

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

The Ruling Principle for All Humanity: Karl Marx

DAVID W. BREESE

1

Beneath the leaden skies north of London met that day a small and sober group of mourners. It was Saturday, March 17, 1883, and the faithful had gathered for the funeral service of the man who was to be called by some the greatest thinker in all of history. The accolades concerning his life and thought border on idolatry, and the promises believed by many as to the future he had created amount to little short of heaven on earth.



The body in the casket was that of Karl Marx.

Who was this man? One of the most expressive answers to that question was contained in the funeral oration made on that occasion by his friend Friedrich Engels. Engels spoke in English to those assembled, and his words are considered one of the best short presentations of the life and work of the man whose body was being placed in the ground.

On the 14th of March, at a quarter to three in the afternoon, the greatest living thinker ceased to think. He had been left alone for scarcely two minutes, and when we came back, we found him in an armchair, peacefully gone to sleep—but forever.

An immeasurable loss has been sustained, both by the militant *proletariat* of Europe and America, and by historical science, in the death of this man. The gap that has been left by the death of this mighty spirit will soon enough make itself felt.

Just as Darwin discovered the law of evolution in organic nature, so Marx discovered the law of evolution in human history; he discovered the simple fact, hitherto concealed by an overgrowth of ideology, that mankind must first of all eat and drink, have shelter and clothing, before it can pursue politics, science, religion, art, etc.; and that therefore the production of the immediate material means of life and consequently the degree of economic development attained by a

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

given people or during a given epoch, form the foundation upon which the forms of government, the legal conceptions, the art, and even the religious ideas of the people concerned have been evolved, and in the light of which these things must therefore be explained, instead of vice versa as had hitherto been the case.

Engels continued that graveside speech:

But that is not all. Marx also discovered the special law of motion governing the present-day capitalist method of production and the *bourgeois* society that this method of production has created. The discovery of surplus value suddenly threw light on the problem in trying to solve which all previous investigators, both *bourgeois* economists and socialist critics, had been groping in the dark.

Two such discoveries would be enough for one life-time. Happy the man to whom it is granted to make even one such discovery. But in every single field which Marx investigated—and he investigated very many fields, none of them superficially—in every field, even in that of mathematics, he made independent discoveries.

This was the man of science. But this was not even half the man. Science was for Marx a historical, dynamic, revolutionary force. However great the joy with which he welcomed a new discovery in some theoretical science whose practical application perhaps it was as yet quite impossible to envisage, he experienced a quite other kind of joy when the discovery involved immediate revolutionary changes in industry and in the general course of history. For example, he followed closely the discoveries made in the field of electricity and recently those of Marcel Deprez.

Here Engels reveals the real Marx:

For Marx was before all else a revolutionary. His real mission in life was to contribute in one way or another to the overthrow of capitalist society and of the forms of government which it had brought into being, to contribute to the liberation of the present-day proletariat, which he was the first to make conscious of its own position and its needs, of the conditions under which it could win its freedom. Fighting was his element. He fought with a passion, a tenacity, and a success such as few could rival. His work on the first *Rheinische Zeitung* (1842), the *Paris Vorwärts* (1844), the *Brussels Deutsche Zeitung* (1847), the *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (1848–9), the *New York Tribune* (1852–61), and in addition to these, a host of militant pamphlets, work in revolutionary clubs in Paris, Brussels, and London, and finally, crowning all, the formation of the International Working Men's

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

Association—this was indeed an achievement of which Marx might well have been proud, even if he had done nothing else.

And consequently, Marx was the best-hated and most-calumniated man of his time. Governments, both absolutist and republican, deported him from their territories. The *bourgeoisie*, whether conservative or extreme Democrat, vied with one another in heaping slanders upon him. All this he brushed aside as if it were cobweb, ignoring them, answering only when necessity compelled him. And now he has died—beloved, revered, and mourned by millions of revolutionary fellow-workers—from the mines of Siberia to California, in all parts of Europe and America—and I make bold to say though he may have opponents he has hardly one personal enemy.

His name and his work will endure through the ages!¹

This eulogy came from the pen of the man who was the closest associate of Karl Marx through the course of his adult life. We can therefore conclude that this speech represents the way Marx and his work was understood by his followers and the degree of influence he and they hoped would result in the world outside of their immediate circle.

