

**“Get On Your Marx, Statue Topplers!”
The Links Between Marxism, Racism and
Genocide**

AUGUSTO ZIMMERMANN*

ABSTRACT

The New Left is commonly associated with Marxist values and ideology. Ironically, when these contemporary heirs to Karl Marx are flinging the standard slur that conservatives are “Nazis” or “Fascists”, to find these dictators’ (Hitler and Mussolini) real legacies they should look much closer to home. Curiously, Hitler himself was willing to concede his debt to Marx, claiming even to have ‘learned a great deal from Marxism’. In fact, the modern practice of genocide was invented by committed Marxists, not the Nazis. The problem is not that the disciples of Marx have paid no attention to policies that have turned out to be genocidal, but instead that Marxism itself prepares the ideological mindset for State-sanctioned extermination of people on a massive scale. There are obvious similarities between Marxist class-warfare and Nazi race-warfare, or between destroying people because of social class and destroying people because of ethnicity. As a consequence, Marxist political regimes and their Marxist-inspired revolutionary movements killed no less than 120 million people in the 20th century alone, and they continue to do so.

* Head of Law, Sheridan Institute of Higher Education.

Until its complete extermination or loss of national status, this racial trash always becomes the most fanatical bearer there is of counter-revolution, and it remains that. That is because its entire existence is nothing more than a protest against a great historical revolution ... The next world war will cause ... entire reactionary peoples to disappear from the earth. And that too is progress. – Karl Marx (1849)¹

The classes and the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way. They must perish in the revolutionary holocaust. – Karl Marx (1853)²

I FIRST CONSIDERATIONS

Across numerous Western countries left-wing protesters have vandalised statues of leading historical figures as part of the *Black Lives Matter* ('BLM') movement. These vandals have a clear ideological framework. The movement's main founder, Patrisse Khan-Cullors, created the *#BlackLivesMatter* hashtag in 2013 and has written widely about the movement. In her bestselling book 'When They Call You a Terrorist: A Black Lives Matter Memoir', she reveals her 'appreciation for the work of the US Communist Party, especially Black communists',³ and her support for 'the great work of the Black Panther Party, the American Indian Movement, Young Lords, Brown Berets, and the great revolutionary rainbow experiments of the

¹ Karl Marx, 'Der Magiarische Kampf', *Neue Rheinische Zeitung*, 13 January 1849 (English translation), quoted in Malachi Martin, *The Keys of This Blood: The Struggle for World Dominion Between Pope John Paul II, Mikhail Gorbachev and the Capitalist West* (Touchstone, 1990) 235.

² Karl Marx, 'Forced Emigration', *New York Daily Tribune*, 22 March 1853.

³ Patrisse Khan-Cullors, *When They Call You a Terrorist: A Black Lives Matter Memoir* (St Martin's Press, 2018) 272.

1970s’.⁴ Khan-Cullors describes herself and fellow BLM co-founders as committed Marxists. In a video from 2015, she says: ‘We are trained Marxists. We are super-versed on, sort of, ideological theories.’⁵ As noted by Brad Polumbo, a policy analyst at the Foundation for Economic Education, ‘the official Black Lives Matter organization is Marxist and anti-American in its values’.⁶ Its views are particularly disturbing to anyone who truly values the rule of law and the Western legal tradition of fundamental rights and freedoms.

Of course, BLM leaders claim to be fighting “systemic” racism both in America and other Western democracies. However, if these BLM activists were more seriously concerned about racism they would not be vandalising the statues of historical figures who championed equality for all. One of these statues vandalised is that of Abraham Lincoln, the celebrated US president who brought black slavery to an end at the cost of 600,000 American lives. Lincoln believed that America’s founders intended everyone to be treated equally and endowed with inalienable rights to life, liberty and property. Enacted on January 1, 1863, Lincoln’s Emancipation Proclamation declared that everyone who was held as a slave ‘henceforward shall be free’. Situated in Boston’s Park Square, the statue was intended to show the 16th President’s commitment to freeing all people of colour from the scourge of slavery. It depicts Lincoln with one arm extended above a freed slave with broken shackles, symbolising that, by Lincoln’s hand, the institution of slavery was broken. The inscription on the statue reads: ‘A race set free and the country at peace. Lincoln rests from

⁴ Yaron Steinbuch, ‘Black Lives Matter Co-Founder Describes Herself as Trained Marxist’, *New York Post* (Web Article, 25 June 2020).

⁵ Brad Polumbo, ‘Is Black Lives Matter Marxist? No and Yes’, *Foundation for Economic Education* (Web Article, 7 July 2020).

⁶ Ibid.

his labors'.⁷ Yet, the country is no longer so much at peace and a new petition, in postmodernist fashion, claims that the monument 'represents us still beneath someone else'.⁸

Similarly, BLM rioters have defaced the Robert Gould Shaw Memorial honouring the Massachusetts 54th Regiment, a monument erected in honour of the first African-American volunteer regiment that saw extensive service in the Union Army during the American Civil War. The superintendent of National Parks of Boston, Michael Creasey, explains that 'the memorial has been a beacon of hope and a rallying point for conversations about race, justice and human rights'.⁹ Another vandalised statue is dedicated to the 19th century entrepreneur and inventor Matthias Baldwin, who fought against slavery and supported black voting rights. His statue in the City Hall was defaced with paint and graffiti during recent BLM protests in Philadelphia.¹⁰ Baldwin opened a school for black children in Philadelphia and for years paid the salary of its teachers. As a machinery manufacturer, he took special delight in hiring blacks to his shops and paid them generously when that was not the norm. 'The irony of vandalizing a monument to those who died to end slavery is lost on the morons who don't know their history', complains Joe Walsh, an active member of the Friends of Matthias Baldwin Society.¹¹

⁷ Anthony Leonardi, 'Boston Mayor in Favor of Removing Statue of Abraham Lincoln Setting Slaves Free', *Washington Examiner* (Web Article, 15 June 2020).

⁸ Marie Fazio, 'Boston Removes Statue of Formerly Enslaved Man Kneeling Before Lincoln', *The New York Times* (Web Article, 29 December 2020).

⁹ Dan Murphy, 'Restoration Work on Shaw 54th Memorial Now Underway', *Beacon Hill Times* (Web Article, 28 May 2020).

¹⁰ Dapaul vid Mikkelsen, 'Did George Floyd Protesters Deface the Statue of an Abolitionist?', *Snopes* (Web Article, 17 June 2020).

¹¹ Zachary Evans, 'Park Volunteer Outraged Over Vandalism of Philadelphia Abolitionist Statue: "He Was BLM Before There Was A Slogan"', *National Review* (Web Article, 11 June 2020).

The desecration of the beautiful statue of poet and abolitionist Jon Greenleaf Whittier provides one final example before I can proceed to the discussion about the Marxist roots of fascism, modern racism and genocide. Whittier's statue was vandalised in the very city that bears his name. The rioters wrote 'BLM' on the seated statue located in the city's Central Park. The protesters fail to understand that Whittier was a human-rights activist and a very active delegate to the first meeting of the American Anti-Slavery Movement.¹² According to Celia Caust-Ellenbogen, an archivist at the Friends History Library of Swarthmore College, 'Whittier edited anti-slavery newspapers, helped to establish the Liberty Party, wrote numerous poems supporting the abolitionist cause, as well as an 1833 tract in favour of immediate and unconditional emancipation of enslaved people'.¹³

II GET ON YOUR MARX, STATUE TOPPLERS!

As these BLM mobs continue to vandalise statues with impunity, they should consider targeting those of their own leftist icons.¹⁴ Modern racism and genocide can be directly traced to that great icon of socialism and darling of the Left: Karl Marx.¹⁵ Two centuries after his birth, he remains idolised by many left-wing activists, politicians and intellectuals, as the unveiling of a five-metre statue of him in his birthplace of Trier, Germany, in 2018 fully testifies. Another statue of Marx is found atop his tomb at Highgate Cemetery, in London. In New York, there is a white bust of Marx displayed at the Smithsonian

¹² Ruby Gonzales, 'Statue of Abolitionist John Greenleaf Whittier Vandalized in his Namesake City', *Whittier Daily News* (Web Article, 15 June 2020).

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ This part draws on Augusto Zimmermann, 'Get on Your Marx, Statue-Topplers', *Quadrant Online* (Web Article, 25 June 2020).

¹⁵ Dinesh D'Souza, *What's So Great About Christianity?* (Regnery, 2007) 220.

Design Museum and a painting of Marx displayed at the Guggenheim Museum.

