visit to the Soviet Union in 1937, he wrote:

> My conversion is like a faith; all my being goes toward a single goal. In the deplorable state of anxiety of the modern world, the plan of the Soviet Union seems to me to constitute the salvation of mankind.6

(After visiting the Soviet Union, Gide changed his opinion completely. We will refer later to the opinions which he expressed after his disillusionment.)

It is this misguided mystical power within Marxism which has allowed it to produce its own calender of "martyrs" and "saints", followers who are ready to give themselves completely for the sake of the Marxist dream.

The soldiers of Mao Tse Tang endured incredible sufferings, and often went without food in order to defeat the armies Chiang Kai Shek. When Mao's troops finally triumphe'd, they may have wanted to celebrate, but Mao told them that they should not believe that their lives would become easier. That was not the way. Their lives would continue to be difficult. He promised them one thing, however: that the lives of their children would be better.

This level of dedication contrasts sharply with the attitude of the "me generation" found in the West. Forty years ago the *Free* World slept while Hitler expanded his territory. During the past decade, we once again did nothing while communism blatantly absorbed Ethiopia, Mozambique, Angola, South Yemen, Grenada, Nicaragua, Afghanistan, Seychelles, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam.

When the first communist revolution occurred in Russia, it might have seemed that it could have no lasting impact on the world. Yet can we say that today? What was almost a joke in 1917 has come to be a most serious and frightening problem for mankind.

---

[5] George Lavan, editor, Che Guevara Speaks (New York: Pathfinder Press) 1980, p.159.

[6] Richard Crossman, editor, The God that Failed, (New York: Harper and Brothers, publishers, 1949), p.173.

No lie can prevail over truth

Nevertheless, the day of the collapse of communism may be fast approaching. This must be so, because communism is based on a lie, and no lie can prevail over truth. Furthermore, the power of all dictatorships throughout history has collapsed when their regimes lost their justification. Communism today faces the same fate, and the political, economic and social trends in communist countries are a clear confirmation of this.

However, in spite of the fact that most communist leaders have ceased to believe in the promises of their own doctrine, the danger which communism poses to the free world is increasing. This danger is two-fold. On one hand, the ideology continues to circulate and be accepted in the developing world and in the free world. On the other hand, the Soviet bloc gravely threatens us with its tremendous military power.

If we monitor Communist news sources, we observe the penchant that Communist leaders have for making excuses and finding scapegoats. Failures are somehow blamed on the "capitalist" and "imperialist" West. According to this tiresome scenario, Communism has met with difficulty, not because of any defect in the doctrine, but because the capitalist regimes of the world still hold great strength, and their thinking infects even the communistic societies.

The official North Korean position on the adoption of martial law in Poland, for example, holds that:

> **Truth to tell, this [martial law] is a disgrace to socialism...But how could the Polish authorities sit calmly when the reactionaries attempted to overthrow the people's power and obliterate the gains of socialism in Poland?**
>
> **The reactionaries open challenge to the socialist system in Poland was part of the subversive activities of the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, behind the scenes, to overthrow the socialist power.** [7]

Faced with a deteriorating domestic situation, one option which becomes increasingly attractive to Communist leaders is to advocate a quick and final assault on the

---

[7] **"North Korea Comments on Poland," Freedom at Issue, May-June, 1982, pp.26-27.**

free world. The Soviet rulers want to'crush the free world now more than ever before. They are goaded, rather than deterred, by the failures of communist theory. If they were to achieve world conquest, there would be no one left to point out the flaws in communist thought and practice. They could rewrite history, curtail intellectual discussion, and turn the entire world into a prison camp. To avoid such a tragic occurrence, the West needs to take new and highly effective measures.

The response of the West, then, must be two-fold. It goes without saying that the free nations must be strongly united, and must secure and maintain military, political and economic supremacy. In addition to this, the communist ideology must be discredited. It must be clearly shown that all of the clever arguments of Communism derive from a 19th century worldview which is bankrupt and non-functional.

A new worldview

This can be done by a new worldview capable of exposing the lies of communism and bringing the truth, thereby bringing new hope and genuine solutions.

CAUSA International is doing just this. We present a sharp critique and effective counter-proposal to the theory of communism, including the theory of materialism, the materialistic dialectic, historical materialism and the economic theories.

It is said that if one knows both himself and his enemy, it is possible in one hundred battles to be victorious one hundred times. At this time, the West needs to know communism and to know itself. Only in this way can victory be certain.

Where to begin?

In this manual, we will start with Marx's theory of the alienation of man. The theory of alienation has been one of Marx's most appealing themes. It is frequently invoked by liberal thinkers as being a part of Marxism which remains valid. Within the very theory of alienation, however, lie the elements which came eventually to bring about the Gulag and the misery of Communism today. That is, Marx's basic view of man's nature and the cause of human unhappiness is irreparably flawed.

Most importantly, the very real problem of the alienation of man, and all its resulting social and historical problems (which Communism has attempted to solve without success), can be resolved through the

God-centered worldview which CAUSA proposes.

We will start, then, at the very root of Marx's thought, the premises on which he based his entire theory. We shall also examine Marx's personality and character to try to understand more clearly the nature of his motivation.

I. MARX'S THEORY OF ALIENATION

Introduction

International Communism, as we know it today, began with the formulation of the Communist Manifesto, authored in 1848 by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

Today there are a number of interpretations of communism. However, the differences among them are primarily tactical in nature, concerning how most effectively to achieve the revolutionary transformation of the world. All forms of Communism are based on the theories of Marx and Engels. No Communist state denies the fundamental aspects of their theories, specifically: dialectical materialism, historical materialism, and the economic theories of Das Kapital. Indeed, Marx is the forefather of Communism, and anyone who wants to understand it must begin with Marx.

In order to better understand Marxism, we should know more about the person of Karl Marx, his motivation, and the thought that went into the development of his theories. In this chapter, we will examine the roots of Marx's theory, in particular:

1) Marx's theory of human alienation.
2) The development of Marxism.
3) The error of Marxism and the CAUSA Worldview.

A. Marx's Era and the Birth of a Thought

In the first half of the 19th century, when Marx was born and grew up, classical liberalism was on the rise. This was carried forward by the momentum of the French Revolution. Wherever feudalism and the absolutism of the ancien regime still remained, the conflict between these and the rising liberalism was severe. In Prussia particularly, the government ruthlessly suppressed liberal dissent.

In England and France, however, the industrial revolution was well advanced. Many, indeed most people lived better in the 18th and 19th centuries than had the generality of men in the 15th and 16th centuries, but the

established social order was torn apart. Individuals and families were uprooted from villages, farms and feudal estates. The rapid growth of industry was accompanied by the mistreatment of the workers. When they had work, they were driven hard. Unemployment, disease and crime were prevelant in the industrial areas. We might think that Christianity should have been a check against the abuse of the laborers, teaching and practicing the love of Jesus and mitigating the harsher aspects of the industrial revolution. As it turned out, however, this was often not done.

Furthermore, amid this overall improvement in the general economic condition, there occurred a perceptible widening of the gap between the poorest and the richest elements of society. Whether or not this widening gap was, in the main unavoidable, is for us an open question. But the fact remains that the social dislocation and sense of uncertainty was enormous during this period. Nowhere was this more so than in France and Germany which were politically and socially transformed and defeudalized in the fifty years from 1770 to 1820.

When governments or leaders of a nation or society fall into corruption, take advantage of their power, or ignore the poverty, oppression, pain and anxiety of their people, then new thinkers and movements emerge to bring about changes. However, when a thinker is formulating his theories, it is not only his acquired knowledge and the social and environmental conditions which influence him; his personality and character are also of great significance. To understand the genesis of Marxism, we need to examine each of these factors as they influenced Karl Marx and his thought.

