

COMMUNISM

Edward Merkus



© Copyright Arc-Design.com.au

2021
Sydney Australia

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. COMMUNISM	2
a. The Manifesto	2
b. Flaws and Contradictions in Manifesto	8
c. Authors Biography and Psychology	10
d. Hegel's Dialectic	20
e. Materialism and Idealism	24
f. The Idealised Mother and Father	25
g. The Positive and Negative Aspects of the Archetypes	29
h. Historical Reflections	33
i. Centralised Government as an Idea of Unity	39

1. COMMUNISM

a. The Manifesto

The Communist Manifesto was written in 1848 by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels and commissioned by the Communist League in London. The document describes the class struggles between the working class (Proletarians) and the owners of the means of production (Bourgeois). The authors argue that society was put back into a “state of monetary barbarism”¹ when it moved from Feudalism to Capitalism brought about by the Industrial Revolution. Before that time society was loosely divided into the nobility, clergy and peasantry. The wealth of the society including land ownership was concentrated in the hands of the nobility. The nobility used the clergy as vassals against the peasantry to show and reinforce the idea of poverty as a necessity for spiritual awareness.²

Marx and Engels suggest that the movement towards capitalism led to the working class cut off from “every means of subsistence” because there is “too much civilisation, too much means of subsistence, too much industry, too much commerce.”³ This shows that Marx and Engels lamented at the loss of small independent craftsman. Instead of small textile weaving shops, it became large mechanized factories, instead of subsistence on a small scale, it became large scale production where the working man had to work on a large scale as small production could not

¹ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, The Communist Manifesto, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 14

² KING JAMES BIBLE, Mathew 24, “And again I say unto you, It is easier fro a camel to through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.”

³ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, The Communist Manifesto, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 14

compete with the efficient factory processes and hence the cost of production.

The move to large-scale production did indeed transform the peasant class to the new working class but instead of being directed by the nobility, it was directed by the Bourgeois as intermediaries for the nobility and royalty. Capital was generated by large-scale production, and the peasant and craftsman classes could not compete due to lower costs and sales prices by large-scale production. This competition drove the working class to the large-scale production facilities to work for payment. Large organizations operate like soft tyrannies in that one must obey the boss's commands or lose one's employment and income.⁴ This is one of the objections that Marx and Engels had with the revolution towards mechanization and large-scale production. It was the loss of small-scale production, serving a boss and becoming a commodity and an appendage to the larger industrial machine.⁵

The manifesto describes how the little workshop of the family father was converted to great factories of the industrial capitalists and workers were organized like soldiers into an industrial army and enslaved by the machine. It mentions that the exploitation continues by landlords, shopkeepers and pawnbrokers. The authors seem confused and in one paragraph they lament at the loss of the 'little workshop' and in the next paragraph, lumping small business owners like shopkeepers and pawnbrokers with the bourgeoisie.⁶ In the following, the authors make generalizations about tradespeople, shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and peasants sinking into the proletariat.

The lower strata of the Middle class—the small tradespeople, 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 specialised skill is rendered worthless by new methods of production. Thus the proletariat is recruited from all classes of the population.⁷

What the authors fail to understand is the great workforce of tradespeople with small businesses that service the building industry. Building products like frames, cladding, lining, plumbing infrastructure, fixtures and fittings may be mass-produced, but it requires individuals to install and maintain

⁴ MERKUS, EDWARD, *The Idea of Unity*, page 375, ISBN 978-0-6484039-0-6

⁵ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, *The Communist Manifesto*, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 14 & 15

⁶ *Ibid*, page 15

⁷ *Ibid*, page 15

them on site⁸ in buildings. Carpenters, electricians, plumbers, gas fitters, plasterers, concreters and so on, still exist to this day.

The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation.⁹

This passage above shows that in the authors' eyes, it is a struggle for mastery over productive forces. We can in this document a psychological struggle over exploitative forces. But what are Marx and Engels actually trying to overcome and control in themselves? They continue with their aggressive rhetoric by regarding the working class as slaves and oppressed,¹⁰ and describe the immediate aim of the Communists is to unite the lower classes, overthrow bourgeois supremacy and conquer their political power.¹¹

The next passage contains one of the most controversial ideas of the Communists, and that is the abolition of private property.

The distinguishing feature of Communism is not the abolition of property generally, but the abolition of bourgeois property. But modern bourgeois private property is the final and most complete expression of the system of producing and appropriating products, that is based on class antagonisms, on the exploitation of the many by the few.

In this sense, the theory of the Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.¹²

In addition to the abolition of private property, they include the abolition of individuality, independence and freedom. They do however define their idea of freedom in terms of bourgeois conditions of production, free trade, free selling and buying.¹³ This reminds me of a quote by George Washington "Freedom and Property Rights are inseparable. You can't have one without the other."¹⁴ The control of individual freedoms continues in the next paragraph.

You must, therefore, confess that by "individual" you mean no other person than the bourgeois, than the middle-class owner of property. This person must, indeed, be swept out of the way, and made impossible.

⁸ There are exceptions today where some homes are manufactured in factories and shipped to site, but this is a small percentage of the building industry.

⁹ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, *The Communist Manifesto*, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 18

¹⁰ *Ibid*, page 19

¹¹ *Ibid*, page 20

¹² *Ibid*, page 21

¹³ *Ibid*, page 22

¹⁴ https://www.azquotes.com/author/15324-George_Washington?p=2

That culture, the loss of which he laments, is, for the enormous majority, a mere training to act as a machine.¹⁵

The following passage gives another hint to the authors' own psychological issues. Not only does the next idea go against norms that humans have based their lives on for millennia, it goes against nature in general.

Abolition of the family! Even the most radical flare up at this infamous proposal of the Communists.

On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of the family among the proletarians, and in public prostitution.¹⁶

Marx and Engels again make an assumption that bourgeois families do not love their children and want the best for them in life. Love of one's children is a universal and natural instinct in mammals and cold-blooded reptiles. For example, a mother crocodile will gently take her young in her mouth to the next watering hole simply to ensure their survival.¹⁷ The authors claim that "The working men have no country", and that the Communists are reproached for desiring to abolish countries and nationality.¹⁸ This statement wishes to abolish patriotism, culture and belonging to a nation or large group of people. In fact, patriotism and culture are actually sustained and developed by the working class. Wars are fought, stories and myths are told, and the working class worships gods.

The following paragraph shows that the individual does indeed figure in the authors thinking contrary to their emphasis on the collective. As we shall see later in the chapter, the word 'exploitation' is the cornerstone of not only the idea behind the manifesto, but also, its impetus.

In proportion as the exploitation of one individual by another is put an end to, the exploitation of one nation by another will also be put an end to. In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end.¹⁹

¹⁵ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, The Communist Manifesto, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 23

¹⁶ Ibid, page 24

¹⁷ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XH3xQQ9_Zml

¹⁸ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, The Communist Manifesto, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 25

¹⁹ Ibid, page 25

The authors demonstrate a lack of understanding of human nature. Exploitation is driven by greed and insecurity and the idea that one has the power to exploit another. All emotions have a positive and negative aspect. Greed for example, as Spinoza explains, 'Avarice is the immoderate desire or love of riches'²⁰, is an obvious and cursory look at the emotion. Emotions have a function in human nature that we share with other creatures, which is often overlooked. Why would an individual, group or nation want to exploit another for their wealth, resources or the like? What is the basic drive behind exploitation and theft?

The drive can be seen in early hunters and gatherers and predatory animals that spend much of their time hunting for food. Physical hunger is a great motivating force and has a psychological component, which uses the ingenuity of ideas to satisfy the hunger. The urgency of a physical hunger can manifest itself in several ways.

The first is a motivating energy to go out and catch or dig up food, which in itself, is stealing from nature. The second is taking food (stealing) from another that has already been caught or dug up. The third is a psychic reaction in the form of ideas to obtain food. The idea to catch food is everywhere to be seen in nature. Creatures use methods such as webs, lures, camouflage and so on. Other ideas include the development of weapons to kill food such as horns, barbs, spears, fangs, poison and so on. The fourth option is the imitation of the way seeds are distributed and grow thus producing crops. All of the above have one thing in common, and that is, the use of differing methods to control (will to power) one's environment and satisfy either a physical hunger, or the idea of hunger. The latter is the motivating urge and energy to exploit others and hoard wealth (matter). As we shall see later in this chapter, this is the crux of the motivating force behind the Communist Manifesto.

It is the will to power, which ultimately is the instinct for survival and can mean the difference between life and death in the wild. Originally human greed stems from the desire for personal security for oneself and family for sufficient food to overcome hunger. The desire comes from within the individual and expressed in the body but can be projected onto a wider group such as family, class or nation. Even though it appears as broader and more prevalent than the individual, the desire or urge comes from within each individual. This, as we shall see later in this chapter is one of the fundamental flaws in the manifesto.

²⁰ SPINOZA B, Ethics, Origin and Nature of Emotions XLVII. Avarice, Heron Books, page 138

The next paragraph shows the struggle the authors have with what group is in charge and the battle between them. It is a clear example of one side in conflict with another and the authors' preference for its reverse.

But let us have done with the bourgeois objections to Communism. We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.²¹

The following points appear at the end of the manifesto and summarise what the authors are proposing.

Nevertheless in most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable.

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralization of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State: the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal obligation of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries: gradual abolition of all the distinction between town and country, by a more equitable distribution of the population over the country.
10. Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production, &c., &c.²²

The above shows that the battle between the working class and ruling elite ends in all authority being centralised in the hands of a large state that owns all property, co-ordinates the means of production, removes inheritance thus breaking family wealth, state owned capital, removing choice of employment and creating industrial armies, combining agriculture and manufacturing and educating children to support the new system.

²¹ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, The Communist Manifesto, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 26

²² Ibid, pages 27-28

Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity declaimed against private property, against marriage, against the State? Has it not preached in the place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and Mother Church? Christian Socialism is but the Holy Water with which the priest consecrates the heart-burnings of the aristocrat.²³

The preceding paragraph tries to show that the Christian ethic encourages Communism but fails to recognise that the rejection of material wealth, asceticism, charity and poverty are based on a spiritual quest chosen by the individual, and not forced upon individuals by a state. There is one sentence in the paragraph that gives us an indication of the psychological motivations for the overthrow of the existing social and political order. That is the emphasis on the capitalised words 'Mother Church'.