The same sentiment as Engels's is expressed by Philip Foner in the preface to an elaborate collection of responses to the death of Karl Marx called *Karl Marx Remembered*:

Marxism is today the most influential body of thought in the world. Hundreds of millions live in societies whose fundamental principles—socialism—were laid down over a century ago by Karl Marx and his collaborator and friend, Friedrich Engels. Both were Germans, but they propounded principles that were and remain universal and international. The universality and internationalism of Marxism have been demonstrated again and again from the moment it came into existence, and one of the manifestations of its international character was evident in the mourning which followed the news that on March 14, 1883, Karl Marx, the father of socialism, had died. Coupled with the grief was the universal respect for the enormous contributions this man made to mankind.²

Foner also asserts: "I am confident that when the two hundredth anniversary of the death of Karl Marx will be observed, the entire world will be socialist."³

¹ Philip Foner, *Karl Marx Remembered* (San Francisco: Synthesis, 1983), p. 38

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

More than a few books could be filled with the eulogistic quotations of the followers—indeed the worshipers—of Karl Marx, using the most complimentary language imaginable to refer to him and the contribution he made to society.

Yes, it could be argued that the world-changing effect of the life and philosophy of Karl Marx is a measurable thing, and by that measure he has been one of the greatest influences in history.

That simple measure testifies that the philosophy of Karl Marx and the political structure that grew from his work has conquered and presently controls one-third of the population of the world. For most of the era following World War II, Communism has been the form of political ideology and consequent government in iron control over the lives and fortunes of one-and-a-half billion people. From 1918 onward, no major international political decision has been made by any power in the world apart from the question, What will Russia and the Communists think of this?

A second form of influence beside political control has been exercised by the ghost of Karl Marx. That is the control that comes about when ideas are extended into a belief structure that dominates the minds of men. The belief structure of Marxism can surely be said to be a dominant feature over another third of the world. The portion of earth we call the Third World is highly Marxist in nature. Western societies have not been exempt, either, for particularly on the academic level, multitudes have been in thrall to Marxism.

Who was this man whose ideas made such an impact in the past and who continues to a high degree to rule the world from his grave?

A minimum definition would call Karl Marx a social philosopher from Germany, born of Jewish parents, and highly influenced by the radical ideas that made an impact upon him in his youth. Marx was born on May 5, 1818, to what would be called a generally upper-class German family. His father was a lawyer of Jewish background who converted from Judaism to Lutheranism in 1817. Some of Marx's biographers suggest that this conversion stemmed more from practicality than from conviction, thereby leading to the suggestion that religion was at the background of the Marx family rather than at its core.

Still, in his early life Marx considered the possibility of entering the Lutheran ministry, and he attended a religious preparatory school for a time. Some of the writings of this aspiring young man remain in which he discussed Christ, Christianity, and the gospel. One gets the impression, however, that he was writing as a young academic observer rather than as a participant in the Christian religion. He studied law at both Bonn and Berlin, but in the process of his education became more interested in abstract philosophy

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

than in the practice of law. He took a Ph.D. degree in 1842 at Jena, where the requirements expected of doctoral candidates were less stringent than they were in Berlin.

In those days, Europe was a place of animated intellectual interaction, with various schools of thought developing around many points of view having to do with the purpose of life, the nature of government, and the engines of history. The ideas of Hegel were much in discussion across Europe. In noting these discussions, we can observe an early exhibition of Marx's reactionary tendencies, for though Marx retained some of the dialectic concepts of Hegel, he rebelled against Hegel's idealistic emphasis and instead embraced the materialism of Ludwig Feuerbach as a philosophy by which life should be lived.

In 1842, Marx began to express not only his growing literary abilities but also his radicalism by becoming the editor of *Rheinische Zeitung*. From that point throughout the rest of his life, Marx was not content simply to give pallid interpretations of the news and the ideas of his time. Rather, he used his verbal abilities to shock and unsettle his readers, calling for radical reforms in the government, reforms the government thought too bizarre to allow Marx to continue advocating. Consequently, the newspaper was suppressed after but a year of publication.

Indignant over this rejection, Marx migrated to Paris, which he considered to be more hospitable to revolutionary ideas and more willing to shelter the malcontents of the world. After all, Paris in the 1840s was still recovering from the seismic shock of the French Revolution. Those drastic days of revolution, in which the social structure of Paris, France, and Europe was torn to shreds, could not avoid becoming the continuing subject of discussion by intellectuals in France and throughout Europe. To this day the French Revolution is viewed by the nations of the West with a kind of strange fascination coupled with horror. At the same time this bloody event is incorporated into Communist thought as a proud part of the heritage of Communist movements throughout the world.