That Karl Marx viscerally abhorred people of colour is beyond dispute. Whereas Hitler later extolled the “master race” and its “right” to eliminate the so-called “weaker races”, Marx believed, in his own words, that ‘the races, too weak to master the new conditions of life, must give way. They must perish in the revolutionary holocaust’.¹⁶ Thus he supported European colonisation on racial grounds and described his adversaries in dehumanising terms such as half-humans, vermin and parasites. Such people deserved elimination for retarding “the long march of history”.¹⁷

Although ethnically a Jew, Marx often resorted to outrageous anti-Semitic tirades. He often used terms like ‘dirty Jew’ and ‘Jewish nigger’ to describe individuals he personally disliked. In 1862, for example, Marx wrote a letter to Engels to report that ‘the Jewish nigger’ Ferdinand Lassalle, a Prussian-German jurist and social-democratic activist, was leaving Britain to return to Germany. Marx described Lassalle as follows:

It is now perfectly clear to me that, as the shape of his head and the growth of his hair indicates, he is descended from the Negroes who joined in Moses’ flight from Egypt (unless his mother or grandmother on the father’s side was crossed with a nigger). This union of Jew and German on a Negro base was bound to produce an extraordinary hybrid. The pushiness of the fellow is also nigger-like.¹⁸

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Paul Johnson, *Modern Times: The World From the Twenties to the Nineties* (HarperCollins, 2001) 62.

¹⁸ Karl Marx, ‘Letter to Engels – 30 July 1862’, in *Karl Marx-Friedrich Engels Werke* (East Berlin, 1956-68) vol XXX, 259, quoted in Johnson (n 16) 62.

Marx wrote to Engels, in 1861, that the Prussian Egyptologist, Karl Lepsius, had “proved” that the Jewish exodus was ‘the expulsion of a Leper people from Egypt, at the hands of whom was an Egyptian priest named Moses’. Likewise, he argued that French evolutionist Pierre Trémaux, author of numerous scientific and ethnographic publications, proved that ‘the common Negro type is the degenerate form of a much higher one’, crowing that this appraisal was ‘a very great advance over Darwin’.¹⁹ Another example comes from his article attacking Moses Levy, the then editor of London’s *Daily Telegraph*. Marx described Levy’s nose as ‘an elephant trunk, an antenna, a lighthouse, a telegraph’.²⁰

In *On the Jewish Question*, Marx attacks Jews for ‘dissolving earlier forms of solidarity and turning Europeans into this own caricature of Jews’. This book is a critique of liberalism but there one finds anti-Semitic tirades such as that ‘money is the jealous god of Israel, in face of which no other god may exist’. To make “the Jew” impossible it is necessary, according to Marx, ‘to abolish preconditions that produced Judaism’.²¹ As stated by him, ‘in emancipating itself from hucksterism and money, and thus from real and practical Judaism, our age would emancipate itself’.²²

Marx also believed that Judaism had to disappear before capitalism could be eradicated. For socialism to become a reality, he concluded,

¹⁹ Diane Paul, ““In the Interests of Civilization”: Marxist Views of Race and Culture in the Nineteenth Century’ (1981) 42(1) *Journal of the History of Ideas* 115, 115.

²⁰ Max Young, ‘Karl Marx: The Racist Godfather of Leftist Racism’, 1828 (Web Article, 4 September 2019)

²¹ Marx (n 18) 57-58.

²² T B Bottomore, *Karl Marx: Early Writings* (McGraw-Hill, 1963) 34-37.

it is necessary to eliminate ‘the Jewish attitude to money’.²³ In other words, to make the capitalist order and its attitude to money disappear, the Jewish religion should entirely disappear. Since this theme is repeated over and over throughout Marx’s political writings, it is reasonable to argue that Marxist ideology has influenced modern anti-Semitism.

Similar to Nazi Germany, Marxist ideology was applied in Soviet Russia to create entire categories of “sub-humans”. In Nazi Germany, this included the physically impaired and mentally ill, followed then by the Jews. In Russia, by contrast, the main targets of mass extermination were the “enemies of the people”, an abstract category that could include entire cultural, national, and ethnic groups, if they seemed (for equally ill-defined reasons) to threaten the Soviet regime. At different times the regime conducted mass arrests of Poles, Chechens, Tartars, and – on the eve of Joseph Stalin’s death – Jews.²⁴ Those classified as belonging to these targeted groups were first dehumanised and then mercilessly destroyed. They were deemed *vermin*, *parasite*, and *infectious diseases* in order to be exterminated for the good of the community.²⁵ This Marxist regime deemed them a “pollution” and ‘poisonous weeds needing to be uprooted’.²⁶ They were considered half-animals and ‘something even lower than two-legged cattle’.²⁷

As further explained below, it is no wonder Marxist teachings inspired the creation in Europe of the first concentration camps.²⁸ Of course, Marx never was in a position to directly carry out large-

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Anne Applebaum, *Gulag: A History* (Anchor Books, 2004) xxxvi.

²⁵ Ibid xxxvi.

²⁶ Ibid 102.

²⁷ Richard Pipes, *The Russian Revolution* (Vintage Books, 1997) 836.

²⁸ Ibid.

scale exterminations. However, his most successful disciples – Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Castro, etc – did practice the very kind of violence that Marx felt in his heart and which his works so strongly emanate.²⁹ Indeed, it is reasonable to argue that the modern practice of genocide was born out of Marx’s teachings and implemented by his disciples at the cost of no less than 120 million lives in the 20th century alone.³⁰

III THE OPIATE OF THE INTELLECTUALS

Since it is common practice to state that the New Left wishes to bring about “Cultural Marxism”, it might be important to explain what Marxism means. Marxism provides a social-political-economic theory that interprets history through a “progressive” prism. Marx claimed to have discovered a dialectical pattern which controls history and that would eventually lead humankind towards a classless (and lawless) utopia. Indeed, Marx conceived laws as instruments of class oppression which would have to disappear when the final stage of communism was achieved. Meanwhile, as Marx put it, a socialist state should aspire to impose the ‘proletarian dictatorship’ consisted of a small *nomenklatura* conveniently described as ‘the vanguard of the proletariat’.³¹

But Marxism is not just a scheme of social, economic and political transformation. Marxism is primarily a form of secular theology which is deeply dogmatic and contains an entire worldview based on

²⁹ Ibid 72.

³⁰ Ibid 71.

³¹ See Yadullah Shahibzadeh, ‘The Vanguard Party and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat’ in Yadullah Shahibzadeh, *Marxist and Left-Wing Politics in Europe and Iran* (Palkgrave Macmillan, 2019) 27-46.

a Social Darwinian explanation of the evolution of human society. Theologically, Marxism is based on a faith that history is progressing towards a certain end, and that a small ruling elite – the “vanguard of the proletariat” – will act as a redemptive force of humanity. Marxism is endowed with prophetic dimensions and dogmatic certainties that are central parts of its message and its appeal,³² thus working as a secular credo grounded in a certain form of ideological prophecy.

Having arrived at such a socialist prophecy of the proletariat’s historic mission, Marx sought to find empirical evidence to justify it. Politics became for him a form of “secular religion” whereby history can be interpreted progressively, moving by means of an ongoing struggle between different social groups. As such, the final stage will occur when humanity transcend struggle and the eschatological consummation of global communism is achieved.³³ To realise this goal any means are justifiable, including violence and deceit, provided that these actions accelerate the advent of communism. Indeed, nothing that advances communism can ever be considered immoral or objectively wrong. As theologian Michael Green pointed out:

Whatever the pogroms of Lenin, Trotsky, Stalin; whatever the revelations of the Gulag Archipelago and the terrifying brutality of the Soviet concentration camps; whatever the rapes of a Hungary, a Czechoslovakia, an Afghanistan, the faith of the committed Communist persists. All personal judgement is obscured in the name of faith; faith is absolutely essential if everything is not to come tumbling round his ears ...

Logically, of course, there is no reason why a modern Communist

³² Martyn Krygier, ‘Marxism, Communism, and Narcissism’ (1990) 15(4) *Law & Social Inquiry* 707, 712.

³³ David T Koyzis, *Political Visions & Illusions* (InterVarsity Press, 2003) 174.

should bother to work for a utopia in which he will never share: this is one of the [irrationalities] in Communism. But he is inspired by the vision, attracted by the prospect, stimulated by the struggle and warmed by the companionship. The millennial utopia held out by Communism ... is both a pale imitation of and unconsciously inspired by the Christian teaching of the Kingdom of God.³⁴

But if Marxism can be described as a form of secular theology, what are then the differences between Marxism and traditional religions? First of all, Marxism exercises a special appeal to the intellectual elite, whereas Christianity has always attracted the poor and the outcast. The intellectual elites feel particularly attracted to its pseudo-scientific formula, including its eschatological view of the transformation of the imperfect man into an ideal man. Marxism offers something that is particularly appealing to the subconscious mind of certain intellectuals. As noted by law professor Mary Ann Glendon and two other American legal academics,

Marxism offers the intellectual leadership in the new world somewhere on this earth. Feudal society has been ruled by military lords, capitalist society by money-minded businessmen, but in the socialist society the intellectuals would rule in the name of the proletariat ... The Platonic fantasy of the 'philosopher king', always surviving in the intellectual's subconscious mind, would be finally realized in historical actuality.³⁵

A secular religion such as Marxism is more appealing to the intellectual elites than to the ordinary citizen. Marxism provides a

³⁴ Michael Green, *I Believe in Satan's Downfall* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1988) 159–161.