In short, the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.

The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win.
Working men of all countries unite!²⁴

The final paragraphs are a call to arms and the overthrow of the existing order by force even though it mentions using democratic systems, and the ascension of the working class as rulers. The last two sentences are particularly important from a psychological point of view. In their view the working class is in chains, they have a world to win and should unite to overthrow the existing order. The use of the term 'unite' is important to note as it has bearing on the following sections.

b. Flaws and Contradictions in Manifesto

One of the main ideas Marx and Engels use in their argument in support of the working class against the ruling class is 'exploitation'. They feel that the working class is downtrodden and exploited by groups that have the capital to control the means of production to provide goods to the greater community. Indeed, during the writing of the manifesto, the ruling class did exploit the working class for their own benefit as they have always done. It is human nature and nature in general, for the more powerful to exploit the less powerful.

²³ Ibid, page 30

²⁴ Ibid, page 40

The crux of the matter is the degree of exploitation and the varying quality of exploitation. The manifesto was written in 1848 shortly after the Bilateral Treaty being signed by the United Kingdom in 1843 abolishing the slave trade. Between 1843 and 1844 the 'Factory Acts' were also passed protecting children from exploitation. The manifesto was written with this background and energy to liberate the working class. The hangover of exploitation and slavery still persisted until 1868 in several forms, one being the sentencing of individuals as convicts for trivial offences and sent to penal colonies such as Australia and the United States. Convicts had lengthy sentences and their labour exploited in building the new colony.

With this atmosphere including the liberation of slaves and child labour, and the conviction and banishment for trivial crimes, it isn't hard to see why a man with a soft heart such as Marx would want to carry this energy further in the liberation of other exploited individuals. Today however, we have very liberal western laws protecting individuals, particularly for the working class and disadvantaged, and extreme exploitation is part of our learned history. We cannot apply the same criteria to our developed nations where we are free to change our employment at will, but more importantly, we are free to explore and grow our own businesses and liberate ourselves from employed work²⁵.

Another flaw in the manifesto is the idea that the working class can gain ascendancy over the ruling class through democratic institutions.

We have seen above, that the first step in the revolution by the working class, is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.²⁶

It is common today for individuals with working class backgrounds to achieve the highest offices of the land through sheer hard work, determination and effort. The flaw is the manifesto proposes a state run entity that distributes wealth based on nothing other than an abstract idea of an individual. It takes no account of ability, work ethic, talent, knowledge or insight. Democracy in itself ensures that the individual can vote for their elected representatives, which means they have a say in running the state. As we have seen in history, all so-called Communist revolutions create totalitarian states where the individual not only loses that freedom but is oppressed, made fearful and murdered if in opposition.

²⁵ Running one's own business has a new set of problems. Instead of wrangling with bosses, you have to wrangle with clients and customers as well as employees.

²⁶ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, The Communist Manifesto, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, pages 26

Democracy revolves around the individual having a say, encourages freedom and not oppression. In other words, there is a gulf in the minds of Marx and Engels between what is wanted and what the outcome will be. Democracy does not lead to slavery, it leads to freedom. A state that is totalitarian extinguishes freedom no matter what their altruistic goals are. Equity of outcome is unnatural in human nature and nature in general. Individuals have an instinct for freedom and independence and do not willingly succumb to oppression by other individuals or a large group like a state.

Marx and Engels didn't seem to realise that human nature is a balance between brotherly love and brotherly control. Handing over all control of production, agriculture, communication, transport etc., leads to a one sided control of a society by a state, which attracts individuals who for personal reasons, are addicted to the control of their fellow man. This is exactly what the manifesto tries to do, that is; liberate the working class from the control of the ruling class. This is the fundamental and overarching flaw in the Manifesto and the thinking of Marx and Engels. The ruling class is simply replaced by the state and the exploitation shifted from one group to the other with dire consequences, as history has shown,

c. Authors Biography and Psychology

To grasp a complete picture of the motivations behind the manifesto, I shall trace a brief synopsis of the author's personal lives and inner characters²⁷ that gives us an insight into the motivating forces behind their attitude.

Friedrich Engels was born on November 28th, 1820, near the Rhine river in Prussia now Germany, and died on August 5th, 1895, in London. Engels was regarded as a German socialist philosopher and grew up in a moderately liberal protestant and wealthy family. His father owned a textile factory in Barmen Germany and a cotton plant in Manchester, England. Engels was devoted to his mother and rebellious towards his strong-willed father who wanted him to carry on the family business in the textile industry.

He came across the work of the German philosopher G.W.F. Hegel and became familiar with the Hegelian dialectic where opposing forces are synthesized into a third function. He met a group of leftist intellectuals called the 'Young Hegelians' who expounded the negative aspects of

²⁷ I use the term 'inner characters' rather than complexes to avoid confusion and false value judgment, and place the motivating forces with an inner character such as a mother or father.

Christianity and helped Engels convert from his agnostic attitude to that of a militant atheist.

In 1842, Engels met Moses Hess, the son of wealthy Jewish parents who convinced Engels that the logical consequence of the Hegelian philosophy and dialectic was communism. Engels moved to England and was a businessman during the day and a revolutionary by night. He rejected the institution of marriage and lived with an uneducated Irish girl named Mary Burns who died in 1863. Later he would live with Mary's sister Lizzy under similar circumstances. In 1844 Engels wrote two articles on the principles of scientific socialism and concluded that the existing political system based on private property was leading to a world made up of millionaires and paupers. The solution was a revolution and the elimination of private property and a "reconciliation of humanity with nature and itself". Here again we see the urge to reconcile the opposites.²⁸ Engels visited Paris with Marx whom he had encountered previously and formed their life long partnership. They refined their communist thinking and helped other worker groups see the value of their communist views.

Karl Marx was born on May 5th, 1818, also near the Rhine River in Prussia and died on March 14th, 1883, in London. He was regarded as a revolutionary, sociologist, historian and economist. His main writings and collaboration with Engels were the Communist Manifesto and Das Kapital. His father Heinrich was a successful lawyer and although being Jewish, was baptised in the Evangelical Church, presumably to adapt to his professional career. His father was also a man of the Enlightenment and studied Kant and Voltaire. Karl was also baptised when he was six. Marx was educated at the University of Bonn in the humanities, ancient mythology and art history. He completed his studies at the University of Berlin after studying law and philosophy.

Marx, like Engels, discovered the philosophy of Hegel and the Young Hegelians, which were moving away from Christianity towards atheism and political action. In 1841 Marx and the group were heavily influenced by a paper called 'The Essence of Christianity' by Ludwig Feuerbach, which criticised the ideas and supported the material aspects of the Christian story. The dual aspect of Hegel's idealism and his concept of the dialectic and Feuerbach's materialism therefore influenced Marx's thinking.

In 1843, Marx married Jenny von Westphalen who was attractive, intelligent woman and four years older than Marx. Marx's father feared

²⁸ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Friedrich-Engels>

that Jenny would also succumb to his son's radical ideas, which came true as the couple moved to Paris where Marx fully adopted his revolutionary and communist ideals. During this period Marx began his lifelong collaboration with Engels. Their revolutionary ideas had them expelled from France and Marx moved to Brussels shortly followed by Engels. In 1845, Marx and Engels collaborated on 'The German Ideology', which detailed their materialistic views and the exploitation by the economically dominant class.

Marx's life was full of struggle and disappointment. He joined several groups only to be disappointed with their factions and retreated into isolation. From 1850 to 1864 he had major financial problems and was evicted from his residence. Engels supported him to some extent but the poverty took its toll. He had four small children and a son and daughter died, his wife suffered breakdowns, all due to their poverty. During this period, Marx worked on his major work 'Das Kapital' which was later edited and published by Engels. Marx's political isolation came to an end in 1864 with the founding of the International Working Men's Association, which invited him to join.²⁹

During the last years of his life, Marx suffered from depression and had a debilitating physical condition where his body was covered with boils. He drank and smoked heavily and had a poor diet most of his life and suffered from liver and gall problems. His abscesses were so bad that he could not sit in a chair and had to write standing up.³⁰

John Spargo wrote an excellent biography on Marx and his life and work. The book is very well researched from biographical articles, family letters and friends' accounts. The first chapter details Karl's parents and how they related to each other. Karl's father Heinrich Marx was a Jewish lawyer and a loyal Prussian that converted to Christianity in 1824 when Karl was six years old. He was a kind, practical and supportive father but lamented over Karl's radical tendencies and believed him to be possessed of the "demon" of revolt. Even at this early stage in Karl's development we can see a counterpoint developing to his father's patriotism, practicality and adaptation to the current economic and political system.³¹ Spargo mentions Karl's negative attitude towards his father's conversion from Hebrew to Christianity, but as we shall see in the following passages, this may be part of a more encompassing attitude towards his father and adaptation in general.

²⁹ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Karl-Marx/Role-in-the-First-International>

³⁰ https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Karl_Marx#/Health

³¹ SPARGO J. Karl Marx, His Life and Works, The National Labour Press Ltd. 1910, page 19

Karl's mother Henriette was a warm, simple, gentle, patient and good-natured woman who also lamented at her son's radical tendencies, lack of practical money sense and inability to manage his expenditure.³²

Wonderful indeed was the wisdom of the young Karl Marx when, in his study of the Hebrew question, he declared that the emancipation of the Jew, and of society from the Jew, required the emancipation of the Jew from himself, from this " practical Judaism "— from money and business.³³

The above passage shows that Karl had rejected the stereotypical idea of Jews as moneylenders and usurers, although he did not embrace the Christian religion as his parents had. Heinrich's father, Karl's grandfather, was one in a long line of rabbis and Heinrich adopted law instead of religion as a career. Karl's mother Henriette also came from a Hungarian Jewish family that settled in Holland where the men of the family also served as rabbis. It is clear that Heinrich and Henriette's decision to break with tradition and become Christian shows how the tone was set for Karl's rejection of Jewish practical matters and contemporary political systems in general.

