

The Communist Manifesto

Recently I heard once again from someone claiming to be a Socialist, that Marx's early work The Communist Manifesto was propaganda. This is arrant nonsense. Marx's clear, coherent and well-argued work describes with exactitude the capitalist system of its day. It allocates the power structure then operating as highly vertical. It is predicated on valuations of money rather than human worth. This analysis, rather than being propaganda, which is a distortion and misrepresentation of the real world, is in fact entirely correct.

Any cursory inspection of capitalist societies today directly reveals that this situation is still in operation. Whilst a desirable feature of some future world, claims by Habermas that capitalism has evolved to incorporate democratic dialogues are largely wrong in Germany and almost entirely void in the UK.

The fascist university system, particularly in the US, promotes the idea that the social constructs developed by Marx do not operate in practice. Any deep analysis of social relations currently operating reveals that the reverse is the case.

Whether or not Stalin had the opinion that The Communist Manifesto was propaganda, he was the head of a highly vertical structure himself, which except for some features of planning and ideology, was highly similar to the Nazi system. I do not think we need to refer to him, despite the fact that he was an expert in the promotion of propaganda.

We have to go further because Marx is associated in the common mind with violence, because you need to know when I look at Marx I do not see it there. Let's be clear that there are many versions of the Communist Manifesto, and it looks to me some are fake and come from somewhere else. Even these are not violent.

When I look at Marx I see a cry from the soul (admittedly Marx would not use the word soul) for the position of the oppressed and the destitute. He remarks on those whose destitution leads them to the Charnel Houses – they are in the sex industry of that era, and here he always identified with these people completely and without reservation. There is no hint of violence here. Definitely I would say there is an inner rage.

When we look at how Marx analyses why this is happening, he puts the ruling classes under close scrutiny and analyses precisely what they are up to, but I am surprised by his detachment. I say no evidence here that he recommends anyone who he so justly and exactly condemns should be executed, even when in that age violent events were common, and it was natural that Marx associated with people who thought ill acts were appropriate against those who did injury to the rights of others.

Marx did not provide a blueprint for a Communist Society. Perhaps if had been able to do so, a better set of principles for that development might have taken place. He put his trust in those that followed him. To conclude, my assumption is not that Marx is a violent revolutionary per se, that was a natural accompaniment of what he was saying, but I see no direct evidence that Marx explicitly initiates violence, at least in what I have read so far. This is a different image from the Marx we have been led to believe was the progenitor of Stalin and the Russian system that began later, and I think was terrible indeed, despite its historical inevitability.