

Karl Marx:

A WORLD WITHOUT JEWS

Books by Dagobert D. Runes

TREASURY OF PHILOSOPHY

TREASURY OF WORLD LITERATURE

DICTIONARY OF PHILOSOPHY

ON THE NATURE OF MAN

OF GOD, THE DEVIL AND THE JEWS

A BOOK OF CONTEMPLATION

LETTERS TO MY SON

LETTERS TO MY DAUGHTER

THE HEBREW IMPACT ON WESTERN CIVILIZATION

THE SOVIET IMPACT ON SOCIETY

SPINOZA DICTIONARY

LETTERS TO MY GOD

THE WISDOM OF THE TORAH

THE WISDOM OF THE KABBALAH

PICTORIAL HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

DICTIONARY OF JUDAISM

A WORLD WITHOUT JEWS

By KARL MARX

Translated from the Original German

With an introduction and an epilogue

by Dagobert D. Runes

Fourth, enlarged edition

PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY

New York

Copyright, 1959, by Philosophical Library Inc.
15 East 40th Street, New York 16, N. Y.
All rights reserved

Fourth, enlarged, edition, 1960

Printed in the United States of America

INTRODUCTION

It is with some reluctance that I have agreed to write these introductory lines to Karl Marx's embittered review of the Jewish problem. My reluctance is caused by the awareness that the Marxian type of anti-Semitism is still virulent among those furtive few who find in Jew hatred a compensative way of living out the envies of their drab existences.

On the other hand, our present era has been offered the repeated spectacle of the yellow badge of anti-Semitism attached to banners allegedly flying for Socialism.

Almost a generation ago, the National Socialist Party of Germany adorned its Staffel with that badge, and in our living days the red flag of the Soviet Union carries next to the hammer and sickle the hooked cross.

Was it just an ill wind of history that brought the evil odor of Jew hatred into these humanitarian camps of Socialist movements? Or are we faced here with a situation of direct cause and effect?

I should like to cite a few paragraphs from the booklet that lies before you. These lines which I am quoting are not from the pen of Adolf Hitler or Colonel Nasser, but verbatim translations from the German original of the Father of Socialism, Karl Marx:

"Money is the zealous one God of Israel, beside which no other God may stand. Money degrades all the gods of mankind and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-constituted value set upon all things. It has therefore robbed the whole world,

of both nature and man, of its original value. Money is the essence of man's life and work, which have become alienated from him: this alien monster rules him and he worships it.

"The God of the Jews has become secularized and is now a worldly God. The bill of exchange is the Jew's real God. His God is the illusory bill of exchange.

"What is the foundation of the Jew in our world? Practical necessity, private advantage.

"What is the object of the Jew's worship in this world? Usury. What is his worldly God? Money.

"Very well then: emancipation from usury and money, that is, from practical, real Judaism, would constitute the emancipation of our time."

* * *

Some readers may raise the question in their minds, what attitude are we to take toward this man who was himself a Jew? To those readers, I reply that in the middle of the nineteenth century anti-Semitism was mainly a religious and social, not a racial, issue, and among converts such as Karl Marx are to be found vitriolic enemies of Judaism. The convert as a tool in the hands of professional Jew baiters is to be found as early as the Middle Ages in the person of the Jew Pfefferkorn who assisted in attempts to put Jewish sacred literature to the torch. And little more than ten years ago in the Soviet Union, the Jew Ilya Ehrenburg led the attack against Jewish writers as being cosmopolitan, non-patriotic and Zionist. This he did at the grave of almost eight hundred Yiddish poets, writers, and novelists who had been executed at the behest of Stalin.

Karl Marx was not only born a Jew; he came from a rabbinical family. His father Heschel Marx accepted Christianity in 1816 in order to practice law in Prussian territory. Like many converts, Marx found it necessary all his life to justify the mass conversion of his family by attacks against his blood brothers.

Anti-Semitic expressions of his are to be found mainly in the present essay, in his *Class Struggles in France*, *In the Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, and in his *Letters to Engels*, censored by Bebel and Bernstein. Some of the editors of his writings attempted to modify the vindictiveness of Marx's aggression. Others, like Mehring, even intensified them.

* * *

I should like to quote at random a few more examples of Marxian Jew baiting:

"It is the circumvention of law that makes the religious Jew a religious Jew." (*Die Deutsche Ideologie*, MEGA V, 162)

"The Jews of Poland are the smeariest of all races." (*Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, April 29, 1849)

He called Ferdinand Lassalle, "Judel Itzig—Jewish Nigger." (*Der Jüdische Nigger*, MEKOR III, 82, July 30, 1862)

"Ramsgate is full of Jews and fleas." (MEKOR IV, 490, August 25, 1879)

* * *

The identification of Judaism with usury and exploitation of the masses, combined with an alleged secret master plan of the Jews with headquarters in Jerusalem to dominate the rest of the world, has been,

and still is, the fundamental platform of political anti-Semitism. Copies of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* and Russia's *Protocols of Zion* have only recently been distributed by Khrushchev's close ally, Colonel Nasser. The late President Zapotocki of Communist Czechoslovakia declared at the time of the mass trials of Jews within the Soviet empire, in reply to protest from the free world, "We will not submit to the Jerusalem-New York axis."

Today in Marxist Russia no Jewish magazine or newspaper may be published, no Jewish cultural center may function, no Jewish rituals may be publicly observed. No Jew may hold major public office or be a member of the Soviet parliament, and even harboring any expression of Zionist character is dealt with as a capital offense.

We also note that in other sectors of the Soviet empire Marxian anti-Semitism is visible. Mao Tse-Tung, the undisputed leader of Red China, declared Israel to be "the Formosa of the Mediterranean" which should be swept into the sea. The Socialist Nehru of India, an ardent admirer of Colonel Nasser, does not permit the liberal and democratic State of Israel to open an embassy, or even a consulate, anywhere in India.

The German as well as the Russian forms of Socialism, be they national or international, have never freed themselves of the taint of a malevolent Jew hatred. And while among the peoples of the free world anti-Semitism has not been completely eradicated, in the West it is only the lunatic fringe that launches propaganda against the Hebrews, while in the Com-

munist domain, the governments themselves spearhead the drive against the ancient people.

The Marxist tendency of identifying Judaism with Mammonism and usury is discernible throughout the Socialist movements of Germany, Austria and Russia.

It is therefore not surprising that Adolf Hitler was able to take over the Marxist unions of Germany almost unchecked. In spite of the brown and red differences, they found themselves to be brothers under the skin in forming a common front against an illusory conquestorial Zionism.

The so-called ideological purges of Stalin were little more than a cover-up for an anti-Semitic onslaught in the Soviet empire, which later engulfed Rumania, Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

As Khrushchev himself confessed, Stalin planned to relegate all the Jews of Russia to the marshlands of Biro-Bidjan in Siberia. On the other hand, the very same Khrushchev stated, paraphrasing Hitler, that Jews could not work in a co-operative society, and he publicly admitted having for that very reason reintroduced the Czarist *numerus clausus* in all schools of higher education in the Soviet Union. This, together with an official anti-Semitic policy combined with a Draconic suppression of all Jewish cultural activities, has succeeded in reducing the Jewish population of Soviet Russia to the status of a colonial people, confined to basically menial and subordinate tasks.

A further threat, through the classification of every act of religious or cultural Judaism as political Zionism, and therefore a capital criminal act, has driven the

Jewish population of Russia into a spiritual house-ghetto. Persons of the Jewish faith do not today dare to practice or observe even the most ancient religious rites in the face of the wanton terror displayed by the dominant Marxist government.

The cunning distinction made by the Soviet leaders and their fellow travelers between Zionism and Judaism is similar to the old Marxist differentiation between the Capitalist Jew and the Sabbath Jew, the Hitler abstraction of International Jew or Cosmopolitan Jew and Commonplace Jew. The people of Soviet Russia today rarely, if ever, are aware of these fine, ignoble shades, and develop in themselves under the relentless propaganda of the Kremlin an almost physical disdain for their Jewish neighbors, just as the people of Germany and Poland absorbed the malevolent Jew-hatred of the Marx-Hitler brand, in spite of the fine-mesh, allegedly protective screening in the uncanny segregation of International Zionism from Sabbath Judaism.

There is no Sabbath Judaism without Zionism. Every daily prayer of the observing Jew carries the undertone of return to Zion. The four great holidays of the Jewish faith are imbedded in Zionist law and Zionist home-coming. Judaism is as little possible without Zionism as Christianity without Christ. It is in this knowledge that Marxist masters of the Soviet empire attempt to prohibit all religious practice of the Jews, because of their being all of Zionistic character. The distinction between Judaism and Zionism is made by the Marxist elements purely to confound the uninitiated and make a pogrom appear like a political police action.

The official Soviet Socialist attitude toward Israel and the Jewish people in general was unmistakably stated in their State publication of 1958, entitled *The State of Israel—Its Position and Policies*, by K. Ivanov and Z. Sheinis.

From this State document we translate “. . . The Zionist movement represents a form of the nationalistic ideology of the rich Jewish bourgeoisie, intimately tied to imperialism and to colonial oppression of the people of Asia. Zionism has tied itself to American and other Western capitalism and, with Jewish terrorist tactics, attacked its Arab neighbors. The national liberation movement of the people of the Middle East, spearheaded by its native leaders (such as President Nasser, King Ibn Saud of Saudi Arabia and King Iman Ahmad of Yemen) is constantly threatened by naked Jewish aggression . . .”

“The clear duty of all Marxists and Communists in this situation is to help the Asian and African people crush the reactionary Jewish forces.”

Such reads the widely-propagated platform of the Khrushchev-Mao Marxist axis. In fundamentals, it differs little from the Hitler-Stalin resolves of a generation ago, and it forebodes no less terror today than the previous anti-Jewish onslaught. Marxism may have failed in many of its postulates and prognostications, but its anti-Semitism lives on unabated.

It is indeed possible that these terrorist practices may succeed where the Roman *soldateska* of Titus and the pyres of Torquemada failed, namely, to bring to reality the sanguinary dream of Karl Marx—a world without Jews.

D.D.R.

FOREWORD

The booklet presented here is the first unexpurgated English language publication of papers written by Karl Marx originally published in Germany as a review of the writings of Dr. Bruno Bauer, a contemporary theologian and social philosopher, on "the Jewish question."¹

It is interesting to note that most of Marx's anti-Semitic references, in his correspondence, his journalistic writings and his books, were entirely eliminated by his various editors. Their full text, however, is now being published by the decidedly anti-Jewish-oriented State Publishing House in Moscow.

The following main references were used:

Collected Works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, 1841-1850, Vol. I, March 1841-March 1844, edited by Franz Mehring, Stuttgart, Dietz Nachf., 1902.

Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe, MEGA, Moscow, 1927-1935; *Marx-Engels Gesamtausgabe*, Third Section, MEKOR, Berlin, 1929-1931.

The State of Israel—Its Position and Policies by K. Ivanov and Z. Sheinis, edited by I. Dinerstein, State Publishers of Political Literature, Moscow, 1958.

¹ *The Jewish Question*, Braunschweig, 1843. *The Capacity of Today's Jews and Christians to Become Free*, Zurich and Winterthur, Georg Herwegh, 1843.

I. THE JEWISH QUESTION

German Jews seek emancipation. What kind of emancipation? Civil and political emancipation.

Bruno Bauer answers them as follows: No one in Germany is politically emancipated. We non-Jews are unfree. How can we free you? You Jews are being egotists when you demand special emancipation as Jews. You should, rather, be working as Germans for the political emancipation of Germany and as men for the emancipation of mankind. You should learn to regard the peculiar form of your oppression not as an exception to, but as a confirmation of, the rule.

Or do Jews simply demand equality with Christian subjects of the state? In that case they recognize the Christian state as the legitimate one and recognize that it is a regime of universal subjection. Why do they object to their particular yoke while accepting the universal yoke? Why should Germans become interested in the liberation of Jews when Jews are not interested in the liberation of Germans?

The Christian state knows only privileges. In that state the Jew has the privilege of being a Jew. As a Jew, he has rights that Christians do not have. Why then does he want rights he does not have but which Christians do?

When the Jew demands emancipation from the Christian state, he asks that the Christian state give up its religious prejudice. Does he, the Jew, give up *his* reli-

gious prejudice? What right, therefore, has he to demand of others the abdication of their religion?

The Christian state cannot by its very nature emancipate the Jew; but, Bauer adds, the Jew cannot, by *his* very nature, be emancipated. As long as the state remains Christian and the Jew Jewish, the one is as incapable of granting emancipation as the other is of receiving it.

The Christian state can behave toward the Jew only in the manner of a Christian state, that is, in a privilege-conferring manner. It permits the separation of the Jew from its other subjects but makes him feel the pressure of the groups from which it has separated him, all the more acutely in that he represents religious opposition to the ruling religion. But the Jew, in turn, can behave toward the state only in a Jewish manner, that is, as a stranger. He opposes to real nationality his chimerical nationality, to real law his illusory laws; he feels that his separation from the rest of mankind is justified; he does not participate in the movement of history as a matter of principle; he waits for a future that has nothing in common with the general future of man; he regards himself as a member of the Jewish people and the Jewish people is for him the chosen people.