Thus she lived to know that the name of her child, her bright and happy Karl, was a terror to the governments of Europe; that he had kindled fires of revolt which could not be extinguished by force; that he was hounded from land to land, an exile from his Fatherland, persecuted and feared, but often hungry to the verge of starvation.

It was the irony of life that the son who kindled a mighty hope in the hearts of unnumbered thousands of his fellow human beings, a hope that is to-day inspiring millions of those who speak his name with reverence and love, should be able to do that only by destroying his mother's hope and happiness in her son, that every step he took should fill her heart with a great agony.³⁴

During Karl's school years prior to university, he was loved by his teachers and successful at his studies and his mother watched him with "wondering admiration, fondly and proudly calling him her 'Fortune Child'."³⁵ At university at the insistence of his father, Karl studied law but described it as a "necessary evil". His father had a growing fear that his son lacked practical common sense and was a radical idealist, which would naturally strain his father's relationship to with his son as a man of the societal law.

³² Ibid, page 26

³³ Ibid, page 21

³⁴ Ibid, page 27

³⁵ Ibid, page 31

As Karl grew to manhood the relationship between him and his father became more and more strained. A letter written to Karl in 1837 shows a growing disgust at his son's attitude to the point where points out that "irrational tone is loathsome to me". Heinrich mentions Karl's upbringing was full of love and support and how lucky he was to have the love of his future wife Jenny.³⁶ Heinrich's anger is evident when he writes:

Complete disorder, silly wandering through all branches of science, silly brooding at the burning oil lamp; turned wild in your coat of learning and unkempt hair; and in your wildness you see with four eyes — a horrible set-back and disregard for everything decent. And in the activity of this senseless and purposeless learning you want to raise the fruits, which are to unite you with your beloved one! What harvest do you expect to gather from them, which will enable you to fulfil your duty toward her?..... A mad composition, which denotes clearly how you waste your ability and spend nights in order to create those monsters. You are surely following in the footsteps of those malicious young men who proclaim their ideas so long and so loud, until their own ears do not hear what their mouths utter; who possess a torrent of words, but perverted thoughts as to the nature of genius.³⁷

Heinrich Marx suffered from tuberculosis and had regular bouts of illness. His desire to guide his son into a reasonable and practical life came to an end with his death in May 1838. Karl was twenty years old. There is no doubt that Karl loved his father dearly and must have been greatly distressed by his father's disappointment of his behaviour and eventual death. At this time of great anguish, Karl turned to the study of Hegel and joined the young Hegelians. He learned that the processes of evolution and growth apply not only to biology, but economics, politics and culture.

Hegel's work was less philosophical speculation and more psychological observation as he recognised the natural process of enantiodromia where an orientation transforms into its opposite. For example, puberty is a great time of upheaval in a young individuals life where the previous attitude of play, fun and carefreeness is transformed into adult responsibility of the sexual burden, marriage, children and work. The process is however, not limited to biological changes such as puberty, although it can be related to such a change. It also includes psychological changes such as the transformation from one psychological function to another.³⁸

³⁶ Ibid, page 39

³⁷ Ibid, page 47, Excerpts from letter written by Heinrich to Karl in 1837

³⁸ JUNG C G, Psychological Types, Routledge and Kegan, 1976, ISBN 0-691-01813-8. This book lays the groundwork for Jung's typology of Extravert and Introvert as well as the four orienting functions of Intuition, Thinking, Feeling and Sensation.

For example, a change in life's circumstances such as a new job, getting married and having children, the death of a parent as in the case of Marx, all may precipitate a change of orientation. As shown in the letters from Karl's father, his son expressed himself in an irrational and rebellious manner, which was less thought and more intuition. With the study of Hegel one would have had to think to understand his somewhat abstract quality of writing.

If we view Karl's personality in terms of ideas, we can see that his rebellious nature was at odds with his contemporary culture and political establishment which his father so strongly supported. In other words, he observed that a certain class of people were being exploited by another class of people and the idea of this became the overwhelming guiding principal for his life's work, so much so, that he used his thinking, knowledge and reasoning to serve the idea. It is a form of possession by an inner character (archetype), or in this case the idea of a parent that goes beyond an individual. As we shall see later in the chapter, even his own mother could not live up to Karl's idea of a mother.

Karl struggled with self-discipline in his University studies at Bonn and wished for an academic career, which did not come about. He then turned to political journalism for his livelihood and fought against the prevailing censorship and for freedom of the press. In 1842 he wrote in the political newspaper *Rheinische Zeitung* "You accept the greatness and power of Nature," he wrote, "without demanding that the rose should bloom like the thistle. But you do demand that different mighty spirits should follow one narrow path." This statement made the government aware of Karl's radicalism and promptly had the newspaper shut down.

The next point is little known, but Marx was in favour of free trade between peoples and nations.

Only under free trade can the immense productive powers of steam, of electricity, of machinery, be fully developed; and the quicker the pace of this development, the sooner and more fully will be realized its inevitable results; society splits up into two classes, capitalists here, wage labourers there; hereditary wealth on one side, hereditary poverty on the other; supply outstripping demand, the markets being unable to absorb the ever-growing mass of the productions of industry; an ever-recurring cycle of prosperity, glut, crisis, panic, chronic depression and gradual revival of trade, the harbinger, not of permanent improvement but of renewed over-production and crisis; in short, productive forces expanding to such a degree that they rebel, as against unbearable

fetters, against the social institutions under which they are put in motion; the only possible solution: a social revolution, freeing the social productive forces from the fetters of an antiquated social order, and the actual producers, the great mass of the people, from wage slavery. And because free trade is the natural, the normal atmosphere for this historical evolution, the economic medium in which the conditions for the inevitable social revolution will be the soonest created — for this reason, and for this alone, did Marx declare in favour of free trade.³⁹

Marx's radicalism and constant attacks on the status quo left him destitute and struggling to provide for his family. In 1849 his fourth child Henry was born and doomed to an early death due to the family's poverty. The following letter by Karl's wife to Mr Weydemeyer shows how desperate the Marx family was at this time:

Almost a year has gone by since I enjoyed the hospitality of your house, where I felt at home and so happy in the company of yourself and your dear wife; and in the whole time I have not given a sign of life. I was silent when your wife sent me that nice letter and even when we received news of the birth of your child. This silence often depressed my mind, but most of the time I was unable to write and it is a hard task even to-day.

But circumstances force the pen in my hand — I beg you to send us the money received for the Review as soon as possible, and the rest as soon as you collect it. We are in sore need of it. Nobody can say of us that we ever made a noise about what we for years have sacrificed and had to endure; very little, or never, have our personal affairs or difficulties been noised abroad.

My husband is very sensitive in such matters, and he prefers to sacrifice the last, before he allows himself to be used by democratic beggary ' like the great official men. What, however, he could expect from his friends mainly in Cologne, was an active, energetic stand for his Review. This he was entitled to expect from the place where his sacrifices for the Rhenische Zeitung were known. Instead of that, the business was totally ruined by careless and unsystematic management, and one does not know whether the dragging along of the publisher or of the manager and friends in Cologne did the most harm.

My husband was almost crushed by the petty worry of life and in such a horrible form that his whole energy was needed to hold him upright in the daily struggles. You know, dear Mr. Weydemeyer, what sacrifices my husband made for the paper. Thousands of thalers of money he put in.

To save the political honour of the paper and the civic honour of his friends, he allowed the whole burden to be unloaded on his shoulders, all the income he sacrificed, and in the moment of his departure he paid the back salaries of the editors and other bills — and he was expelled by force from the country. You know that we did not keep anything for

³⁹ SPARGO J. Karl Marx, His Life and Works, The National Labour Press Ltd. 1910, page 105

ourselves; I went to Frankfort to pawn my silverware, the last we had; at Cologne I sold my furniture. My husband went, when the unhappy epoch of the counter revolution set in, to Paris; I followed with my three children. Barely settled in Paris, we were again expelled; myself and my children were also forced to go.

I followed him across the Channel. A month afterwards our fourth child was born. You know London and its condition well enough to know what it means. Three children and the birth of a fourth! For rent alone we paid 42 thalers a month. We were able to meet all that by our own means, derived from the sale of some property, but our small resources were soon exhausted. In spite of agreements the money did not come from the Review except in small amounts, so that we drifted into the most terrible condition.

I will describe to you only one single day of this life, and you will see that very few fugitives have gone through similar experiences. The keeping of a wet nurse for my baby was out of question, so I resolved to nurse the child myself, in spite of constant terrible pains in the breast and in the back. But the poor little angel drank so much silent worry from me that he was sickly from the first day of his life, lying in pain day and night. He did not sleep a single night more than two or three hours. Then he became subject to cramps and was wavering constantly between death and miserable life. In

those pains he drew so hard that my breast got sore and broke open; often the blood streamed into his little wavering mouth. So I was sitting one day, when unexpectedly our landlady stepped in, to whom we had paid 250 thalers during the winter and with whom we had a contract to pay after that the rent to the owner of the house. She denied the contract and demanded five pounds, the sum we owed for rent, and because we were unable to pay at once two constables stepped in and attached my small belongings, beds, linen, clothes, all, even the cradle of my poor baby and the toys of the two girls, who stood by crying bitterly. "In two hours, they threatened, they would take all and everything away. I was lying there on the bare hard floor with my freezing children and my sore breast.

Schramm, our friend, hurried to the city to seek help. He stepped into a hack; the horses shied and ran away. He jumped out and they brought him bleeding into the house where I and my poor shaking children were crying and moaning.

The next day we had to get out of the house. It was cold, raining and gloomy. My husband was out hunting for rooms. Nobody wanted to take us in, when he talked of four children. In the end a friend helped us. I sold my bedding to satisfy the druggist, the baker, the butcher and the milkman, who got scared and all at once presented their bills. The bedding was brought to the sidewalk and was loaded on a cart. We were able, after the selling of everything we possessed, to pay every cent. I moved with my little ones into our present two small rooms in the German Hotel, i, Leicester Street, Leicester Square, where we have found a week's shelter and board for five and one-half pounds.