Starting with an inchoate set of political ideas, the French Revolution thrashed its way into revolutionary political activity and then massive military campaigns that were to consume the lives of perhaps 4 million of the sons of Europe. The most notable aspect of the French Revolution is that it created the kind of man who had not seriously existed on earth before.

This new kind of man was the professional revolutionary.

The professional revolutionary is the radical individual who, while disbelieving in God, soul, and eternal destiny, is still willing to hazard his life to produce revolutionary change. The professional revolutionary is possibly the world's most dangerous man.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

Marx knew, and the thinkers of that time knew, that behind the terrors of the French Revolution was the philosophy articulated by Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–78). Rousseau contended that the progress of the sciences and the arts had actually contributed to the corruption of humanity rather than to its improvement. Put another way, Rousseau rejected the doctrine of original sin and held instead that it was the advance of civilization that had corrupted society. Therefore, civilization, as represented by capitalism, royal government, and a long-established church, needed to be rejected. Man must immerse himself in a back-to-nature movement.

The mature Rousseau then took to analyzing government and concluded that the lone acceptable form of government was the one that would come to pass on the basis of a “social contract” between the citizens and the government. Reasonable men were entirely able to form a compact with one another that would do away with the forms of corruption other analysts of history have called *sin*. Righteous men were the answer, Rousseau asserted, defining righteous people as those who lived as he did and embraced his points of view. The trouble is that Rousseau was a perfectly despicable character. He fathered five illegitimate children by his semiliterate mistress, Thérèse le Vasseur, which children he then sent off to die in the local children’s “hospital.”

The ideas of Rousseau quickly matured into the grievous scenes of the French Revolution. Those fearful days demonstrated for all to see that man was not essentially righteous, good, and charitable. Rather, they gave evidence that man has a lower nature, which, if given free reign, could turn him into a monster. Indeed, in the revolutionary days of 1789, human monsters owned the streets of Paris. They used the pike and the guillotine to speak to their enemies—and to many of their friends.

Those fearful, revolutionary days, succeeded by the reign of Napoleon Bonaparte, went a long way in producing the France, the Paris, of the nineteenth century. And that is where Marx now chose to live.

It is interesting to note that President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union, while speaking in the United States in 1989, referred to the great heritage of Communism. He announced that the glorious accomplishments of the socialist world revolution were based on two great events in history. Those he identified as the French Revolution of 1789 and the Russian Revolution of 1917. We hardly need to remind ourselves that these were two of the cruelest political earthquakes in the history of the world. We ought not, therefore, to take lightly a person or nation that still holds those revolutions as a sacred part of their heritage.

It was in Paris in the 1840s that Marx began his lifelong friendship with Friedrich Engels. At the same time, Marx became a socialist and began to pay careful attention to the

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

socialist writers of that day. We do well to wonder what took place in the mind of Karl Marx during those years as he formed his doctrines of “scientific socialism.” In some coffee shop, some beer parlor, some darkened library, Marx conceived the notion that has since become fatal to millions. He fancied himself as discovering certain “laws” within the social structure that produce the inevitable advance of socialism. He called this set of laws the “socialist world revolution” and developed the idea that the destiny of the world was at stake in the implementation of those laws for all men and for all nations. The “discovery” of the laws of history, which he saw as working inevitably in the advancement of culture, became a flame within the soul of self-absorbed and impressionable Karl Marx.

7

So it was that in 1847 he joined the Communist League where, not surprisingly to us, he soon became its leader. Commissioned by the League to bring to the world an expression of its ideas, Marx, along with his friend Engels, penned and published the now famous *Communist Manifesto*. A look at the Manifesto is instructive for the person who would attempt to fathom the reason for the influence of Communism.

Marx opened this fiery piece by saying:

A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter; Pope and Czar, *Metternich* and *Guizot*, French Radicals and German police-spies.

It is high time that Communists should openly, in the face of the whole world, publish their views, their aims, their tendencies, and meet this nursery tale of this Specter of Communism with a Manifesto of the party itself.

To this end, Communists of various nationalities have assembled in London, and sketched the following Manifesto, to be published in the English, French, German, Italian, Flemish, and Danish languages.⁴

Then follows seventy-five pages of invective against the establishment and the announcement that revolutionary socialism would come inexorably, inevitably upon the world.

In the *Manifesto* Marx ascribes all of the cruelties and grievances of history to an entity he calls the *bourgeoisie*. By *bourgeoisie*, Marx means capitalists, the owners of the means of social production and employers of wage-labor. By *proletariat*, he means the class of

⁴ Karl Marx, *The Communist Manifesto*, Gateway Edition (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1954), pp. 11–12.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

modern wage-laborers who, having no means of production of their own, are reduced to selling their labor-power in order to live.