On what grounds, therefore, do you Jews demand emancipation? On the grounds of your religion? It is the deadly enemy of the state religion. As citizens of the state? There exist no true citizens in Germany. As human beings? You are no more human than those to whom you appeal.

After criticizing the existing positions and the solutions proposed to them, Bauer considers the Jewish question from a new angle. What is the nature, he asks, of the Jew who seeks emancipation and of the state which is to emancipate him? He answers with a criticism of the Jewish faith, analyzing the religious opposition between Judaism and Christianity, and elucidating the character of the Christian state. He does this with boldness, acuteness, spirit and thoroughness, in language that is precise, vigorous and meaningful.

How does Bauer solve the Jewish question? His formulation of the question itself contains his solution. An analysis of the Jewish question provides the answer to it. His analysis can be summarized as follows:

We must emancipate ourselves before we can emancipate others.

The stiffest form of opposition between Jew and Christian is religious. How is it to be resolved? By making it impossible. How can this be achieved? By abolishing religion. As soon as Jew and Christian recognize their respective religions as different stages in the evolution of the human spirit, as successive snake-skins shed by history—man being the snake that bore them all—they will no longer stand in a religious relationship to each other, but in a critical, scientific, human relationship. Science is their ground of unity, and contradictions in science are resolved by science itself.

The German Jew in particular is faced with a lack of political emancipation in a state that is avowedly Christian. But Bauer holds that the Jewish question

has universal significance, independent of the specific German situation. It is, for him, a question of the relations between church and state and of the contradiction between religious ties and political freedom. Emancipation from religion is presented as a condition both to the Jew who is to be emancipated politically and to the state which is to emancipate him as well as itself.

"Very well," one says—and the Jew himself says it—"the Jew is to be emancipated not as Jew, not because he possesses such broad ethical principles; he is, rather, to fall in line with other citizens and become one of them *in spite of* being a Jew and wanting to remain one. That means he is and remains a Jew in spite of his being a citizen living in typical human circumstances: his limited character as a Jew always wins in the end, even over his human and political obligations. The prejudice remains, even though it is overtaken by general principles. But if it remains, then it takes over everything else. . . .

"The Jew can remain a Jew in political life only sophistically, only in appearance. If he wants to remain a Jew this appearance becomes reality and triumphs. This means that his life in a state is only an appearance and an exception to reality and rule."

Let us see how Bauer views the duty of the state.

"France," he says, "has recently offered us, with regard to the Jewish question—and with regard to all other political questions—the spectacle of a life which is free but which revokes its freedom by law, that is,

it proclaims freedom a mere appearance and contradicts free law by deeds . . .

"Universal freedom is not yet law in France, nor is the Jewish question solved there, because the legal freedom which makes all citizens equal is limited in actual life, which is still ruled and divided by religious privilege. This lack of freedom in real life turns on the law and forces it to divide citizens, in themselves free, into oppressors and oppressed."

When will the Jewish question be solved in France?

"The Jew would cease being a Jew if he stopped letting his Law prevent him fulfilling his duties toward the state and his fellow citizens—for instance, if he went to the Chamber of Deputies on the Sabbath and took part in public debates. All religious privileges, including the monopoly of a privileged church, would have to be abolished, and if a man, or some men, or the overwhelming majority of men, still believed it necessary to fulfill religious duties, such fulfillment would be left a purely private matter. . . .

"Religion no longer exists when there is no privileged religion. Take from religion its exclusive power and it ceases to exist. . . . Just as M. Martin du Nord felt that the proposal not to mention Sunday in the law was a proposal to declare that Christianity no longer existed, it may be assumed with equal justice that a declaration that the Sabbath law is no longer binding on Jews would amount to a proclamation that Judaism had been dissolved."

Thus Bauer asks, on the one hand, that the Jew give up Judaism, and man generally give up religion,

in order to achieve political emancipation. On the other hand, he holds that the political abolition of religion means the abolition of religion as such. A state which assumes religion is not yet a true, a real state. "The religious concept does, indeed, offer guarantees to the state. But to which state? To what kind of state?"

It is here that Bauer's one-sided presentation of the Jewish question becomes apparent.

It is by no means enough to investigate the question who is to emancipate and who emancipated. Still a third kind of question must be subjected to analysis: What kind of emancipation is at stake? What conditions are assumed by the kind of emancipation demanded? Only an analysis of political emancipation itself provides an ultimate analysis of the Jewish question and its inclusion in "the universal questions of our time."

Since Bauer does not raise the question to this level he falls into contradictions. He presents conditions which are not based on the true nature of political emancipation. He raises questions which are not pertinent to his problem and solves problems that leave his questions unanswered. Bauer says of the enemies of Jewish emancipation that "their mistake lay in assuming the Christian state to be the only true one and failing to subject it to the same criticism as the Jews." We hold that Bauer's error consists in subjecting only "the Christian state" to criticism, rather than the state as such, and in failing to investigate the relation of political emancipation to the larger emancipation of mankind, so that he presents conditions that can only be

explained by an uncritical confusion between political emancipation and human emancipation in general. Bauer asks the Jews: "Have you, from your own point of view, the right to demand emancipation?" We, on the contrary, ask: "Has the champion of political emancipation the right to demand of the Jews the abolition of Judaism, and of mankind the abolition of religion?"

The Jewish question receives a different formulation depending on the country in which the Jew finds himself. In Germany, where there is no political state as such, the Jewish question is a purely theological one. The Jew finds himself in religious opposition to a state which believes that Christianity is its basis. This state is a theologian *ex professo*. Criticism here is two-fold, of both Christian and Jewish theology. And so we are still operating, however critically, in the sphere of theology.

In France, a constitutional state, the Jewish question is a constitutional one, a question of the incompleteness of political emancipation. Since France maintains the appearance of a state religion, even though by the empty and self-contradictory formula of "the religion of the majority," the relation of the Jew to the state still maintains the appearance of a religious, a theological opposition.

It is only in the free states of North America—or at least in some of them—that the Jewish question loses its theological character and becomes a truly secular one. Only where the political state exists in completely realized form can the relation of the Jew, and of the religious man generally, to the state appear in all its

purity and peculiarity. Analysis of this relationship ceases to be theological as soon as the state ceases to stand in a theological relation to religion and replaces that relationship with a political one. Criticism then becomes a criticism of the political state.

It is at this point, where the question ceases to be theological, that Bauer's critique ceases to be critical: "*Il n'existe aux Etats-Unis ni religion d'état, ni religion déclarée celle de la majorité, ni prééminence d'un culte sur un autre. L'état est étranger à tous les cultes.*" ("There exists in the United States no state religion nor any religion proclaimed to be that of the majority, nor pre-eminence of one religion over another. The state is foreign to all religions.") (*Marie ou l'esclavage aux Etats-Unis*, by G. de Beaumont, Paris, 1835.) Indeed, there are some American states where "*la constitution n'impose pas les croyances religieuses e la pratique d'un culte comme condition des privilèges politiques*" ("the constitution does not impose religious belief and the practice of a religion as the condition of political rights"). All the same, "*on ne croit pas aux Etats-Unis qu'un homme sans religion puisse être un honnête homme*" ("in the United States it is not believed that a man without religion can be a gentleman"). Nonetheless, America is peculiarly the land of religiosity, as Beaumont, Tocqueville and the Englishman Hamilton unanimously agree.

But the American states serve only as an example. The question is: What is the relation of full political emancipation to religion? If we find even in the land of full political emancipation that religion not only

exists, but blossoms fresh and strong, we have proof that the existence of religion is not opposed to the full development of the state. But since the existence of religion is the existence of a defect, the source of this defect can be sought only in the nature of the state. We hold that religion is no longer the operating cause but the result of human limitation. We therefore derive the religious small-mindedness of free citizens from their general small-mindedness. We do not maintain that they must abolish their religious limitations in order to abolish their human limitations. We do not turn secular human problems into religious ones; we turn religious questions into secular ones. History has too long been dissolved into superstitions; we now dissolve superstitions into history. The question of the relationship of political emancipation to religion becomes for us a question of the relationship of political emancipation to human emancipation. We criticize the religious weakness of the political state by criticizing, rather, its defective worldly constitution. We resolve the contradiction between the state and a particular religion, such as Judaism, into a contradiction between the state and certain secular elements, religion in general and the state's own assumptions.

The political emancipation of the Jew, the Christian or the religious man in general is a question of the emancipation of the state from Judaism, Christianity and religion in general. The state emancipates itself from religion, both as to form and content, by emancipating itself from any state religion—that is, by professing no religion except its own statehood. Political

emancipation from religion is not emancipation from religion carried out without opposition because political emancipation is not human emancipation carried out without opposition.

The limit of political emancipation lies in the fact that the state can free itself from a limitation without its citizens becoming free from it, and that the state can be a free state without the man in it being a free man. Bauer himself admits this tacitly in setting the following condition of political emancipation: "All religious privilege, including the monopoly of a privileged church, would be abolished, and should some or many or even the overwhelming majority feel bound to fulfill religious obligations, such fulfillment would be their private affair." The state, therefore, can still emancipate itself from religion if its overwhelming majority is religious. And the overwhelming majority does not cease being religious by being religious only in private.

But the attitude of the state, and particularly of a free state, toward religion is only the religious attitude of the men who form the state. It follows from this that man frees himself from political limitations, through the intermediary of the state, by raising himself above this limitation, in an abstract, limited and partial manner. It also follows that when man frees himself politically, he necessarily frees himself indirectly, through an intermediary. It follows, finally, that when a man proclaims the state atheistic—he is still tied to religion because he proclaims himself only indirectly, through an intermediary. The state is the intermediary between man and his freedom. As Christ is the intermediary

whom the Christian burdens with his divinity and all his religious ties, so the state is the intermediary whom man burdens with his entire non-divinity and his complete absence of ties.

The political triumph of man over religion shares all the advantages and disadvantages of political triumph generally. Thus, for example, the state annuls private property: man proclaims politically that private property is abolished as soon as he abolishes the property qualifications for the vote, as has been done in several American states. Politically speaking, Hamilton judges this fact quite correctly: "The great mass has won a victory over the owners of property and wealth." Is not private property as an idea abolished when the non-owner becomes legislator for the owner? The property qualification for the vote is the ultimate political form of the recognition of private property.

But political annulment of private property does not abolish the existence of private property; on the contrary, it necessarily assumes that existence. The state in its own way abolishes differences of birth, status, education and occupation when it proclaims that these differences are nonpolitical; when it makes every member of the people without regard to such differences an equal participant in popular sovereignty; when it judges all the elements making up the actual life of the people from the point of view of the state itself. Nonetheless the state permits private property, education and occupation to continue in themselves, that is, as private property, education and occupation, and to make their particular natures felt. Far from abolishing

these activities, the state exists only through assuming their existence. It recognizes itself as a political organism and makes its over-all character felt only in opposition to these, its particular elements. And so Hegel correctly judges the relation of the political state to religion: "If the state is to come into being as a self-conscious, ethical and spiritual reality, it must be differentiated from the forms of authority and belief. But such a differentiation occurs only when the church itself is separated from it: the state can define the universal nature of its law, the principle of its form, and so bring itself into existence, only by opposing particular churches." (*Philosophy of Law*)

The perfect political state by its nature defines the life of man as of a particular kind, in opposition to his material life. In bourgeois society all the assumptions of this self-centered material life remain outside the sphere of the state, but they remain the characteristics of bourgeois society. Where the state has achieved true form, man leads a double life, not only in his thoughts and consciousness but in reality as well. It is both a heavenly and an earthly life—life in a political community, where he feels himself a member of the community, and life in bourgeois society, where he is active as a private individual, uses other men as means to an end and reduces himself to the same role of plaything of powers outside himself. Spiritually speaking, the state is to bourgeois society as heaven is to earth. It opposes it just as religion opposes and overcomes the secular world, by creating it, recognizing it, and letting itself be ruled by it. In bourgeois society man is a secular

being. There, where he counts as an individual to himself and to others, he is an untrue phenomenon. In the state, however, where man counts merely as one of his kind, he is an imaginary link in an imagined chain of sovereignty, robbed of his individual life and endowed with an unreal generality.

The conflict in which man as believer in a particular religion finds himself, with his own citizenship and with other members of the community, is reduced to the secular split between the political state and bourgeois society. For the bourgeois man, "life in the state is only an appearance or a momentary exception to essence and rule." Indeed, the bourgeois, like the Jew, remains only sophistically in the state, just as the French *citoyen* remains a bourgeois or Jew only sophistically. But this sophistry is not personal; it is the sophistry of the state itself. The difference between the religious man and the citizen is the difference between the merchant and the citizen, the landowner and the citizen, the living individual and the citizen. The contradiction between the religious man and the political man is the same as that between the bourgeois and the *citoyen*, in which the member of bourgeois society, wearing his political lion's skin, finds himself.

