

Critique of the Communist Manifesto

Matthew Cserhati

Karl Marx wrote the Communist Manifesto in 1848, which was the founding document of the deadliest ideology ever known to mankind, claiming more than 100 million victims and destroying the lives of individuals and whole nations in its dark path, giving birth to the monster of the USSR (the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), also known as the Evil Empire.

Marx's ideology describes a constant centuries-long struggle between the rich and the poor, the freeman and the slave, the lord and the serf. His ideology is very much akin to the evolutionary struggle for the survival of the fittest. Marx even wanted to dedicate his book, "Das Kapital" (Capital) to Darwin. Marxist Communism is a natural extension of Darwinian theory; biological evolution is followed by social evolution, which ultimately leads to Utopia, where there is no class distinction.

Karl Marx describes in his own words a process he imagined starting with the industrial revolution of how capital played into the hands of a group of people called the bourgeois. The industrial revolution was hallmarked by great progress made in science and technology, making it possible to increase production manifold, even exponentially with newer and newer machines and inventions. It marked the end of the age of serfdom and the aristocracy where the nobles ruled over their peasant subjects. In this new era, however, due to this over-production, the rich capitalists got richer, and the poor got even poorer. The poorest segment of society were known as the proletariat, the workers who had to sell themselves to the rich capitalists for their labor in factories where they operated the assembly lines and the factory machines which were in the hands of the bourgeois capitalists.

Marx described their fate as even worse than that of the serf, who at least could produce and sell crops on his own land, or the craftsman who owned their own tools and were thus able to produce items, albeit on a small scale. According to Marx, why, the proletariats were even worse off than common slaves, since slaves had a constant, though wretched existence due to their being owned as property by their masters. On the other hand, the proletariat's existence was only temporary as they constantly had to sell themselves for labor and for compensation. Marx rails against slavery in the Southern part of the United States and colonialism in general. Yet at the same time, the Soviet Union which was built upon his ideology formed "colonies" of its own in the satellite countries of the eastern Bloc.

In the Communist Manifesto the proletarians were even worse off than the handicraftsmen or the peasants, as these owned their own tools or land on which they could produce food, or wares. The proletariat had none of these and could thus not compete even with these layers of society. Therefore it is logical as to why the Communists mercilessly raided and beat up rich peasants during the Communist era in countries such as Hungary¹. Things got so bad during Communism in East Germany that even

¹ These people were called "kuláks"

factory workers themselves protested against their living conditions imposed upon them by the Communist ruling elite.

Marx rails against the big factory owners who, investing in technological development are capable of making newer and better machines which are capable of increasing production and wealth to untold new limits. However, since only the rich industrial elite could afford such large, expensive machines, it left a large number of factory workers to man these machines. It is as if though Marx was anti-technology and against scientific development. Indeed, logically so, for during the Communist era the Communists were highly suspicious of what they degradingly called “imperialist inventions”. As an interesting anecdote, we can recount the tale of a Hungarian agricultural worker who one day came across the infamous Trofim Lysenko, who for several decades opposed the science of genetics in the Soviet Union. This man was trying to get bulls to breed with cows. The agricultural worker inquired as why didn’t Lysenko inspect the bull’s sperm under the microscope? Lysenko’s arrogant reply was that he would not, because the microscope was an “imperialist invention”.

Reading through the document one cannot avoid the author’s feeling of enmity and hatred towards the bourgeois class as well as feelings of envy which are so characteristic of our modern society. Marx personally was a hateful man, always hot-tempered and angry². He was also a member of the Satanist church and also a 32 degree Mason. Surprisingly, his own father was a wealthy lawyer³. The Communist Manifesto ends in a “call to arms” for the workers of the world to unite and cast away their chains, the only thing they can lose, a subtle threat to the bourgeois class that their doom is coming.

The essence of Communism is the abolition of private property, class distinction, and competition. These three reasons are why Communism ultimately failed.

Marx writes: “It has been objected [by the bourgeois] that upon the abolition of private property, all work will cease, and universal laziness will overtake us.” History shows that Marx was dead wrong and the bourgeois were exactly correct. If private property is abolished, there is no incentive to excel, or to produce too much, because someone else will enjoy the fruit of your own labor. Since “everybody owned everything”, this led not only to universal laziness, but *also to stealing*. This happened in former Communist countries such as those in Eastern Europe. The logic was that if I have a share in everything and anything around me, then there should be no problem if I take things home from the factory, or the workplace. After all, I am allowed to use it, *since it’s not private any more*. In Communist societies nobody was unemployed. But as to how people were employed was another question, entirely. People could be counted as employed for very short periods of time, or they could be employed with extremely simple jobs, much akin to burger flipper jobs we have today in America.