Pardon me, my dear friend, for my so lengthy letter, but my heart is streaming this evening, and I must pour out my heart before one of our

oldest, best and most earnest friends. Do not believe that these petty sufferings have bent us. I know only too well that we are not the only ones who suffer, and I rejoice that I even belong to the chosen privileged lucky ones, because my dear husband, the support of my life, yet stands at my side. But what strikes me the hardest and causes my heart to bleed is that my husband has to endure so many petty annoyances while he could be helped with so very little and that he, who is willing and with pleasure has helped so many, stands here so helpless and nobody to help him, believe me, dear Mister Weydemeyer, that we do not ask anything from anybody.

“The only thing my husband expected of those who received so many thoughts from him, to whom he was so much a support in every way on the Review, is the little they owe him. I don’t know why I wrote, dear Mr. Weydemeyer, so much about our situation. My husband only knows that I, in his name, have begged you to hurry the collection and the sending of the money as much as possible.

Farewell, dear friend. The heartiest regards to your dear wife and kiss your little angel for a mother who drops so many a tear on her baby. Our three oldest children develop magnificently in spite of all and everything. The girls are pretty, blooming and happy and our fat boy is an example of humor and fun.

The little rascal sings the whole day with a monotonous pathos and a giant voice, and when he sings the words in Freiligrath’s Marseillaise, with a terrible voice, the whole house trembles. Maybe it is the historic mission of his mouth like his two unlucky predecessors to open the giant fight again in which we all will join hands. Farewell.⁴⁰

The following is an excerpt from a letter written by one of Marx’s daughters:

Karl Marx was the kindest, the best of fathers; there was nothing of the disciplinarian in him, nothing authoritative in his manner. He had the rich and generous nature, the warm and sunny disposition, that the young appreciate; he was vehement, but I have never known him to be morose or sullen, and steeped in work and worry as he might be, he was always full of pleasantry with us children, always ready to amuse and be amused by us. He was our comrade and playfellow.⁴¹

These letters show that Marx was a very kind and loving father. The children in his neighbourhood who also saw a kind and loving father figure, calling him “Daddy Marx”, also reinforce this.⁴² This shows that his relationship with his wife and children was good even though their poverty and circumstances resulted in the death of several of his children at a young age while living in London. As his daughter mentions, Marx was not an authoritarian father, but rather playful and warm who indulged in

⁴⁰ Ibid, page 180 to 183

⁴¹ Ibid, page 185

⁴² Ibid, page 186

boisterous boyish fun.⁴³ He often contemplated going into business at this time to alleviate their poverty and give up his studies and writing, but his wife encouraged him to stay the course. We don't know if his wife had this attitude because she valued his work or didn't want him in the world of business to maintain her control over him.

Unlike many depictions of Marx, he was not a violent revolutionary. He believed revolution was a slow and incremental process carried out through legislation. He regarded such things as accident insurance, employer liabilities, old age pensions, the legal eight hour day, child labour laws and so on, be legislated through the trade union movement.⁴⁴ This shows that although he was to some extent possessed by a central idea, his loving nature stopped him from trying to achieve his goals through violent revolution.

Although Marx was an atheist, he did not have contempt for religious beliefs and was tolerant of the opinions of others. He showed sympathy for the ethical principals underlying most religions. It was even said that Marx had a deeply spiritual nature⁴⁵ although this seems to be fixated on his central idea. Marx is regarded as materialist, meaning that he works at liberating the working man from his physical condition, but the motivating force is his youthful idealism. His thinking, research and writing reinforced the rebellious intuitive nature of his youth and the central idea to liberate the working man from his poor physical conditions.

He could however not alleviate the tragedy of his own physical condition and that of his family. Marx was a heavy drinker and smoker most of his life. He was rebellious by nature, wanted to change the world and liberate the working man from their own poverty, but could not liberate himself and his family from his own poverty. As mentioned earlier, he had liver and gal issues, worked obsessively at night and had a poor diet. From 1863 he had issues with boils covering his body, which hindered his work, as he could not sit for any length of time. The illness increased over time until it finally overcame Marx at the age of 64.

Marx's relationship to his parents is particularly important in understanding the motivating forces in his personality. We mentioned above his practical, supportive yet disappointed father who lamented at Karl's reckless spending and irrational behaviour. Karl's mother on the other hand, admitted to suffering from "excessive mother love" in a letter to her son written while he was at university.⁴⁶ She is described as

⁴³ Ibid, page 191

⁴⁴ Ibid, page 252

⁴⁵ Ibid, page 275

⁴⁶ KARL MARX A LIFE, Francis Wheen, W. W. Norton & Company, 1999,

narrow-minded, inarticulate and socially awkward,⁴⁷ yet she was loving, supportive and tried to treat her children equally. Her love did not however extend to infinity as she also lamented her son's inability to support himself and his family. She is quoted as saying "if only Karl had made Capital, instead of just writing about it".⁴⁸ This tough attitude grew as she got older to the point where she refused to support Karl during his desperate times. As we shall see later in this chapter, Karl's relationship to his mother grew more and more negative to the point where her son wondered when 'she would fall off her perch'⁴⁹ so he could get her capital. Desperate times bring out desperate attitudes.

d. Hegel's Dialectic

Hegel, like Kant, identified the opposites of psyche and matter. Kant's view was that an individual perceived an object and a corresponding idea of the object was activated. He believed that individuals could never really know the object, but only know the idea of the object. In other words, the psychic content (idea) of an object is the only true reality that we can understand. Hegel on the other hand, believed that with a dialectical method we could differentiate the object from subject and synthesize their union. Indeed, life is like this in that we perceive an object, an idea of the object is presented to the mind and we are either intrigued and attracted or repelled by the object and move on.

This is the basis of scientific investigation. We perceive an object⁵⁰ and an idea presents itself to the observer and therein we can formulate a hypothesis. Careful observation, experimentation and so on either prove or disprove the idea. To some extent Kant is correct in that we can never really know the object. We can however, increase our knowledge and understanding of an object so that the idea slowly transforms and resembles the object more closely. This is what Hegel regarded as the synthesis or union of object and idea.

To make this clearer, consider the study of a celestial body such as the moon. In Greco-Roman cultures the moon was seen as a deity in relationship with the sun. Her name was Selene and the sun's name Sol.⁵¹ The moon was perceived logically and given feminine qualities due

ISBN 0-393-32157-6, page 12

⁴⁷ Ibid, page19

⁴⁸ MCLELLAN D. Karl Marx: A biography, London 1973/1995, ISBN 9780333639474, page 320

⁴⁹ KARL MARX A LIFE, Francis Wheen, W. W. Norton & Company, 1999, ISBN 0-393-32157-6, page 246

⁵⁰ The term 'object' is used in its philosophical sense and means anything that has a physical existence. Hegel used the term object to refer to the idea as well, which to some extent confuses the issue.

⁵¹ The moon was not always seen as feminine. The Proto-Indo-European religion the moon was regarded as a male god.

to her waxing and waning, ability to be visible during the day, reflect the sun and her ability to illuminate the night when full. This was our western idea of the moon at that time. Today we know that the moon is a sphere and its surface a stony and dusty desert, has no atmosphere and is void of water and life. The moon hasn't changed but our idea of it has. Unfortunately, our knowledge of the moon has removed the ancient personification and transformed the idea of her into something quite disappointing and banal. However, the moon's behavior hasn't changed and she still provides us with the same attributes as mentioned above. Even though she doesn't have water, she does affect the water on the earth through her gravitational pull on the oceans, which causes the tides.

What this shows is this instance, is that the idea of the moon has changed dramatically whereas the moon itself has not. Obviously this is not true for all objects as they too are capable of change particularly when the object is a living creature, a class or group of people. Hegel abstracted the reality of our functioning into a dialectic system. He explains his process as follows:

In this connection there is a moment in the process just mentioned which must be brought out more clearly, for through it a new light will be thrown on the exposition which follows. Consciousness knows *something*; this object is the essence or the *in-itself*; but it is also for consciousness the in-itself. This is where the ambiguity of this truth enters. We see that consciousness now has two objects: one is the first *in-itself*, the second is the *being-for-consciousness of this in-itself*. The latter appears at first sight to be merely the reflection of consciousness into itself, i.e. what consciousness has in mind is not an object, but only its knowledge of that first object. But, as was shown previously, the first object, in being known, is altered for consciousness; it ceases to be the in-itself, and becomes something that is the *in-itself* only *for consciousness*. And this then is the True : the being-for-consciousness of this in-itself. Or, in other words, this is the *essence*, or the *object* of consciousness. This new object contains the nothingness of the first, it is what experience has made of it.⁵²

In the passage Hegel explains how consciousness knows something, in other words an object is perceived. The idea, which Hegel calls another "object" thus establishing the object/idea duality, one is perceived with the senses and the other perceived with the mind. The great aspect of Hegel's identification of this duality is that he regards the idea as another object, which means that he does not identify with the idea but gives it an objectivity of its own. This is quite a breakthrough in not only philosophy

⁵²HEGEL G W F, *Phenomenology of Spirit*, Oxford University Press Translated by A. V. Miller, 1977, ISBN 0-19-824597-1, page 55

but in the psychology of human functioning. Jung described Hegel's philosophy as a form a psychology as the following shows:

The victory of Hegel over Kant dealt the gravest blow to reason and to the further development of the German and, ultimately, of the European mind, all the more dangerous as Hegel was a psychologist in disguise who projected great truths out of the subjective sphere into a cosmos he himself had created. We know how far Hegel's influence extends today. The forces compensating this calamitous development personified themselves partly in the later Schelling, partly in Schopenhauer and Carus, while on the other hand that unbridled "bacchantic God" whom Hegel had already scented in nature finally burst upon us in Nietzsche.⁵³

In the following passages Hegel identifies the two sides of our nature. The first physical world of objects, the second the world of ideas and their source as "subjective reflection", "as its negative" and from "something dark and beyond", meaning the unconscious. He firmly places the ego, the individual perceiving both object and idea as independent from either which Plato alluded to centuries ago.