Bauer permits this worldly conflict, to which the Jewish question is ultimately reduced, to continue by polemicizing against its religious expression. The conflict springs from the relation of the political state to its assumptions, whether they concern material elements, such as private property, etc., or spiritual ones, such as education, religion, the opposition between general

and particular interests, etc. Bauer writes: "It is precisely its foundation, the need that establishes bourgeois society and makes it necessary, that maintains in it an element of insecurity and brings about this continuously changing mixture of wealth and poverty, of prosperity and adversity, indeed the very change itself."

Consider his whole chapter, "The Bourgeois Society," based on Hegel's philosophy of law. Bourgeois society in opposition to the political state is considered necessary because the political state is recognized as necessary.

Political emancipation is indeed a great goal. It is not the ultimate form of human emancipation, but it is the ultimate form possible within the present world order. And let it be understood that we mean real, practical emancipation.

Man emancipates himself from religion politically by relegating it from public to private law. It is no longer the spirit of the state, where man, in community with other men, behaves as a member of his kind, observing special forms in a special sphere. It has become the spirit of bourgeois society, of the sphere of egotism, of the *bellum omnium contra omnes*. It is no longer the essence of community but the essence of differentiation. It has become an expression of the differentiation of man from his communal nature, from himself and from other men—which was its original function. It is now only the abstract confession of a particular peculiarity, of a personal whim. The infinite splits of religion in the United States give it even the external appearance of a purely individual affair. It

has been exiled from the sphere of the community as such and has been thrust among a crowd of private interests of which it is but one. But let there be no mistake about the limit of political emancipation. The splitting of man into private and public man, the dislocation of religion from the state in bourgeois society, is not a stage in political emancipation but its completion. It no more abolishes the true religiosity of man than it intends to abolish it.

The division of man into Jew and citizen, Protestant and citizen, religious man and citizen is not a lie against citizenship or a way to circumvent political emancipation: it is political emancipation itself, the political way of emancipation from religion. However, in a period in which the political state is brought forth violently from the womb of bourgeois society, when the liberation of man is sought in the form of political liberation, the state can—and indeed must—go so far as to abolish religion. But it must do so only in the way that it abolishes private property—by placing a maximum limit on it, by confiscation, by progressive taxation—or as it abolishes life itself—by the guillotine. In moments of especially acute self-consciousness, political life tends to smother its own presuppositions, that is, bourgeois society and its elements, and to constitute itself as the real and uncontradicted life of man as a member of the race. But it can do this only in violent contradiction to its own condition of existence, by proclaiming the revolution permanent. Otherwise, the political drama is bound to end with the restoration of religion, private property and all the elements of bour-

geois society, as war is bound to end with peace.

The perfect Christian state is not the so-called Christian state which acknowledges Christianity as its official religion and excludes all others, but rather the atheistic state, the democratic state, which banishes religion to the level of other elements in bourgeois society. The state that remains theological, that continues to make an official profession of Christianity, has not yet succeeded in achieving the human basis of which Christianity is but an overwrought, worldly expression. The so-called Christian state is simply a nonstate, for it is not the Christian religion that expresses itself in human creations, but merely the human foundation of that religion.

The so-called Christian state is a Christian denial of the state, not in any way the political fulfillment of Christianity. The state that continues to profess Christianity as a religion does not yet profess it in political form because it still behaves religiously toward religion. This means that it is not a genuine fulfillment of the human basis of religion, because it is still the product of unreality, of the imaginary shape of the human nucleus. The so-called Christian state is the imperfect state, and it treats Christianity as a supplementation and sanctification of its imperfection. It treats religion as a means to an end and becomes thereby hypocritical. There is a great difference between a perfect state that counts religion as one of its assumptions because of a lack in the nature of the state, and an imperfect state which proclaims religion to be its very foundation because of a lack in its own make-up. In the latter case

religion becomes imperfect politics; in the former the inability of religion to offer a perfect policy is immediately apparent. The so-called Christian state needs the Christian religion to complete itself as a state. The democratic state, the true state, requires no religion in order to be politically complete. It can indeed forego all religion because it achieves the human basis of religion in a worldly way. The so-called Christian state, on the other hand, behaves religiously toward politics and politically toward religion. Where it reduces the forms of politics to appearances, it likewise reduces religion to an appearance.

In order to express this contradiction clearly we need to examine Bauer's concept of the Christian state, a concept developed from that of the Christian-Germanic state. He writes:

"To prove the nonexistence or the impossibility of a Christian state it has recently been argued that there are certain passages in the Gospels which the state not only does not obey, but which it could not obey without dissolving itself. . . . But the matter cannot be dismissed so easily. What do these Biblical passages demand? Self-denial in favor of the Supernatural, submission to the authority of Revelation, a turning away from the state, the abolition of secular concerns. But this is all demanded and achieved by a Christian state. The state has made the spirit of the Gospels its own and if it does not render it in the exact words of the Gospels, that is because it expresses that spirit in its own forms. These forms follow from the nature of the state in this world, but they are reduced to an appearance by the religious

rebirth they must undergo. It is the withdrawal from the state that uses the forms of the state to achieve itself."

Bauer goes on to describe how the people of a Christian state are a nonpeople who no longer have a will of their own but lead their existence through their ruler, to whom they are subject but who is by his very nature foreign to them, since he was given them by God without their being consulted in any way. Further, that the laws of such a people are not their own work but revelations handed down to them; that the ruler has to have privileged intermediaries between himself and the people; that the masses themselves divide into separate groups, accidentally determined and divided by special passions and prejudices, but permitted as a privilege to remain separate from each other; etc.; etc.

Bauer goes so far as to say: "If politics is to be nothing as religion, it cannot be politics, any more than the cleaning of cooking pots can be considered an economic matter if it is to be a religious matter." But in the Christian-Germanic state religion *is* an "economic matter," just as all "economic matter" is religion. In this state the religion of government is the government of religion.

The distinction between "the letter of the Gospel" and "the spirit of the Gospel" is an irreligious act. The state that lets the Gospel speak in political terms or, for that matter, in any other terms than those of the Holy Ghost, commits an act of sacrilege, if not in the eyes of men then in its own religious eyes. The state that regards Christianity as its highest expression and

the Bible as its Charter must be made to come to terms with the words of Holy Writ, for the Gospel is holy in its every word. This state, along with the human law on which it is based, is placed in a painful contradiction that cannot be resolved by mere religious conviction, when it is made to face those pages of the Gospel which "it not only does not fulfill but which it could not fulfill without dissolving itself completely as a state." And why does it refuse to dissolve itself completely? It cannot answer this question, either to itself or to others. The official Christian state carries on its conscience an obligation whose carrying out is unachievable. The state can affirm its own existence only by lying to itself, and must therefore be a dubious, unreliable, problematical thing even to itself.

The critics are therefore fully justified in forcing such a state, which professes to stand on the Bible, into questioning its convictions, to discover whether they are real or figments of the imagination, and so that its infamous worldly purposes may be brought into plain conflict with its pious religious convictions, which declare religion to contain the meaning of life. Such a state might free itself from its internal conflicts by becoming the policeman of the Catholic Church. In relation to this Church, which proclaims worldly power its servant, the state is impotent, as is all worldly power which claims to be under the rule of the religious spirit.

What counts in the so-called Christian state is alienation, not man. The only man who does count, the king, is a creature who is designated different from other

men, a divinely appointed creature directly related to Heaven and to God. The conditions that obtain here are still the conditions of faith. The religious spirit is therefore not yet secularized.

But the religious spirit *cannot* become secularized for it is nothing but the nonsecular form of the human spirit at a certain stage of its development. The religious spirit can realize itself only insofar as that stage of development of which it is the expression assumes a secular form. This is what happens in the democratic state. It is not Christianity but the human foundation of Christianity which is the foundation of this state. Religion remains the ideal, unworldly conviction of its members because it is the ideal expression of that particular stage of human development.

The members of the political state become religious by means of a dichotomy between their individual lives and the lives of the species, between the life of bourgeois society and its political life. They are religious insofar as man is related to life in the state, which is contrary to his real individuality, and insofar as their religion represents the spirit of bourgeois society and is an expression of the separation of man from man. Political democracy is Christian inasmuch as in it man—not just any man but every man—counts as of sovereign and ultimate worth. But this is man in his uncivilized and unsocial aspect, in his accidental existence, corrupted by the entire organization of our society, lost and alienated from himself, yielding to the rule of inhuman conditions and forces—in a word, man not yet a true member of his species. The dream creature of

imagination, the postulate of Christianity, the sovereign man—different from real man—is in democracy a sensual reality, a presence and a worldly symbol.

Religious and theological conviction counts in a democracy all the more for being apparently without political importance or earthly purpose, an affair of spirits in flight from the world, the expression of a limitation on reason, a product of whim and fancy, a truly other-worldly existence. Christianity here achieves its practical force as a universal religion by appropriating the most varied world views, while demanding of others not Christianity necessarily, but simply religion, any religion (see Beaumont, quoted above). Religious conviction glories in the wealth of contradictions and multiplicity of viewpoints in religion.

We have shown that political emancipation from religions permits religion to continue, though not privileged religion. The contradiction with his civil duties in which the adherent of any particular religion finds himself is merely one aspect of the general secular contradiction between the political state and bourgeois society. The perfect Christian state professes itself a state which ignores the religion of its citizens. The emancipation of the state from religion is not the emancipation of man from religion.

We do not, therefore, say to the Jews as Bauer does: "You cannot be politically emancipated unless you emancipate yourselves from Judaism." We say, rather, to them: Since you can become politically emancipated without abandoning Judaism completely, political emancipation will not bring you human emancipation. If

you want to emancipate yourselves politically without emancipating yourselves humanly, the contradiction lies not merely in you; it lies also in the nature of political emancipation. If you are bound by this, then you share the general fetters. Just as the state dabbles in religion when it behaves toward the Jews in a Christian fashion, so the Jew dabbles in politics whenever he demands political rights.

But if a man can become politically emancipated and win civil rights even though he is a Jew, can he then also claim and win so-called human rights? Bauer denies this: "The question is whether the Jew as such—that is, the Jew who realizes that he is forced by his true nature to live in eternal separation from others—is able to receive general human rights and grant them to others. . . .

"The Christian world discovered the idea of human rights only in the last century. They are not inborn in man; they are, rather, won only after a struggle against the historical traditions in which man has hitherto been educated. Human rights are therefore not a gift from nature or a dowry from history, but the price of a struggle against the accident of birth and the privileges that history has passed on from generation to generation. They are the results of culture, and only he can possess them who has acquired them and won the right to them. . . .

"Has the Jew really earned this right? As long as he remains a Jew, the limited nature of his Jewishness triumphs over the human nature that would link him with other men, and separates him from non-Jews. By

this separation he proclaims the special nature that makes him a Jew to be his true and highest nature, to which all human nature must yield. . . .

"In the same way, the Christian as Christian cannot grant human rights."

According to Bauer, man must sacrifice "the privilege of faith to be able to receive universal human rights." Let us consider for a moment these so-called human rights in their authentic expression, the expression they were given by their discoverers, the Americans and the French. These human rights are partly political rights, rights that can be exercised only in community with others. Participation in the community, the political community or state, provides their content. They fall under the category of political freedom, of civil rights, which, as we have seen, by no means presupposes the abolition of religion. That leaves for consideration those other human rights, the *droits de l'homme* (rights of man) as distinguished from the *droits du citoyen* (rights of the citizen).

Among these is freedom of conscience, the right to practice the religion of one's choice. The privilege of belief is implicitly recognized either as a human right or as a consequence of human rights (freedom).

"*Nul ne doit être inquiété pour ses opinions même religieuses*" ("No one must be disturbed on account of his beliefs, including religious ones"). (*Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen*, 1791, Article 10.) Article 1 of the Constitution of 1791 guarantees as a human right "*la liberté à tout homme d'exercer le culte*

religieux auquel il est attaché" ("every man's freedom to practice the religious worship to which he is attached").

The *Déclaration des droits* of 1793 includes among human rights, in Article 7: "*le libre exercice des cultes*" ("freedom of worship"). With regard to the right to publish one's views and opinions it even goes so far as to say: "*La nécessité d'énoncer ces droits suppose ou la présence ou le souvenir récent du despotisme*" ("The very need to proclaim these rights presupposes the presence or the recent memory of despotism").

The Constitution of Pennsylvania, Article 3, Paragraph 9, reads: "All men have received from nature the imprescriptible right to worship the Almighty according to the inspiration of their conscience and no one may be legally constrained to obey, institute or support against his will any worship or religious ministry. No human authority can, in any case, intervene in questions of conscience and control the powers of the soul."

The Constitution of New Hampshire, Articles 5 and 6, reads: "Among the natural rights some are inalienable by their nature because nothing can be their equivalent. Of such are the rights of conscience."