Marx inveighs against those who own the means of production, saying, “The *bourgeoisie* has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked upon with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-laborers.

“The *bourgeoisie* has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation.”⁵

In the *Manifesto* Marx speaks of the steps by which the Communists intend to bring to pass their goal of “revolutionizing the mode of production”:

- 1) Abolition of property and land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
- 2) A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
- 3) Abolition of all right of inheritance.
- 4) Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
- 5) Centralization of credit in the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exclusive monopoly.
- 6) Centralization of the means of communication and the means of transport in the hands of the state.
- 7) Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the state; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
- 8) Equal liability of all to labor. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
- 9) Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of population over the country.
- 10) Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children’s factory labor in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, etc.⁶

⁵ Ibid., p. 19.

⁶ Ibid., p. 55.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

He then promises: “When, in the course of development, class distinctions have disappeared, and all production has been concentrated in the hands of a vast association of the whole nation, the public power will lose its political character.”⁷

Marx then makes a utopian promise:

If the *proletariat* during its contest with the *bourgeoisie* is compelled, by the force of circumstances, to organize itself as a class; if, by means of revolution, it makes itself the ruling class, and, as such sweeps away by force the old conditions of production, then it will, along with these conditions, have swept away the conditions for the existence of class antagonisms, and of classes generally, and will thereby have established its own supremacy as a class.

In place of the old *bourgeois* society, with its classes and class antagonisms, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all.⁸

Time and space would fail to repeat all the demands and promises made by Marx in the *Manifesto*. But it is useful to observe the famous conclusion to the *Manifesto*:

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The *proletarians* have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win!

Working men of all countries, unite!⁹

We would do well to remember that Europe in 1848 was in a revolutionary mood. A number of the nations of Europe were in the process of destabilizing themselves. Therefore, the suggestion made by Marx that the true division of society was between the *bourgeoisie* and the *proletariat*—the ruling class and the working class—fell on responsive ears. There can be no doubt that a pro-socialist percolation took place across Europe—in France, Germany, Russia, England, and Italy. Communist parties, by one name or another, began to develop in these lands of Europe and did not neglect to plant the seeds of revolution in the United States. Marx saw himself as the instigator of these changes. So, finally, did the world.

⁷ Ibid., p. 56.

⁸ Ibid., pp. 56–57.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 81–82.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

Ideological success is a heady wine indeed.

When one sees his ideas begin to take root in the lives of a few others, he finds it difficult to resist the aspiration to do and say more. Marx was no exception.

Over the next fifteen years he and his friend Engels expended themselves in speech-making, publishing, organizing, and especially in writing on behalf of the coming socialist world revolution. Encouraged by the response to the *Manifesto*, they buried themselves in the cause of establishing Marx's theory of economics and in producing page after page of authoritative-sounding pronouncements as to how that theory would work out in practice.

The result of their efforts was a major work on economics, *Das Kapital*, which appeared in 1867. This book was the first part of a three-volume work edited by Engels. Thus it was that from 1867 forward the world was given massive doses of economic theory far more extensive in sheer volume than anything that had come before. *Das Kapital* was in a quantitative sense so far ahead of any other book of its time that it simply blanked out the competition. The economically minded of the populace reeled under the wagonload of Marx's economic thought. So great was the effort of assimilating the massive volume of impassioned ideas that the economic community hardly had time to recover from its effects when along came volumes 2 and 3 of *Das Kapital*, and the smothering effect began again.

No one can deny that the publication of *Das Kapital* had a stunning effect on social and economic thought. Some even called the book "the greatest ever written," and Marx was idolized as an economic thinker who stood on a mountaintop of intellectual insight far above the *petit bourgeoisie* intellectuals of his time—the same view, incidentally, Marx had of himself.

In the sixteen years between the publication of *Das Kapital* and the end of his life, Marx continued to live the life of a near-recluse, his hermitage being the royal library of England. At the same time, his theories of scientific socialism made their way across the world. One can appreciate the impact he made on many individuals by noting some of the remarks published on the occasion of his death in 1883. The *New York Sun* said:

Karl Marx was by far the best-known, most influential, and intellectually the ablest of those *katheder sozialisten*, or highly educated reformers who in Germany have scrutinized the assumptions and deductions of the orthodox political economists from a new point of view.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

If the title of prophet and protagonist belongs to any of the promoters of the world socialist movement, it would by the consent of all intelligent observers be awarded to Karl Marx.