414. The self-identity of the mind, thus first made explicit as the Ego, is only its abstract formal identity. As *soul* it was under the phase of *substantial* universality; now, as subjective reflection in itself, it is referred to this substantiality as to its negative, something dark and beyond it. Hence consciousness, like reciprocal dependence in general, is the contradiction between the independence of the two sides and their identity in which they are merged into one. The mind as ego is *essence*; but since reality, in the sphere of essence, is represented as in immediate being and at the same time as "ideal," it is as consciousness only the *appearance* (phenomenon) of mind.⁵⁴

Hegel identifies the synthesis of both sides and the central position between them.

415. As the ego is by itself only a formal identity, the dialectical movement of its intelligible unity, i.e. the successive steps in further specification of consciousness, does not to it seem to be its own activity, but is implicit, and to the ego it seems an alteration of the object. Consciousness consequently appears differently modified according to the difference of the given object; and the gradual specification of consciousness appears as a variation in the characteristics of its objects. Ego, the subject of consciousness, is thinking: the logical process of

⁵³ JUNG C G, *The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche*, Routledge London, 1969, ISBN 0-415-06581-X, page 169

⁵⁴ HEGEL G W F, *Philosophy of Mind, B. Phenomenon of Mind and Consciousness*, Oxford University Press 1990, page 155

modifying the object is what is identical in subject and object, their absolute interdependence, what makes the object the subject's own.⁵⁵

This unity that Hegel speaks of is the same unity that Jung calls the Self. It is the central position between the physical world of objects and the unconscious world of ideas. Objectification of the unconscious is by no means an easy task as all things in the mind feel like they are not only created, but belong to the individual. This is why dreams are so important in any kind of exploration of this realm. This is because we are not conscious when we dream while asleep and have very little say in what occurs in each dream. Dreams do however change when they are studied, as they tend to reflect or comment on one's conscious life.

Having established Hegel's dialectic, I now turn to how Marx might have interpreted this understanding of human nature. The opposites that Marx identified were the working class and the ruling class. He sided with the working class and his idea that one side exploited the other. This may have been the case but his idea to remove the exploiter and give power to the exploited is based on one side usurping the other and becoming a providing state. This controlling entity as we have shown is Marx's idea of an all-providing mother.

If we give all sides anthropomorphic qualities we can see that Marx wished to elevate the ideal mother to controlling status over the exploiting father. This shows that Marx did not understand the Hegelian dialectic as the removal of one side for the sake of the other does not lead to a unity of personality, or in this case, unity of society. There can be no synthesis of the opposites if one side simply conquers the other. For unity, both sides require acknowledgement and finding the aspects that bring them together in a common understanding. This is probably why Communism has to be enforced with physical violence and fear because it is an unnatural and one-sided way to organise society and is the same as organising one's personality to the idea of a mother and rejecting the father.

One crucial aspect of Hegel's thought that Marx and Engels did not understand is the evolution of humanity towards consciousness and freedom of thought.

The History of the world is none other than the progress of the consciousness of Freedom; a progress whose development according to the necessity of its nature, it is our business to investigate.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Ibid

⁵⁶ HEGEL G. W. F., *The Philosophy of History*, Batoche Books, 2001, page 33

Hegel rightly identifies the slow but inevitable progression of humanity from slavery, oppression and unconsciousness to consciousness of freedom. To be aware of one's functioning is to be truly free. The same applies to our physical existence, as the stifling of free thought is as bad as the stifling of our liberty in the world, as one is the reflection of the other. The Communist ideal wishes to unite workers and form a state to take control of the population, seize the ruling class property, redistribute wealth and reorganise society, which usurps the will and freedom of some of the people.

e. Materialism and Idealism

Another way to look at the Communist ideal is in the light of the opposites of Materialism and Idealism. Marx studied a materialistic conception of history and obviously came to the conclusion that the physical well being of the lower classes throughout history is littered with oppression, coercion, violence and death. Indeed, our history is full of conquering and conquered nations and communities. Slavery was prevalent for thousands of years and only in the last few centuries has it been abolished in the west.

No one can argue that the abolition of slavery isn't a good outcome. Marx knew this but regarded the lower classes still being exploited and abused by the ruling classes. Indeed they were, but equality was evolving. It was a big and positive step to abolish slavery, but the biggest difference between slavery and paid work is however, choice. A slave has no choice and freedom of expression or the ability to free themselves from the oppression. Paid work however has a choice attached to it. If the work is unsuitable and one has the feeling of being exploited, the choice to quit and find alternative employment is possible. What I am trying to show is that human nature and the way societies are organised has made great leaps to liberate the individual from slavery to freedom. It is a slow evolution and liberation of the individual from potential oppressors in our liberal⁵⁷ oriented western democracies.

In these cultures we still have the choice to move from employer to employer, and make one's own mistakes and employment opportunities and even start our own businesses so that we can be our own boss.⁵⁸ Spargo breaks down Marx's philosophy in the following:

⁵⁷ I use the term liberal in its original sense. Derived from 'Liber' meaning 'free man'. Willing to respect and accept the behaviour or opinions of others different from one's own and open to new ideas.

⁵⁸ Running one's own business still has authorities such as government regulators, insurance companies and so on, that oversees the operation of the business.

Thus we have three distinct, but correlated, discoveries, which together form the body of the Marxian philosophy. First, the materialistic conception of history; second, the role of class struggles in social evolution; third, surplus value as the explanation of the struggle of the classes in present society, and the cause of that expansion of capitalism which must inevitably lead to another form of social organization.⁵⁹

In the above Spargo details the materialistic conception of history and the struggle of the lower class with the ruling class in social evolution and finally, the expansion of capital, which must lead to a new social organisation. His analysis is quite right in that humanity has evolved from ruler and slave to ruler and employee. The one factor that is not mentioned is the slow freeing of the individual in this evolution. To continue this evolution one would expect that the individual attain more and more freedom and choice of either employment or the freedom to pursue one's own livelihood. Unfortunately, as I shall show below, every Communist experiment is far from freeing the individual and full of horror, coercion, fear and mass murder.

Marx was indeed an idealist in that he envisaged a utopian organisation of society where all people are treated equally, resources are distributed equally, and with no ruling class exploiting the lower class. His idealism was pointed at the materialistic (physical wellbeing) aspects of society. In other words, his thinking, studiousness and insight were at the service of the ideal of a utopian society.

Materialism is by definition related to its root word 'matter' which in turn is the root word of 'mother'. Matter equals mother as in Mother Nature, mother earth and the original container of all life. The father on the other hand is equated with the spirit, insight, reason and a determinism that leads to a deity we often call god.

f. The Idealised Mother and Father

The ideal of a mother has many permutations. The ancient Greek myths had several characters including Gaia as a personification of the earth and Demeter as a personification of the fertile and cultivated soil. The general consensus is that the word Demeter derives from 'De', meaning earth and 'meter' meaning mother. Demeter was also regarded as the goddess of fruits, corn and the riches of the fields. In short, Demeter was an agricultural mother goddess.⁶⁰ Other depictions of the mother in

⁵⁹ SPARGO J., Karl Marx, His Life and Works, The National Labour Press Ltd. 1910, page 329

⁶⁰ LAROUSSE, New Encyclopedia of Mythology, Hamlyn Publishing, 1968, ISBN 0-600-02351-6, page 150

purified form include Isis from ancient Egyptian mythology and the Virgin Mary and the mother of god from the Christian tradition.

Carl Jung in his book *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious* gives an excellent overview of what he calls the 'Mother Archetype'.

The qualities associated with it are maternal solicitude and sympathy; the magic authority of the female; the wisdom and spiritual exaltation that transcend reason; any helpful instinct or impulse; all that is benign, all that cherishes and sustains, that fosters growth and fertility. The place of magic transformation and rebirth, together with the underworld and its inhabitants, are presided over by the mother. On the negative side the mother archetype may connote anything secret, hidden, dark; the abyss, the world of the dead, anything that devours, seduces, and poisons, that is terrifying and inescapable like fate.⁶¹

Notice that he uses the term 'it' when describing the mother archetype. This is intentional as in its pure form the inner character is not a person but an elemental force and personification of one aspect of our instinctual foundation. This instinctual foundation is common to all people and therefore has a collective nature that exerts an influence on each individual. As mentioned previously, when viewed in the individual, the inner character is seldom pure and appears contaminated by other archetypes and a personal orientation. These archetypes have such an elemental force upon us and can possess the individual to such an extent that all other ideals and characters are excluded from the personality. In this case an ideal such as Communism can dominate an individual's life's work, to the exclusion of all other concerns, even physical well-being as in the case of Marx.

Marx's father Heinrich also encouraged and loved his son as did his mother. This is where inner characters become complex, in that inner characters work in everyone. In this case Heinrich's loving and supportive nature can be regarded as a mother's expression in the man. There is little to no information on Heinrich's mother although he did come from a long line of Jewish rabbis and therefore had a strong spiritual orientation in the family. Being a practical down to earth man, he regarded adaption more important than loyalty to his heritage and renounced his Jewish religion for Protestantism. Karl however, did not listen to his parents' concern over his lack of practicality and adaption, and followed his own daimon.

⁶¹ JUNG C G, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969, ISBN 7100-6295-8, page 82

In addition to the biography on Marx, John Spargo also wrote a book called *Socialism and Motherhood*.⁶² In it he makes the very important connection between the ideal of a socialist system and the behaviour of an idealised mother. Before proceeding I need to emphasise the difference between the idea of a mother or father and an actual mother and father. The latter very seldom appears in pure form as humans by nature have many gender influences governing their personalities.⁶³ For example, in the case of Marx, his idea of how a mother should behave was different to how his actual mother did behave. Although she regarded herself as 'motherly' she had enough common sense as an individual, not to encourage her sons dependence on her financially and emotionally. When she balked at living out her son's ideal, their relationship became negative.