Incompatibility between religion and human rights is so far removed from the concept of human rights that the right to be religious, the right to be religious in a certain way, and the right to practice the worship of a given religion, are expressly enumerated among human rights. The privilege of belief is a universal human right.

The *droits de l'homme*, the rights of man as such, are distinguished from the *droits du citoyen*, the rights of the citizen. Who is this "*homme*" who is distinguished from the *citoyen*? None other than the member of bourgeois society. Why does the member of bourgeois society in this view become "man," plain man? Why are his rights called human rights? How can we explain this fact? By the relation between the state and bourgeois society, by the nature of political emancipation. Above all, we note that the *droits de l'homme* as distinguished from the *droits du citoyen* are none other than the rights of a member of bourgeois society, that is, of egotistical man, of man separated from the community. The most radical constitution, that of 1793, speaks for itself:

"*Ces droits (les droits naturels et imprescriptibles) sont: l'égalité, la liberté, la sûreté, la propriété*" ("These rights [natural and imprescriptible] are: equality, liberty, security and property"). (Article 2.)

What is "*liberté*"? Article 6 says: "*La liberté est le pouvoir qui appartient à tout homme de faire tout ce qui ne nuit pas aux droits d'autrui*" ("Liberty is the power belonging to each man to do anything that does not infringe the rights of others"), or as stated in the Declaration of Human Rights of 1791: "*La liberté consiste à pouvoir faire tout ce qui ne nuit pas à d'autrui*" ("Liberty consists in being able to do anything that does not harm others").

Liberty is thus the right to do anything that does not harm others. The limit within which each can move without harming others is determined by the law, just

as the boundary between two fields is determined by a fence. It is the liberty of man conceived as an isolated man referring only to itself.

Why, then, is the Jew, according to Bauer, incapable of receiving human rights? "As long as he remains a Jew, the limited nature of his Jewishness wins out over the human nature that would link him as a man to other men, and separates him from non-Jews." But the human right of liberty is not based on the link between man and man, but rather on the separation of man from man. It is the right to this separation, the right to the individual limited to himself.

A practical example of the human right to liberty is the right of private property. What is that precisely?

"Le droit de propriété est celui qui appartient à tout citoyen de jouir et de disposer à son gré de ses biens, de ses revenus, du fruit de son travail et de son industrie" ("The right of property is the right belonging to each citizen of enjoying and disposing at will of his goods, his income, the fruits of his labor and industry"). (Article 16 of the Constitution of 1793.)

The human right of private property is thus the right to enjoy and dispose of one's wealth at will, without reference to others and independently of society; it is the right of private use. It is this freedom, and its practical applications, which forms the foundation of bourgeois society. It causes each man to find in his fellows not the realization of his freedom, but its limitation. It proclaims, above all, the human right *"de jouir et de disposer à son gré de ses biens, de ses revenus, du fruit de son travail et de son industrie."*

There remain those other human rights, "*égalité*" and "*sûreté*."

"*Egalité*" is used here in its nonpolitical sense; it is nothing but the equality of the "*liberté*" described above, that is, that every man is viewed equally as a monad sufficient unto himself. The Constitution of 1795 determined appropriately the importance and force of this equality: "*L'égalité consiste en ce que la loi est la même pour tous, soit qu'elle protège, soit qu'elle punisse*" ("Equality means that the law is the same for all, whether it protects or punishes"). (Article 5.)

And "*sûreté*"? "*La sûreté consiste dans la protection accordée à chacun de ses membres pour la conservation de sa personne, de ses droits et de ses propriétés*" ("Security consists of the protection offered by society to each of its members with regard to the preservation of their persons, their rights and their property"). (Article 8.)

Security is the highest social concept of bourgeois society, the police concept that the entire society exists only to assure each of its members the preservation of his person, his rights and his property. Hegel refers to this when he calls bourgeois society "the state of necessity and reason" (*Noth- und Verstandesstaat*).

Bourgeois society does not raise itself above its egotism through this concept of security. Security is, rather, an insurance of its egotism.

None of the so-called human rights, therefore, goes beyond the egotistical man, the man who, in bourgeois society, is separated from the community and withdrawn into himself, his private interest and his private

will. Man is not conceived here as a member of his species; rather, the life of the species, that is, society, is conceived as a framework imposed upon individuals, a limitation of their original independence. The only bonds that hold them together are natural necessity, private interests, the conservation of property and their egotistical desires.

It is rather curious that a people just beginning to free itself, to break down the barriers between its individual members and form a political community, should solemnly proclaim the granting of rights to egotistical man, separated from his fellow men and from his community (Declaration of 1791). This people goes on to repeat this proclamation at a time when only the most heroic sacrifices can save its nation, when the sacrifice of all bourgeois interests has become the order of the day and egotism is punished as a crime (Declaration of 1793). All this becomes even more curious when we consider that citizenship in the political community was reduced by the political emancipators to the role of a mere means for the preservation of these so-called human rights. The *citoyen* is proclaimed servant of the egotistical *homme*; the sphere in which man acts as a member of his community is placed under the sphere in which he acts as a partial being. Finally, it is not even man as *citoyen*, but man as *bourgeois*, who is proclaimed the real, the true man.

"Le but de toute association politique est la conservation des droits naturels et imprescriptible de l'homme"
("The aim of all political association is the preservation

of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man"). (Declaration of 1791, Article 2.) "*Le gouvernement est institué pour garantir à l'homme la jouissance de ses droits naturels et imprescriptibles*" ("Government is instituted to guarantee man the enjoyment of his natural and imprescriptible rights"). (Declaration of 1793, Article 1.) So even in moments of youthful enthusiasm, fired by the urgency of circumstances, political life is proclaimed a mere means, the end of which is bourgeois society. True, the practice of the Revolution was a flagrant violation of its theory. While security was proclaimed a human right, the secrecy of correspondence was openly and daily violated. While the Constitution of 1793 guaranteed, in Article 122, "*la liberté indéfinie de la presse*" ("unabridged freedom of the press") as a consequence of the right of individual freedom, in reality freedom of the press was completely abolished, for "*la liberté de la presse ne doit pas être permise lorsqu'elle compromet la liberté publique*" ("freedom of the press must not be permitted when it compromises public liberty") (Robespierre). This means simply that the human right of freedom ceases to be a right as soon as it conflicts with political realities, though the theory states that political life is a mere guarantee of human rights, the rights of individual man, and that it must be abolished as soon as it conflicts with those rights. But the practice is only the exception and the theory is the rule. If one chooses to regard revolutionary practice as the correct statement of the relationship, there still remains the mystery of why the

relationship was turned on its head by the political emancipators so that ends appeared as means and vice versa.

The mystery is easily cleared up.

Political emancipation also meant the dissolution of the old society, upon which the state and the government power were founded. What was the character of that old society? One word defines it: feudalism. Old bourgeois society had a political character only indirectly, that is, such elements of bourgeois life as property, family, and kind and manner of work were raised to the level of political life through seignorial rights, estates or corporations. Only in these forms did they affect the relation of the individual to the state, that is, his political relation, his separation and exclusion from the other elements of society. For the feudal organization of national life did not raise work or property to the role of social elements; rather, it separated them from the state as a whole and constituted them as special societies within the total society. The functions and living conditions of bourgeois society were still political, if only in the feudal sense, that is, they separated the individual from the state as a whole; they converted his special relation to the state into a general relation to national life, and his special bourgeois activity and position into a general activity and position. The consequence of this social organization was that the state, in all its activities, that is, the governing power in general, was the special concern of the ruler and his servants, divorced from the people.

The revolution which dethroned this power and

turned the affairs of the state into the affairs of the people, and the political state into the affair of all—that is, the true state—inevitably destroyed all the estates, corporations, guilds and privileges which were so many varying expressions of the separation of the people from its community. The political revolution thus abolished the political character of bourgeois society. It broke up bourgeois society into its simple constituents: on the one hand the individuals, and on the other the material and spiritual elements that composed the bourgeois life of these individuals. It set loose the political spirit that had been scattered and concealed in the various cul-de-sacs of feudal society. It gathered up its parts, freed it from bourgeois life and turned it to the service of the community, the universal concern of the people, for an ideal independence from the elements of bourgeois life. Special activities and statuses sank to the level of the individual importance. They no longer comprised the relation of the individual to the state as a whole. Public concern became the general concern of each individual and political function became a universal function.

But the achievement of idealism in the state meant at the same time the achievement of bourgeois materialism. The shaking off of the yoke became the shaking off of the bonds that had fettered the egotistical spirit of bourgeois society. Political emancipation meant the emancipation of bourgeois society from politics, from even the appearance of having a content.

Feudal society was resolved into its basis, into man—but into man as he really was, egotistical man.

This man, the member of bourgeois society, is now the basis, the presupposition, of the political state. He is recognized as such in the various declarations of human rights.

The recognition of the freedom of egotistical man, however, is the recognition of the unrestrained movement of spiritual and material elements that form its content.

Man, therefore, was not freed from his religion but received religious freedom. He was not freed from property but received freedom of property. He was not freed from professional egotism but received freedom to practice it professionally.

The constitution of the political state is the dissolution of bourgeois society into separate individuals, whose relationship is based on rights, whereas that of the men in estates and guilds was based on privilege. But man, as a member of bourgeois society, as unpolitical man, necessarily appears to be "natural man." Thus the *droits de l'homme* appear to be *droits naturels*, for self-conscious activity concentrates on the political act. Egotistical man is the passive product of a dissolved society, the object of direct certainty and therefore a natural object. Political revolution resolves bourgeois life into its constituent parts without submitting these parts to a revolutionary examination. It treats bourgeois society—the world of needs, works, private interests and rights—as the foundation of its existence, as an assumption that needs no further justification, as its natural basis. Finally, man as a member of bourgeois society counts himself truly man, *homme* as distinguished from

citoyen, because he is man in his sensual, individual and immediate existence while political man is abstract and artificial man, man as an allegorical and moral being. Real man is recognized in the shape of the egotistical *homme*, true man in the shape of the abstract *citoyen*.

"Celui qui ose entreprendre d'instituer un peuple doit se sentir en état de changer, pour ainsi dire la nature humaine, de transformer chaque individu, qui par lui-même est un tout parfait et solitaire en partie d'un plus grand tout, dont cet individu reçoive, en quelque sorte sa vie et son être, de substituer une existence partielle et morale à l'existence physique et indépendante. Il faut qu'il ôte à l'homme ses forces propres pour lui en donner qui lui soient étrangères et dont il ne puisse faire usage sans le secours d'autrui."

("He who dares the undertaking of starting a people must feel himself capable, so to speak, of changing human nature, of transforming each individual, who is in himself a perfect and separate unit, into part of a larger whole from which he will in some way receive his life and existence, and of substituting a partial and moral existence for an independent and physical one. He must take away from man his own powers and give him in return powers which are alien to him and which he cannot use without the help of others.") (*Social Contract, Book I*, London, 1757.)

All emancipation is a reduction of the human world, of human relations, to man himself.

Political emancipation is the reduction of man, on the one hand to the status of membership in bourgeois

society, to the egotistical and independent individual, and on the other to the status of citizen, to the moral person.

Human emancipation is achieved only when the individual gives up being an abstract citizen and becomes a member of his species as individual man in his daily life and work and situation, when he recognizes and organizes his "*forces propres*," his own strength, as part of the forces of society, which are then no longer separated from him as a political power.

II. THE CAPACITY OF TODAY'S JEWS AND CHRISTIANS TO BECOME FREE

Under this title Bauer deals with the relationship between the Christian and the Jewish religions and the relationship of religion to "the capacity to become free."

His conclusion is this: "The Christian has only one stage to go in order to abolish religion altogether (that is, to become free). . . .The Jew, on the other hand, has to break not only with his own Jewish nature but also with the perfectionist trend of his religion, a trend to which he has remained essentially alien."

Bauer thus turns the question of Jewish emancipation into a purely religious one. The old theological argument as to who has the better prospect of salvation, Christian or Jew, is repeated in a new form: Which of the two is more capable of emancipation? The question is no longer: Is it Judaism or Christianity which makes one free? It is, on the contrary: Is it the negation of Judaism or of Christianity which makes one freer?

"If the Jews want to be free they should embrace Christianity, but a dissolved Christianity, dissolved religion in general, that is, enlightenment, the critical spirit and its consequence, a free humanity."

And so there is still left a profession of faith for the Jews, though no longer that of Christianity but of a dissolved Christianity.

Bauer asks the Jews to break with the tradition of the Christian religion, a demand, which, as he himself admits, does not jibe with Jewish nature.

Since, toward the end of his study, Bauer views Judaism as a mere religious criticism of Christianity, it was to be expected that he would view Jewish emancipation as a philosophical and theological act.

Bauer takes the ideal, abstract nature of the Jew—that is, his religion—as his whole nature. He therefore correctly concludes: "The Jew contributes nothing to humanity when he disregards his limited Law, when he abolishes his Judaism."