³⁵ Mary Ann Glendon, Michael Wallace Gordon and Christopher Osakwe, *Comparative Legal Traditions* (West Publishing Co, 1985) 676.

final purpose and a sense of mission; a conviction that a person's life is worthwhile when history requires a certain intellectual "vanguard" to lead others towards a future utopia and creation of the "New Man". Other religions postpone happiness as a reward to be enjoyed in the afterlife. By contrast, Marxism promises the ultimate reward here on this earth, claiming to speak for the foreseeable future of humanity's redemption. After presenting Marxism as a form of secular religion, the late Harvard legal historian Harold Berman concluded:

The writings of Marx and his collaborator Engels are in effect the New Testament of Communism. Lenin is the Pauline apostle to the gentiles who adopted the gospel to a new generation and a new people. Stalin is the Soviet Emperor Constantine, who make of the new religion a State Orthodoxy ... It was on the foundation of Marxian analysis of the origin, growth, and decline of societies that the Russian Revolutionaries set out to construct a new social order. Led by Lenin, these men were thoroughly grounded in Marxism and were fanatical believers in its doctrines.³⁶

Whenever one focus on analogies with traditional religions, institutionalised Marxism undoubtedly has a lot in common with them. Glendon et al describe this important "religious" appeal to the intellectual elites in the following terms:

As a world secular religion, Marxism has its dialectic which is akin to Calvinist predestination. Like other creeds, Marxism has its sacred text, its saints, as well as its holy city. If Marx is its Messiah, Lenin is its St Paul. As is true of many other world religions, Marxism too has witnessed a luxuriant proliferation of sects and subsects — the deviationists, the revisionists,

³⁶ Harold J Berman, *Justice in Russia* (Harvard University Press, 1950) 8-9.

the fundamentalists, the modernizers, and so on ... But after all these analogies have been made, what remains to be emphasized is how different Marxism is from other religions. Unlike Christianity, for instance, its appeal has always been first to the intellectuals. Christianity was resisted by the ancient philosophers, who regarded it as an aberration of the lower classes; it spread upwards. Marxism, on the contrary, has been carried out by the intellectuals to the proletarians and peasants. To intellectuals it has appealed as no other doctrine has because it integrated for them most fully discordant psychological motives. In Marxism one finds for the first time a combination of the language of science and the language of myth — a union of logic and mysticism. Scientific criticism in the 19th century has deprived intellectuals of their God and left them uncertain as to the foundation of their ethics. Scientific agnosticism was an austere self-denial in a world inherently lifeless and undramatic, a world with neither purpose nor climax. Social movements had assumed the character of a superficial altruistic anodyne ungrounded in the nature of the universe. In Marxism, however, one's ideals could be taken as expressions of an underlying historical necessity in things.³⁷

There is a widespread though entirely false impression that socialism and communism are merely up-to-date secular versions of Christianity. However, as noted by Richard Pipes, 'the difference is that whereas Jesus urged his followers to give up their own possessions, the socialists and communists want to give away the possessions of others'.³⁸ Moreover, Jesus did not advocate for wealth redistribution and Saint Paul's well-known saying about money is often misquoted:

³⁷ Glendon, Gordon and Osakwe (n 35) 676.

³⁸ Richard Pipes, *Communism: A History of the Intellectual and Political Movement* (Phoenix Press, 2003) 2.

he said not that ‘money is the root of all evil’ but that ‘the *love* of money’ is – in other words, greed. Ultimately, the legacy of Marxist ideology is entirely different from Christianity’s. As Professor Martyn Krygier correctly points out,

The great world religions have endured for millennia and, if they have been involved in the infliction of pain, they have also been responsible for glorious achievements – achievements of the spirit; cultural, artistic, civilizational, architectural, monuments, both literal and metaphorical; and in certain cases, if Weber is to be believed, significant economic achievements. Institutionalized Marxism lasted 70 years [in Soviet Russia and other Eastern European nations]. In that short time it has cost millions of lives, enslaved millions of people and reduced once-civilized countries to dilapidated ruins. Its spiritual legacy is nil. Almost its only moral achievement (not small) has been the tempering of those characters that did not break or bend in hard times. The only great literature for which it was clearly responsible, and almost the only great literature produced under it, has been a literature of opposition and suffering. The less said about its monuments the better.³⁹

IV MARXIST ROOTS OF NAZI-FASCISM

5 May 2018 was the 200th anniversary of Karl Marx’s birth, given that Communism killed more than 120 million people in the 20th century alone,⁴⁰ we should expect the European Union oligarchs to have shown a bit more respect for the innocent victims of this complicated ideology. However, Jean-Claude Juncker, the head of the European

³⁹ Krygier (n 32) 712.

⁴⁰ This part draws on Augusto Zimmermann, ‘Adolf Hitler’s Debt to Karl Marx’, *Quadrant Online* (Web Article, 9 May 2019).

Commission attended the celebration marking the 200th anniversary of Marx's birth in Trier, Germany, and commented that he was 'celebrating the father of Communism'. He argued that Marx was not responsible for mistakes and atrocities committed in his name after his death. Reportedly, the EU President even delivered 'an impassioned speech praising the legacy of the German philosopher'.⁴¹

According to French historian François Furet, Fascism grew up on the soil of Italian Marxism.⁴² The Italian Fascist movement was introduced after World War I by Benito Mussolini. Raised by a Marxist mother and an Anarchist father, at the age of 29 Mussolini became 'one of the most effective and widely read socialist journalists in Europe'.⁴³ In 1912, he was elected leader of the Italian Socialist Party at the Congress of Reggio Emilia, proposing that Italy should be thoroughly Marxist.

Mussolini was a member of the revolutionary wing of the Socialist movement prior to supporting Italy's entry into the Great War.⁴⁴ On the eve of the First World War, Mussolini predicted: 'With the unleashing of a mighty clash of peoples, the bourgeoisie is playing its last card and calls forth on the world scene that which Marx called the sixth great power: the socialist revolution'.⁴⁵ 'Karl Marx', wrote Mussolini, 'is the father and teacher. He is the magnificent philosopher of working-class violence'.⁴⁶ Mussolini also stated: 'I wish to prepare my country

⁴¹ John Stone, 'EU President Juncker Defends Karl Marx's Legacy', *The Independent* (Web Article, 5 May 2018).

⁴² François Furet, *The Passing of an Illusion: The Idea of Communism in the Twentieth Century* (University of Chicago Press, 1999) 22.

⁴³ Johnson (n 17) 57.

⁴⁴ Furet (n 42) 22.

⁴⁵ Johnson (n 17) 37.

⁴⁶ Benito Mussolini, *Opera Omnia* (La Fenice, 1951-63) vol II, 32, 126 quoted in Johnson (n 17) 57.

and accustom it to war for the day of the greatest bloodbath of all, when the two basic hostile classes will clash in the supreme trial'.⁴⁷

The coming of that war coupled with his determination to bring Italy into it resulted in Mussolini losing his official position within the Italian Socialist Party.⁴⁸ As a result, on 23 March 1919, he created his own Fascist Movement which promised the partial seizure of all finance capital; the control over the national economy by corporatist economic councils; the confiscation of church lands; and agrarian reform.⁴⁹ Although Lenin's economic failures in Soviet Russia turned him away from direct expropriation of industry, Mussolini's main goal was to create a socialist utopia in which a powerful State would dictate how private business should be allowed to operate.⁵⁰ As noted by Paul Johnson,

Mussolini now wanted to use and exploit capitalism rather than destroy it. But his was to be a radical revolution nonetheless, rooted in the pre-war 'vanguard élite' Marxism and syndicalism (workers' rule) which was to remain to his death the most important single element in his politics.⁵¹

Mussolini pledged 'to make history, not to endure it'.⁵² Lenin, another of Marx's most successful disciples, described his Bolshevik party as a highly disciplined and centralised movement. Likewise, Mussolini wanted to create a 'vanguard minority' formed by highly-trained revolutionary leaders. Through the adoption of symbolic invocations,

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ Johnson (n 17) 96.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Thomas Sowell, 'Socialist or Fascist', *The American Spectator* (Web Article, 12 June 2012).

⁵¹ Johnson (n 17) 96.