Furthermore, if competition is eliminated, then there is no incentive to excel, or to create a better product. If there is nobody to compete against, then only mediocre products will be made to put into a monolithic economy. If there are no worries that a better product will hit the market, then you have

² Apostate: The men who destroyed the Christian west. Kevin Swanson. Generations with /vision. 2013.

³ <http://antineeworldorder.blogspot.com/2007/10/who-was-karl-marx.html>

nothing to fear. Indeed this way Communism again is shown to be against technological development, and anti-science⁴. This is why factories in former Communist countries produced washing machines which didn't work properly or Trabant automobiles with plastic casing which fell apart at low-speed collisions with trees. Upon opening up to capitalism and democracy, Eastern European cars such as the Skoda or Lada improved in quality.

One of the fundamental flaws in Communism is that it tries to make everybody *uniform*. This is impossible, since everybody is different from everybody else. It was more of this type of non-uniformity that sparked Marx to jealousy, and class envy. Nevertheless, even though the goal of Communism is to reach a classless Utopia, Communist dictators and part leaders were good to only replace the monarchs and the nobility of previous centuries.

Marx completely misunderstands that there is no fix-sized amount of wealth which must be "fairly" redistributed. Why should we trust politicians (and Communists at that) to be wiser than us to know how to appropriate our hard earned wealth to others? Each man according to his capabilities and hard work can produce and multiply. This is the true spirit of capitalism, and the free market. Ideas such as these were espoused by Max Weber, an ideology far superior to the misguided and unprofessionalism of Marx.

The aftermath of Marxism is mirrored in the class envy, no, the class warfare of modern-day American society. This can be well seen in the feminist movement, which marches hand in hand with the LGBT movement. According to feminist ideology, "In the world marriage is a battlefield on which a vicious, relentless struggle rages between the tyrant-husband and the rebel-wife. Now the one, now the other, is temporarily victorious. At present in our society, the rebellious woman has the upper hand. If the world lasts, the male will again assert himself, overthrow the woman's dominance, and rule her more tyrannically than before."⁵ And on the other hand, the gay agenda strongly allied itself with the anti-war, anti-capitalist movement whose goal was to uproot the existing social order in the 1960's and 1970's, was capable by the force of sheer revolution to delete homosexuality from the list of mental illnesses of the American Psychiatric Association in 1973⁶. Furthermore, the gay agenda claims that it will unmask familiar public figures as homosexuals, not the safe familiar bourgeois figures we assume them to be, that the family unit will be abolished, as part of a firing of guns and manning barricades of the ultimate revolution⁷.

While the Bible makes it very clear that the rich shouldn't exploit the poor because of their monetary power, it also says that "Neither shalt thou countenance a poor man in his cause."⁸ According to the

⁴ In 2010, even 20 years after the fall of Communism a factory worker could make more money than a PhD student researcher in Hungary.

⁵ The secret thoughts of an unlikely convert. Rosaria Butterfield. Crown and Covenant Publications, 2012.

⁶ Homosexuality and American Psychiatry – the politics of a diagnosis. Ronald Bayer. Princeton University Press. 1987.

⁷ Michael Swift. Gay Community News. Feb 15-21, 1987.

⁸ Ex. 23:3

Biblical parable⁹, some people receive only one talent, some two, and some five. God created us all differently, to His own pleasure, and free will. Furthermore, the Bible also speaks out against the abolition of private property. If private property is abolished, then the common individual is completely defenseless against the government which would have ultimate power to exploit everybody – power corrupts, but absolute power corrupts absolutely. In the story of the evil king Ahab in 1 Kings 21 we read how King Ahab steals the vineyard of Naboth out of jealousy. In verse 3 Naboth resists giving his only source of continuous sustenance to the king, who represents the state. Naboth received the vineyard from his father as an inheritance, something which the Communists also wanted to abolish.

God is our greatest resource. If He created the heavens and the earth, then He can surely provide for those who love Him. God has foreordained everything which shall come to pass, and He will certainly provide every necessary thing for His people in order for them to fulfill His will¹⁰. Therefore let us trust in Him and His provision instead of the Socialist party, Big Brother who is watching you, the state, or Karl Marx.

⁹ Matthew 25:14-30

¹⁰ Matthew 6:25-34