The relation between Jews and Christians is therefore as follows: The Christian's only interest in Jewish emancipation is a general, humanitarian, theoretical one. Judaism is a fact offensive to the Christian's religious eye. As soon as his eye ceases to be religious, however, the fact ceases to offend him. And so Jewish emancipation in itself involves no work for the Christian.

But the Jew who wants to be emancipated has to do not only his own work but that of the Christian as well—such as the higher criticism of the Gospels, *The Life of Jesus*, etc.

"They may look on; they will determine their own fate; but history will not be mocked."

Let us break the theological framing of the question. For us the question of Jewish capacity for emancipation becomes the question of which element in society must be overcome in order to abolish Judaism. For the Jews capacity for emancipation depends on the

Jews' relation to the emancipation of our whole enslaved world.

Let us look at the real Jew of our time; not the Jew of the Sabbath, whom Bauer considers, but the Jew of everyday life.

What is the Jew's foundation in our world? Material necessity, private advantage.

What is the object of the Jew's worship in this world? Usury. What is his worldly god? Money.

Very well then; emancipation from usury and money, that is, from practical, real Judaism, would constitute the emancipation of our time.

The organization of society so as to abolish the preconditions of usury, and hence its possibility, would render the Jew impossible. His religious conviction would dissolve like a stale miasma under the pressure of the real life of the community. On the other hand, should the Jew recognize his materialistic nature as valueless and work for its abolition, he would be working for simple human emancipation and the shedding of his development to date, thus rejecting the highest practical expression of human self-alienation.

Thus we recognize in Judaism generally an anti-social element which has reached its present strength through a historical development in which the Jews eagerly collaborated. Jewish emancipation means, ultimately, the emancipation of humanity from Judaism.

The Jew has already emancipated himself in the Jewish way: "The Jew, who is, for example, merely tolerated in Vienna, determines by his money power the fate of the entire German Empire. The Jew, who is without rights in the smallest German state, decides the fate of Europe. . . .

"While corporations and guilds are closed to the Jew or are not yet favorable to him, the daring of private industry mocks the obstinacy of medieval institutions." (*The Jewish Question*.)

This is no isolated fact. The Jew has emancipated himself in the Jewish fashion not only by acquiring money power but through money's having become (with him or without him) the world power and the Jewish spirit's having become the practical spirit of the Christian peoples. The Jews have emancipated themselves to the extent that Christians have become Jews.

"The pious and politically free inhabitant of New England," reports Colonel Hamilton, "is a kind of Laocoon who makes not the slightest effort to free himself from the snakes which are strangling him. Mammon is the God of these people: they worship him not only with their lips but with all the powers of their bodies and soul. The earth in their eyes is nothing but one great stock exchange and they are convinced that they have no other mission here below than to become richer than their neighbors. Usury has taken hold of all their thoughts, excitement derives from some change in its object. When they travel, they carry their office or store, so to speak, with them on their backs and speak of nothing but interest and profits and if they turn their eyes for an instant from their own business it is only to turn them to the business of others."

Indeed, the materialistic rule of the Jew over the Christian world has in the United States reached such everyday acceptability that the propagation of the Gospels, the teaching of Christianity itself, has become an article of commerce, and the bankrupt merchant deals in Gospels just as the enriched gospeler deals in business. *"Tel que vous le voyez à la tête d'une congrégation respectable a commencé par être marchand; son commerce étant tombé, il s'est fait ministre; cet autre a débuté par le sacerdoce, mais des qu'il a eu quelque somme d'argent à la disposition, il a laissé la chaire pour le négoce. Aux yeux d'un grand nombre, le ministère religieux est une véritable carrière industrielle."* ("The man who is now leading a respectable congregation may have started out as a merchant; his

business having failed, he became a minister. Another started out as a minister; but as soon as he accumulated some money, he left the pulpit and went into business. In the eyes of many people, religious ministry is a genuine business career." (Beaumont, *op. cit.*)

Bauer holds that it is a fiction to state that the Jew is deprived of political rights while in practice he wields enormous power and exercises wholesale a political influence whose retail use is denied him.

The contradiction between this actual political power and Jews' political rights is the universal contradiction between politics and the power of money. Theoretically, the first stands over the second; in practice it has become its slave.

Judaism has maintained itself alongside Christianity not only as a religious criticism of Christianity, and as an official questioner as to its religious origin, but also because the materialistic spirit of Judaism has kept itself alive in Christian society and achieved there its highest expression. The Jew who remains a special member of bourgeois society is only a special phenomenon of Judaism within that society.

Judaism has maintained itself not in spite of, but because of, history.

Bourgeois society continuously brings forth the Jew from its own entrails.

What was the essential foundation of the Jewish religion? Practical needs, egotism.

The monotheism of the Jew is therefore actually a

polytheism of many needs, and it makes even renunciation the object of divine law. Practical need, egoism, is the underlying principle of bourgeois society and is recognizable as such immediately this society sets up its own political state. The god of practical needs and private interest is money.

Money is the zealous one God of Israel, beside which no other God may stand. Money degrades all the gods of mankind and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-constituted value set upon all things. It has therefore robbed the whole world, of both nature and man, of its original value. Money is the essence of man's life and work, which have become alienated from him. This alien monster rules him and he worships it.

The God of the Jews has become secularized and is now a worldly God. The bill of exchange is the Jew's real God. His God is the illusory bill of exchange.

The view of nature gained under the dominion of money and private property is a genuine contempt, a materialistic degradation of nature, such as exist in Jewish religion, if only in fancy.

It is in this sense that Thomas Münzer complains that "all creatures have become property, the fish in the water, the birds in the air, the plants on the ground—the creatures, too, must become free."

What is stated as theory in Jewish religion, namely, contempt for theory, art, history and man as an end in himself, is an actual and conscious point of view, held to be virtuous by the man of money. Even the relations between the sexes, between man and woman, become an object of commerce. The woman is auctioned off.

The chimerical nationality of the Jew is the true nationality of the merchant, of the man of money.

The law of the Jew, lacking all solid foundation, is only a religious caricature of morality and of law in general, but it provides the formal rites in which the world of property clothes its transactions.

Jewish Jesuitism—that practical Jesuitism which in the Talmud, as Bauer shows, deals with the clever circumvention by the world of private interest of the laws that rule it—is the chief art of that world.

The transactions of this world within its own laws

are, indeed, necessarily a constant abrogation of real law.

The Jew obeys his laws not because they express his will and nature but because man is dominated by these laws and will be punished for transgressing them.

The religion of practical necessity can, by its very nature, achieve perfection only through practice, because practice is its truth.

Jewry cannot create a new world; it can only draw the world's new-made creations and relationships into the sphere of its industriousness, because practical need, whose motivation is private interest, acts passively and never initiates growth, only feeds on the growth of society.

Jewry reaches its peak with the perfection of bourgeois society; but bourgeois society reaches perfection only in the Christian world. Only under the rule of Christianity, which externalizes all human relationships—national, natural, ethical and theoretical—could bourgeois society isolate itself entirely from the life of the state, destroy all those bonds that link man as a species, replace them with egotism and the demands of private interest, and dissolve the human world into a world of atomized and mutually hostile individuals.

Christianity sprang from Judaism; it has now dissolved itself back into Judaism.

The Christian was from the start the theorizing Jew; the Jew therefore the practical Christian, and the practical Christian has once more become Jew.

Christianity overcame real Judaism in appearance only. It was too refined, too spiritual, to abolish raw

material needs save by elevating them into the wild blue yonder.

Christianity is the sublime thought of Judaism, Judaism is the everyday practical application of Christianity. But this application could become universal only after Christianity had been theoretically perfected as the religion of self-alienation of man, from himself and from nature.

Only then could Jewry become universally dominant and turn alienated man and alienated nature into alienable, salable objects, subject to the serfdom of egotistical needs and to usury.

Sale is the practice of alienation. Just as man, so long as he is engrossed in religion, can objectify his nature only by turning it into an alien and fantastic being, so, when he is dominated by egotistical needs, can he busy himself in production only by putting his products in the power of an alien being and bestowing upon him his own alien products the value of money.

The Christian egotism of salvation is inevitably turned in practice into the materialistic egotism of the Jew, heavenly need into earthly, subjectivity into private interest. We explain the Jew's tenacity not by his religion but rather by the human foundation of his religion—practical need, egotism.

Since the real nature of the Jew is amply fulfilled in bourgeois society, this society could hardly convince

the Jew that his religious nature (which is only the ideal form of practical necessity) is not real. And so we find the real nature of today's Jew not only in the Pentateuch and the Talmud but in contemporary society as well—not as a theoretical but as a highly empirical fact, and not only as a limitation upon the Jew but as a Jewish limitation upon society.

As soon as society can abolish the empirical nature of the Jew, that is, usury and its preconditions, being a Jew will become impossible because his conviction will no longer have any object, since the subjective basis of Judaism (practical necessity) will have become humanized and the conflict between man as a sensual individual and as a species will have been abolished.

The social emancipation of Jewry is the emancipation of society from Jewry.

FURTHER COMMENT ON "THE JEWISH QUESTION"

Contrary to the masses the "intellectual" behaves critically by regarding his own narrow-minded work as absolute and its opponents as sinners. In his first reply to the critics of his work (*The Jewish Question*), Bauer reveals no awareness of its shortcomings but insists that he has traced the true and universal (*sic*) significance of the Jewish question. His further reply will force him to admit his "oversight."

"The reception of my work proves that those who have spoken for freedom and who still do so are precisely those who must rebel against the intellect. The defense of my work, to which I will now devote myself, will offer further proof of how lacking in thought are the spokesmen of the masses who think they achieve giant stature when they talk about emancipation and 'human rights.' "

The "masses" must evidently have begun to prove their opposition to the "intellectual" in connection with this work of absolute criticism, since their very existence is conditioned and proved by their opposition to absolute criticism.

The polemics of some liberal and rationalist Jews against Professor Bauer's *Jewish Question* have naturally quite different critical implications from the mass polemics of liberals against philosophy and of ration-

alists against Strauss. Incidentally, this quotation from Hegel shows just how original the phrase used above is: "The special form of bad conscience which manifests itself in the type of oratory to which that kind of [liberal] shallowness is prone, is noticeable, in the first place, in its talk of the intellect when it is least intellectual and in being most lifeless when it talks about life."

As regards "human rights" an article "On the Jewish Question," in the *Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher*, proves that it is not the spokesman of the masses but Professor Bauer himself who has misunderstood their nature and abused them dogmatically. Compared with his objection that human rights are not "inborn"—a discovery made countless times in England forty years ago—Fourier's argument that fish, animals, and so on have natural rights is the argument of a genius.

We quote here only a few examples of Professor Bauer's contest with Philipppson, Hirsch and Company. Even these feeble enemies are not conquered by absolute criticism. Professor Philipppson is by no means talking nonsense, as the absolute critic believes, when he voices this objection: "Bauer is thinking out a peculiar kind of state . . . the philosophical ideal of a state." Professor Bauer, who confused the state with humanity, human rights with man, and political emancipation with human emancipation, had of necessity to invent a peculiar state, the philosophical ideal of a state, even if he did not think one out.

"Herr Hirsch, instead of writing down his elaborate sentence, should rather have refuted my argument that the Christian state, because a certain religion is its very

principle of life, cannot grant . . . the adherents of another religion full equality."

If Hirsch had really refuted Professor Bauer's argument, and shown that the exclusively Christian state is not only an imperfect state but even an imperfect Christian state, Professor Bauer would have replied as he did previously: "Reproaches are irrelevant in this connection." To Professor Bauer's statement, "By pressing against the elastic spring of history the Jews have produced a counter pressure," Professor Philippson answers correctly: "Then they must have had some influence on history, and since it is Herr Bauer who says so he must be wrong when he says that they have contributed nothing to modern culture." Herr Bauer answers: "A thorn in the eye is also a contribution—but does it contribute to my eyesight?" But a thorn that has been in the eye since birth (like Judaism in the Christian world), growing and shaping itself with my eye, is not an ordinary thorn, but a miraculous thorn which belongs in my eye and which must have somehow contributed to the growth of my vision. The critical "thorn" does not prick Professor Hirsch. Besides, Professor Bauer's view of the importance of Judaism in "the formation of modern culture" has been well refuted in the work mentioned above.

The theological representative of absolute criticism felt so injured when a Rhineland deputy to the Landtag said that "the Jews are perverse in their own Jewish way, not in our so-called Christian way" that it later called him to task for using such an argument.

Professor Bauer comments on the statement of an-

other deputy that "civic equality of Jews can exist only where there are no Jews," by saying: "Right. And right only when the other term of criticism, which I achieved in my work, is also present," namely that Christianity, too, must cease to exist.

In his first reply to the attacks on his *Jewish Question*, the absolute critic still insists that the abolition of religion and atheism are the necessary condition of bourgeois society. He thus reveals that he has not better insight into the nature of the state than that proved by the "oversight" of his work.