⁵² Ibid.

the fascist leaders expected to raise the consciousness of the Italian proletariat.⁵³ Above all, Mussolini agreed with Lenin that violence was a valid means to achieve ultimate power and complete dominance.⁵⁴

In the 1920s another nationalist/socialist movement followed in the wake of the Italian Fascists: the *National Socialist German Workers' Party (National-Sozialistische Deutsche Arbeiterpartei — NSDAP)*. This party was established as a mass movement to bring together the ideals of nationalism and socialism. It added to that the specific element of racism and anti-Semitism in particular. Co-written in 1920 by Adolf Hitler and Anton Drexler the *NSDAP 25 Points Manifesto* were the unalterable and eternal objectives of National Socialism. Besides anti-Semitism, this manifesto promised government expropriation of land without compensation; nationalisation of all basic sectors of the national industry; the abolition of market-based lending; and the confiscation of all income unearned by work.⁵⁵ In a speech on Labour's Day on 1st May 1927, Hitler declared:

We are socialists. We are enemies of today's capitalistic system for the exploitation of the economically weak, with its unfair salaries, with its unseemly evaluation of a human being according to wealth and property instead of responsibility and performance, and we are *determined to destroy this system under all conditions*.⁵⁶

The combination of socialist and nationalist policies was not alien to German political culture. In its modern form the "welfare state"

⁵³ Ibid 57.

⁵⁴ Ibid 58.

⁵⁵ See Jonah Goldberg, *Liberal Fascism: The Secret History of the American Left, From Mussolini to the Politics of Change* (Three Rivers Press, 2009) 410-413.

⁵⁶ Adolf Hitler (Speech, Munich, 1st May 1927) quoted in John Toland, *Adolf Hitler* (Doubleday & Co, 1976) 306.

actually originated in 19th-century Germany and from this sort of combination.⁵⁷ The nation's statesman and militaristic Chancellor, Otto von Bismarck, pioneered what is now recognised as the modern welfare state through a series of compulsory insurance schemes enacted in the 1880s, including work accidents, health, disability, and old age.

Bismarck called these measures "State Socialism", declaring in 1882: 'Many of the measures which we have adopted to the great blessing of the country are Socialistic, and the State will have to accustom itself to a little more Socialism yet'.⁵⁸ He wanted the German workers to feel grateful to the state authorities, and therefore to him. It was the collapse of this statist model created by Bismarck in the 1930s that ushered the most oppressive of all forms of welfare state: National Socialism.⁵⁹ As Götz Aly points out,

The National Socialist German Workers' Party was propagating two age-old dreams of the German people: national and class unity. That was the key to the Nazi popularity, from which they derived the power they needed to pursue their criminal aims. The idea of the Volkstaat – a state of and for the people – was what we would call a welfare state for Germans with the proper

⁵⁷ Tom G Palmer, 'Bismarck's Legacy' in Tom G. Palmer (ed), *After the Welfare State* (Jameson Books, 2012) 34.

⁵⁸ Ibid 35.

⁵⁹ 'The National Socialist welfare state, which instituted such an embracing system of patronage, dependence, and loyalty among the German population, was financed ... by means of stripping the Jews of their wealth (from their money, businesses, and homes down to their dental fillings, children's toys, and even their hair), confiscating the assets of enemies of the state, and looting the rest of Europe through requisitions and deliberate inflation of the currencies of occupied countries. It was also a pyramid scheme that required an ever-greater base of people paying into it to channel the loot upwards. Like all pyramid schemes, the Third Reich was doomed to fail'. Palmer (n 52) 36.

racial pedigree. In one of his central pronouncements, Hitler promised 'the creation of a socially just state,' a model society that would 'continue to eradicate all social barriers'.⁶⁰

By the time the Nazis achieved power state ownership had increased exponentially in both the war and non-war sectors of the national economy. These economic policies dramatically expanded government control over prices, labour, materials, dividends and foreign trade. They had restricted both competition and private ownership, in an attempt to redirect all segments of the economy toward a policy of "general welfare".⁶¹

German unionised workers' movement were strongly supportive of the Nazi regime. On 1st May 1933, Labor Day, thousands of them packed Berlin's Tempelhof district at the behest of their union bosses to provide a "gigantic demonstration" of support for Hitler and the Nazi leadership. Their beloved *Führer* spoke of the country's rebirth and of taming capitalist exploitation in order to make way for the creation of a new social and economic order.⁶² As Richard Pipes points out:

The Nazis appealed to the socialist traditions of German labor, declaring the worker 'a pillar of the community', and the 'bourgeois' – along with the traditional aristocracy – a doomed class. Hitler, who told associates that he was a 'socialist', had the party adopt the red flag and, on coming to power, declared May 1 a national holiday: Nazi Party members were ordered to

⁶⁰ Götz Aly, *Hitler's Beneficiaries: Plunder, Racial War, and the Nazi Welfare State* (Henry, Holt & Co, 2006) 6.

⁶¹ Walter J Rinderle and Bernard Norling, *The Nazi Impact on a German Village* (University of Kentucky Press, 1993) 148.

⁶² R C van Caenegem, *An Historical Introduction to Western Constitutional Law* (Cambridge University Press, 1995) 287.

address one another as ‘comrades’ (*Genossen*). His conception of the party was, like Lenin’s, that of a militant organization, a *Kampfbund*, or ‘Combat League’ ... His ultimate aim was a society in which traditional classes would be abolished, and status earned by personal heroism. In typically radical fashion, he envisaged man re-creating himself: ‘Man is becoming god ... Man is god in the making.’⁶³

Although Hitler condemned the incarnation of Marxism in the Soviet Union, he had no problem to describe his party as thoroughly socialist in nature. In private conversations Hitler claimed to have widely read Marxist literature, both as a young man in Munich in 1913-1914 and during his stay in Landsberg prison in 1924.⁶⁴

He admitted that Marxism had greatly influenced his ideas. Indeed, shortly after coming to power he told his closest friends not only that had learned a great deal from Marxism but also that the whole of National Socialism was based on it. Hitler, in fact, ‘often remarked that Marxists made the best Nazis because they understood that politics was a violent activity’.⁶⁵ Thus he predicted in the Spring of 1934 that:

It is not Germany that will turn Bolshevist, but Bolshevism that will become a sort of National Socialism ... There is more that binds us to Bolshevism than separate us from it.⁶⁶

On another occasion, Hitler confessed to his closest associates:

I have learned a great deal from Marxism as I do not hesitate to

⁶³ Richard Pipes, *Russia under the Bolshevik Regime* (Vintage Books, 1995) 260.

⁶⁴ George Watson, *The Lost Literature of Socialism* (Lutterworth Press, 2nd ed, 1998). Watson’s book details Hitler’s praise of Marx and Stalin.

⁶⁵ Stephen G Fritz, ‘Reflections on Antecedents of the Holocaust’ (1990) 23 *The History Teacher* 162.

⁶⁶ Ibid.

admit ... The difference between [Marxists] and myself is that I have really put into practice what these peddlers and pen-pushers have timidly begun. The whole of National Socialism is based on it. Look at the workers' sports clubs, the industrial cells, the mass demonstrations, the propaganda leaflets written specially for the comprehension of the masses: all these new methods of political struggle are essentially Marxist in origin. All I had to do is take over these methods and adapt them to our purpose.⁶⁷

There are therefore, important commonalities between Nazism and Marxism. It is patently wrong to assume that Nazism is the polar opposite of Communism, or that the Nazis were 'reactionary capitalist counter-revolutionaries'.⁶⁸ As a matter of fact, the Nazis were committed socialists who received no support from the German industrialists, even from those who later benefited from the country's rearmament. The Krupp family, for instance, financially opposed Hitler at the 1932 German presidential election. As noted by Jonah Goldberg:

In Germany the aristocracy and business elite were generally repulsed by Hitler and the Nazis. But when Hitler demonstrated that he wasn't going away, these same elites decided it would be wise to put down some insurance money on the upstarts. This may be reprehensible, but these decisions weren't driven by anything like an ideological alliance between capitalism and Nazism. Corporations in Germany, like their counterparts today, tended to be opportunistic, not ideological ... The Nazis rose to power exploiting anti-capitalist rhetoric they indisputably believed. Even if Hitler was the nihilist cipher many portray him

⁶⁷ Hermann Raushning, *Hitler Speaks* (Thornton Butterworth, 1939) 134.

⁶⁸ Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship: The Origins, Structure and Effects of National Socialism* (Praeger Publishing, 1970) 10.

as, it is impossible to deny the sincerity of the Nazi rank and file who saw themselves as mounting a revolutionary assault on the forces of capitalism. Moreover, Nazism also emphasized many of the themes of later New Lefts in other places and times: the primacy of race, the rejection of rationalism, an emphasis on the organic and holistic – including environmentalism, health food, and exercise – and, most of all, the need to ‘transcend’ notions of class.⁶⁹

By contrast, due to ideological similarities the German Communists were happily prepared to collaborate with the Nazis against the Weimar Republic. The Nazis were assisted by the Communists when the latter refused to make common cause with the Social Democrats.⁷⁰ Working under strict orders from Moscow, German Communists regarded the Social Democrats as their main political opponents, not the Nazis. This position weakened any possible resistance against the Nazis and ultimately paved the way for their takeover from which the Communists themselves became one its first victims. In the clash between Social Democrats, Communists and Nazis, Pipes comments:

Moscow consistently favored the Nazis over the Social Democrats, whom it called ‘social Fascists’ and continued to regard as its principal enemy. In line with this reasoning, it forbade the German Communists to collaborate with the Social Democrats. In the critical November 1932 elections to the Reichstag (Parliament), the Social Democrats won over 7 million votes and the Communists 6 million: their combined votes exceeded the Nazi vote by 1.5 million. In terms of parliamentary seats, they gained between them 221, against the Nazi 196.