The model for the age of revolution was the machine. The physical and mechanical sciences operated on the basis of verifiable laws or principles. Must there not be similar laws governing society and human fulfillment? The task seemed to be to uncover them and thereby better understand the human condition. That was what Marx sought to do. Marx saw not only the deplorable circumstances of poor factory workers and the disparity between them and their employers, he also saw an overarching lack of fulfillment and happiness in his own soul which he in turn universalized to be the human condition. This latter phenomenon he called alienation.

B. <u>The Life of Karl Marx</u> (1818-1883)

Marx was born in Trier, Rheinisch Prussia, on May 5, 1818, as the second son in a lineage which had been traditional Jewish rabbinical. His father, Heinrich Marx (1782-1838), had converted to Christianity in 1816 because

of an ordinance designed to purge Jews •from public life. In 1824, he converted his seven children including Karl Marx. However, Karl's mother, Henrietta (1787-1863), resisted the conversion. In 1825, she did convert, but returned to Judaism after her husband's death.

This, then, was Marx's family situation. On one hand, he was discriminated against by the Prussian society for being Jewish, and on the other, he was looked down upon as an apostate by the Jewish community. [8] In this situation, Marx must have had strong feelings of loneliness, alienation, inferiority, humiliation and defeat. We can imagine that this lack of identity and self-assurance eventually transformed him into an extremely rebellious and militant person, bitter toward the world.

In addition, Marx came to despise the self-satisfied attitudes of Jews and Christians alike. He seems to have been religious during his childhood, but he began to challenge religion even from his secondary school days.

In 1841 in the introduction to his doctoral thesis, Marx wrote:

> Philosophy does not hide its intentions, it makes its own the profession of faith of Prometheus: "In one word, I hate all gods!" In this expression, philosophy opposes itself to all the gods of heaven and earth that do not recognize the human conscience as the supreme deity. Philosophy accepts no rival. But to the sad sirens that rejoice in their social situation, philosophy at its turn uses the response that Prometheus made to Hermes, the servant of the gods: "Be assured I will never change my miserable fate against yours; I attach more importance to being chained to a rock than to being the faithful valet and messenger to Zeus--the Father." In the philosophical calender, Prometheus occupies the first rank amongst saints and martyrs.10

[8] Wataru Hiromatsu, Theory of Marx's Youth, (Tokyo: Heibonsha Press), p.15.

[9] See the poem, "Invocation of One in Despair," written by Marx in 1837. The Collected Works of Marx and Engels, (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975), Vol.I, pp.563-564.

[10] Ibid., p.30.

Marx was familiar with the ideals of Christianity, yet around him, he found hypocrisy. As early as 1842, he wrote a newspaper editorial about religion being a tool for those in power. [11] By 1843, Marx would proclaim that "religion is the opiate of the people."12

C. The Influence Of Hegel

In his university days, Marx was very much influenced by the work of George Hegel, the most revered German philosopher of that time. Marx utilized the main themes of Hegel's thought, among them: development through contradiction, the eventual establishment of an ideal society, and the realization of freedom.

Hegel maintained that throughout history, all humanity was making its way towards freedom. In primitive society, freedom was enjoyed only by one individual--the slave master. The same could be said for the king in a monarchic state. Yet gradually a greater percentage of society was coming to experience true freedom.

According to Hegel, the bureaucracy of a state such as Prussia would be the instrument through which God would work so that all of mankind would come to enjoy freedom.

In the preface of his book, The Philosophy of Law, Hegel stated: "What is rational is actual, and what is actual is rational." After Hegel's death, his followers were divided into a conservative and a more radical group. The conservative, or Right Hegelians, put greater emphasis on the latter half of this thesis, that "what is actual is rational." For them, since the Prussian government was actual, it was the means to eventually secure freedom for its citizens. Thus, they unconditionally supported the Prussian autocracy.

Left Hegelians, however, claimed that Hegel had failed to recognize the implications of his own basic ideas. They emphasized that "what is rational is actual." In considering Prussia, they saw a government which had been an instrument of oppression and injustice, and was

---

[11] Marx, "Comments on Latest Prussian Censorship Instruction," Ibid., p.118.

[12] Marx, "Contribution to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Introduction," Collected Works, Vol.3, p.175.

not rational. They maintained that •through the then-existing Prussian government, freedom could never be realized, and the Prussian government must therefore be reformed. Marx came to be greatly influenced by the Left Hegelians.

When Marx finished his studies at the University of Jena in 1841, he became the editor of a newspaper known as the Rheinische Zeitung. Almost immediately he began to involve the paper in various political and social causes.

Marx became especially concerned about the deplorable situation of the Prussian peasant. The Prussian government passed a law prohibiting peasants from going into the woods to gather firewood for sale. This legal action left many peasants without a source of income.

Marx began a campaign to defend the peasants. When he started this campaign, however, he was attacked from all sides. Particularly, the All emeine Ausburger Zeitung, another German newspaper, went so far as to accuse Marx of being a socialist or a communist.

Up to this point in his studies, Marx had devoted himself only to philosophy. Thus, he knew very little about economics and politics. When Marx was accused of being a communist, he stated:

> I...frankly admitted in a controversy with the Allgemeine Ausburger Zeitung that my previous studies did not allow me to express any opinion on the content of the French theories. [13]

As Marx witnessed more personal dislocation and suffering in the face of the breakup of society, he came to the conclusion that philosophy could not bring a solution to humanity's problems. In 1843, he resigned from the newspaper and sought refuge in Paris. He married Jenny von Westphalen (1814-1881), daughter of a Prussian aristocrat, in June of that year.

D. Marx's Critique of Hegel

Before beginning his study of economics, Marx felt that it was very important to critique Hegel. Hegel had come to symbolize blind faith in the Prussian bureaucracy, and Marx found Hegel's philosophy powerless in solving the actual problems of society.

---

[13] Marx, "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," Selected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1969), p.502.

Hegel believed that although there is constant conflict between individuals in civil society, the state offers the possibility of resolving these through a higher form of unity. Thus he supported the bureaucratic government of the Prussian model. In other words, he believed that the idea of freedom in history is actualized in the law of the state.

According to Hegel, the complete freedom of man would come about through the work of God, using the state as a means. For Marx, however, God did not exist. Then Marx had to propose a different method to attain human freedom.

In trying to solve this problem, Marx found himself at a dead end. Then, he found a "saviour" in the person of Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872). Feuerbach had written The Essence of Christianity (1841) and Provisional Theses for a Reform of Christianity (1842), in which he criticized the Christian view of God and Hegel's view of the relationship between thinking and being.

Concerning God, Feuerbach wrote:

> [God] is...the human nature [man's reason, feeling, love, will] purified, freed from the limits of the individual man, made objective...
>
> The divine being is nothing else than the human being.[14]

Feuerbach said that it is necessary to make Hegel's subject into the predicate and Hegel's predicate into the subject. For Hegel, thought is subject and being is predicate. For Feuerbach, "being must be subject and thinking must be predicate."[15]

That is, Feuerbach was a materialist and atheist. He claimed that God is not the creator of man, but rather it is man who has created "God." That is, spirit is the product of matter and God is simply the objectification of the essence of man. However, while denying God, he stressed that the confusion in society can be settled by improving human relationships and exalting human virtues such as love, friendship, and compassion. He did not advocate violence.

---

14 Ludwig Feuerbach, The Essence of Christianity, (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1957), p.14.

15 Feuerbach, Provisional Theses for the Reform of Philosophy.

Reading Feuerbach gave great satisfaction and hope to Marx. Not only did he immediately adopt Feuerbach's materialism, but he accepted his humanism as well. One can get the idea of Marx's jubilation from what Engels later wrote:

> One must himself have experienced the liberating effect of this book to get an idea of it. Enthusiasm was general, we all became at once Feuerbachians. How enthusiastically Marx greeted the new conception and how he was greatly influenced by it in spite of critical reservaqons may also be noted in The Holy Family.