The absolute critic is vexed when something which he claims as the latest scientific knowledge is proved to be generally known. A deputy from the Rhineland remarks: "Nobody has stated that France and Belgium are distinguished by a particular clarity in the recognition of their principles." The absolute critic might answer that this statement was projecting the present into the past by claiming that the chronic inadequacy of French political principles today is a traditional state of affairs. But the absolute critic would gain little from such a reply. He must, instead, claim the obsolete view as the present view and the present view as a deep secret, yet to be revealed to the masses by his critical studies.

He must therefore say: "This idea (the antiquated prejudice) has been stated by many (the masses); but a thorough investigation of history will prove that, after France's accomplishment, there remains much to be done about the understanding of principles." And so even thorough historical investigation will achieve no

understanding of principles, but merely prove that there is still much to be done on the subject. Quite an assumption, especially after the great works of Socialism!

Much is contributed toward an understanding of present-day social conditions by Professor Bauer's remark: "The present ruling certainty is uncertainty." When Hegel says that the present ruling Chinese certainty is "to be" and the Indian one "nothingness," etc., the absolute critic joins him in "pure" fashion when he reduces the character of our time to the category of "uncertainty," and all the more purely since "uncertainty" belongs, together with "to be" and "nothingness," in the first chapter of speculative logic, that of "quality."

We cannot take leave of the reader without making a general remark on the first contribution to *The Jewish Question*.

A main task of absolute criticism is to place all questions of the day in their appropriate form. It does not answer real questions, but substitutes others for them. It must first turn the questions of the day into "critical-critical" questions. If it is a matter of the Code Napoleon, it would first prove that it is a matter of the Pentateuch. It makes questions topical by critically twisting and distorting them. And so it twisted the Jewish question in such a way that the political emancipation with which it pretended to deal no longer needed to be investigated, and a criticism of Jewish religion and a description of the Christian-German state were made to act as substitutes.

This method, like all the methods of absolute criti-

cism, is merely the repetition of a speculative joke. Speculative philosophy, that is, Hegel's philosophy, first had to translate all questions from the language of every sound common sense into the language of the speculating intellect and turn every real question into a speculative question before it could answer it. Once speculation had twisted my question in my mouth, and then, like the Catechism, put the question back into my mouth, it could, like the Catechism, have a ready answer for each of my questions.

THE PRIVATE LIFE OF KARL MARX*

Just as the 16th century may be called the century of discovery, the 17th, the century of libertarian philosophies, the 18th, the century of scientific innovations, we may rightly designate the 19th century the century of Social Reorientation.

The Revolt of the American Colonies against British Exploitation, and the fateful uprising of the French Bourgeoisie against suppression by a decadent court nobility gave not only the oppressed but also their oppressors an impetus toward social reorientation.

Then, before the eyes of startled Europe, that astonishing conversion of a feudal society into an industrial organization, created by the inventive genius of the 18th and 19th centuries, began to take place. Steam driven machinery and huge factories grew like mushrooms over England, France and Germany. Slowly but steadily the shoemaker, the weaver, the smith, the carpenter were driven from their home work shops into the army of factory workers. The division of production became the division of labor. The artisan was told to forget his schooling and take his place at the machine along with unskilled strangers. The era of the machinist began. The shoemaker became a machine cutter, the coachman, a locomotive man, the sailor, a steamship oiler. And the owners of these machines began to flood the world with products created *en masse*. Overnight, more shoes were made than people

* Reprinted from *The Soviet Impact on Society* by Dagobert D. Runes, published 1953.

could wear, more clothes manufactured than people needed, more wheat harvested than people could eat. But people still were barefoot, poorly clothed and hungry. And the owners of the machines became a power, a new power in what were now industrial states.

It was only natural that at such a time of industrial and agricultural upheaval, thousands of scholars, students, humanitarians and quacks would stand up and propose laws, formulas and systems which would enable the new society to run properly.

There was the British Robert Owen, who envisioned groups of small, independent, collective communities. There was the Frenchman, François Charles Fourier, who suggested a system of colonies on a communist plan. There was the German, Ferdinand Lassalle, who demanded co-operative workshops supported by state credit. There was Pierre Joseph Proudhon, who attacked the idea of private property, calling possession theft. Bakunin, Etienne Cabet, Wilhelm Weitling, hundreds and hundreds of dreamers, scientists and charlatans hawked about their visions of the coming society.

The major problems which required solution were: How should those millions of former artisans be compensated, having been made machine operators practically overnight; by what right do the owners of these machines exploit the artisan's labor; what should society do to protect both the worker and the progress of industry?

It would be futile to take up the numerous proposals of these social scientists and utopians in detail. However, they all possessed one common denominator;

namely, the desire to transform society into a more or less complete socialist community.

Jean Brady, among the British Utopians, suggested the creation of a National Bank of Exchange with a nationwide network of branches. Each of these branches would be in possession of a "storehouse of commodities." And every working man would receive his wages in the form of notes indicating the "time of labor" he put in. He would receive, for example, a note for "one week, two days and three hours labor-time." With that note he would be able to draw his merchandise at the "storehouse of commodities." By this measure Mr. Brady hoped to make sure that every working man would receive the full value of his labor, and that no surplus value would remain for anybody to grab.

This was the first time that labor-time was proposed as an exchange basis in economy. Karl Marx later made Brady's definition the mainstay of his economic theory.

Among those communist critics of the new society was Karl Marx, born in 1818, the son of the German convert to Protestantism, Hirschel Marx. In sympathy with Protestantism although his ancestors on both sides were Jewish, Karl Marx was anti-Semitic all his life. He never really overcame the feeling of inferiority that he possessed because he was born of Jewish parents. He even went so far as to show that through his system of social emancipation the world would be rid of even the Jew and his usury. "As soon as society," he said, "succeeds in eliminating the empiric nature of Judaism,

usury, and its premises, the Jew becomes impossible. The social emancipation of the Jew is the emancipation of society from the Jew." (Die Judenfrage)

As a student of law in Berlin he came under the influence of Professor Hegel, founder of *Dialectical Idealism*, the predominant philosophy of the time. His association with Hegel's critical student, Feuerbach, acquainted him with the latter's materialistic conception of reality. We all remember Feuerbach's saying: "Man is what he eats."

Marx combined Hegel's conception of all reality and history as being one divine process of development of the Absolute Ideal of God (Creating, negating and re-creating: dialectical idealism) with Feuerbach's philosophy of reality and history as being solely materialistic entities. He developed the notion of so-called *Dialectical Materialism*, which makes Materialism the God who is triumphantly realized in nature in his evolutionary process through assertion, antagonism and final reconciliation. Thus, and this is pretty much as Feuerbach would have stated it, all the activities of man, all his thoughts and desires, all social forms, all historic developments are based upon economic conditioning.

For a while Marx did editorial work in Germany, having married the high society Jenny von Westphalen, sister of a Prussian Cabinet member. He finally settled in London, where his friend and collaborator, Frederick Engels, part owner of the firm "Ermen and Engels," practically supported him for more than thirty years.

Marx's collaboration with Engels was unique and extraordinarily close. For example, some of the articles

sent by Marx to the New York *Tribune*, for which he was paid, were written by Engels.

Actually and directly Marx lived off the surplus value of "Ermen and Engels." To characterize Marx's personal attitude toward social responsibility, one must realize that practically all his lifetime he lived parasitically on other people's labor. First his wife's, then his friends' (Engels, Lassalle, Wolff), then his old mother's. He brazenly admitted to the friends from whom he continually borrowed money that he lived "rather above my means." He told them that he had to live better so that his daughters "may make connections and contacts which will assure their future." A quite typical and low bourgeois ideology which shows an apparent distrust in the future of communist society.

We quote from a letter addressed to Engels which shows the champion of the proletarian revolution in an off-stage light:

Dear Fred,

My long silence was, as you have probably guessed by now, due to unpleasant causes.

I am living for two months off the pawnshop with accumulated and daily demands upon me that are unbearable. This will not surprise you if you consider: First, that I did not earn any money during that period; second, that the mere repayment of debts and the furnishing of the house cost me £500 (two thousand five hundred dollars). I have kept accounts of that money [Karl Marx refers here to an inheritance from his revolutionary friend, Wilhelm Wolff, who died in 1861, to

whom Karl Marx dedicated the first volume of CAPITAL], penny by penny, as I myself was wondering how the money disappeared. Added to this, from Germany, (where, God knows how, rumors of my inheritance were spread) there came every possible kind of antediluvian money demand.

I wanted to see you personally first in order to talk these things over with you, but at this moment any time lost is irreplaceable. Last Saturday night I told the Subcommittee of the "International" of my departure, in order to have at least 14 days all free and undisturbed for pushing on with my work.

I assure you, I'd rather cut off my thumb than write this letter. *It is rather terrible to remain dependent for half of one's life.* The only thought that sustains me in this is that we two are conducting a partnership where I devote my time to the theoretical and party part of the business. *I live rather above my means and besides this year we have lived better than usual.* But this is the only way, so that besides compensating the girls for the bad times they have had, *we may make connections and contacts which will assure their future.* I think you yourself will agree that merely from the business point of view a *simple proletarian apartment* would be *unsuitable* for me *here*. Should I live alone with my wife or if the girls were boys——.

Yours,

K.M.

On January 7, 1863, Engels, deeply grieved by his wife's death, wrote to his friend: "Mary is dead—I can-

not tell you how I am. The poor girl loved me so much." And on the next day, Karl Marx replied:—"The news of Mary's death shocked me. She was good-natured, witty and she loved you. My visits in France and Germany to raise money were in vain and, as is only natural, with your seventy-five dollars I did not get far.

"Could not, instead of Mary, my mother, who is now anyhow full of physical ailments and has lived her life thoroughly——."

Bebel and Bernstein, who edited Karl Marx's correspondence, took the last paragraph out. They felt that such a materialistic interpretation of events could not be stomached by even the proletariat; the proletariat about whom Engels wrote to Marx (II, XII, 1851): "What else is there to that mob if it stops fighting"; and (IX, V, 1851): "They will never love us, the democratic reds or even the communistic rabble."

Marx had the same possessive attitude towards his work that he exhibited in his private life; and the same disregard of the emotional life of friends and co-workers. His vanity and hatred against all who dared to disagree with him were unbearable. Bakunin, deeply wounded, once wrote: "Marx is personally like a madman. He says 'my ideas' and does not want to understand that ideas belong to no one, that the greatest ideas always were the product of all."

Marx's and Hitler's Professor Hegel

To understand Marx and his dialectical materialism we must go back to his teacher, Herr Professor George

Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, the originator of the dialectical interpretation of history.

According to Herr Professor Hegel, a very conservative bigot and loyal servant of the Prussian State, all reality is an "Idea" which is in a constant process of evolution. Herr Hegel does not find it necessary to describe that mysterious all embracing and all creating "Idea" any further. However, he states in one place that: "The 'Idea' is not alone, God is with it. Whenever 'Idea' materializes itself, God is active." To speak further with Herr Hegel:—"What has happened and what is happening every day is not only never without God, but essentially God's own work." "In fact, World History is God's Justification in History." (PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY).

Why God has to justify himself in history, Hegel fails to disclose. However, let us follow his discourses and dialectics further:—

"Since God or the Idea is constantly in process of development (evolution) there must be something (!) to make such development plausible; *i.e.*, a hindrance! That hindrance is the 'Being-Different' in Nature."

"This 'Being-Different' is identical with 'Matter'—as opposed to the 'Being-Itself' of the 'Idea' or the Spirit. Philosophy or Science are: Reconciliation of God with Himself and Nature ('Matter')." (PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, II.)

"Humanity was estranged from God but Jesus Christ won again unity between the two."

"The main thing is to perfect our power of logic so

much as to be able to grasp the contents of religion." (OP. BD. 13)

"'Idea' is not only reality, it is the only reality and the world is constantly in the process of development toward the 'Perfect Ideal.' History is development of the 'Idea' overcoming 'Matter.'"

We could quote hundreds of pages of Herr Hegel which ramble away along these lines. William James once said: "Let's have less generalities and more simple facts."

When it comes to facts, we find Herr Hegel not only a very accommodating interpreter of science as the servant of religion, but also a very ardent defender of the most reactionary Prussian State.

"The State is materialization of the Divine Will." (Op. Bd. 7) "The people without a monarch are a formless mass."

In other words, God is with the King.

It is interesting to note that Professor Hegel is not only the patron philosopher of Karl Marx and his followers, but also the state philosopher of National Socialism. His ideal of the absolutist state gives philosophic background to Hitler's Totalitarianism.

Now let us look at the "dialectics," an art so highly developed by Herr Hegel, and about which so much ado was made by Marx and his followers.

Dialectics means in Greek a type of discussion popularized by Plato. One party presents a thesis; the other party offers an anti-thesis; and then either party may drop his own thesis and go home or incorporate some

points of the other man's thesis in his own, and thus form a new combined point of view, the synthesis. In such a discussion, contradiction is just a step to better understanding.

Hegel, of course, thought of God as a dialectician who runs the world as a synthesis of "Idea" and "Matter"; history being a realization of the Perfect Idea.