The complicated nature of inner character is born out of the fact that these characters can exert an influence on our personality regardless of gender. In the case of Marx, his father was as supportive of him as his mother until they realised that their son was not adapting to the world, supporting his own family and stirring up trouble wherever he went. Both parents regarded him as the 'fortune child' early in his schooling but later lamented at his inability to be practical, even recognising his early possession by an inner character as his father calls it the 'demon' of revolt.

Towards the end of Heinrich's life, he lamented his son's inability to be practical and adaptive to his contemporary political situation. Instead, Karl became openly hostile and revolutionary towards the political establishment, causing him much anguish, which in the end left him stateless. It appears from what was written at the time that Karl openly and vehemently opposed the current political and economic system and rejected any thought of adapting to the world as his father had wished him to do.

In *Socialism and Motherhood*, Spargo spells out the whole nature of the ideal state leaning towards the mother.

It is not difficult for the mother to understand how common ownership of the means of production can be combined with private ownership in consumption goods in social economy. Every mother can see that the principle is the same as that which governs the home. The ideal home is, indeed, only a microcosm of the ideal state. In the well regulated home there equal care for the collective interest of the family as a whole and

⁶² SPARGO J., *Socialism and Motherhood*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1914

⁶³ In rare cases an inner character can possess and consume an individual's personality to the highest extent. This is however, not the norm.

for the individual interest of each member. The comfort and advantage of each individual member of the family depends upon the denial of the power to monopolize many things in the home, and maintaining them as the common property of all the members. No one member can assert and exercise a right to the sole ownership and control of these things without injuring every other member of the family. On the other hand, there are many things, which must be regarded as belonging to individual members, if harmony is to prevail.

Every mother sees this and comprehends the philosophy of distribution upon which it is based. If there are things that are essential to the welfare and happiness of all the members of the family, the control of which by a single member would give that member a power to rule all the rest, and to deny them comfort and happiness except upon irksome and humiliating conditions, the safety of the family is only assured by making those things common to all.

Socialism, then, is an attempt to realise in the larger life of the community that rational and fair adjustment of collective and individual power and responsibility, which is exemplified by the family at its best. And to the mother-genius with its full understanding of family life Socialism may well bear its programme, confident of a sympathetic understanding.⁶⁴

The problem with such an attitude is that it views the home as a collective ideal. "Its not difficult for the mother to understand" and "every mother can see" shows that Spargo views motherhood is idealised rather than seeing the reality of an individual woman who happens to be a mother. In other words, the idea of a mother is more important than a real mother with a definite personality. His ideal is that of all encompassing love, equality, well regulated, denial of power, common property/sharing, the mother/genius and understanding. He does however; give a small concession to things belonging to the individual for the sake of harmony.

We can see the same problem with Marx's idea of a mother. In his case he felt that his mother should take care of him financially far beyond the typical age range for such a dependency. In addition, he built his whole life around this idealised inner character of a mother to the point where his intellect served that inner character. This is a form of possession as mentioned previously, which dominated and lasted his whole life and supported by his own wife. The Manifesto itself, hints at Marx's idea of the mother when he uses Christianity in his argument:

Nothing is easier than to give Christian asceticism a Socialist tinge. Has not Christianity declaimed against private property, against marriage,

⁶⁴ SPARGO J., *Socialism and Motherhood*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1914, pages 52 to 54

against the State? Has it not preached in the place of these, charity and poverty, celibacy and mortification of the flesh, monastic life and Mother Church?⁶⁵

Marx's personal father represented adaptation to the status quo; sensible, balanced and practical income management; and disdain for his son's revolutionary inclination. All these characteristics seem to have been rejected by Marx either consciously or unconsciously. His use of the Christian ethic for his argument against private property, marriage and state shows that he may have lived a life of poverty on purpose but when it became critical, his instinct for survival activated and he lied and begged his way out of his difficulties. His adaptation to the status quo was disastrous and he was exiled from several countries only to end up in London as a stateless individual.

So far I have not mentioned much about Engels due to the fact that Marx was the leading proponent in their work. As mentioned previously, Engels came from a wealthy family where his father owned textile mills. His father was a strong willed and tough man and expected his son to adapt to his privilege and business concerns. Engel's was groomed to take over the family business but was very resistant to the idea except for periods where he needed to support himself. As a consequence he came to resent his father and became more devoted to his mother who softened and maintained the relationship between them.⁶⁶ In this respect, Engel's attitude was more balanced than Marx's and still honoured his father's authority to work in the family business and earn a living.

g. The Positive and Negative Aspects of the Archetypes

I. The Mother

The archetypes or inner characters present themselves in a myriad of differing images and manifestations. For example, the purified mother such as Isis and the Virgin Mary have dispensed the human aspects of power, revenge, jealousy and so on, and lean towards an all good and loving nature. The mother archetype of ancient Greece such as Demeter and her daughter Persephone are still down to earth and closer to nature, in that Demeter is the archetype of the soil and cultivation of the earth. Persephone goes even deeper into the earth and the underworld being abducted by Hades.

⁶⁵ MARX, KARL & ENGELS, FREDERICK, *The Communist Manifesto*, Published Online by the Socialist Labor Party of America, 2006, page 28

⁶⁶ <https://www.britannica.com/biography/Friedrich-Engels>

Demeter can best be described as a personification of the natural planting, cultivation and growth of crops. She is the idea of agriculture. She was impregnated by the sun god Zeus and gave birth to Persephone who was abducted by Hades, taken to the underworld only to return each spring. In other words, the union of Demeter (cultivate earth) and Zeus (sun) resulted in the seed (Persephone) which is planted under the surface of the soil which nurtures it (cultivated and watered with love) by Demeter and taken to the underworld (grows roots) only to return in Spring with her maidenly beauty and value as new life (new shoots striving for the sunlight), sustenance and nourishment. When sufficiently matured the crop is harvested causing Persephone to return to the underworld, the cycle complete for her return next season.

The purified positive mother is the personification of the idea of mother removed from the gross aspects of our physical humanity. It provides spiritual food in the form of unconditional love and understanding, and a purified life void of intrigue and negative emotion and sacrificing her own needs for her children or those in her care. The earth mother on the other hand, provides sustenance for our bodies and includes how the earth takes the seed which then seeks the sun and light from the darkness of the soil. Other positive symbols of the mother include the longing for redemption such as Paradise, the Kingdom of God, Heavenly Jerusalem, Valhalla, the mother church, and as Marx puts it, caves, large organisations that contain their patrons such as universities, city or country, earth as noted above, the ocean and sea, matter and the moon, to name only a few.

The negative aspects of the mother archetype are also numerous. They include the witch, the dragon, the gorgon, a sphinx, the succubus, the whale, any large devouring and entwining animal. Other symbols include the grave, deep water, death, nightmares and so on. The characteristics of the negative mother archetype are the will to power, control of people, sucking the life out of people, selfish, exploiting as Marx notes it, and other negative emotions. The three essential aspects of the whole mother archetype are "her cherishing and nourishing goodness, her orgiastic emotionality and her Stygian depths".⁶⁷

II. The Father

Like the Mother archetype, the father also displays varying qualities that can be considered positive and negative. The mythological and historical depictions of the father vary from characters that have power and wield it

⁶⁷ JUNG C G, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969, ISBN 7100-6295-8, pages 81 & 82

to those that display unconditional love. These include characters such as Uranus, Cronus and Zeus from Greek mythology that were a family of descendants, that is, grandfather, father and son from Zeus's point of view. Zeus's characteristics depict a strong father figure with power and wisdom but not without emotion and could be quick to anger and sexually lascivious. Although Zeus is a particular idea of the father archetype, he was a well-rounded idea as he displayed many physical human traits of emotion and sexual interests. He was therefore just as much influenced by his power and wisdom as his physical traits of emotion and sexual instinct.

Another example of the idea of a father is the Old Testament prophet Moses and his relationship to his father Yahweh. We can see a development and differentiation of this archetype away from the physical and earthly of Zeus, towards a purely psychic phenomenon. This is present from the very beginning where Yahweh chooses animal husbandry over agriculture in the story Cain and Able. Agriculture fixes a people to one spot and a dependence on that land, (anchored to the earth) whereas animals can be taken along on the journey and graze wherever there is grass. The father of Moses like Zeus was powerful and wise and like Zeus was also quick to anger, jealous and murderous. Unlike Zeus however, there is no hint of sexual proclivity.

The differentiation of the idea of father is further developed in the Christian tradition with the birth of a pure and untainted son from an uncorrupted mother. Here we see the complete disconnection of the sexual instinct from the father making him a purely psychic phenomenon. All negative emotion of jealousy, hate, greed and so on are denied and only the positive emotions such as love, acceptance and generosity etc., are acknowledged and expressed. The sexual instinct is removed from the idea of father as well as the son.⁶⁸

The negative aspects of the idealised father are therefore negative emotions such as cruelty, jealousy, vindictiveness, hate etc., and attributes such as power for power's sake, dogmatism, murderousness, sexual lasciviousness and so on. The positive aspects are love, acceptance, generosity, forgiveness, inspiration and so on. Before proceeding to the relationship between the mother and father archetype, I should point out that these characters never appear or behave in a purely one-sided way. There is always a cross contamination between the

⁶⁸ It should be noted that the idea of a pure son and father beyond the corruption of earthly desire is exactly that, an idea. I say this because the historical documents such as the Gospel of Judas excluded from the Bible states that Jesus often kissed Mary Magdalene on the mouth. This contradicts the purity of the son of god as depicted in the Bible. The idea of a pure and uncorrupted son of god was a more important idea to the other apostles than historical accuracy.

idealised pair and how they interact with each other, which varies their behaviour as it does in the human being. For every pure and good God, there has to be an equal and opposite Devil.

III. Mother and Father

Zeus was married to Hera who was very jealous of his sexual exploits, so much so that on one occasion she disguised herself and appeared before Zeus's lover Semele. Hera suggested to Semele to ask Zeus to appear before her in all his majesty and glory, knowing that no mortal could view a god without perishing. Semele asked Zeus and he reluctantly appeared before her and she indeed perished, consumed by his celestial flames. Before her death, Zeus removed the baby she had in her womb and placed him into his own thigh until his birth as his son Dionysus.⁶⁹

We can see from this interaction that Hera as wife of Zeus, exacted vengeance over his lovers and their offspring, as she could not overcome his philandering due to his power and took her anguish out on his lovers. We can see that not only Zeus but also his wife Hera had perfectly human reactions to differing scenarios. Jealousy, vengeance, retribution etc., are all fully embraced and acted upon.