⁶⁹ Goldberg (n 55) 58-59.

⁷⁰ Richard Pipes, *Communism: A History of the Intellectual and Political Movement* (Phoenix Press, London, 2003) 75.

Had they joined forces, the two left-wing parties would have defeated Hitler at the polls and prevented him from assuming the chancellorship. It thus was the tacit alliance between the Communists and the National Socialists that destroyed democracy in Germany and brought Hitler to power.⁷¹

Instead of joining forces with the German Social Democrats, those Communists voted together with the Nazis as a parliamentary bloc or coalition, in the Reichstag (ie, the German Parliament).⁷² Their mutual support was more vividly illustrated on 12 September 1932, when Hermann Göring, a leader of the Nazi Party and one of the primary architects of the Nazi police state in Germany, with the support of the Communist MPs, was elected as President of the Reichstag. They helped him orchestrate a vote of no confidence in the von Papen government by which a Nazi-Communist coalition voted together to dismiss the cabinet.⁷³ As Paul Johnson points out,

The only notice the Communists usually took of the Nazis was to fight them in the streets, which was exactly what Hitler wanted. There was something false and ritualistic about these encounters ... In the *Reichtstag*, they combined to turn debates into riots. Sometimes collaboration went further ... Blinded by their absurd political analysis, the Communists actually wanted a Hitler government, believing it would be a farcical affair, the prelude to their own seizure of power.⁷⁴

Whereas Communism embraces *International Socialism*, the Nazis aspired to a *National Socialism* that despised anything considered

⁷¹ Ibid 96.

⁷² Goldberg (n 55) 77.

⁷³ Laurence Rees, *The Dark Charisma of Adolf Hitler: Leading Millions into the Abyss* (Ebury Press, 2013) 95.

⁷⁴ Johnson (n 17) 282.

to be “supranational”. Yet, the top Nazi leadership openly admired Soviet Russia. Joseph Goebbels, the Nazi Propaganda Minister, wrote: ‘The good Nazi looks toward Russia, because Russia is that country most likely to take the road to socialism with us’.⁷⁵ In a 1935 article published in *Völkischer Beobachter*, Goebbels defined his ideological movement as ‘a party of revolutionary socialists’.⁷⁶ The main difference between them and the Communists, wrote Goebbels, was the internationalism of the latter as compared to the alleged nationalism of the former.⁷⁷ Still, Goebbels manifested his desire to work together with the Communists against “Jewish power in the West”.⁷⁸ Such a confession at a first glance appears to be rather extraordinary. However, as F A Hayek rightly notes:

The connection between socialism and nationalism in Germany was close from the beginning. It is significant that the most important ancestors of National-Socialism – Fichte, Rodbertus, and Lassalle – are at the same time acknowledged fathers of socialism ... From 1914 onwards there arose from the ranks of Marxist socialism one teacher after another who led, not the conservatives and reactionaries, but the hardworking labourer and idealist youth into the national-socialist fold. It was only thereafter that the tide of nationalist socialism attained major importance and rapidly grew into the Hitlerian doctrine. The war hysteria of 1914, which, just because of the German defeat, was never fully cured, is the beginning of the modern development which produced National-Socialism, and it was largely with the assistance of old socialists that it rose during this period.⁷⁹

⁷⁵ Fritz (n 65) 162.

⁷⁶ Max H Kele, *Nazis and Workers: National Socialist Appeals to German Labor 1919–1933* (University of North Carolina Press, 1972) 93.

⁷⁷ Ibid 92.

⁷⁸ Rees (n 73) 66.

⁷⁹ Friedrich A Hayek, *The Road to Serfdom* (Routledge, 2008) 173.

The Nazi leadership claimed to forge a socialist unity among the German *Volk*. The word *Volk* means ‘people’ in a sense of racial community. According to Hitler, Germany should be a nation of “one race” whereby all class distinctions would be abolished. Ethnic Germans should not be blamed for their troubles since these would be corrected in a classless society ruled by a charismatic leadership that would emerge from them and be able to gain power at the head of a national revolution.⁸⁰

According to the late Brazilian ambassador, J O de Meira Penna, the Nazi concepts of ‘lebensraum’ and ‘holocaust’ was first developed by the young Karl Marx in his early journalistic writings. As a young journalist, wrote Meira Penna, Marx stimulated notions of German imperialism by advocating the concepts of life as a “fight for space” and of national community as “evolving organic body”.⁸¹ Marx’s closest collaborator in the foundation of modern Communism, Friedrich Engels, made significant attempts to “biologise” the German sense of national identity, which is now widely condemned because of its undeniable affiliations with National Socialism.⁸² Engels thought that Poland had no reason to exist and anticipated the Nazi holocaust by arguing that the Germans should exterminate the Slav populations (Russians, Czechs, Croats, etc). For example, in an article published by *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* on 14 February 1849, Engels stated:

⁸⁰ Rees (n 73) 31.

⁸¹ See J O de Meira Penna, *A Ideologia do Século XX: Ensaio Sobre o Nacional Socialismo, o Marxismo, o Terceiro-Mundismo e a Ideologia Brasileira* (Editora Nórdica, 2nd ed, 1994). J O de Meira Penna (1917-2017) was a Brazilian classical liberal writer and diplomat. He was one of the exponents of Brazilian classical liberalism, the Austrian School of Economics, and an active member of the Mont Pelerin Society.

⁸² Rod Burgess, ‘The Concept of Nature in Geography and Marxism’ (1978) 10 *Antipode* 1.

To the sentimental phrases about brotherhood which are being offered here on behalf of the most counter-revolutionary nations of Europe, we reply that hatred of Russians was and still is the primary revolutionary passion among Germans; that since the revolution hatred of Czechs and Croats has been added, and that only the most determined use of terror against these Slav peoples can we ... safeguard the revolution. We know where the enemies of the revolution are concentrated, viz in Russia and the Slav regions of Austria, and no fine phrases, no allusions to an undefined democratic future for these countries can deter us from treating our enemies as enemies. If Slav nationality leaves the revolution entirely out of account, then we know what we have to do.⁸³

This racist notion derived from Marxism played a decisive role in Hitler's decision to conquer and occupy "living spaces" in the East, either by enslaving or by entirely replacing the local populations. Hitler also adhered to an economic theory advocated by Marx called the "shrinking markets" theory.⁸⁴ As a consequence, he believed that the German economy was too dependent on exports and that such dependence was a mistake. The German dictator had in mind a planned economy that would make Germany "independent" of the world economy by conquering a new *lebensraum* ('vital space') in the East. Indeed, Hitler's self-professed admiration for the Marxist economic system, as superior in his opinion to the capitalist one, is found several of his statements. In this context, addressing a small circle in August 1942, the Nazi dictator stated that Stalin was 'quite a genius', for whom 'one has to have unqualified respect', especially

⁸³ Friedrich Engels, 'Democratic Pan-Slavism', *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* (14 February 1849).

⁸⁴ Rainer Zitelmann, 'Why Hitler Wanted to Conquer New "Lebensraum" in the East', *The National Interest* (Web Article, 21 June 2021).

given his all-encompassing economic planning.⁸⁵

Curiously, the Soviet Union under Stalin actively collaborated with Nazi Germany against Poland through the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact, which was signed in August 1939.⁸⁶ Moscow even returned to Germany all the German Communists who had sought refuge in Soviet Russia.⁸⁷ The Nazi leadership found in their Soviet counterparts ‘a ready model for the one-party state’.⁸⁸ Back in those days Communist parties all over the world advocated peace with Nazi Germany at any price and actively sabotaged the war-effort when it came. At the height of the Nazi invasion of France, Maurice Thorez, head of the French Communist Party, broadcast from Moscow begging the French troops not to resist the Nazi occupation of the country.⁸⁹

One of the factors exploited by Hitler in the elections of 1932-33 was the general fear among the Germans of a Communist takeover. One of the reasons Hitler aimed first to eliminate the socialist Left, before he went after the conservative Right, was the undeniable Nazi appeal to the same social base as well as the adoption of similar language and categories.⁹⁰ At this time Germany was ideologically split apart as popular support not only for the Nazis but also for the Communists dramatically increased.⁹¹ By January 1932, more than six million

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Caenegeem (n 62) 279.

⁸⁷ Pipes (n 27) 76.

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ Johnson (n 15) 361.

⁹⁰ Goldberg (n 55) 70.

⁹¹ Rees (n 73) 80. Rees then gives the account of Fritz Arlt, an 18-year old student in the 1930s. Influenced by an older brother, Fritz initially flirted with Communism but eventually decided to embrace National Socialism once he felt that the ‘solidarity’ of International Socialism across national boundaries wasn’t possible because of the individual countries effectively pursuing their own national self-interests.