From his new Feuerbachian standpoint, Marx began a thorough criticism of Hegel.

Marx considered the conflictive and self-interested nature of man in civil society to be the original and actual nature of man. He said that the reason that man had become such a self-centered being was that man had reached a high degree of legal and political freedom, but was still restricted economically. Contrary to Hegel, who considered that selfish individualism in civil society will be overcome by means of the state (in which the idea would be actualized), Marx considered that the state was depriving man of his original nature.

He claimed that the way to settle the confusion of civil society is to recapture man's lost original nature. He also claimed that this recapture (the liberation of man) must be carried out by the individual himself, and not by the forces of untrustworthy bureaucrats.17

When we observe the development of Marx's critique of Hegel's philosophy, we can find that certain critical features of his argument gradually changed and developed. By the time he wrote A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law (August 1843), he had only reached the conclusion that the disorder of civil society could not be **overcome by the power of the state.** Two months later, however, in the text On the Jewish Question (October 1843), he maintained that overcoming the disorder

---

16 Engels, "Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy," Selected Books, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1970), vol.3, p.354.

17 Collected Works, vol.3, p.47.

of civil society **will be achieved by individual men as they restore their original species-essence.**

Exactly how will the original species-essence be recovered? In On the Jewish Question, this was not disclosed. However, in December 1843, (again a time period of two months had passed), in Contribution to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Introduction, the solution was revealed to be **the negation of private property.**

Recovering the original species-essence

Feuerbach had *said* that man has an essential nature which is different than animals, with the qualities of reason, emotion, love and will. However, by objectifying this essence and making it a "God," man has made himself into a powerless being. Belief in God, in Feuerbach's view, destroys the essence of man. Accordingly, the recovery of man's lost nature can only come about when man denies God and reclaims from Him the essence of man.

At first Marx accepted this contention, but he later claimed in Contribution to a Critique of He gel's Philosoaty of Law, Introduction, that what man had lost was something legal and political rather than something religious (what Feuerbach called the divine being). In so doing, he departed from Feuerbach and headed for a thought of his own. He abandoned the position of Feuerbach's humanism and disclosed that he would treat the problem of the alienation of man on the level of law and politics. From this point, the question of the alienation of man became the motivation of Marx's formulations.

He eventually came to the conclusion (in Contribution to a Criti•ue of He gel's Philoso•h of Law Introduction) that the fundamental way to settle the problem of the alienation of man is the negation of private property. He was thus gradually clarifying the nature of his concept of class struggle.

It is important to note that even though Marx at first accepted Feuerbach's materialism and humanism with deep conviction, he later abandoned humanism and utilized only materialism in settling the question of alienation. He further declared that he would turn from the "criticism of heaven" to the "criticism of earth," by which he meant that he would deal with law and politics rather than religion and theology. [18]

---

[18] Collected Works, vol.3, p.176.

At this point he had already made a strong determination that the capitalist political system must be abolished by all means for the sake of recovery of the essential human nature. **His plan for the liberation of human nature was the "negation of private property."**

He not only decided upon the **overthrow of the capitalist system** as his goal, but also portrayed the **proletariat** as the only force having the power to bring about a revolution.

What was the reason that in two months from October to December 1843, Marx abruptly changed his view that "the liberation of man must be accomplished by the hands of actual man in civil society" and insisted upon recapturing the lost essence of humanity by "the proletariat's negation of private property"? Marx did not disclose the answer, but we would do well to consider certain circumstances of his life at that time.

(1) Marx resigned from the Rheinische Zeitung under duress--strict censorship and pressure from the Prussian government. He harbored hostility against that government, and this, coupled with his own rebelliousness, was decisive in the formulations which he made in Paris. It becomes clear when we read from A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Introduction:

> War on the German conditions! By all means! They are below the level of history, beneath any criticism, but they are still an object of criticism, like the criminal who is below the level of humanity but still an object for the executioner...[The object of the criticism] is not to refute but to exterminate...Its essential sentiment is indignnion, its essential activity is denunciation.

Marx's sentiment of indignation toward Prussia seems to have driven him to his theory of revolution--the negation of private property through the proletariat. It was the subjective factor in the formulation of his thought.

(2) Furthermore, he must have already borrowed Hegel's dialectic of "thesis-antithesis-synthesis" and applied it materialistically to civil society. Thus, even before studying economics, he arrived at the conclusion that private property (the thesis) must be "negated." This can be seen in the The Holy Family (February 1845)

---

19 Collected Works, vol.3, p.177.

where Marx sets private property and the proletariat against one another as thesis and antithesis.

> Private property as private property, as wealth, is compelled to maintain itself, and thereby its opposite, the proletariat, in existence...The proletariat, on the contrary, is compelled as proletariat to abolish itself and thereby its opposite, private property, which deterlApes its existence and makes it proletariat.

(3) Finally, Lorenz von Stein had introduced French socialism and communism in 1842 with his text The Socialism and Communism of Today's France. He described the proletariat as a united body awakened under the purpose of the negation of private property. It appears that Marx borrowed that expression intact.

Marx went to Paris and began to study economics in order to arm himself with the type of intellectual materials which he would need to settle the question of the alienation of man legally and politically.

In the introduction to his A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Marx reminisced that soon after he arrived in Paris in 1844, he had already come to the conclusion that the materialistic relations of production are the foundation of legal and political forms.

He started studying economics in Paris, and what served as "a guiding thread" for his studies was the general conclusion which he had already reached. Declared Marx:

> The general result at which I arrived and which, once won, served as a guiding thread for my studies, can be briefly formulated as follows: In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensible and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces. The sum total of these relations .of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social

---

20 "The Holy Family," Collected Works, vol.4, p.36.

consciousness.[21]

Marx wrote his A Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philoso•hy of Law, Introduction before he ever studied economics. Nevertheless, he set as his goal the overthrow of the capitalist system by the proletariat.

How did Marx, who had not yet studied economics or discovered the "contradictions" in capitalism, arrive at the conclusion that the proletariat was to liberate man by abolishing private property? The evidence strongly suggests that he formed his conclusions first, and then looked for a means of justifying them. Furthermore, it is clear that his philosophy had no basis in facts or science. He could not prove by logic or history, for example, that the true human species-essence would emerge after private property had been abolished.

In general, a scientist may formulate an hypothesis and seek to verify it through experiment and observation. However, he must be prepared to yield his hypothesis to whatever lessons those experiments and observations may teach him. Marx was unwilling to do this. In preparing revisions of Capital, for example, as Kolakowski has pointed out, he disingeniously ignored updated statistics which disprffed his predictions of the impoverishment of the worker.

Furthermore, when a thinker is influenced by the thought of other men, he must be scrupulously careful not to abstract concepts which lose their original meaning when removed from their context. Marx borrowed the dialectic from Hegel, but the significance of Hegelian dialectic is lost when removed from the unique framework of Hegel's historical scheme. Marx also took elements of Feuerbach's materialism, but stripped them of their significance by discarding Feuerbach's humanism. In the same way, he took the concept of negation of private property from Lorenz von Stein, apparently without verifying that it was valid in constructing the utopia which he envisioned.

Finally, when Marx took these concepts, he proceeded to distort them to fit his apriori needs. In invoking the

---

[21] Marx, "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," Selected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977), p.20.

[22] Leszek Kolakowski, Main Currents of Marxism. 1., trans. by P.S. Falla, (New York: Oxford University Press), 1978, p.290.

dialectic, for example, he completely alters the Hegelian meaning of the terms "opposites," "contradiction" and "negation."