Freiheit said: "On 14 March in London at the age of 65, the greatest thinker of his century, the father of modern socialism, the trailblazer of a new science, the founder of the international working men's association, a hero of the socialist revolution, died—Karl Marx.

"From his grave comes the call which for 40 years he constantly hurled to the world: 'Proletarians of all countries, unite!' "

The *Boston Daily Advertiser* said: "Karl Marx was one of the most remarkable men of our time, although he lived in comparative obscurity, and his principal work, on *Capital*, is a special plea rather than an inductive or philosophic treatise."

The *Chicago Tribune* called him "a man of high intelligence, a scholar, and a thinker."

It is obvious, therefore, that the influence of Karl Marx extended into the years following his life. And as we have seen, he continues to hold a major influence in our time, ruling from his grave. Why is this the case?

Why indeed? How is one to explain the fact that nations have been captured by his philosophy and that millions of people, many of them willingly, have marched to their deaths on many battlefields in order to be true to his cause?

We may be helped in answering that question by first asking the basic question, What is Communism? That is because it is Communism that gave us the socialist world revolution and that continues to press upon the intellectual elements of our society its continued call to change the world.

Communism is first of all *atheism*. At the core of its philosophy and conduct is the conviction and the oft-repeated announcement "There is no God."

We must therefore remind ourselves that the declaration of the absence of God is not simply another acceptable philosophic point of view among many others. Rather, it is the denial of the Christian claim—yes, the teaching of the Bible—that there is a just, holy, loving, and personal God who has created the universe and who presides over its continuance. Obviously, there are many implications of such a view, and the Bible is not silent concerning these implications, these dreadful consequences. The Psalmist has told us:

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

The fool hath said in his heart, "There is no God." They are corrupt, they have done abominable works, there is none that doeth good. The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy; there is none that doeth good, no not one. (Psalm 14:1–3)

This penetrating discourse on the implications of atheism continues by saying, "Have all the workers of iniquity no knowledge, who eat up my people as they eat bread, and call not upon the Lord? There were they in great fear; for God is in the generation of the righteous" (Psalm 14:4–5).

We learn from the Bible, then, that atheism is the philosophy of a fool. It is the emanation of an unsound mind. It is not a philosophy; rather, it is one of the forms of insanity. In any discussion concerning the nature of atheism, we must remember that God has said, "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead, so that they [the Communists and all other atheists] are without excuse" (Romans 1:20).

Do we not have, then, a presentation of the deterioration of the mind of all who may be moving from theism to atheism? Indeed we do. The Scripture says. "Because, when they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things" (Romans 1:21–23).

The atheist, therefore, can be expected to move from sanity to depravity, from reasonable activities to abominable works. It has been well said: "If you invite an atheist over to dinner, be sure to count the silverware."

A second major feature of Marxist thought is *materialism*. This is the notion that all that exists in every possible mode of being is constructed of atoms and molecules. All is material. Materialism denies the existence of such unseen, immeasurable realities as love, honor, courage, and fidelity, yet because those concepts continue to exist in the *bourgeois* mentality, the Communists have redefined them, giving them definitions that, like their currency, are useful only within the Communist system.

Consistent materialism must even deny the uniqueness of man himself and declare that the human is merely matter in motion determined by the chemistry of his brain. The Marxists have, therefore, placed great stock in what we now call the conditioned reflex,

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

the knee-jerk response of a mechanism to a stimulus. Pavlov's dogs were for the Communists the great lesson on the nature of the human being.

They reject the response of man to the call of his soul by describing that human activity as nonsense. World Communism has made unanswerable the question of Christ, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" In its attempt to gain the world, Marxism has left behind all matters of the spirit. What remains is the philosophic cadaver of a body without a soul.

In the place of spirit Marxism has advocated the materialism that came out of a confluence of ideas—some borrowed from the German idealist and proponent of the dialectical scheme of things, George Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel—that took place in the mind of Karl Marx. Marx called this confluence of ideas *dialectical materialism*.

For Marx, dialectical materialism referred to the notion that all of reality, and especially all historical processes, moved in a dialectical fashion. By that, he meant that a wave motion is built into the fabric of time and history. According to Marx, all societies previous to the Communist society were inherently unstable. In those societies nature itself persistently attempted to rise in successive waves of historical progress, each wave overwhelming the existing status quo. Borrowing from Hegel, the status quo Marx called the *thesis*. The opposing wave motion he called the *antithesis*. Marx claimed that it is inevitable that the antithesis overwhelm the thesis and produce a resolution of those two opposing forces called the *synthesis*.