Karl Marx, Hegel's follower, just turned the stick upside down and we have in place of Hegel's Dialectical Idealism, Marx's Dialectical Materialism.

And so we hear from Karl Marx:—"History is Development of Economic Materialism. Society is in a process of development, realizing the historic role of materialism in opposition to all idle ideology."

"All doing of man, all thoughts and desires, all social forms, all historic development, is based upon economic conditioning."

"Law, Morals, Art, Science, Religion, are just 'ideological superstructures' of economic conditioning."

Instead of Hegel's Historic Idealism we have in Marx Historic Materialism. And just as Hegel had a fatalistic faith in his final realization of the Idea of God, Marx persisted fanatically in his belief in the final undeterrable realization of Historic Materialism.

By adopting Professor Hegel's flimsy but complicated metaphysical structure, along with its whole paraphernalia of logic, talmudism and dialectics, Karl Marx gave his radical opinions the semblance of a highly scientific edifice. But he unwittingly invited the suspicion of a more enlightened century.

If Marx's philosophy adapted itself so perfectly to

Hegel's Logic, perhaps his historic Materialism is just as scientific and sound as Hegel's fantastic Idealism.

Karl Marx's Predictions and Nightmares

Mr. Karl Marx seemed to retain a peculiarly sentimental regard for the old continental social order. The modern bourgeoisie, he wails, "has put an end to all feudal, patriarchal, *idyllic* relations. It has *pitilessly* torn asunder the motley feudal ties that bound man to his 'natural superiors,' and has left no other bond between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous 'cash payment.'" "It has drowned the *most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor, of chivalrous enthusiasm (sic!), of philistine sentimentalism, in the icy water of egotistical calculation.*" "The bourgeoisie has stripped of its halo every occupation hitherto honored and looked up to with reverent awe. It has converted the physician, the lawyer, the priest, the poet, the man of science, into its paid wage-laborers." (COMMUNIST MANIFESTO) "The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation."

At first thought one is tempted to think Mr. Marx is thus describing the destruction of some socialist society by modern capitalist bourgeoisie, but the Professor is merely bewailing the passing of feudal Europe with its small tradespeople and handworking artisans. Mr. Marx sees a very dark future ahead with the advent of the "egotistical" modern industries, inventions, etc.; as if the early 18th century artisan of England was less ego-

tistical than the manufacturer of the 19th. He regrets deeply the passing of the "idyllic" relations of the good old days when, (in fact) the artisan's helpers were kept, boarded and fed quite without that "chivalrous enthusiasm." Whether modern industrialism has really drowned "the most heavenly ecstasies of religious fervor" is also questionable.

It really is pathetic to see the militant atheist and cynic shed crocodile tears over such sentimentalities.

As to the doctors, lawyers, poets, priests and scientists who have become mere paid wage-laborers in our industrial society—why Mr. Marx, are these professional people entitled to a different status in society than the worker?

However, the fact is that the only place and only society where these people have really become mere paid wage-laborers is the communist society. In so-called capitalist society these men still enjoy the freedom and economic independence of their professions. Our doctors still maintain their own offices, and so do our lawyers and scientists. As to the poets, I suppose they secretly wish they could be put on the basis of paid wage-laborers.

The difficulty lies in that Mr. Marx is a German dialectician and, as he proudly states in his *CAPITAL*, a true follower of Hegel's logic. And the trouble with Hegelians is that they have a system on hand and all that's necessary is to fit the world into that system.

Hegel's system is the materialization of a perfect world through conflict. History is the story of the materialization of that divine idea. And Mr. Marx, being by

environment, birth and conviction opposed first to the Prussian state, then to all states and all living societies, —sees a new approach to Hegel's interpretation of history. That new approach is: The history of the world is the materialization of the conflict between the hated industrialists, capitalists and state officials on one side and the wage-laborers on the other side. They are in fact two classes: the evil and good. And the final evolution of this class-struggle will bring the materialization of the divine society where "use and pleasure will be the leading motive of all production." And it is this design that Mr. Marx pleases to call the "materialist interpretation of history."

To fit this living world of infinitely diversified professions, industries, activities and people into his "system" Mr. Marx divided the inhabitants of the world into two classes: the proletariat (meaning those who possess nothing but offspring—proles) and the bourgeoisie (which means to him "possessive, exploitative, soulless, calculative, Jewish" etc.). It is, in fact, the proletariat against the rest of shabby mankind. And all this because the modern inventive mind destroyed petty hand artisanship and paved the way for production on a grand scale.

The proletarians of whom Mr. Marx speaks have no family, no father, no mother, no children, no friends, no country, no religion, no savings, no education, no property, personal or otherwise—no future.

"In proportion as the bourgeoisie; i.e., capital, is developed," says Marx, "in the same proportion is the proletariat, the modern working class, developed." "A

class of laborers who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital; these laborers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity like every other article of commerce and are, consequently, exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market."

"Modern industry has converted the little workshop of the patriarchal master into the great factory of the industrial capitalist. Masses of laborers, crowded into the factory, are organized like soldiers. As privates of the industrial army they are placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of officers and sergeants. Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class and of the bourgeois state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the over-seer, and, above all, by the individual bourgeois manufacturer himself. The more openly this despotism proclaims gain to be its end and aim, the more petty, the more hateful and the more embittering it is."

"Differences of age and sex no longer have any distinctive social validity for the working class. All are instruments of labor, more or less expensive to use, according to their age and sex."

"The lower strata of the middle class—the small trades-people, shopkeepers, and retired tradesmen generally, the handicraftsmen and peasants—all these sink gradually into the proletariat; partly because their diminutive capital does not suffice for the scale on which modern industry is carried on, and is swamped in the competition with the large capitalists, partly because

their specialized skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population."

"The various interests and conditions of life within the ranks of the proletariat are more and more equalized in proportion as machinery obliterates all distinctions of labor and nearly everywhere reduces wages to the same low level."

"Further, entire sections of the ruling classes are, by the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence. These also supply the proletariat with fresh elements of enlightenment and progress."

"The 'dangerous class,' the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution."

"The proletarian is without property; his relations to his wife and children have no longer anything in common with bourgeois family relations; modern industrial labor, modern subjection to capital, the same in England as in France, in America as in Germany, has stripped him of every trace of national character. Law, morality, religion, are to him so many bourgeois prejudices, behind which lurk in ambush just as many bourgeois interests." (COMMUNIST MANIFESTO.)

Thus Marx described, almost a hundred years ago, what is going to happen to the working people of the Western world. What Marx predicted did come to pass—but only in one country; namely, Marxist Russia. Russia, which Mr. Marx neglected to include at the

time of his writing because it was too unimportant and too backward for a proletarian revolution, became the first and only country where Marxism materialized on a large scale.

Communist Russia is the only country where all these things happened—all that enslavement, suppression, subjection and regimentation of the working and middle class people which Mr. Marx predicted for the proletarians of France, England and America.

In Marxist Russia, and only there, all the small tradespeople, shopkeepers, handicraftsmen, farmers, lawyers, physicians, and business people alike, were degraded to the status of proletarians, remaining with nothing but their proles.

In Marxist Russia the workers are herded into factories, organized like soldiers and placed under the command of a perfect hierarchy of the Communist Party.

In Marxist Russia every farmer who owned more than one cow was stigmatized as a Kulak, robbed of his cattle, home, tools and even personal property and driven into Siberian concentration camps and icy wood-choppers' barracks. At the same time the rest of the farmers "voluntarily" turned over all their property to a collective which put itself under the command of the same hierarchy of the political ruling class.

In Marxist Russia the whole farming population, or three-quarters of the people, were degraded to the level of propertyless landlaborers.

In Marxist Russia the income of the workman and farm-laborer are curtailed, almost entirely, to the bare

means of subsistence required for maintenance and the propagation of the race. The Russian worker labors two months for a pair of boots and four months for a suit of clothes.

In Marxist Russia the worker is driven to increased production by the steadily increased speed of the machinery.

In Marxist Russia all distinctions between classes of labor have been obliterated and wages reduced to the same atrocious level. The worker is not paid a regular wage sufficient to sustain a proper living standard, but by a piece of work scale.

Only in Marxist Russia, of all the countries of the civilized world, is the worker treated merely as an implement of production and thus paid by what he produces instead of by what he needs! The laborers, farm, factory or otherwise, do not receive wages in this communist society; but are paid by the piece work system; a degrading method no bourgeois society permits today.

In Marxist Russia the worker and farmer are without property. They may be sent to any distant place on any unwanted job by the political hierarchy. The farmer may never leave his community; he is bound to the soil like the serf of old. The farmer, too, is not paid a wage, but must "sell himself piecemeal."

In Marxist Russia differences of sex no longer have any distinctive social validity. Women are put to the same heavy labor that men perform; bricklaying, ditch-digging, etc. They are often taken off heavy labor for weeks in the event of pregnancy, then returned to the

pickaxe a few weeks after they have given birth—their offspring turned over to public nurseries.

In Marxist Russia the proletarians do not even have their offspring. These belong to the political hierarchy. Their relations to wife and child have truly “no longer anything in common with bourgeois family relations.” The political hierarchy teaches the offspring of these proletarians to hate the religion their parents believe in, to mock their faith, to ridicule their habits.

In Marxist Russia a twelve-year-old boy was publicly honored for denouncing his father, who at home had expressed criticism of an act of the ruling hierarchy.

In Marxist Russia the people have all been degraded to the status of slaves of the political ruling class, without property, home, freedom, family, rights or privileges.

And what of Mr. Marx’s prediction about America, England, and France?

Our farmers still grow their grain and raise their cattle and build their homes as free men in a free country.

And our workers in the mills and at the wheels earn wages and get a week’s pay for five days’ labor, and join protective unions to safeguard their rights and privileges. Their children are their own, and their wives are not forced into foul intimacy with sweating male ditch-diggers. And the worker may tell his child of his faith, without having mockery, the product of political propaganda schools, spat in his face.

And our workers and farmers, together with the shopkeepers, lawyers and physicians who contrary to

Mr. Marx's prediction have not been flattened out to the status of proletarians by our social system,—they all, these people of the thousand diversified professions, may get together peacefully and openly and elect their own officers to conduct their affairs of government.

What Marx predicted for the great industrial democracies has come true under the so-called proletarian dictatorship of his own friends and followers. They truly made a lot of rich people poor, but made no poor man rich.

On the Theory of Surplus Value

"The materialist interpretation of history and the theory of surplus value are Marx's great discoveries," said Engels.

We have dealt with the materialist interpretation of history in connection with Professor Hegel's philosophy. Now what is this startling discovery of the theory of surplus value?

According to Mr. Marx, the worker under the Capitalist system "is nothing else all his life but labor-power." "The Capitalist," says Mr. Marx,—and by Capitalist he means not only Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Ford, but every small-town shopkeeper, farmer or professional man who employs one or a number of persons—"is using the worker to increase his capital; and, therefore, the only purpose of labor is to increase capital." In fact, according to CAPITAL the worker ceases to exist if he fails to increase capital.

"What the worker sells is not his work but his work-

power, the value of which is determined by the value of his physical necessities (to sustain this work-power, to develop it, to retain it and perpetuate it)." In other words, the capitalist buys labor merchandise or labor power just as he buys his raw materials or his machinery, or steam power. Although, according to Mr. Marx, the employer pays the established price for machinery, raw materials, etc.; for labor power he pays the minimum wage, or the minimum necessary for the subsistence of the laborer.

How Mr. Marx can reconcile such a statement with the obvious fact that workers in one kind of industry are paid two and three times as much as workers in another kind of industry, no one can understand. If worker "A," who is a skilled engraver, receives \$80.00 a week from his employer, and worker "B," who is an unskilled night watchman, is paid \$20.00 a week from the same employer, are both getting the minimum necessary for their mere subsistence, or are they paid on the basis of what they produce?

This basic premise of Karl Marx's *CAPITAL*; viz., that the capitalist pays the worker only the minimum necessary for his subsistence, is just as irrational as most of the other basic statements and premises of Mr. Marx. Objective economists have long ago demonstrated the contradictions inherent in the economic premises of *CAPITAL*. Communist interpreters of Mr. Marx, however, choose to ignore reason and criticism with the remark that, "These economists were Bourgeois Intellectuals and in the pay of capitalist society."

But reason is reason and two times two is four in a

capitalist as well as a communist society; and if the premises of Mr. Marx's CAPITAL, as we intend to show, are wrong and basically so, then his whole system is cockeyed.

But let us follow the processes of Mr. Marx's logic, developed at the feet of the great German Professor and Metaphysician, Mr. Hegel.