What we criticize strongly here is not merely that Marx and Engels went outside of the scientific method in making their theories, but rather that they took great pains to conceal what they were doing. They spoke incessantly about "scientific" socialism, apparently to gain creditability, but were anything but scientific.

E. Studies of Economics and the Theory of Alienation

Marx remained in Paris from November 1843 to February 1845, devoting himself to the study of economics. On the foundation of Engel's Outline of a Critique of Political Economy, he studied the works of Smith, Ricardo, Say, Sismondi and others. He composed three manuscripts of his studies during this period which were later lumped together and published under the title, Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts.

The main points which Marx came to espouse after ' studying economics while in Paris were: first, that in capitalist society "the worker has become a commodity" and, second, that capitalist society thrives only by exploiting the worker. Thus, regardless of however hard the worker may work, all the product of his labor will be plundered, so that "the wicker becomes all the poorer the more wealth he produces."

Marx claimed that as a result of the dehumanizing system of capitalism, and in particular the loss of the fruit of the worker's labor, both capitalist and worker are estranged from their human nature:

> The propertied class and the class of the proletariat present the same human self—estrangement. But the former class feels at ease and strengthened in this self—estrangement, it recognizes estrangement as its own power a2i has in it the semblance of a human existence.

Neither one leads a life of fulfillment, but the capitalist maintains the semblance of a human existence. The lost human nature of both must be recovered.

---

[23] Marx, "Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844," Collected Works, vol.3, p.271.

[24] "The Holy Family," Collected Works, vol.4, p.36.

F. Types of Alienation

For Marx, the essence of man is labor. In attempting to elaborate and substantiate Marx's ideas, Engels wrote that through labor man had developed the ability to communicate and the capacity of reason. According to Marxism, what permits a man to develop and evolve is "social labor". (For Feuerbach, reason, love and will are the essence of man, but for Marx, the essential factor is labor.)

In Marx's theory, labor can be said to replace God as the creator of mankind, and labor is the species-essence of humanity. It follows that for Marx, alienation is due to class-based labor relations, and comes about in the following manner:

1. Alienation of the laborer from the product of his labor.

The ability to labor being the species-essence of man, it follows that man is "man" as he labors and produces. His very humanness is thus intimately connected to his relationship with the products of his labor. Under the capitalist system, however, whatever the laborer produces is immediately taken from him and becomes the property of someone who played no part in its production. When the products of labor are taken, the worker experiences estrangement or alienation from his own essence, and cannot function as the social being which he should be.

2. Alienation of the laborer from his labor.

In Marxism, labor is "G'od." It is labor which has fashioned human beings from apes. Even so, the capitalist system defies the essence of humanness and dehumanizes the laborer.

In this situation, the worker finds that the more that he works, the richer the capitalist becomes. Since the products of his labor are expropriated by the capitalist, why should he work? The more he pours out his blood and sweat, the more the capitalist benefits, entrenching himself in a position of dominance, and reinforcing the entire capitalist system.

The worker is like a prostitute. He sells his body, working day after day in a factory, completely without dignity. The worker does not know his identity or his true value. Everything about himself which is important is lost.

3. Alienation of the human species.

Man's species-essence refers to the free and conscious activity of production, which distinguishes man from an animal directed only by its physical instincts and producing only what it or its offspring directly require.

"Man" is man acting in freedom upon the objective world, specifically, engaging in the free activity of creation. Because the worker is alienated from his labor, however, labor has been reduced to merely the means of satisfying the desire to maintain one's physical existence, and labor no longer exists as a free conscious activity.

Laborers have been deprived of creativity in the capitalist system. Therefore, they have lost all of their humanity.

4. Alienation of man from man.

In the de-humanized world of capitalism, laborers are not free in their human relationships. How can they be? They are not human. They do not experience joy among themselves, nor do they discover love and understanding. Capitalism drives them deeper into misery, and in so doing, molds them into a strong revolutionary force.

The root of alienation: private ownership of property

The root of all of these types of alienation is private ownership of property. According to Marx, this is the origin of alienation, and when private ownership has been abolished, the human condition will change.

Marx considered that the capitalists had seized the products of labor as their private property. Thus, the private ownership system is in fact an aggressive form of suppression. Accordingly, the only way to recover the alienated human nature is the elimination of private ownership of property. Marx said:

> The abolition of private property is therefore the complete emancipation of all human senses and qualities.

Marx thus claimed that the elimination of private property is the basis for recovering the species-essence

---

[25] "Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844," Collected Works, vol.3, p.300.

of man and ending his alienation.

G. The Development of Marxism

Before his days in Paris, the idea of man's species-essence was somewhat ambiguous for Marx, meaning either his "freedom," or his "public activities." After studying economics in Paris, however, Marx linked freedom with labor. Labor as free productive activity (life activity) came to be clearly fixed upon as the species-essence of man.

Although Marx believed that the private ownership system was the cause of alienation, he did not immediately call for radical, violent solutions. Initially, he advocated transcending or sublating private property as the way to recover the original human nature.

Soon after he arrived in Brussels in the spring of 1845, Marx wrote Theses on Feuerbach, parting completely from the humanism of Feuerbach. He began the writing of The German Ideology with Engels, who had emigrated to Brussels, and finished by May of the next year. They completed the foundation of dialectical and historical materialism and concluded that a violent Communist revolution was the formula to end human alienation.

In The German Ideology, Marx criticized the views of the leading Germans of his day, from Feuerbach through Bruno Bauer, M. Stirner and the German socialists. In particular, he objected to any suggestion that solutions were possible without violent action.

From January 1847, Marx criticized Proudhon's The Philosophy of Poverty which advocated a peaceful reform of capitalism. He published his response under the title of The Poverty of Philosophy (July 1847). Again, his strong objection was against peaceful paths to change. Furthermore, for the first time, Marx dealt seriously here with economic questions.

The Birth of Communism

Up to this point, Marx had generated a body of writings demanding violence against the existing order, but there was no specific plan of action. In the summer of 1847, however, Marx and Engels joined "The League of Communists" in London. The league requested them to draw up a summary of the Communist position on social and political questions. They responded by writing the Communist Manifesto in February 1848.

In the Communist Manifesto, Marx and Engels exalt the role of class struggle in human history. They insist on

the abolition of private property and• criticize all previous forms of socialism. The Communist Manifesto concludes by declaring that the task of all communists is revolution. Communism had been born.

The leap from the sublation (transcendence, aufhebung) of private property, which was Marx's assertion in his Paris days, to the abolition of private property demanded in the Communist Manifesto corresponds to a change in the attitude which Marx came to hold with regard to violence. Marx's original objective was to liberate man's true nature. His study and his experience from 1845-1847 led him to conclude that this could be done only through a proletarian revolution.

Marx expressed frankly in the Communist Manifesto that the essence of the Communist theory is the abolition of private property by violent revolution.

> In this sense Communists can condense their theory in the slggle sentence: Abolition of private property.

It is important to emphasize here that the subjective factor in formulating a theory is extremely important. Marx was deported from Paris in 1845, due to pressure from the Prussian government, and was persistently sought after in Brussels by the Prussian government agents. Eventually, the Prussian government pressured the Belgian government to deport Marx from Belgium, and Marx abrogated his Prussian nationality.

He must have felt a great deal of loneliness and pressure, as well as resentment toward the state. It seems that these feelings progressively transformed into a visceral hatred for the Prussian government. This, no doubt, prompted Marx's ultimate commitment to violent revolution and the overthrow of the existing order.

> They [the Communists] openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcibl, overthrow of all existing social conditions.

H. Synopsis of the development of Marx's position

We can trace the thought of Karl Marx through the

---

[26] Marx and Engels, "Manifesto of the Communist Party," Collected Works, vol.6, p.498.