Quickly, however, the synthesis would become the new thesis and would be opposed by the next wave, the new antithesis. With this, the same process would be repeated as the inevitable dialectic of history moved on and on.

For reasons that have yet to be explained, Marx then insisted that the last wave of history was the socialist world revolution. This wave would overwhelm the thesis—capitalist society—and bring a beautiful and lasting resolution to the forces of history. This resolution would produce the Communist utopia, the new Communist man, the final resolution of every competing force in the universe. Yes, heaven on earth would be produced by the resolution of the dialectical forces of history. For the Communist, the declaration that "Communism is the wave of the future" is not merely a slogan; it expressed the core of the Communist faith.

Marx was, however, impatient with the rate at which the forces of history appeared to be moving. For him, social evolution was not enough. Although he was a great admirer of Charles Darwin, he thought that evolution needed help from the outside. Marx's call, therefore, was for a more powerful, dynamic, forceful, world-changing form of

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

evolution—namely, revolution. Hence his call: “Workers of the world, unite; we have nothing to lose but our chains. We have a world to win!”

A third characteristic of Marxist thought has to do with economics. It is best called *economic determinism*.

What really determines the direction in which history is to move? If there is no God, what hand of guidance is placed upon culture so that it will move inexorably toward the proper point on the compass? Marx’s answer was economic determinism.

Marx believed in a form of natural selection, but he held that this selection was produced not primarily by biological forces but by economic forces. For him, the *bourgeois* societies are weak, decadent, cruel, and exploitive because the capitalists produce an economic environment that fosters these negative human qualities. Children are raised to believe that they own their clothes, their shoes, their bicycles, and later, their automobiles and homes. Marx saw this concept of personal possession as the grossest of evils because he believed that what a person presumed to own he owned in contrast to, indeed in opposition to, the good of society. To Marx the individual counted for nothing and was only significant as he functioned for the good of society. The greatest evil was that which is inimical to the advancement of the Marxist society; and the greatest good was that which advanced the Marxist society.

The good society Marx saw as only coming to pass through an economic revolution that removed all possessions from the hands of the individual and placed them into the hands of the state. Then the class struggle would disappear and everyone would work “according to his ability” and give to each “according to his need,” to quote the famous dictum.

But for Marx, the guidance of mere economic determinism was not a strong enough engine to accomplish his ends. There must be a firmer hand upon the wheel of history. That firmer hand would be the god he invented—the Communist Party.

Marx saw the true Communist as a person possessed with profound insight, a limitless vision for the future, a willingness to do anything to bring that future to pass, and a total loyalty to the Party.

Instantly, as anyone can see, there was created the great contradiction to Marxism—a new class. The Communist Party instantly took to itself all possessions, all power, all ability to lead. The Party became the custodian of every plan for the future and of the life of every individual in the system. So it was that Marx, who advocated with his dying breath

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

a classless society, created a new, firmer, crueler class than any *bourgeois* society in the whole world.

Yes, the Communist Party became a god. The mind of man has been so created by God so that it cannot function as an autonomous entity. It must have an ultimate truth, a final authority, a god it sees as the fountainhead of all values and from which all final truth is derived. Having denied the existence of the living and true God, Marxism in cynical contradiction turned to atheism to create a god for man to serve joyfully — the Party.

It can safely be said that all of the thousands of derivations of Marxist thought are built on these basic principles of Marxism that are at the core of Marxist thought: atheism, dialectical materialism, and economic *determinism*.

Now any system of philosophy that purports to change the world must over the passage of time prove its point. The test of time is the great test any philosophic view must eventually face. A thousand systems can be created in as many clever minds, and at the beginning have no need for proof. They are stated as articles of faith, even though they were in fact created in midair by people who call themselves philosophers, sociologists, historians, and ideologists. We can thank God that out of these 1,000 intellectual concepts, 999 disappear without a trace. They fall with a moan into the grave of their originators and are unheard of by subsequent generations. Most such systems are quickly and mercifully decapitated by a perceptive rebuttal in the period in which they were presented. A thoughtful public usually gives them a quick analysis and declares them to be nonsense.

Unfortunately, that did not happen with Marxism. It was a system with a sufficient voice and a wide enough constituency to override those who stood to claim of it, "Lies, all lies!"