"How can we," asks Mr. Marx, "determine the actual value of the wage the capitalist is paying to the laborer?" "In the capitalist world," Mr. Marx says, "one capitalist cannot make profit on the other because they can deal in fair exchange. The capitalist does not sell his merchandise at a higher price to the other capitalist, he only exchanges his products in the generally adopted means of exchange; viz., gold, or money." "But workers," says Mr. Marx, "receive the minimum necessary for their subsistence in exchange for, let us say, eight hours of labor." "How much," asks Mr. Marx, "does it take, or rather, how many working hours does it take to produce the necessary means of living which the worker gets in his eight hours of labor?" "Supposedly it takes four hours of labor to produce the material (food, clothing, housing) necessary to keep body and soul of the worker together." "Then here we have," says Mr. Marx, "the day-value or wage of the worker." Triumphantly, Mr. Marx points out: "The worker is getting four hours worth of merchandise for an eight-hour day of labor." "Ah," exclaims Mr. Marx triumphantly, "and what does the capitalist do with the surplus value of four hours? That is his profit." "The capitalist does not profit," says Mr. Marx, "in the ex-

change with the other capitalist," the process which we generally call buying and selling, because, according to Mr. Marx, no capitalist would be foolish enough to exchange merchandise of more value for merchandise of less value, or even for gold or money of less value. The capitalist is making his profit by robbing the worker of four hours of labor. The capitalist's profit is the surplus value of labor. As Mr. Marx states it: "To interpret the general nature of profit one must start with the premise that as a rule merchandise is sold at its real value; i.e., in relation to the labor contents represented in it." "The value of labor determines the value of merchandise and nothing else."

We all know that every one of the statements made by Mr. Marx in *CAPITAL*, as well as in *WAGE, PRICE AND PROFIT*, are utterly without foundation. The price of merchandise is not determined by its labor content, but purely by offer, demand and supply. In fact, the same merchandise may be produced by one manufacturer at twice or three times the labor cost of another. The value of the merchandise still remains the same.

A manufacturer might be compelled to "sell or exchange," to use Mr. Marx's terminology, his product below cost because of the need for immediate cash. He, therefore, may sell part of his merchandise at one price to one buyer, and at another price to another buyer. Again, he may sell the same merchandise with the identical labor content at one price today, and demand and receive much more or much less for it at a later date; depending upon the supply, offer and demand.

Of course, to point out these fundamental errors of

logic means to destroy the very theoretical basis of Marxism; because, as Mr. Engels and Mr. Kautsky have clearly pointed out, the theory of surplus value is the backbone of Marx's CRITIQUE OF BOURGEOIS ECONOMICS.

Incidentally, as to Mr. Marx's discovery of the theory of surplus value—explanations of the theory can be found as far back as 1831, in SOCIAL SYSTEM and other books written by Mr. John Gray, and published in Edinburgh in that year. In his SOCIAL SYSTEM Mr. Gray uses "labor-time" as the unit of direct economic measure and exchange, for the first time. This was, of course, prior to Mr. Marx.

But let's, for the moment, follow Mr. Marx's excursion into the theory of value. Exactly what happens under a Communist system to that surplus value of which the worker is robbed by the capitalist? Does the worker, for instance, in Communist Russia cease to work a certain amount of time gratis for the benefit of the capitalist? Does the worker in the USSR receive the full measure of his labor? And does he get more than the mere minimum necessary for his subsistence; which, according to the Communist theory, our "poor workers" in the United States receive? In his CRITIQUE OF THE GOTHA PROGRAM, Mr. Marx goes into the following poetic tirade: "The whole capitalist theory of wages hitherto prevailing, together with all the criticisms hitherto directed against it, was once and for all overthrown and the fact clearly established that the laborer is only degraded to work for his living; i.e., to live so long as he works a certain amount of time

gratis for the capitalist, and also for those who share the surplus value with the capitalist. The pivot around which the entire capitalist system of production turns is to increase this unpaid labor time either by a longer working day, or by developing the productive powers of labor, or by straining the laborer to more intense exertion. Therefore, the system of wage labor is a system of slavery, and indeed, slavery which moreover grows harder in proportion as the productive powers of labor are developed in society. Through abolition of all class distinctions, all social and political inequality will disappear of their own accord." "In the higher phase of Communist society, after the enslaving subordination of the individual under the division of labor has disappeared, and therewith also the opposition between manual and intellectual labor; after labor has become not only a means of life, but also the highest want in life; when, with the development of all the faculties of the individual, the productive forces have correspondingly increased, and all the springs of social wealth flow more abundantly—only then may the limited horizon of capitalist justice be left behind entirely, and society inscribe on its banners: 'From everyone according to his faculties, to everyone according to his needs!'"

This was Mr. Marx's prediction. Paper is patient, but economics are difficult!

Lenin, an avowed Marxist, tried to put Marxist theories into practice. After only a few months of experimenting he had to execute his famous right-about-face. There was nothing further said about equality of wages; nothing more about the full value of a man's

labor which Mr. Marx promised the coming proletarian society. Instead, Lenin said: "We must now get hold of the old Bourgeois means and of the high compensation for service of the great Bourgeois specialists. It is clear that such action represents a compromise, a moving away from the principles of the Paris Commune and every proletarian system. It is clear that such a measure means not only stoppage of the offensive against capital, but also a step backward of our socialist Soviet." (Lenin in his THE NEXT DUTIES OF THE SOVIET POWER, page 19).

And once Comrade Stalin had the job of running the economic system of Russia on his hands, this is the manner in which he tried to rationalize around the problem: "We cannot tolerate that an engine driver on the Railway should get the same wages as a Copying Clerk." (In a speech on June 23rd, 1931).

All classes in Russia, so they say, have been abolished; but the profits resulting from the industries of the country are far from being distributed equally. As Comrade Ordjonikidze, Stalin's supervisor for heavy industries, emphatically stated (see INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT IN 1931): "In the matter of wages we are still struggling hard to overcome that incubus impeding real progress, the unfortunate wage leveling tendency. Such wage leveling has nothing in common with Bolshevism. We must terminate this non-Bolshevist wage policy at the earliest opportunity."

It is evident that in Communist Russia the worker is not getting just the minimum necessary for his subsistence. He is getting less than that. For how can a

man subsist on 150 Rubles a month—the wage-norm—when 1 lb. of butter costs 10 Rubles, 2 lbs. of meat 10 Rubles, one egg $\frac{1}{2}$ Ruble, one pair of shoes 300 Rubles, one suit of clothes 600 Rubles, one shirt 50 Rubles? Marxist Russia is paying the worker less for his labor than that minimum of subsistence which Mr. Marx maintains the capitalists are trying to get away with. Compare the purchasing power of the laborer's wage in Marxist Russia with the purchasing power of the laborer's wage in the Capitalist United States, or for that matter, Great Britain or France; and you will quickly come to a decision as to where the actual exploiters flourish.

If there is any merit at all to the theory of surplus value, the Marxist leaders in their own so-called classless Soviet Russia have degraded the laborer to mere labor—power which they are using for their own purposes—and God knows labor power in their country is cheap. Soviet Russia is the only country in which Marx's statement holds good: That "labor only lives as long as it increases profits." The worker in Soviet Russia who does not help to increase the profits of the Russian State Capitalist cannot live. The workers and farmers in Soviet Russia are nothing but labor-power in the service of the State Capitalists and their all-powerful bureaucracy. They are the incarnation of that drab picture Karl Marx has painted of the machine-enslaved worker.

That Magic Word—Expropriation

Mr. Marx was so utterly convinced of the infallibility of his calculations with regard to the inevitable

bankruptcy of our modern economic structure, that he did not even bother to lay down a draft or scenario telling us how the great mass of proletarians were to take over power from the decayed and moldering bourgeoisie.

Mr. Marx is convinced, out of sheer Hegelian dialectics, that the present day capitalists, industrialists and land owners must perish, and that a new era of proletarian self-government must come. This will finally culminate in a paradisiac society without state or any other bondage, in which every man will produce for pleasure and use and not for profit, where everybody will choose his own profession and lead a life of unencumbered abundance.

Mr. Marx's land of milk and honey is not much different from the utopias of the other social fantasists of his time. What makes all the difference in the world between Marx and, for example, Owen, Fourier, Proudhon or Bakunin, is Mr. Marx's blood red slogans of expropriation and extermination for those who possess property.

There is hardly a man living, who did not, at least once in his life, want to do a little expropriating. Young people, for instance, who have a long road of hard work ahead of them, students who have the threat of tenfold examinations dangling over their heads, un-skilled laborers who dread weary training, the failure, the misfit, the unemployed, the crank, the lazybone, the autodidact who has his head full of undigested literature—they all would like to do a little expropriating and take a shortcut to the granaries of this world.

This is Mr. Marx's magic word: expropriation. It is this appeal to the caveman instinct that put Marxism over, and not the well-known but never read *Capital*.

The other man's pasture always looks greener. Men hear of the abolition of private property, and they forget what they have to give up; they think only of what they will take away with them. As if it would land in their pockets.

If they could only see Rockefeller running a gasoline station and Ford working as a car mechanic! But oil would still have to be pumped, and coal dug in dirty mines, and wheels turned, and presses fed, and dishes washed, and ditches dug, and garbage removed. The world is a place in which to work and will remain pretty much the same as long as we have to plow the fields and chop the wood. And if the question is: who should manage our business enterprises, industries and farms, citizens hardened in years of work and experience, or a bunch of Marxist politicians poisoning their power on the roar of misfits, disgruntled failures or ignoramuses, I throw my fate in with the former.

Our present system of what Mr. Marx chooses to call bourgeois society surely has its weak points and deficiencies; but dumping the can with the milk will make no one fat.

Communism promised the worker production for pleasure and use and not for profit. I wonder if the girls in Moscow choose subway digging and bricklaying for pleasure; and I also wonder if Russia's extensive export trade with Germany and Italy are of any use to the

worker; or if depriving the farm laborer of his best horses and cows and sending them to Moscow are of any use to him? Perhaps the hustling pieceworkers in Moscow also wonder where those eighty Rolls-Royce cars that were imported from Great Britain went?

Even if Communist Russia is selling its products at a profit, the workers still get their 150 Rubles a month. The rest goes for the upkeep of the world's largest political suppression machinery; where spies lurk on every corner and stoolpigeons in every parlor.

Mr. Marx was so engrossed in chasing down quotations to prove the correctness of his theories of value and Hegel's dialectics that he forgot to tell us how to run the worker's paradise. And even if the thing came about by sheer historic accident, it was no better than any other society, only worse. The joke of the matter is that Communism became a reality in agricultural Russia; while Mr. Marx explicitly prophesied that such a thing was impossible there and could happen only in the great centers of industry. Mr. Marx predicted that Communism would come where industrial wealth had been finally concentrated and accumulated in the hands of a few (Capital I). This centralization of wealth, he said, would completely proletarianize all of the people but the wealthy.

The fact of the matter is that Russia at the time of the revolution was neither industrialized nor top heavy with centralized capital, like the Western countries. Communism was established by a *coup d'état* of the shrewd and practical politician, Lenin, who used a

beaten and demoralized army and a mass of war-tired workers to establish a military dictatorship over a defeated nation.

In fact, of the four countries where Marxism was (even if temporarily) established, Hungary, South China, Bavaria, Russia, none was industrial and none had a centralized small group of grand-capitalists slowly choking the proletarians. Even where Marxism happened, it happened *contra* Marx and ended in military dictatorships for the benefit of ruthless politicians. No one has ever taken more advantage of the worker than the so-called workers' governments.

Marxism itself is so bare of any definite, constructive program (except of course, the thing: expropriating) that as late as 1891 at the Erfurt Party Congress it was resolved: "It is not the point that we accomplish something: for us the main issue is to make demands which no other party makes."

Mr. Marx himself went so far as to work for measures which would reduce workers' wages, just to increase the contrast between workers and industrialists. In his lecture at Brussels in 1847 he said: "What is Free Trade? Free Trade is Freedom for Capital. Yes, it will reduce the price of bread, but it will still *more reduce the worker's wages*—it will finally drive the contrast between Proletariat and Bourgeois to a breaking point; and in this revolutionary sense, I vote for Free Trade."

Mr. Marx did not care much about the loss the workers would suffer, so long as it would contribute to

the intensification of his fantastic class struggle creation. These tactics of agitating against the actual interests of the working people in order to add to the fuel of class struggle have repeatedly been adopted by Marxist Labor Unions. Marxist Labor Unions do not speak for the cause of labor, they speak only for the benefit of the break-up between employee and employer; and in the final analysis for the purpose of establishing a political Communist superstructure. They even go so far as to destroy peacefully operating labor unions and sacrifice working agreements advantageous to labor in order to bring strife into the social field. A satisfied worker is loathsome to them—they want to make the worker militant, disgruntled, reckless, for the benefit of their political machine. Marx has told them that only proletarianized labor will be ready for a revolution; so they would rather see labor exploited, suppressed, impoverished and overworked, instead of content.

Employers must bear in mind that Marxist Unions are not the unions of labor; they are instruments of red bossism. Lenin was fully aware of the importance of leading the trade unions into conflict with the employer; therefore, his admonishing words: "One must understand—to make any and all sacrifices—and if necessary, to use tricks, shrewdness, *illegal methods*—in order to get into the trade unions, there to remain and to conduct Communist propaganda." (Left Wing Communism—Infantile Disorder.)