The ancient Egyptian myth of Osiris and Isis shows a movement towards the good spirit in their interactions and behaviour. Osiris is a good king, and his sister wife Isis, a loving and accepting mother. Horus their son is a good prince. All that is negative in the myth is concentrated in the character of Set who is the brother of Osiris. Set is jealous of Osiris and wants his position and wealth. He tricks him into a trunk and casts him into the river and later dismembered by Set. Isis and her son Horus forgive Set and do nothing to harm him. They find all the pieces of Osiris except for his penis, which was eaten by a fish. They put Osiris back together again and fashion a penis out of gold.⁷⁰ Having been transformed, Osiris could now ascend to the realm of the gods with the help of Isis and Horus.

The parallels between the Egyptian myth of Osiris and the Christian life of Jesus are unmistakable. Once again, we have an all-good father figure who begets an all-good son from and all good mother without the bestial act of procreation. Evil is constellated in the Devil who Jesus overcomes and everyone loves his good nature. Jesus lets himself be tortured and sacrificed, resurrects and ascends to his place in heaven.

⁶⁹ LAROUSSE, *New Encyclopedia of Mythology*, Hamlyn Publishing, 1968, ISBN 0-600-02351-6, page 105

⁷⁰ PIOTR O. Scholz (2001). *Eunuchs and castrati: a cultural history*. Markus Wiener Publishers. p. 32

After this short detour into the ideas of mother and father we can now apply this knowledge to the idea of Communism. The life of Marx shows that his parents were very supportive and loving but lamented his rebellious and combative attitude. Marx's atheism shows that his idea of a father was weak or rejected, but his idea of a mother very strong. His loving and accepting wife also reinforced this, even though they lived in poverty at times. His attitudes to the practical matters of life, unlike his personal father, were weak and rejected. Engels too had leanings towards the mother although his rejection of the father and all that he represented was not as extreme as Marx.

It is clear that Marx was to some extent possessed by the idea of an all-loving and providing mother who did not differentiate between ability and orientation and provided for her children in equal share. The idea of a great mother such as that has a very stabilising and nurturing feeling and can possess an individual to mould their whole life to suit the ideal. Marx did indeed; sacrifice his whole life to this ideal. If we look at the idea of mother in its chthonic or down-to-earth sense, we can see her loving and caring nature combined with a brutality and horror of the 'will to power' and survival. Had he considered an equal and opposite ideal of a father, he may have balanced his attitude and realised that there are many permutations of the archetypes and how they behave. The positive aspect of the mother archetype is to love and care for her children equally. The negative aspect is to keep her children attached, dependent and subservient. This is exactly how the idea of communism plays itself out in the world, as we shall see in the next section.

h. Historical Reflections

The mother archetype shows herself in many forms as discussed above. As an aspect of nature, and indeed, our nature she never exists in positive form alone. Her loving and caring side, is always accompanied by her 'will to power', brutality and urge for destruction. If we only see her positive aspects as illustrated by Isis and Mary, we neglect to see her dark side as illustrated by Hera, a more realistic depiction and the witch, Gorgon, Sphinx and other negative depictions.

In contrast to Spargo's idea of motherhood and Communism, the reality of a state that adopts such a system is far from the benevolent idea of an all-loving mother.

Ask the thoughtful mother why she hates war and militarism, and she will answer: " I am a woman-a mother. All the strength and pride of men which war has disfigured, maimed and slaughtered upon all the battlefields of history have been carried beneath the hearts of mothers

who dreamed of joyous and beautiful lives for their sons. We, the mothers of the race, have been most despoiled by war: we have paid the supreme forfeit. The lives blotted out in the bloody mists of war have all been conceived in our wombs and nursed at our breasts. The lives broken and marred by war have all been blood of our blood, bone of our bone, flesh of our flesh. Why, then, should we mothers do aught but hate war and love peace?"⁷¹

The abolition of war! What an inspiration to believe that this great international movement will make real the sublime vision of universal peace! That the genius of mankind, inspired by the Socialist ideal, will forge into tools of peaceful industry the cruel weapons of destruction! That never again shall vultures prey upon bloody corpse-strewn battlefields..... This, then, is the programme of Socialism. That it makes a powerful appeal to the mother-instinct cannot be denied.⁷²

SOCIALISM is most fittingly symbolized by the twofold character of the Spirit of Motherhood.⁷³

The problem with the above is its rosy outlook of human nature. The reality of women with strong maternal instincts is that it often becomes dominating and ruthless in its enforcement. She cares for people so that they love her and are dependent on her. Jung puts it simply:

The exaggeration of the feminine side means an intensification of all female instincts, above all the maternal instinct. The negative aspect is seen in the woman whose only goal is childbirth. To her the husband is obviously of secondary importance; he is first and foremost the instrument of procreation, and she regards him merely as an object to be looked after, a long with children, poor relations, cats, dogs, and household furniture. Even her own personality is of secondary importance; she often remains entirely unconscious of it, for her life is lived in and through others, in more or less complete identification with all the objects of her care.⁷⁴

The same is true when a state adopts such an ideal. The manifesto goes into great detail to give ultimate power to the state as carer and distributor of resources and a usurper of individual rights. To achieve this goal requires the abolition of property ownership, inheritance rights, nationalisation of banking, instruments of production, communication and transport, equal obligation of all to labour and the abolition of distinction between town and country. As with the negative aspect of the mother, the

⁷¹ SPARGO J., *Socialism and Motherhood*, B. W. Huebsch, New York, 1914, page 63

⁷² *Ibid*, page 67

⁷³ *Ibid*, page 126

⁷⁴ JUNG C G, *Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious*, Routledge and Kegan Paul 1969, ISBN 7100-6295-8, pages 87 & 88

state takes control over the individual and all aspects of the lives of those she cares for.

Further to these controls are the abolition of religious beliefs, the family unit, freedom of speech and expression, and a ruthless crackdown on all opposition. This is not mere idle speculation for we have numerous examples of state run campaigns to remove the influence of religion, family and individual rights.

I. The Russian Revolution of 1917

In 1905 civil unrest broke out due to mismanagement by Tsar Nicholas II and the Romanov Family, who were the wealthiest family in the world at that time. The mismanagement came to a head during World War I when the Russian army suffered multiple defeats and poor conditions. Nicholas was held responsible for the losses and food shortages caused by runaway inflation due to unbridled money printing to finance the war. After the 1905 uprising and the day called 'Bloody Sunday' where hundreds of unarmed protestors were shot by Nicholas's troops, a general strike occurred which paralysed the country. Nicholas tried to placate the uprising with a manifesto establishing a democratically elected parliament.

The Russian Revolution began in 1917 with the fall of the Monarchy, the House of Romanov and ended in 1923 with the establishment of the Bolshevik Government. The revolution was in two parts. The first in February 1917 where the Russian military mutinied, leading to members of the Russian parliament assuming control and forming the Russian Provisional Government. The interests of the presiding capitalists and nobility dominated the newly formed government.

This period was marred by political chaos and cultural upheaval, which led to the second part of the revolution in October 1917 led by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks controlled workers militias and created the Red Guards, which later became the Red army. With this army they led an armed insurrection and overthrew the provisional government and formed the world's first socialist state. The Bolsheviks then formed a secret police called the Cheka to remove dissidents and anyone who opposed their agenda.

Liberal and monarchist forces formed the 'White Army' and went to war with the Bolshevik's 'Red Army' in 1918, resulting in what is known as the Russian Civil War.⁷⁵ The White Army was supported by the United

⁷⁵ "Allied War in Russia, 1918-22". www.criticalenquiry.org.

Kingdom, France, Japan and the United States⁷⁶, at the same time as the Bolsheviks were being funded by Wall Street bankers such as Schiff, Warburg, Rockefeller, Harriman and Morgan and the Rothschilds.⁷⁷ All this because the Tsar refused to allow the establishment of a central bank in Russia

The civil war was eventually won by the Bolsheviks and in the first year most industry was nationalised. Private ownership of urban real estate and inheritance was abolished and the state became the sole owner of the productive and income-yielding assets. A gigantic bureaucracy known as the Supreme Council of the National Economy managed the wealth and income. In addition, ordinary citizens lost their life savings, private trade was forbidden and the citizens were required to work whenever ordered. Bread and other foods were scarce as the producers of agriculture were unwilling to sell their produce at the depreciated rates. Lenin tried to resolve the food shortages by ordering the peasants to surrender all surplus grain to the state at prices that did not reflect its worth. The army forcibly extracted food from the villages and established political bases in the countryside to counteract the resulting peasant resistance.

The Bolsheviks became increasingly unpopular and Lenin had the whole Romanov family including the Tsar executed. The formal 'Red Terror' began in September 1918 after an attempted murder of Lenin. The Cheka carried out mass executions of political opponents and others with an estimated 140,000 people killed.⁷⁸ The Civil war and confiscation of grain and other foods also led to a general famine with an estimated 10 to 30 million lives lost.

The Bolshevik Communists also attacked culture; education and religion, which they regarded as antithetical to their cause and heavily censored publications. They did, however give some freedom for creative expression as long as it didn't challenge their authority. This was to gain support from intellectuals and artists and was supported by an artistic group called the Futurists. The education system was reformed to reflect the Communist ideals and all courses that were deemed subversive were dropped.

The Bolshevik Communists were predominately atheistic and regarded religion as a superstition. They nationalised church property, outlawed religious instruction and collecting dues. This left the church

⁷⁶ It seems that the United States bankers were playing both sides.