Germans were unemployed and when a German workman was unemployed 'there was only one thing left', said Johannes Zahn, a German economist, 'either he became a Communist or he became an SA man [ie, a Nazi Storm Trooper]'.⁹²

V MARXIST ROOTS OF MODERN GENOCIDE

The traditional goal of Marxism is to criticise the putative structures of "capitalist domination". In *Principles of Communism* Engels describes the idea of inalienable rights of the individual as a "fraudulent mask" used by the bourgeoisie to legitimise their social exploitation. Accordingly, all the most cherished values of western democracies, including basic legal rights, can be summarily dismissed and denounced as ideological tools for the legitimisation of an exploitive economic system.⁹³ Along with Engels, Marx contended that the notion of fundamental rights works as an ideological tool designed to perpetuate "bourgeois" power and to make people more selfish. What Marx had in mind was explained by George Lukacs:

The 'freedom' of the men who are alive now is the freedom of the individuals isolated by the fact of property which both reifies and is itself reified. It is a freedom vis-à-vis the other (no less isolated) individuals. A freedom of the egoist, of the man who cuts himself off from others.⁹⁴

Coming from this premise the western liberal tradition of inalienable rights is interpreted as a class-conditioned construct. These basic

⁹² Ibid 80.

⁹³ J M Kelly, *A Short History of Western Legal Theory* (Oxford University Press, 1992) 330.

⁹⁴ Georg Lukacs, *History and Class Consciousness* (MIT Press, 1971) 315.

rights are not deemed to fixed in nature but evolving throughout the progressive stages of social warfare. In *On the Jewish Question*, Marx boldly proclaimed: 'The so-called rights of man are simply the rights of egoistic man, of man separated from other men and from the community'. Accordingly, these basic rights are no longer deemed unalienable but established on the basis of separating people; 'it is the right of such separation'.⁹⁵ If power is taken on the basis of rights, Marx wrote in *The German Ideology*, then:

[R]ight, law, etc, are merely the symptoms of other relations upon which state power rests. The material life of individuals ... their mode of production and form of interest which eventually determine each other ... this is the real basis of the State ... The individuals who rule in these conditions, besides having to constitute their power in the form of the State, have to give their will ... a universal expression as the will of the State, as law.⁹⁶

On this basis, can Marxists truly believe in the universality of human rights? Of course, Marx did not think so and argued that the 'narrow horizon of bourgeois right' should be entirely eliminated. He contended that no right can have a practical meaning apart from its historical context, implying that a given right only exists if it is socially recognised insofar as the ruling class creates it, accepts it, and eventually allows it to exist.⁹⁷ As noted by François Furet:

What Marx criticized about the bourgeoisie was the very idea of the rights of man as a ... foundation of society'. Marx regarded such rights as 'a mere cover for the individualism governing

⁹⁵ Bottomore (n 22) 24-26.

⁹⁶ Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *A Critique of the German Ideology* (Progress Publishers, 1968).

⁹⁷ E A Harriman, 'Review of Enemy Property in America' (1924) 1 *The American Journal of International Law* 202.

capitalist economy. The problem was that capitalism and modern liberty were both subject to the same rule, that of freedom or plurality ... and he impugned it in the name of 'humanity's lost unity'.⁹⁸

In addition to objecting to universal human rights, Marxism objects to objective standards of right and wrong.⁹⁹ Marx notoriously despised any such moral standards.¹⁰⁰ He singled out morality as invariably ideological and relative to class interests and particular modes of production.¹⁰¹ In *The German Ideology* he effectively mocks such an idea as 'unscientific' and an obsolete obstacle to the advancement of revolutionary socialism. Instead, he elevated such a revolution as the only "basic good" to be achieved at all costs. To achieve it, Marx concluded, the pre-conditions of morality and circumstances of justice would have to be entirely eliminated.¹⁰² This amounts in practice to an attack on non-relativist ethics, undermining the sense of personal responsibility and duty towards an objective moral code, which was at the centre of nineteenth-century Western civilization.¹⁰³ In Marxist ideology, writes legal philosopher Michael Freeman:

[A]ll that 'basic laws' would do is furnish principles for the regulation of conflicting claims and thus serve to promote class compromise and delay revolutionary change. Upon the attainment of communism the concept of human rights would

⁹⁸ Furet (n 42) 10-11.

⁹⁹ M D A Freeman, *Lloyd's Introduction to Jurisprudence* (Sweet & Maxwell, 8th ed, 2008) 1151. Objective morality is, for instance, what one finds in Christian jurisprudence and the Western legal tradition of God-given inalienable rights of the individual.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Ibid* 1150.

¹⁰² *Ibid* 1152.

¹⁰³ Johnson (n 17) 11.

be redundant because the conditions of social life would no longer have need of such principles of constraint. It is also clear (particularly in the writings of Trotsky) that in the struggle to attain communism concepts like human rights could be easily pushed aside – and were.¹⁰⁴

This makes it possible to speculate whether the undercurrent of violence manifested by every Communist regime might represent a projection of the Marxist foundations of lawlessness or moral relativism. The disdain of communist regimes for legality is a well-known occurrence but not a mere accident. It is certainly ideologically driven. According to Krygier, the very notion that legality can be used to restrain power was entirely ‘alien to Marx’s thought about what law did or could do, alien to his ideals, and alien to the activities of communists in power’.¹⁰⁵ As also stated by Krygier, ‘the writings of Marx had nothing good to say about the rule of law; it generated no confidence that law might be part of a good society; it was imbued with values which made no space for those that the rule of law is designed to protect’.¹⁰⁶

Communist regimes do not answer to higher moral standards apart from the concept of ‘advancing socialism’. These regimes are controlled by a small political caste who ultimately decides who shall

¹⁰⁴ Ibid 1153.

¹⁰⁵ Martin Krygier, ‘Introduction’ in Martin Krygier (ed), *Marxism and Communism: Posthumous Reflections on Politics, Society, and Law* (Rodopi, 1994) 14.

¹⁰⁶ Martin Krygier, ‘Marxism, Communism, and Rule of Law’ in Krygier (n 106) 117.

live and who shall die for becoming “socially undesirable”.¹⁰⁷ As such, political assassinations are justified by the dogma of a new world which is coming into being, so that everything that might assist its difficult birth can be morally justifiable.¹⁰⁸ In Soviet Russia, for example, the regime’s primary victims were the “enemies of the people”, a broad category who included not only political opponents but also ethnic groups if they seemed (for equally ill-defined reasons) to threaten the Communist regime.¹⁰⁹ These individuals would be arrested and executed not for what they had done but for what they were socially.¹¹⁰ As Stéphane Courtois points out:

In Communism there exists a socio-political eugenics, a form of social Darwinism. ... As master of the knowledge of the evolution of social species, Lenin decided who should disappear by virtue of having been condemned to the dustbin of history. From the moment that a decision had been made on a ‘scientific’ basis ... that the bourgeoisie represented a stage of humanity that had been surpassed, its liquidation as a class and the liquidation of the individuals who actually or supposedly belonged to it could be justified.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁷ As per Editorial of the Soviet newspaper, in 1918: ‘We reject the old system of morality and ‘humanity’ invented by the bourgeoisie ... Our morality has no precedent, and our humanity is absolute because it rests on a new ideal ... To us, everything is permitted, for we are the first to raise the sword not to oppress races and reduce them to slavery, but to liberate humanity from its shackles ... Blood? Let blood flow like water! Let blood stain forever the black pirate’s flag flown by the bourgeoisie, and let our flag be blood-red forever! For only through the death of the old world can we liberate ourselves from the return of those jackals!’ – Nicolas Werth, ‘A State Against its People: Violence, Repression and Terror in the Soviet Union’ in Stéphane Courtois et al, *The Black Book of Communism: Crimes, Terror, Repression* (Harvard University Press, 1999) 102.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹ Applebaum (n 24) xxxvi.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹¹ Stéphane Courtois, ‘Conclusion: Why?’ in Courtois (n 107) 752.

Marxism is the application of Darwinism to social development.¹¹² In Darwin's model, change in nature occurs through heredity, selection and the struggle for survival. In contrast to this model of evolutionary causation, Marxist theory envisages a mechanical reading of social progress which approaches history as a series of unique events that reveal a certain directionality.¹¹³ Pipes explained:

The injection of evolutionary thinking into socialist theory introduced into it the element of inevitability. According to 'scientific socialism', human actions may somewhat retard or accelerate social evolution, but they cannot alter its direction, which depends on objective factors. Thus the emotional appeal to this belief is not so much different from the religious faith in the will of God, inspiring those who hold it with an unshakable conviction that no matter how many setbacks their cause may suffer, ultimate victory is assured. It would hold especial attraction for intellectuals by promising to replace spontaneous and messy life with a rational order of which they would be the interpreters and mentors.¹¹⁴

Marxism asserts that dialectical materialism describes the unfolding succession of economic systems, each with its own contradictions creating social conflict.¹¹⁵ Lenin, the founder of Soviet Russia and one of Marx's most successful disciples, defined "morality" as anything that advances class struggle; whereas immoral is anything that might hinder the inexorable historical march towards Communism.