[27] Ibid., p.519.

following steps as he arrived at the conclusion that the abolition of private property through cIsss struggl-e Is the ultimate answer to the ills of society.

1. The true essence of man is labor, thus production activities are the original nature of man.

2. The product of labor is seized by the capitalists as their private property.

3. For the capitalists to have deprived the workers of the products of their labor has resulted in the alienation of man.

4. The solution to the alienation of man and the human community (the liberation of man) can only be achieved by the abolition of the private ownership of property.

5. The method of abolishment of private property is violent revolution.

6. Only the proletariat is capable of leading this revolution.

These points constitute the groundwork of Marxism, and Marx was adamantly opposed to compromising or altering them. He opposed attempting a peaceful process to achieve the elimination of private property. He also opposed any kind of utopian socialism which would appeal to human sympathies or morality. He saw that previous attempts to realize ideal socialist communities always failed. Marx laid the blame for their failure on lack of philosophy and a disregard for the vital role of mass violence.

Marx could foresee that the success of a revolution would hinge upon inciting the masses to take violent action. To be successful, therefore, he needed a weapon to mobilize the masses. Marx found the means for this in a highly convincing and inflammatory ideology. Marx said:

> As philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapons in philosophy. The head of the emancipation[28] is philosophy; its heart is the proletariat.

He began the search for philosophical components to

[28] Marx, "Contribution to a Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Introduction," Collected Works, vol.3, p.187.

be used in constructing an ideological weapon. His goal, the "abolishment of private property by violent class struggle and seizure of power from the bourgeoise by the proletariat" became the foundation of all of his work.

The proletariat

With the goal before him, the task which remained was to actually foment the revolution. How could it be done? Marx had already decided that the workers, or proletariat, would be the instruments. His job was to awaken and incite those workers--to mold them into a force which could destroy the established bourgeois and capitalist order, even if it meant the loss of their lives. To achieve this, Marx understood the importance of ideology. He had to construct an ideology, a system of beliefs, which would provide 1) a philosophical basis, 2) hope and a vision, and 3) a plan of action.

Marx knew that the ideological weapon which he would construct required three essential components:

(1) An analysis of capitalism, showing it to be a dehumanizing system which cannot be reformed, but must instead be destroyed.

That is, he needed a clear indictment of the capitalists, a verdict of guilty, and a sentence of death. To fulfill this need, he constructed his economic theories--the labor theory of value and the theory of surplus value.

(2) A philosophical justification showing why workers are right to kill capitalists and reactionaries with a clear conscience.

Without this element, there could never be the revolution which Marx advocated so passionately. To serve this purpose, he developed what has come to be known as dialectical materialism, an explanation of the origin and behavior of the universe which denies the existence of God and tries to show that only matter, functioning according to dialectical rules, has always existed. Dialectical materialism justifies killing, characterizing it as the law of nature.

(3) A historical, apocalyptic vision.

It must be proven to the potential revolutionaries that the time to act is now. The opportunity is at hand. With the historical mandate before him, why should the worker hesitate? There is nothing to lose and a world to win. Historical materialism was developed for this purpose.

These three components complete the ideological weapon. They are the parts necessary to incite people to commit their lives to violent revolution. As an engineer of ideas, Karl Marx was truly a genius. Millions of people around the world have been intoxicated by his analysis of history and prediction of the coming utopia. When a person is exposed to Marxism, it can create in him an electrifying fervor and an almost religious passion.

I. The three components of Marxism

Let us examine the three components in greater detail.

1. The labor theory of value, and the theory of surplus value

The purpose of the labor theory of value and the theory of surplus value is to show that capitalist society is something which must be destroyed. It cannot be reformed or gradually improved, according to Marx, because its very essence is perverted and dehumanizing.

Through his economic theories, Marx tried to show that capitalist society can do only one thing: exploit. The capitalist himself has only one purpose, to make profit, and capitalism is the system which protects and perpetuates him.

According to Marx, the capitalists have always plundered the profit which rightfully belongs to the workers. The two classes, worker and capitalist, are totally opposed to one another. There can be no coexistence between them, because the system is such that the more that the workers work, the more the capitalists are able to exploit them and thus reinforce the system. There can be only one solution--the total elimination of the capitalist. That is the only way the workers can get their due profit. There can be no compromise with destruction.

This is the essence of Marxist economic theory.

2. Dialectical Materialism

As early as 1842, Marx began to challenge Christianity. He said it was a tool to teach the people to "be submissive to authority, for all authority comes from God."

Dialectical materialism tries to show that the base of all things is not God, but matter. Man is matter and nothing more. Man does not need to follow the

commandments of a God that does not exist. Instead man must understand the lessons that matter teaches.

What are the lessons of matter? The essence of matter is motion. Motion exists because there is contradiction and conflict within matter. Within any particle, within the different species, between the germ and shell in a seed--everywhere--we find conflict. Conflict is not the exception, but the rule. It is ultimately the formula for development. According to dialectical materialism, no development can occur without conflict.

Certainly within every man there is a wide range of emotions, including hate, anger and resentment. Christianity tells us that hatred and resentment are not man's original nature. If God does not exist, however, and matter is the base of all things, then the contradiction that we feel within ourselves must have its roots in matter itself. For that reason Marxism says that hatred is man's nature, and it should not be **suppressed,** it should be **expressed.** The way to express it is to participate in the violent revolution.

Marx made use of the dialectic of Hegel virtually in its entirety, but there are some essential differences between them. It is important to note them at this point. The dialectic of Hegel deals with the process of the development of thought, whereas that of Marx deals with the process of material development.

Another important difference is the interpretation of the words opposition and contradiction in Hegelian and Marxist usage.

There was, in Hegel's dialectic, no meaning of struggle whereby one overthrows or exterminates the other. In Marxist dialectic, however, opposition and contradiction are given the meaning of struggle involving overthrow or extermination.

Marxist dialectic states that there are unity and struggle between opposites (elements in contradiction), but struggle is emphasized far more than unity. Unity is relative and struggle is absolute. Lenin, who took these ideas and established the first Marxist state, expressed it this way:

> The unity of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is **absolute, just as development and motion** are absolute.29

Lenin went on to say that "development is the

struggle of opposites,.[30] and in this way carefully justified his program of violence.

Marx inherited Hegel's dialectic and included in it the notion of struggle in the sense that one overthrows or exterminates **the other. This was, of course, in order to suppor* philosophically the proletarian revolution.**

Here we see a most vivid example of how Marx put t gether a theory that would justify his purpose. He farrowed the dialectic from Hegel, rejecting his idealism and leaving out whatever did not suit his purpose, He **combined this with Feuerbach's materialism, rejecting his humanism and changing the meaning of conflict in the process, and making it mean violent struggle.**

3. Historical Materialism

Marx still needed one additional component to complete his project. He needed to give the worker a sense of urgency. To do that, he elaborated his vision of the apocalpyse. He showed the worker that he was living in the "Last Days." This is the role of historical materialism.

Historical materialism shows that man has "fallen" from a state of innocence where all was held as common property, progressed through various stages of exploitation (slavery, feudalism, and capitalism), and now has arrived at the point where the ultimate exploiter is about to be exterminated. When this final villain, the capitalist, is destroyed, we will enter into a new and final stage, the Communist utopia, heralded by its harbinger, world socialism.

Historical materialism says to the workers: Your moment is now. This is the moment that we must seize. We have nothing to lose, and if we act now, we have a world to gain.

If we consider the development of Christianity, expecially in its first centuries, we can recognize that much of its power came from its apocalyptic vision and strong belief in the prompt return of Christ. Historical materialism **is what gives the same type of apocalyptic vision to Communism. Communists are promising the**

---

[29] **V.I.Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics," Collected Works, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1976), vol.38,** p.358.