No, Marxism gathered momentum and became a mighty force in the world. Under the leadership of Vladimir Ulich Ulanov (who changed his name to Nikolai Lenin so that he could write somewhat anonymously) it took to itself organizational structure and the fire and steel of revolution. Lenin became the organizer that Marx needed to produce the revolutionary cadres for the revolutionary conquest of *bourgeois* nations.

During the turmoil of World War I, Lenin made his play. By this time, he was one of the best-known revolutionaries in the world and was even being observed by the police forces of a number of nations. He lived at that time in Zurich, Switzerland, where he spent his days brooding over the possibility of revolution in the Soviet Union. For that matter, he would have been happy for revolution in a Communist direction in any of the nations of the world. Looking at the crumbling monster of Russia, however, he thought that it would be the best opportunity.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

The Germans thought so, too. They considered that if a Bolshevik revolution could be stimulated in Russia, that would take their eastern enemy out of the war and greatly enhance their own chances of victory against France and the West. The Germans therefore became co-conspirators in the Russian Revolution.

Through their spies in Zurich, the Germans communicated with Lenin and offered him the opportunity to return to Russia. Sensing that history was laying its hand of destiny upon his shoulder, Lenin accepted. Complicated arrangements were made, and Lenin, along with his party, was moved by secret train across Germany into Russia. His arrival in St. Petersburg created a spectacular impact and was considered something of a miracle by the people. Immediately, he took to the soap box and with fiery speeches raised the call to overthrow the czar. The response in St. Petersburg by the citizenry was just enough to give success to Lenin's revolution. By the narrowest of votes by the people's representatives, Lenin seized the reins of government.

So it was that Russia, weakened by the war and dispirited with the leadership of the czars, became the first nation to be captured by "the wave of the future." Before his death in 1924, Lenin announced that the Communist conquest (revolutionary deliverance) of Russia was just the beginning. Having begun, he said, Communism would then move out across Europe, Asia, and the United States and would inevitably become the master of the world. Then government would wither away, police forces would be no longer needed, the family itself would become irrelevant, and the blessed society, the Communist utopia, would come to pass. Perfect happiness would come upon all men as the social contradictions of the world were resolved. So, bright with the promise of a changed world, there began under Lenin and then under Stalin one of the blackest eras of history.

The Communist parties of the world, encouraged by the example of Russia, moved out in their attempt at the ideological conquest of the rest of the nations. In the following years, they captured by subversion and aggression Eastern Europe, China, North Vietnam, North Korea, Cuba, Ethiopia, and other hapless nations.

They came with their promise of Communist utopia. They murdered multitudes who resisted. They also killed by the millions those who even lifted a voice in disagreement. Before the world as a whole was fully aware of what was happening, one-third of its population was captured and fell under the iron control of the Communist world dictatorship.

Virtually every day following that remarkable program of conquest, the Communists announced that they were on their way to turning the world into a virtual paradise. Yes, there would be delays and problems, but the coming of the perfect society was inevitable.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

The world now has a right to ask, Have the Communists kept their promise? Have these captured nations become workers' paradises?

The answer to these questions is clear and tragic. There is now on record what the philosophy of Marx has produced in flesh and in fact. That record is a terrible one indeed. Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn had this to say of it:

I am very much aware that eastern Slavic orthodoxy, which, during the sixty-five years of Communist rule, has been subjected to persecution even fiercer and more extensive than that of early Christian times....

In this persecution-filled age, it is appropriate that my own very first memory should be of Chekists in pointed caps entering St. Panteleimon's Church in Kislovodsk, interrupting the service, and crashing their way into the sanctuary in order to loot. And later, when I started going to school in Rostov-on-don—passing on my way a kilometer-long compound of the Checka-GPU and a glittering sign of the League of Militant Atheists—school children egged on by Komsomol members taunted me for accompanying my mother to the last remaining church in town and tore the cross from around my neck.

... Orthodox churches were stripped of their valuables.... Tens of thousands of churches were torn down or desecrated, leaving behind a disfigured wasteland that bore no resemblance to Russia as such.... People were condemned to live in this dark and mute wilderness for decades, groping their way to God.... 15,000,000 peasants were brought to death for the purpose of destroying our national way of life and of extirpating religion from the countryside.... Hatred of religion is rooted in Communism.... Khrushchev simultaneously rekindled the frenzied Leninist obsession with destroying religion.... The ruinous revolution has swallowed up some sixty million of our people.¹⁰

Sixty million people dead. What a story of hell on earth! Why?

Solzhenitsyn sums up the reason for these fearful developments: "Men have forgotten God."