¹¹² Paul Blackledge, 'Historical Materialism: From Social Evolution to Revolutionary Politics' in Paul Blackledge and Graeme Kirkpatrick, *Historical Materialism and Social Evolution* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2002) 16.

¹¹³ Ibid 11.

¹¹⁴ Pipes (n 27) 8.

¹¹⁵ Richard Overly, *The Dictators: Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia* (Allen Lane, 2004) 266.

This formulation gave an unlimited confidence and opportunity for individuals like him, the so-called “vanguard of the proletariat”, to advance their revolutionary struggle in line of the forms of actions which are deemed the most appropriate under the existing conditions of societal development.¹¹⁶

Leon Trotsky, another Marxist revolutionary, considered Marxism ‘the application of Darwinism to human society’.¹¹⁷ He explained that Marx relied on the concept of ‘progress’ to assume that history was invariably on his side. Since history was dogmatically interpreted in light of an evolutionist prism, when Marxists talk about “moral progress” they are simply progressing ‘an amoral Darwinian theory which is held to explain the genesis of moral standards and their role as weapons in the class war’.¹¹⁸ Thus wrote the late British political theorist HB Acton:

The superiority of a moral standard consists in its replacing the standards of vanquished classes, and the superiority of a classless morality consists in its having ousted all others, just as, for Darwin, the fittest are those who succeed in surviving, not those who, in some moral sense, ought to survive ... Out of the clash of classes, they supposed, superior forms of society are developed which would never have existed at all if the clashes had been mitigated or suppressed.¹¹⁹

Under the autocratic rule of Stalin, ‘evolutionary Marxism became the dominant ideology of the Soviet ruling class’.¹²⁰ Stalin, one of the

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Ibid.

¹¹⁸ HB Acton, *The Illusion of the Epoch: Marxism-Leninism as a Philosophical Creed* (Liberty Fund, 1962) 188.

¹¹⁹ Ibid 188.

¹²⁰ Ibid 19.

most notorious mass-murderers in human history, thought that social changes are defined by scientific laws that, as he put it in 1952, comprise ‘the reflection of objective processes which take place independently of the will of man’. In *Dialectical and Historical Materialism*, an essay he published in 1938, Stalin contended: ‘Everything in nature is part of an objective material world that is both completely integrated and constantly subject to change’. In sum, he claimed that changes in society emerge dialectically, an idea first used by the German philosopher GWF Hegel to describe ‘the dynamic contradictions that propel all phenomena from lower to higher forms of existence’.¹²¹

One of the most common characteristics of every Marxist-oriented Communist regime is the principle on which murderous policies can be rationalised and justified. When power is achieved, the repressive apparatus of the Communist State can be used to hunt people down not just for what they might have done at a personal level, but due also to their “social category”. Of course, once the idea of personal guilt is eliminated, governments can more easily eliminate people on grounds of race, profession, occupation, parentage, etc. There is indeed no limit to the extent to which the “enemies of the people” principle can be applied to eliminate those who are considered undesirable by the powerful political elites. Indeed, entire groups can be classified as the “enemies” and then condemned to imprisonment and slaughter. As properly stated by Paul Johnson:

Christianity was content with a solitary hate-figure to explain evil: Satan. But modern secular faiths needed human devils, and whole categories of them. The enemy, to be plausible, had to be an entire class or race. Marx’s invention of the

¹²¹ Overy (n 116) 267.

‘bourgeoisie’ was the most comprehensive of these hate-theories and it has continued to provide a foundation for all paranoid revolutionary movements, whether fascist-nationalist or Communist-internationalist. Modern theoretical anti-Semitism was a derivative of Marxism, involving a selection (for reasons of national, political or economic convenience) of a particular section of the bourgeoisie as the subject of attack.¹²²

In Communist Russia and elsewhere the realisation of the ‘New Man’ implies that the authorities must be prepared to sacrifice ‘the sorry specimens that populate the corrupt world’.¹²³ With this in mind in 1921 Lenin rationalised that the great famine of 1921-22, which led to more than 5 million people dying of starvation, would be actually a “positive” thing. Instead of lamenting that tragedy and trying to remediate the situation, instead Lenin rejoiced over it and expected that this could ‘strike a mortal blow against the enemy’ – the Russian Orthodox Church. In a March 1922 letter addressed to the Politburo, Lenin candidly stated:

With the help of all those starving people who are starting to eat each other, who are dying by the millions, and whose bodies litter the roadside all over the country, it is now and only now that we can – and therefore must – confiscate all church property with all the ruthless energy that we can still muster ... We must therefore amass a treasure of hundreds of millions of gold rubles ... think how rich some of these monasteries are! ...

No matter what the cost, we must have those hundreds of millions of rubles. This can be carried out only at the present moment, because our only hope is the despair engendered in the masses by the famine, which will cause them to look at us

¹²² Johnson (n 17) 117.

¹²³ Ibid 68.

in a favourable light or, at the very least, with indifference. I thus can affirm categorically that this is the moment to crush the ... clergy in the most decisive manner possible, and to act without any mercy at all, with the sort of brutality that they will remember for decades ...

The more representatives from the reactionary clergy and the recalcitrant bourgeoisie we shoot, the better it will be for us. We must teach these people a lesson as quickly as possible, so that the thought of protesting again doesn't occur to them for decades to come.¹²⁴

The other great famine of 1932–34 was not like the others that similarly devastated Russia. Rather, that famine was the result of a genocidal assault by the Communist regime on the people of the countryside. Nearly 40 million peasants were affected and at least 6 million of them died as a result of that systematically perpetuated famine. While millions were left starving to death, the regime was shipping 18 million hundredweight of grains abroad.¹²⁵ As Nicolas Werth points out:

This famine alone, with its 6 million deaths, exacted by far the heaviest toll of Stalinist repression and constitutes an extreme and previously unknown form of violence. After having been collectivized, the kolkhoz peasants of a number of the richest agricultural regions of the country (Ukraine, North Caucasus, and Black Lands) were robbed of their entire harvests, then 'punished' for having tried to resist – passively – this plundering. This punishment managed to transform the situation from one of scarcity to one of famine.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ Cited in Werth (n 108) 125.

¹²⁵ Ibid 164.

¹²⁶ Nicolas Werth, 'Strategies of Violence in Stalinist USSR' in Henry Rousso (ed), *Stalinism and Nazism: History and Memory Compared* (University of Nebraska Press, 1999) 74.

Forced to hand over everything they had, and lacking the means for buying food, millions of peasants attempted to escape to the cities just to survive. On 27 October 1932, the local authorities were ordered to ban by all means necessary the large-scale departure of peasants from Ukraine and the Northern Caucasus for the towns.¹²⁷ Desperately struggling to survive, those peasants were criminalised with a range of laws which condemned them to death by starvation. Seven decades after being emancipated, those peasants were not just re-enslaved but actually enslaved and left to die by starvation. As noted by Pipes:

Collectivization degraded the peasant more than did pre-1861 serfdom, since as a serf he had owned (in practice, if not in theory) his crops and livestock. The new status was that of a slave labourer who received the bare minimum of subsistence.¹²⁸

In light of the foregoing, it should not surprise that the Soviet Union was the first European nation to establish concentration camps on European soil.¹²⁹ As early as October 1923, there were more than 300 of them spread all over the country. From 1929 to 1951 at least one Russian adult male in five had passed through these concentration camps. Over that same period more than 15 million Russians were brought into forced labour, with about 1.5 million dying in prison. Six million were deported because of family ties or ethnic identity. Hitler knew about such camps and was inspired by them in order to create his own concentration camps. Hence the comment in the summer of 1940 by Hitler's closest collaborator in the "Final Solution", Heinrich Himmler, that the "physical extermination of a race" was only possible through "Bolshevik methods". Also revealingly was

¹²⁷ Werth (n 108) 164.

¹²⁸ Pipes (n 38) 60.