[30] **Ibid., p.358.**

imminent coming of Heaven, but it will. be Heaven without God. Forever free from class oppression, mankind will no longer need God.

Marxism succeeded in communicating three fundamental points to the European workers: 1) you are in a state of hopeless exploitation, 2) your revolutionary action is justified by the dialectic, the foundation of all ethics, and 3) your moment to act is now.

By means of these three areas of theory, Marx was able to argue persuasively that the worker was living in a situation in which there was no hope without revolution. The revolution was thus not only the responsibility of the laborer, but his duty.

It was through the Communist revolution that alienation was to be resolved. Through Communism the worker would no longer be alienated from his labor product, nor from his work. Likewise, there would no longer be alienation within himself and finally, alienation among men would be non-existent.

J. <u>Has Marxism Solved Alienation?</u>

The <u>Communist Manifesto</u> has been invoked to justify various revolutionary efforts since its writing, and a communist state was born in 1917. That was exactly 66 years ago. Since then, scores of countries have fallen under Communist control. Virtually one third of the world population is now living under the Communist yoke. It must be said that Marxist theory has been given ample time to prove itself. Looking at the record, does Marxism provide the means to solve the probl

In 1960, Nikita Khruschev promised his people that by the year 1980, the Communist ideal state would exist in the Soviet Union. What is the reality? Can we say that the Soviet worker has come to enjoy the Communist utopia?

Tragically, no.

1. Instead of a workers paradise, millions of Russians and other peoples have been delivered into a living hell. In the name of collectivization, millions were exterminated. Even today, the system cannot function without a Gulag of thousands of prison camps.

Soviet workers are supposedly working for the state, and the state is supposedly taking care of the workers in an optimum fashion. Yet Soviet workers today are not advancing toward an optimum life, they are struggling to survive.

The average salary of the Soviet laborer is 171 rubles per month, yet the necessary salary for subsistence[3] of an average family is 210 rubles.

Today many Soviet citizens in Azerbaijian and other parts of the Soviet Union are living in caves. Many of them do not even speak the Russian language nor can they read or write.[32]

In spite of this, according to Michael Voslensky's, La Nomenklatura, a certain group lives quite well in the Soviet Union. They enjoy the newest products from Europe, Japan and the United States. Their children attend private schools. They are the new Soviet super-elite, and the price of their well-being is the blood, sweat and tears of the Russian laborer.

Andre Gide, whom we quoted above as a one time ardent supporter of communism, travelled to the Soviet Union and wrote afterward in disillusionment:

> The disappearance of capitalism in Soviet Russia has not brought freedom of the Soviet worker. It is essential that the proletariat abroad should realize this fully...It was precisely in order to find none of the poverty that I went to the Soviet Union, but poverty there is frowned upon... one might imagine that it was indelicate and criminal... it does not arouse pity or charity... only contempt. Those who parade themselves so proudly are those whose prosperity has been bought at the price of this infinite poverty...[33]

2. Marx promised that through the revolution, the laborer would no longer be alienated from his work, and his labor itself would become a source of great satisfaction. Yet today in the Soviet Union there is a common saying among Russian workers: "They pretend to pay us, and we pretend to work."[34]

---

31 Minard and Michaels, Forbes, p.141.

32 Ilja Zemtsov, La corruption en Union Sovietique, (Paris: Librarie Hachette, 1976).

33 Andre Gide, in The God that Failed, p.183.

34 Minard and Michaels, Forbes, p.138.

3. What can be said about the alienation of the human species? Has the Soviet system led to the emergence of true human beings? References that avow that this **is** not the case are plentiful. Konstantin Simis, formerly **a** defense attorney in the Soviet Union, writes:

> The corruption that has rotted the ruling apparat of the country has had the terrible effect of eating away the morals not only of the people who give or receive bribes, but also of the innocent, those who have not been party to corruption but who have merely been living in an atmosphere of corruption ay have been forced to breathe its tainted air.
>
> And now, finishing this book, I ask myself: What next? What is the future of the country? And I answer my own question with bitterness: The Soviet government, Soviet society, cannot rid itself of corruption as longAs it remains Soviet. It is as simple as that.

4. Finally, has Marxism solved the alienation among men? Did international Communism achieve the global brotherhood of men? Absolutely not. Today, within the Soviet Union, the tension between white and non-white is acute. The Soviet Union is a country where soon 50% of the people **will** be non-white, yet 11 of 12 members of the Politboro are Russians or Ukrainians. The division between China and Russia is a further affirmation of the fact that communism has not been able to resolve the problem of racial discrimination.

Marxism does not solve the problems of alienation. It worsens them. Ironically, the very conditions which pushed Marx and Engels to write the Communist Manifesto have reached their greatest perfection in the Soviet Union.

In total, what is Marxism? It **is nothing more than an apologetic for violent revolution and a justification for murder.** Marx maintained that his study was scientific and objective, but as we have seen, **it is** really a set **of** arguments engineered to buttress prior conclusions.

The analysis made by Marx is an after-the-fact

---

35 Konstantin Simis, USSR: The Corrupt Society, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982) p.248.

36 Ibid., p.300.

analysis. The conclusion was already there. Marxism is not a genuine search for truth. It was deception from the beginning, and the application of this deception is responsible for the deaths of 150 million people. The death tolls are still mounting, while Communism, the worst crime to humanity which history has ever seen, is determined to conquer the world.

II. MARXISM AND ITS ERROR, AND THE CAUSA WORLDVIEW

So far we have studied Marxist theory from its origin into its formation and development as a movement. We must note that Marx and has associates made painstaking efforts to make the theory of Marxism appear scientific. Karl Marx himself proudly boasted that his theory, unlike all other types of socialism, resulted from scientific analysis.

We have now witnessed the practice of Marxist theory for 66 years in Soviet Russia and other Communist countries. It is our consensus that that system is not working. Even Communist dictators can no longer hide this fact. As the Western media reported, Soviet president Yuri Andropov has openly admitted that his country has become riddled by corruption and graft. Despite the idealism and sacrifice of many followers of Communist theory, Communism has taken its followers on a long march to nowhere.

It is our duty now to make the correct diagnosis of Marxism, and its errors, so as to reveal the falsehood which it contains. Why did Marxism not work? What did Karl Marx overlook? What was his fundamental error? Answering these questions is, indeed, the first and most important step in bringing a true solution to world Communism today.

A. Four Fundamental Errors which Marx Committed

The CAUSA worldview reveals clearly that Marx has committed four fundamental errors in the formulation of his theory.

1. In understanding the origin and nature of the universe.

2. In diagnosing the true cause of human alienation.

3. In the methodology used to bring a solution to human alienation.

4. In understanding human history.

a. Marx's first error--misunderstanding the origin and nature of the universe

The principle error of Marxism stems from its denial of the existence of God. Marx based his theory on the belief that the essence of the universe is matter. He assumed that there is no God, and from this basic assumption, all his theories were developed.

Karl Marx could not explain the origin of the universe and its purpose of existence. As Kolakowski points out, Engels, in his texts on the dialectic, rejected the possibility of uncaused phenomena, and:

> asserted that matter by its very nature tends to evolve higher forms of Being in the manner observable on earth. He does not explain, however, in what way the higher forms are potentially contained in the elementary attributes of matter.[37]

Why does he not consider more carefully the lawful relationship which exists between cause and effect? Science indeed holds that nothing occurs by accident. The universe is a resultant phenomenon, then there must be a cause. Without determining that cause, you cannot fully understand reality.

Marxism begins its argument with the conjecture that the universe is matter and that matter has always existed. Matter is considered to be the only objective reality, and that which will endure forever. The question of the cause of the universe or the meaning or purpose of existence is considered irrelevant.