⁷⁷ MULLINS. Eustace, *The World Order, Our Secret Rulers*, Ezra Pound Institute of Civilization, 1992, page 65

⁷⁸ <https://www.britannica.com/place/Soviet-Union/Brest-Litovsk>

establishment destitute and the state mounted a campaign to discredit religious belief.⁷⁹

As we have shown above, Marx did not condone violent revolution and had warm feelings towards religious belief. The idea of a mother taking care of her children equally seems to have been lost by the Bolsheviks who seem to have been vehemently possessed by the idea of such a system that their brutality, murderous nature and lust for power overtook their common sense and kindness, all to serve their central ideal of an all-providing state.

II. China and Mao Zedong

Unlike Lenin who controlled workers' militias, Mao led a few hundred peasants and formed the military arm of the CCP (Chinese Communist Party) and the Red Army to fight against the established government of Chiang Kai-shek. The peasants were already rising up against Chiang, which gave Mao the opportunity to consolidate power, and eventually defeated the government and gained control of the country.

During the years 1930 to 1935, Mao consolidated his influence as a figurehead of the CCP. The rise of Japan in 1935-36 and a congress in Moscow proclaimed the principle of an antifascist front where the Communists considered an allegiance with the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek. The third threat of Japanese subjugation united the CCP with the Nationalists in a formal agreement 1937. To alleviate the threat posed by the Japanese, the red army was broken up into smaller guerrilla units, which enabled the CCP to expand military control and establish an effective grassroots political control over the population.

During this period between 1936-40, Mao studied Soviet writings on philosophy and produced his own account of dialectical materialism with two publications entitled 'On Practice' and 'On Contradiction'. Other works included his own experience of revolution and how it should be carried forward with a united front and allegiance with the Nationalists. By 1940 the situation had however changed, and Mao argued that a Chinese revolt was part of a world wide proletarian revolution directed against imperialism.

In 1943 Mao became chairman of the Secretariat and of the Political Bureau. During this time the Soviet arm of the CCP was purged and a civil war began with the nationalists. The Red army became the People's Liberation Army and led the communists to take over power in China in

⁷⁹ Ibid

1949. Mao signed a treaty with Stalin and found them dragged into a war in North Korea against the west.

In 1958, Mao instituted several reforms, notably the 'Great Leap Forward' and the 'Cultural Revolution' in which he toured the country and stamped out dissent. The agricultural lands became centrally controlled and production briefly soared. Urban populations swelled and further collectivisation and the stagnation of the farming industry led to major grain shortages and famine with an estimated death toll of 15 to 40 million individuals. To add to this tragedy, Mao created labour camps for so-called 'enemies of the people' where torture and executions become routine.⁸⁰

Like the Bolsheviks, Mao's Cultural Revolution became brutal and murderous and persecuted those that did not agree with the ideal of communism and the collectivisation and centralisation of all facets of the economy at the expense of individuals' human rights. Once again, possession by an idea or archetype at the expense of one's kinder and compassionate side emphasises the danger of possession of this kind. As mentioned previously, possession by this inner force and the struggle over our human nature, is a personal struggle not to be projected onto the world at large. This shows how important it is to be on occasion introspective, particularly for those oriented towards the world as extraverts.

III. Cambodia and Cuba

Khmer Rouge is the popular name given to members of the Communist party of Kampuchea (CPK), which ruled Cambodia between 1975 and 1979. The Khmer Rouge grew in power in the jungles of eastern Cambodia supported by the North Vietnamese army, the Viet Cong, the Pathet Lao and the Communist party of China. They fought against the then current pro-American Khmer Republic and overthrew the government in 1975. Their leader Pol Pot believed in social engineering similar to China's 'Great Leap Forward' and attempted agricultural reform and collectivisation, which once again resulted in widespread famine.

Like China, they too murdered hundreds of thousands political opponents and racial minorities. Ultimately 25%, some 1.5 to 2 million of Cambodia's population was murdered through famine, torture and execution. Along with persecution of dissenting voices, the atheistic Khmer Rouge also persecuted religious institutions although they had some tolerance for Buddhism even though 25,000 monks were killed by the regime. In

⁸⁰https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Crimes_against_humanity_under_communist_regimes?wprov=srpw1_0

addition the Khmer Rouge wanted to erase all traces of its imperialist past, and education came to a virtual standstill. Intellectuals, artists, creative individuals and religious leaders were executed.

Cuba was taken over by the Spanish after Christopher Columbus and his fleet arrived. It remained under Spanish rule until the Spanish American War in 1898 and remained under US military rule until it gained independence in 1902. The government was marred by corruption and the dictator Fulgencio Batista was overthrown in the Cuban Revolution in 1959 by Fidel Castro, Che Guevara and Raul Castro. The new government aligned with the Soviet Union and embraced atheistic Communism.

Castro ruled Cuba as a Communist nation until 2006 when his brother Raul took over the leadership and Cuba remains a Communist state till this day. There were no mass killings or famine to speak of, but the Communists did take over the country by force in what is called the Cuban Revolution. Like other Communist regimes, all means of production was nationalised and Cuba became somewhat stagnant in its cultural and technological development. It seems that the idea of an all-providing state (mother) was a little kinder than other Communist regimes.

i. Centralised Government as an Idea of Unity

One of the major failures in the Communistic ideal is the all-pervading necessity to control all means of production and centralise all decision-making. This failure led to either intentional or accidental famine, which killed millions of individuals. Rather than allow local markets and the natural laws of supply and demand to co-ordinate agriculture, the Communists tried to manage it by an overarching and bloated bureaucracy that in most cases had no ability to manage agriculture.

In addition, the Communists did not take heed of the wisdom of ancient stories such as Joseph in the Five Books of Moses recommending to the Pharaoh the storage of grain in times of bounty to avoid famine in the times of drought. It is this blatant 'will to power' and disregard for human nature, life and the way humans exchange goods and services and their natural urge for independence that will see all Communist States fall as it did in Russia. A state cannot exist if its leaders are so inflated and insecure of their own power that they must destroy all opposition and believe they can control every aspect of its people's life when they can't even control their own murderous impulses.

Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were kindred spirits and had an ideal that they dedicated their whole lives' to. Their ideal is based on their own

personal interpretation of the inner character (archetype) of an all-providing mother. On the surface this seems quite reasonable and benign in that a system based on this ideal would take care of all individuals equally and distribute resources equally. Unfortunately the possession by such a character and its constructed ideal is that it makes the conscious practical individual its servant. In other words, what seems like practical materialism and providing material well-being (food, shelter etc.) for a population, it is based on an ideal of an all-providing mother.

In psychological terms, a man would use his conscious power, ruthlessness, murderousness and so on to serve the ideal of an all-providing mother. We can only conclude that individuals such as Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot and so on, were led by this unconscious character, and not in control of their own behaviour and resulted in a ruthless unwavering commitment to the ideal and the exclusion of human kindness, compassion and love. Their possession led to unspeakable atrocities for the sake of holding together a system that they must have regarded as their idea of unity.

The danger of being possessed by an inner character cannot be underestimated. An individual may feel righteous in the idea of liberating a working class from oppression and bringing a balance and reduction of exploitation, but in reality, this seldom happens because to see a real balance one has to see both sides of an argument. The fact that all opposition was removed and the ideal enforced in murderous ways shows that the unity of the ideal was no unity at all. It was purely a possession of one side (Ego) by the other side (unconscious inner character).

Unity requires that both sides are acknowledged and united in the third function, which is exactly the basis of the Hegelian Dialectic, albeit in projected form. For example, if an individual has feelings of compassion for a group of people such as a peasant or working class, then it is noble to want to liberate that group just as it was noble to liberate slaves from their masters. On the other hand, if that feeling to liberate a group dominates the thinking of the individual and they use all their means to preserve those opposites, there can be no synthesis in the third.

It is like an individual has feeling for things that he learned from his mother and wishes to overcome the influence of his father so he can possess and cherish his mother. He will try and remove all threats to that urge to unite with mother which has gripped his personality, with the idea that mother nature (mater, matter, material, the earth) will provide all his needs and he will feel like being in paradise.

All thinking is directed to the earth and practical matters, as that is where Mother Nature resides. Little does he know that Mother Nature also presides in his psyche. Practical thinking (father) is then placed at the service of the urge (mother) to unite with Mother Nature herself. In fact, when seen in this light we can understand the murderous nature of individuals, as Mother Nature can be at once kind and loving as well as cruel and controlling.⁸¹

This is why introspection is an important tool for self-awareness. Had the likes of Lenin or Mao looked at their own behaviour, personal myths and projections, they may have realised that the unity they were seeking did not belong in the physical world of people, but in themselves as psychic functions. For example, as Hegel perceived, a function such as Feeling can only be united with a function such as Thinking by an intermediate function such as Intuition or Sensation.⁸² This is Hegel's thesis/antithesis united in a synthesis.

The Communists regard themselves as atheists but this is far from the truth. The belief in a benevolent and loving father as in the Christian tradition or even a jealous and murderous father as in the Old Testament is as much an inner character (archetype) as it is an idea of an all providing mother based on the physical world of nature. It is the idea of an all-providing Mother Nature that becomes the belief system. To claim to be atheistic is to deny the reality of an alternative worship. Just because you don't worship a father figure, doesn't mean you worship nothing. It simply means you worship something else, and that something else can take many forms. This is why it is important not to identify with your own inner characters and what they produce in the form of ideas, fantasies, dreams and so on. Objectivity of the physical world requires objectivity of the inner world. Communism is an ideal to recreate a childhood environment where we have little responsibility, all our needs are taken care of and we are equal to everyone else.

This ideal destroys creativity, a work ethic, striving, entrepreneurship, individuality and freedom. It is a misinterpretation of a natural process of an individual adapted to the world and all its external activity complimented by inner reflection and personal analysis of inner myth-making characters. This is something that only individuals can explore. It cannot be thrust upon a people as a collective ideal that has to be enforced through fear, violence and murder.

⁸¹ I refer the reader to chapter 5. Ideas of Unity in Psychology, a. Freud S. S. (1856-1939) in my previous work The Idea of Unity, 2018, Archetypal Design, ISBN 978-0-6484039-0-6 page 243

⁸² JUNG C G, Psychological Types, Routledge and Kegan, 1976, ISBN 0-691-01813-8