It is fair, then, to ask the question, Is Marxism true? If the truth of a point of view is known by its fruits, by its results, the answer is obvious. Considering its dominance for so many years of Russia, China, Eastern Europe, and other nations, it can reasonably be said that Communism has been responsible for the violent, sadistic deaths of at least 100 million people. It has closed tens of thousands of churches, burning many to the ground. It has

¹⁰ Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, "Men Have Forgotten God," *National Review*, July 22, 1983, p. 872.

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

kept hundreds of millions of people in the most abject slavery known to the history of man. It has developed the prison system Solzhenitsyn described as gulag archipelago, working millions of slave laborers to the point of disease and death in the cruelest slave labor camps the world has ever known. More than many books could be filled with the egregious results of the pitiful philosophy of Karl Marx. The mind gropes for words to describe the pathetic gullibility of the millions of people who became willing Communist cadres and whose lives are now the stumbling, burned-out remains of a groundless faith and a hopeless future.

Make no mistake about it, though: Marxism continues to be a powerful force in our time. There are many ways in which it continues to exert a remarkable influence across the world. Two of them should particularly be considered.

The first is that Marxism continues to be a powerful force ideologically. Millions of young people are being trained every day in the doctrines of Marxism/Leninism. The Communists have set up an educational system whereby this ideology is presented, analyzed, and illustrated in a thousand clever ways. It is difficult for the people of a free society to realize the near-total extent to which thought control is practiced in its most sophisticated form in the educational structure, the press, and in all other avenues of information within a Communist society. To this day, any trouble that may be faced within the Communist system is not ascribed to the fallacies of Marxism/Leninism. Rather, shortages, suffering, and political instability are blamed on the fact that Communist ideology has not been properly taught. It is held that a deficiency in application is the reason for any difficulty, rather than a shortage of truth. Communist methodology may therefore be altered, but Communist ideology retains a stubborn constancy.

The influence of Marxism must also be considered immensely strong because of the retention and expansion of the military establishment in the Soviet Union. Even in these days of *perestroika* and *glasnost*, while the West is reducing its military capability, the opposite is taking place in the Soviet Union, so much so that the President of the United States admitted reluctantly, "Yes, I am concerned about the expansion of the Soviet military machine in these very days."

All suggestions to the contrary, because the Soviet Union has retained its military capability it must be seen as not having yet abandoned its intention of world conquest. A dictatorship must be evaluated not in terms of its stated intentions but rather in terms of its retained capability. For the Marxists, stated intentions, promises, and agreements are something very different from what we in the West think them to be. For us, for the most part, an agreement is an agreement. For the Communists, it is simply another device to use in lulling its enemies into submission and causing them to mistakenly interpret

Lion and Lamb Apologetics'

Communist intentions as benign. Foolish is the nation that looks at the most powerful dictatorship that has ever appeared on the face of the earth, the Soviet Union, and says, "They do not intend to use that power." That kind of naiveté is dangerous today and could be fatal tomorrow.

It also needs to be said that Communist ideology is one of the largest exports of the Soviet Union. Marxism continues to have a profound influence upon the intellectuals of the West. In greater numbers than we are perhaps aware of, the Western academicians in France, England, Germany, the United States, Canada, and many other nations are Marxist in their thinking and teaching. They reject the idea of Judeo-Christian morality in favor of atheism. For them, democracy is a naive point of view useful only as a tool to advance the Marxist party line. Consequently, the impact of Marxism on the student mind takes place not just in the Soviet Union but in Western academia as well. To many a naive student from the effete societies of the West, the maxim "from each according to his ability to each according to his need" sounds like a plausible answer to the needs of the world.

This, in part, is the reason that virtually all of the Communist leaders of today's world were recruited not as members of the toiling masses but rather as student intellectuals. "The toiling masses" is a group in which the Communists pretend to be interested, but their great thrust is the ideological conquest of the college and university campus. There they have a mouthpiece speaking for them in the form of many of the teachers of philosophy, sociology, history, and especially journalism. Nor are the schools of religion in the West without a Marxist interpretation of religion and of Christianity in particular.

If something is too good to be true then it is probably not true. That should be kept in mind by anyone who hears of the breakdown of Marxism in the Soviet Union. The man buried beneath a tombstone at Highgate Cemetery in north London still retains influence across the world beyond what many grasp. On that tombstone are written the words "Philosophers have attempted to interpret the world, but their real purpose is to change it." That is a task the ghost of Marx is still attempting to carry out¹¹

¹¹ Breese, D. (1990). *Seven men who rule the world from the grave* (pp. 55–77). Moody Publishers.