This is the first fundamental error which Marx committed. He overlooked or denied the most basic universal relationship of cause and effect. Therefore, Marxism recognizes no absolute value or absolute being. Everything is relative. Man is responsible to no one and man must take the law into his own hands. He determines all values. He becomes God.

When man with his greediness and frailty takes the position of God, chaos results. When this becomes the official state policy, and the state determines man's values, society becomes a collection of beasts. The atrocities of 66 years of Communism stem from this dreadful error.

---

[37] Kolakowski, p.384.

The CAUSA worldview is a God-centered philosophy. It recognizes God as the first cause of the universe. When we establish the existence of God as the first cause of the universe, then Marxist theory crumbles from the ground floor. (1) The falsehood of the Marxist view of man is made clear, as is the deception of the dialectic. (2) Historical materialism is absurd when God is understood, as history takes its purpose from the original ideal of God.

God is the creator of man and the universe. He initiated and carried out this creation with an absolute purpose. (In later sections, we will discuss the ontology of God and His purpose of creation.)

Therefore, the universe is His before it is ours. God not only has purpose for this universe, but also unchanging and unique laws and principles to govern it. God Himself is unchanging and unique, and absolute value originates from Him. This absolute value gives rise to absolute morality, and this absolute morality becomes the guiding light for every man.

In any sovereign country, there are laws and means of enforcing those laws. The laws have been established for the well-being of the citizens. By obeying them, everyone can accomplish his purposes and aims. When someone violates the law, he will be punished by the law enforcement officials.

In the same way, all men are living in the sovereign universe of God and mankind, and the universe has laws and principles to govern it. When you are living up to these principles and laws, you are able to fulfill the purpose of your life. When you violate them, you suffer frustrations and possibly injuries and destruction.

This is precisely the error of Marxism. Marx not only denied the universal law of cause and effect, he also denied the very existence of God and His authority. Karl Marx was ignorant of God, the most significant being in the universe. It is impossible that he could develop any kind of progressive and useful program for human life.

b. Marx's second error--a false diagnosis of the cause of human alienation

CAUSA can agree with Karl Marx on one thing, that human alienation exists. However, Marx made a grave error in failing to understand the true cause of human alienation.

Marx claimed that all human misery stems from the alienation of the product of labor: The fruits of labor have been plundered by the capitalists; the workers have been exploited; and the plundered products of labor have only served to make the capitalists rich and powerful. He saw the only solution to be the negation of private ownership of property and the extermination of all capitalists.

Since Karl Marx already had denied God and the eternal spirituality of man, he defined man as an economical being and nothing more. Man's economical behavior and his production relationships are the total of his existence according to Marx. Productive labor makes up the core of man's species-essence. It is what gives humanness to man.

In the CAUSA worldview, the economical behavior of men is seen as only one dimension of human life. In fact, although important, it is secondary to the spiritual dimension, the inner man. Man's economic behavior is governed and controlled by the inner man or the spiritual dimension. If we follow Marx's definition of man, it boils down to the conclusion that man is an advanced animal. There is no essencial difference between animal life and human life.

In the CAUSA view, man is distinct from the animals because he is both spiritual and physical. Man is a spiritual being who will live for eternity, governed by the moral principles of God. Man's awareness of God and obedience to His law set him apart from the animal world. Every human being is capable of recognizing God as the Creator and living under His moral principles, experiencing His love and compassion. Furthermore, man has the capacity to give himself sacrificially for the sake of the well-being of others. In short, man is man because he loves God and his fellow man. This is the original blueprint for man.

If this is the original nature of man, then clearly alienation has occured. It is the alienation of man from his own original nature. Men have lost their greatest virtues and blinded themselves to spiritual reality. In essence, man has seperated himself from G'od, descending to an animal-like level. Greed and selfishness have proliferated. This is all due to man's loss of his God-given original nature. When man seperated himself from G'od, he lost absolute value to live for. Man's perception of the universe was reduced to the material level. Since then, men have progressed through history in spiritual darkness.

It is CAUSA's view that the remedy for human

alienation must come from the root: the mind and heart of the individual human being. The priority of values which people hold must be redirected. In other words, a solution must come to the innermost part of man. When this occurs, the behavior of man--and the economical functioning of society--will automatically change. Karl Marx could not see this. He dealt only with the superficial dimensions of human life, and believed that an economical solution brought about by force would yield a worker's utopia. He attacked the symptom, but left the sickness unaltered. It is no wonder that one communist society after another has completely failed to solve alienation. Even though they destroyed the capitalist system, they established a new one run by the same corrupt people, and no change was made. Communism, by taking the knowledge of God and spirituality out of a man, can only make things worse.

c. Marx's third error--a false methodology for bringing a solution to human alienation.

As we have mentioned above, Marx misunderstood the origin and nature of the universe and he misdiagnosed the cause of human alienation. Under these circumstances, what kind of solution could he offer? If a doctor does not understand the anatomy of a healthy person and proceeds to misdiagnose a serious desease, he will undoubltedly prescribe the wrong treatment. When the patient takes the wrong medicine, he only gets worse.

Since Marx felt that evil results from the capitalists plundering the products of labor from the workers, he proceeded to call for the extermination of the capitalists, and the subsequent negation of private ownership of property. In order to achieve that goal, he devised a methodology: a class struggle of the proletariat against the capitalists or bourgeoise.

To justify this class struggle through violent revolution, he developed what later came to be known as dialectical materialism. He made the dialectic a law of nature and society, and stated that progress can only come through opposition and conflict. When he spoke of the struggle between contradictory elements, he made it clear that he meant overthrow or extermination. The law of the dialectic inevitably becomes a justification for barbarism, because killing ceases to be a crime.

For this reason, the 66 year record of communism is a history of murder. Murder being the inexorable law of progress, it continues long after the revolution is finished. On June 11, 1937, for example, Stalin suddenly conceived of the entire Red Army leadership as a threat to him and an enemy of the revolution. Marshall Tukhachevsky

and his family were condemned to death and executed within 48 hours.[38] Stalin went on to execute 90% of all the generals, 80% of the colonels, and 50% of the entire officer corps (about 30,000 men). Between January 1937 and December 1938, there were 7 million recorded arrests and deportations, one Vlion executions, and two millon deaths in prison camps.

In contrast to the Marxist dialectic, the CAUSA worldview affirms that the law of progress in nature and society is that of giving and receiving in relationships of mutual cooperation. Every creation in the universe is formed from the union of paired subject and object elements which share a common purpose and are pursuing mutual benefit. The complementary relationship between the two provides the energy for existence, action, multiplication and progress.

The law of cooperation is in operation from the smallest levels of particles, such as the proton and electron, to the highest level of creation, human life. In human society, husband and wife form a reciprocal relationship where the giving and receiving of love fulfills their happiness and multiplies children. Ultimately, even the relationship between God and man conforms to this law. In this case, God is the subject, and all men are the objects forming reciprocal relationships with Him. This fulfills the joy and satisfaction of God which is the purpose of creation, and also fulfills the joy, satisfaction, and eternal life of man. (An entire chapter will be devoted later to explaining this extremely important relationship.)

d. Marx's fourth error--a false understanding of human history

Marx greatly misunderstood human history. He saw it as a succession of class struggles, and developed historical materialism, applying it to history from its imagined beginnings. This view is a conjecture which does not correspond to historical evidence.

Marx maintained that at the beginning of history there existed a primitive comunal society where everyone lived in harmony without private possessions. With the emergence of slaves and slave masters, this communal

---

38 Boris Souvarine, Stalin, (New York: Alliance book Corp., 1939), p.629.

39 Figaro, 1978.

society became a slave society, and class struggle began. Transition from one stage of social organization to another can only be made through violence.

Contrary to this observation, however, peaceful transitions from one stage to another are possible. In the case of the Meiji empire of Japan, for example, the transition was made from feudalism to a modern industrial society through cooperation between the heads of state and the people. There was no violent revolution.