¹²⁹ Ibid.

the extent to which, from the mid-1930s' up to the state of Operation Barbarossa, 'the Gestapo and the NKVD, Stalin's successor of the Cheka collaborated and exchanged information'.¹³⁰ As noted by Kaminski:

The leaders of Soviet communism were the inventors and creators of ... the establishments called 'concentration camps' ... [They] also created a specific method of legal reasoning, a network of concepts that implicitly incorporated a gigantic system of concentration camps, which Stalin merely organized technically and developed. Compared with the concentration camps of Trotsky and Lenin, the Stalinist ones represented merely a gigantic form of implementation ... And, of course, the Nazis found in the former as well as the latter ready-made models, which they merely had to develop. The German counterparts promptly seized upon these models.¹³¹

Some knowledge of Soviet laws might help us understand why the peasants formed the vast majority of prisoners in those concentration camps in the 1930s.¹³² For example, a law enacted on 7th August 1932 condemned anyone who took a potato from a collective plantation (kolkhoz) to either execution or being sent to such a camp for 'theft or damage of socialist property'. That legislation also criminalised an extensive number of other minor offences. A tendency was developed throughout the 1930s and 1940s to fill those concentration camps called Gulags with millions of such prisoners. Gulag, an acronym for Main Camp Administration, was the quintessential expression of the Soviet repressive system.¹³³ Over time the term came to mean not

¹³⁰ Fritz (n 65) 173.

¹³¹ Werth (n 108) 73.

¹³² Applebaum (n 24) 47.

¹³³ Ibid xxix.

just those camps but the entire repressive system in all its varieties of labour camps, punishment camps, women's camps and children's camps. This was consistent with the regime's understanding that 'the class enemy had to be weeded out, destroyed and smashed, without any sign of mercy'.¹³⁴

After all, Marx himself had explicitly advised that violence formed an essential element in the socialist revolution. That being so, Lenin never quailed before the necessity to employ Terror. He had inherited from Marx an ideological justification for the use of violence. As Lenin pointed out, in 1901: 'In principle we have never renounced terror and cannot renounce it.'¹³⁵ In a 1919 lecture at the University of Moscow, Lenin argued: 'The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat shall be ruled, won, and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, rule that is unrestricted by any laws'.¹³⁶ According to Paul Johnson,

Lenin always insisted that Marxism was identical to absolute truth ... Believing this, and believing himself the designated interpreter ... Lenin was bound to regard heresy with even greater ferocity than he showed toward the infidel. Hence the astonishing virulence of the abuse which he constantly hurled at the heads of his opponents within the party, attributing to them the basest possible motives and seeking to destroy them as moral beings even when only minor points of doctrine were at stake.

The kind of language Lenin employed, with its metaphors of the

¹³⁴ Vladimir Tismaneanu, 'Communism and the Human Condition: Reflections on the Black Book of Communism' (2001) 2(2) *Human Rights Review* 126.

¹³⁵ V I Lenin, *Collected Works* (Progress Publishers, 1972) vol IV, 108 cited in Johnson (n 17) 67.

¹³⁶ *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky: Selected Works*, (Progress Publishers, 1951) vol II, pt 2, 41 quoted in Martyn Krygier, 'The Rule of Law' in N J Smelser and P B Baltes (eds), *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences* (Elsevier, 2001) 13404.

jungle and the farmyard and its brutal refusal to make the smallest effort of human understanding, recalls the *odium theologicum* which poisoned Christian disputes about the Trinity in the sixth and seventh centuries, or the Eucharist in the sixteenth. And of course once verbal hatred was screwed up to this pitch, blood was bound to flow eventually ... Just as the warring theologians felt they were dealing with issues which determine whether or not countless millions of souls burned in Hell for all eternity so Lenin knew that the great watershed of civilization was near, in which the future fate of mankind would be decided by History, with himself as its prophet. It would be worth a bit of blood: indeed a lot of blood.¹³⁷

In his celebrated *Democracy and Totalitarianism*, the late French political theorist Raymond Aron discusses ideas that inspired both Marxist regimes and Hitler's National Socialism. According to him, the notion that Nazism and Communism are polar opposites is actually a socialist fallacy that hides the fact they are actually "kindred spirits". There is indeed a remarkable convergence of ideas between these two totalitarian ideologies. Such convergence was made evident even before the German Communists joined forces with the Nazis and eventually the Soviet Union turned into a military ally of the Nazis in the outbreak of World War II. Aron's conclusion is quite simple: all the crimes, oppression and terror ever inflicted by these communist regimes are deeply inspired and directly motivated by Marxist theory.¹³⁸

¹³⁷ Johnson (n 17) 56.

¹³⁸ Raymond Aron, *Democracy and Totalitarianism* (Frederick A Praeger, 1969).

VI FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Marx believed that laws are the product of class oppression, and that legality would have to disappear with the advent of the communist utopia. In practice, the Marxist concept of ‘proletarian dictatorship’ turned out to be a dictatorship of a few privileged individuals over the rest of the population, especially manual labourers and peasants.¹³⁹ Marxist-oriented regimes amount to the dictatorship of a small ruling elite over all the other remaining social classes.¹⁴⁰ Accordingly, Marxism creates an entire justification for such political tyranny to be carried out by those who conveniently describe themselves the vanguard of the proletariat. In a society where the State machinery owns all the productive wealth, those who control it automatically become the absolute masters over everyone and everything. Or, in the words of Leon Trotsky: ‘In a country where the sole employer is the state, opposition means slow starvation’.¹⁴¹

Marxism and National Socialism effectively share important assumptions drawn from Darwinism on the primary of struggle and the centrality of conflict. Both ideologies conceive the same enemies in common, particularly liberal capitalism, and both think in terms of collective guilt as well as a claim to utopianism and social transformation. Just as importantly, both claim to be “progressive”. As noted by history professor Stephan Fritz, ‘Hitler saw himself as did Marx, acting in accordance with the historical and scientific laws, as cold, impersonal, modern and progressive’.¹⁴² Also according to

¹³⁹ Pipes (n 38) 15.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid 39.

¹⁴¹ Leon Trotsky, ‘Chapter 11: Whither the Soviet Union?’ in Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed* (1936) <<https://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1936/revbet/ch11.htm>>.

¹⁴² Aron (n 139) 173.

Professor Fritz, Hitler's anti-Semitism was directly rooted in Marxism. Marx developed a thesis of the rapacious Jews which appears to be saying that the Jews had poisoned European society. As he points out, 'Hitler's nightmare of the "Jewish bacillus" infecting German society and driving a class wedge between workers and employers in order to accomplish an "inner Judaization" of the German people paralleled Marx's notion of the Jewish attitude to money slowly transforming bourgeois society'.¹⁴³

Once a Communist regime is conceived there is no limit to the extent to which Marxist principles can be used to justify tyranny and oppression. For example, entire categories of individuals can be conveniently classified as the "enemies of the people" and so to be condemned to imprisonment or slaughter on grounds of skin colour, racial origins, and even nationality. According to Paul Johnson, 'there is no essential moral difference between class-warfare and race-warfare, between destroying a class and destroying a race. Thus the modern practice of genocide was born.'¹⁴⁴ As mentioned, the Nazis were not the first in the business of mass deportations, concentration camps and extermination of whole groups according to objective criteria.¹⁴⁵ Indeed, the "class murder" of the Bolsheviks was the logical model for the late "race murder" of the Nazis. The model for the Nazis was Stalin's Gulag and Hitler simply did to the Jews what the Red Terror had done to its enemies in the 1920s and 1930s.

Above all, history shows beyond reasonable doubt that the class genocide carried out by Marxist regimes across the globe has been aided and abetted by a Darwinian theory that encourages totalitarian

¹⁴³ Ibid 163.

¹⁴⁴ Johnson (n 17) 71.

¹⁴⁵ Fritz (n 65) 161.

policies that turn out to be profoundly genocidal. In the past century alone, Marxist-oriented Communist regimes and Communist-inspired revolutionary movements have killed no less than 120 million people. It is not so much that self-professed Marxists have not paid enough attention to policies which have eventually turned out to be genocidal. Instead, the problem is that Marxism itself contains the ideological seed which prepares the entire mindset for the elimination of all those who are deemed socially “undesirable” and in a massive scale.

This article has also established that Marx nurtured a visceral hatred of other ethnic groups apart from the Jews. If these BLM activists really believed in equality and abhorred all forms of racial discrimination, then they would condemn the appalling racism of this great icon of the New Left, who often called one of his political adversaries a “Jewish Nigger”. Arguably, those who vandalise or demand the removal of statues on racial grounds should for consistency’s sake demand the removal of the bust of Marx from a place of honour in the Smithsonian Design Museum. As Allie Stuckey correctly puts it: ‘If the statue-topplers were really doing so because of outrage over slavery, they would be outraged by Marx and Lenin, whose ideas led to the objectification and slaughter of millions. But they don’t – they worship them’.¹⁴⁶

Of course, this is all part of an ongoing assault on Western values, history and tradition. Arguably, the “useful idiots” who empower these BLM leaders by destroying the statues of people who fought against inequality are simply too ignorant and brain-washed to know what they are doing. As for the true ideologues, of course, they know

¹⁴⁶ See Bill Muehlenberg, ‘The Cancel Culture: Crucify Him Again’, *CultureWatch* (Web Page, 23 June 2020).

exactly what they are doing. Black lives are not important unless they are useful to advance the Marxist cause and score a few political gains. One can safely assume that these disciples of Marx are not really interested in equality but are hypocritical virtue signallers who appeal to racial issues to advance their own diabolical Marxist agenda.