Furthermore, there were many wars in history that had nothing to do with class struggle. The struggle that is occurring in Ireland today has its roots in religious differences. Canada is experiencing division due to differences in languages and culture.

By viewing all struggles as class struggles, Marxist thinkers have consistently misunderstood the nature of conflicts. During the first world war, Lenin urged the workers of Russia, Germany, France and England not to go to war. He believed that the most important basis for unity and solidarity was class. Lenin failed to understand that there are many things more powerful than class. Love of country is one of these. In spite of all of Lenin's pleas, the workers chose to go and fight for their nations.

Furthermore, we find that Marx only applied his dialectical law selectively. If the dialectic is the basis of all behavior, there should be no exceptions. If all of history is a manifestation of its functioning, then why will it cease to function when a communist society has been established? Will all progress stop at that point? Apparently Marx had a hidden double standard for applying the dialectic.

In the CAUSA worldview, the ultimate cause of struggle in this world stems from the internal struggle that exists in man. As great political and ethical philosophers from Plato and Aristotle have noted, this is a struggle between virtue and vice, selfishness and unselfishness, and this struggle is manifested externally on the levels of society, nation, and world as a struggle between good and evil. There is no doubt that there have been tremendous struggles throughout history, but this was not meant to be. These struggles came about because selfishness and evil have become part of man's nature. The many struggles of history stem from the same cause, the struggle between good and evil.

How can this conflict be resolved? Certainly not through class struggle. Man must restore establish an

appropriate relationship with God and with his fellow man. Man must find a way to conquer selfishness and evil in his own daily life. This is only possible if man can find God and find eternal value in relationship with Him.

It is CAUSA's view that man has hope because his original, true nature is good. When a man changes his priority of values, establishing his proper relationship with God, this will permanently solve the problem of alienation. From that point, there shall be no more war and conflict. Man and the universe will progress according to the original pattern of giving and receiving in mutual cooperation.

III. THE PRACTICE OF MARXISM

Marxism claims to be the champion of the cause of human rights. It claims to be a harbinger of peace and the champion of national liberation. Meanwhile, it is responsible for the deaths of 150 million people in 66 years. It has produced the worst possible economic stagnation and failure in the Soviet Union, along with unimaginable human suffering and atrocities. Why? Because of the faulty application of Marx's principles? Because of simple mismanagement? Absolutely not.

The miserable failure of Communism and its evils stem from the roots of the Marxist philosophy itself. There is inherent defect and falsehood in the doctrine, and in accordance with the natural principles of the universe, it has failed. Let us look at the practical application of Marxist philosophy.

1. Communism says there is no God. Then man cannot be a child of God. If there is no God, then what is the difference between men and animals? Without a clear answer to this question, an individual is responsible to no one. Men can easily kill other men who stand in their way. Murder in the name of the revolution is not only justified, it is glorified.

2. Communism says that man has no eternal life. The consequences of saying this are very significant. It means that man suffers no consequences for his actions. He can do anything to his fellow man without sanction. Man is only a temporary phenomenon of matter which is going to quickly return to the elements of which it is composed. Communism offers nothing more to man's life than the physical satisfaction which may be possible on the earth. To achieve earthly ambition, anything is

permissable. When a person subscribes to this view, he becomes a beast, and a human being who has been reduced to the level of a beast, endowed with skills and intellect, is a far more fearsome thing than any savage animal on earth. The gas chamber was Hitler's tool. The Gulag was Stalin's, and it still operates and is growing, because under this system, it is seen as the means of revolutionary progress.

3. Communism says that the essence of man is his capacity **to perform** labor. Whoever does not perform "social labor" is not human. Lenin defined social labor as revolutionary activity. Whoever does not participate in the revolution is not a "man." Eliminating such a person is automatically justified.

At the time of the fall of Cambodia, the communists killed former members of the army. They killed the former schoolteachers; they also killed all those who had a position with the former Cambodian government. Why? Because they were not "men."

When Mao Tse Thng's forces occupied Tibet, they pounded nails into the eyes of Buddhist priests. Why was that? Since the Buddhist priests had not worked for the revolution, it was reasoned that they were not human. This is the practical implication of the Marxist definition of men.

4. What is the practical implication of the dialectic? It is the justification for murder.

Lenin maintained that the cause for the failure of the Paris Commune in 1871 was that not enough people were killed, and he saw to it that the same failure did not occur in Russia. [40] Trotsky quoted hiw i as saying, "There is no revolution without a bloodbath."

Communist strategists blame the failure of Allende to consolidate power in Chile on the fact that he did not trigger off the violent revolution quickly enough. Fidel Castro went to great lengths to pursuade him of the necessity of pushing the workers to violence, and presented him with a gun as a gift.

---

[40] Alexander Solzhenitsyn, Denuncia, (Santiago, Chile: Academia Superior de Ciencias, November, 1981), "Mensaje a los trabajadores norteamericanos," pp.69-70.

[41] Figaro, 1978.

5. **What are the implications of historical materialism?** It means totalitarian dictatorship. According to Marxist theory, during the socialist stage of society, before Communist utopia can be estabished, repression is absolutely essential to avoid slipping back into capitalism and to insure progress toward the ultimate state of communism. As a "good Marxist," Joseph Stalin took this concept literally, and killed millions of his own people.

In conclusion, the essence of Marxism is an apologetic for murder. The French new philosopher Andre Glucksmann once said:

> I do not believe in God, but after reading about the Gulag, I have cciae to the conclusion that the Devil must exist.

Indeed, Marxism resembles evil incarnate. It represents evil of a dimension which human history has never before seen.

IV. THE PRACTICE OF THE CAUSA WORLDVIEW

In the CAUSA worldview:

1. **God exists.** He is the Creator and Father of mankind. We are all his children. Each man is ultimately responsible to God for his thoughts and deeds, and each person merits the highest respect and love from his brothers and sisters. Under one Father, God, humankind is one family.

2. **Man has an eternal life.** We not only live on this earth, but also continue to live on in an eternal spiritual dimension. Eternal happiness is the goal of every person.

Only when people are aware of this can they have a sense of the eternal responsibility which they bear for their actions. We are eternally responsible towards every other human being, and man will truly reap as he sows. Man's supreme duty is the love of God and of his fellow man.

3. **Human happiness and progress can be wrought by mutual cooperation in the action of giving and receiving.** The virtue of selfless love brings the highest good **and**

---

42 Maurice Clavel, Deux Siecles chez Lucifer, (Paris: Seuil, 1978), p.18.

benefit for one's eternal well-being. Man's earthly life is his unique opportunity to develop. What we achieve here in the short period on earth has eternal consequences. When a person selflessly gives himself for the sake of the well-being of others, he is able to fulfill his ultimate potential. The family is the fundamental institution which God has given to man, and this is where man is able to learn and practice selfless love. The family is the basic unit of the community, and the community is the basic unit of the nation. The nation is the basic unit of the world society.

4. **God has endowed man with the gift of free will. By doing so, God endowed man with responsibility.** Man is **free to choose between what is conducive to spiritual life and growth and what is detrimental. God has given man the ultimate responsibility of steering** his own destiny. This is the unique privilege which every person has. At the same time, the privilege may become a curse if it is misused. In the CAUSA view, man **has been misusing his freedom and failing to take his responsibilities seriously.** This has caused a great deal of human misery and the rise of many evils, including Communism itself.

Man's highest hope is to fulfill the purpose of creation which God has given him. This can only be achieved when man completely fulfills his responsibility, and fulfills the purpose **of his life and God's creation. This is the source of joy for God and man.**

The CAUSA worldview, based on these powerful truths, is capable of completely solving the problem of Communism. This will be further elaborated in later chapters.